

VERHANDELINGEN DER KONINKLIJKE NEDERLANDSE
AKADEMIE VAN WETENSCHAPPEN, AFD. LETTERKUNDE
NIEUWE REEKS - DEEL LXXI - No. 1

HOMERIC MODIFICATIONS OF FORMULAIC PROTOTYPES

Studies in the development of Greek epic diction

A. HOEKSTRA

NORTH-HOLLAND PUBLISHING COMPANY

AMSTERDAM - LONDON - 2nd printing 1969

Aan de nagedachtenis van mijn leermeester
P. GROENEBOOM

AANGEBODEN IN DE VERGADERING
VAN 15 JUNI 1964

CONTENTS

PREFACE	5
I. THE FORMULA AND ITS USE AS A CRITERION OF STYLISTIC DEVELOPMENT	7
II. QUANTITATIVE METATHESIS	31
III. INITIAL DIGAMMA	42
A. DECLENSION OF FORMULAE	47
B. CONJUGATION OF FORMULAE	49
C. AN ARCHAIC CONSTITUENT OF A FORMULA IS REPLACED BY A MORE FAMILIAR FORM	53
D. A FORMULA IS SPLIT BY THE INTRODUCTION OF ANOTHER WORD	54
E. A FORMULA IS REMOVED FROM ITS TRADITIONAL POSITION	58
<i>Permutation of P₂ and T₂ formulae</i>	61
IV. N-MOVABLE	71
THE GROWING INCIDENCE OF <i>v</i> -MOVABLE IN EARLY POST-HOMERIC DICTION	75
I. <i>The Hymn to Aphrodite</i>	75
II. <i>Hesiod's Erga and Theogony</i>	83
THE GROWING INCIDENCE OF <i>v</i> -MOVABLE IN HOMERIC AND PRE-HOMERIC DICTION	88
A. DECLENSION OF FORMULAE	88
B. CONJUGATION OF FORMULAE	89
C. AN ARCHAIC CONSTITUENT OF A FORMULA IS REPLACED BY A MORE FAMILIAR FORM	91
D. A FORMULA IS SPLIT BY THE INTRODUCTION OF ANOTHER WORD	94
E. A FORMULA IS REMOVED FROM ITS TRADITIONAL POSITION	100
F. ENJAMBEMENT	101
<i>The behaviour of πᾶω in connection with enjambement</i>	107
<i>The behaviour of Ionic ἀτάξ in connection with enjambement</i>	108
G. MODIFICATION OF A NARRATIVE TYPE OF FORMULA?	110
V. LINGUISTIC, PROSODIC AND STYLISTIC PECULIARITIES RESULTING FROM A CORRESPONDING TREATMENT OF FORMULAIC PROTOTYPES	112
A. DECLENSION OF FORMULAE	112
B. CONJUGATION OF FORMULAE	112
C. AN ARCHAIC CONSTITUENT OF A FORMULA IS REPLACED BY A MORE FAMILIAR FORM	113
D. A FORMULA IS SPLIT BY THE INTRODUCTION OF ANOTHER WORD	114
E. A FORMULA IS REMOVED FROM ITS TRADITIONAL POSITION	116
I. <i>Permutation of P₂ and T₂ formulae</i>	116
II. <i>Indications of other kinds of shifting</i>	120
F. ENJAMBEMENT	121
APPENDIX	124
VI. THE LIMITATIONS OF THE METHOD. INNOVATION AND CONSERVATISM	131
INDEX OF PASSAGES	155
GENERAL INDEX	166
ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA	173

PREFACE

It has never been my intention to write anything like an exhaustive study on the subject in question. Such an undertaking would at least have involved analysing all of Homer's lines and entering the various categories on a card-index. However, I had neither the time, nor the inclination to accomplish this. What fascinated me, were scattered symptoms, which, pieced together, seemed to point to a certain development. Following these tracks has produced a number of chapters, which more or less wrote themselves, and the outcome is a collection of essays rather than a systematic treatise.

The above implies that the work must needs be of a very provisional character. This is also true because of another factor. The fact is that these studies would have been superfluous, if we had possessed sufficient and reliable data on the development of the Greek dialects and their mutual relationship from the Mycenaean period up to the age in which the Homeric epics were created. Since this is not the case, it appeared necessary, in order to sketch what might be called a historical style-morphology, to start from the text we have before us and from this to try and penetrate as far into the past as possible. But this also means that many conclusions, particularly those of chapters IV and VI, are dependent on certain linguistic and prosodic premisses. I hope that in making these premisses I have acted with the circumspection and reserve required. As to Mycenaean: convinced of the fundamental correctness of the decipherment, but sceptical of many an incidental interpretation, I have considered it right to limit the references to cases of which we are absolutely certain or all but certain.

It is self-evident that at the other end of the chain there is a problem which, given the starting-point chosen here, is of far more importance for this study: the unity of Homer. It also stands to reason that I have to confine myself here to stating my position, without dwelling on the pros and cons. This position is: the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are two self-contained wholes; the *Odyssey* was created later, though not much later than the *Iliad*, either by the same or by another poet; both poems undoubtedly contain later additions, but only very few of them can be isolated beyond possible doubt. For the sake of brevity, therefore, the name of Homer has been used for the total of the more than 27800 verses. Such a simplification seemed the more justifiable to me, as here we have to do with the history of a diction. I wish to state explicitly that the following inquiry ignores every *Schichtenanalyse* and that its results are of no value for it whatsoever.

While writing a book like this, one is deeply impressed by the large amount of fruitful work that, long before the conception of an epic diction, was done by generations of scholars (I think of old Immanuel Bekker.

for instance). Of the most recent literature, I only mention two writings, studies that were published shortly before this inquiry was closed: G. S. Kirk's excellent *The Songs of Homer*, and the short, but very important study by J. B. Hainsworth, *The Homeric Formula and the Problem of its Transmission*. My own conclusions, both as to the main lines and in the limited field of the handling of the formula, considerably gravitate towards the views of these two scholars. Much that from earlier periods may have been of importance for the subject, either direct or indirect, must have escaped my notice. I can only hope that I have profited sufficiently from what did catch my attention and from the help rendered me by many. The Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.) has enabled me to find time to record the results of the inquiry by granting me a stipend. I feel greatly indebted to this Organization and to the staff of the Buma-library at Leeuwarden.

Further I want to tender my sincere thanks to the Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen for publishing this work, to Professor W. J. W. Koster for his co-operation, and to Professor F. B. J. Kuiper and Dr. C. J. Ruijgh, who were willing to enlighten me on a number of linguistic points about which I was uncertain.

Above all, I am obliged to Professor J. C. Kamerbeek for his criticism, his suggestions, his encouragement and his aid to get the book published, to Dr. J. B. Hainsworth, who read the whole manuscript and gave a number of most valuable hints, and to Mr. E. M. H. van Gendt, whose assistance made it possible to write the work in English.

Needless to say that for whatever imperfections and errors that may have crept into this study despite such eminent pieces of advice, I accept full responsibility.

Rotterdam, June, 1964.

PREFACE TO SECOND IMPRESSION

I would have liked to revise a number of points to which reviewers have objected and to put up a fight over those which I am not yet prepared to concede. Owing to the nature of the argument, however, this could not be done within the limits of a preface, and since the photographic process used for this reprint ruled out any form of revision, I have confined myself to adding a number of *addenda et corrigenda*. My thanks are due to all those who, in reviews or otherwise, have called my attention to the errors in question.

Beersel (Belgium), June, 1969.

I

THE FORMULA AND ITS USE AS A CRITERION OF STYLISTIC DEVELOPMENT

In an essay on Swinburne a great Dutch poet has compared the rich poetical tradition which existed in England in the late nineteenth century with contemporary conditions in the Netherlands. There a new generation of poets had to break down a literary jargon which had been degenerating for about two centuries. "Such cataclasm" Gossaert says, "are just as fatal as they are necessary, because under such circumstances the poets have to devote much of their creative power to the making of a new language instead of using it to create in their language".¹⁾

I quote this remark because it exemplifies very well the value of a poetical tradition. Of course the richest poetical language cannot make a great, or even a minor, poet, but on the other hand, especially in times like ours, the importance of the instrument which the poet has at his disposal is too easily overlooked. With regard to Homeric poetry there is the more reason to stress this as some scholars, who obviously have had some trouble adapting themselves to the notion of the formulaic and traditional language, actually are not far from excusing the poet (or the poets) of the epics for using it. They apparently think that Homer was a great poet in spite of his language and they seem to consider his unknown predecessors mere artisans, whose only task it was to produce the poet of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Against this I wish to state emphatically that in my opinion the unknown singers, who created *Φόρμα πόντων* and *ζεφέδωρον ἀγορῶν* were men of imagination and creative power and that Homer's greatness is partly due to the magnificent instrument he could play, to the highly refined character, that is, of a diction which was intensively moulded and fashioned into an immense variety of patterns by his forerunners.²⁾ It is mainly my admiration for this instrument and the interest in the history of its development that have induced me to examine it more closely. But this was not my only motive. In the fields of Homeric philology and archaeology the question of chronology, either absolute or relative, has been put with increasing frequency, especially in the publications of K. Meister, Nilsson, Chantraine, Miss H. L. Lorimer, Porzig, Risch, Miss D. H. F. Gray, Shipp, Ruijgh, Webster, Page, Kirk and so many others. It is not impossible that the inquiry under consideration may give us a few indications on certain aspects of this matter too.

¹⁾ Geerten Gossaert, *Essays*, 22.

²⁾ Its elaborate character is not equalled, as Bowra, *Heroic Poetry*, 236-240, states, in any oral poetry of other peoples.

The object of this inquiry, however, is primarily a stylistic one. It is not my purpose to examine grammatical, dialectal or archaeological phenomena and to add a few pages to the immense quantity of literature which has already been written on these subjects. I propose to study the circumstances under which certain phrases or types of phrases appear in their actual Homeric forms, to examine the question whether or not they can be shown to have developed from pre-Homeric prototypes, and, if so, to establish what causes have brought about the alterations in question. Now if Homer had created 'normal' poetry, such an attempt would clearly be futile because the only documents of pre-Homeric Greek, the Linear-B tablets, are so poor in incontrovertible evidence, so distant in time and written in such a different style that for our purpose little or nothing is to be learned from them.¹⁾ It is only because of the very special character of Homeric diction that we are able to make an attempt of this kind. For some time after Homer this diction pursued its course of evolution and decomposition. Hence the differences we can observe between the Homeric phase and the final stages it has reached in Hesiod and the earliest Hymns, give us the clue to finding a method for the analysis of some of its phenomena in the Homeric phase. This method will be discussed in due course but in order to avoid ambiguity the principles underlying my approach to Homeric diction must first be stated as exactly as possible.

In the history of Homeric scholarship since the beginning of this century no single man has so profoundly influenced later researches as Milman Parry. Yet a strange fate has befallen his works.²⁾ For more than a decade

¹⁾ Of the already voluminous literature on the relations between Linear B and Homer I mention only C. J. Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*, Assen 1957, *Les datifs pluriels dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien*, Mnem. XI (1958), 2, 97-116, *Le traitement des sonantes voyelles dans les dialectes grecs et la position du mycénien*, Mnem. XIV (1961), 3, 193-216, T. B. L. Webster, *Early and Late in Homeric Diction*, Eranos LIV (1956), 34-48, *From Mycenae to Homer*, London 1958, 93-98 and *pass.*, P. Chantraine, *Grammaire Homérique I (1958), 495-513, J. Chadwick, *Mycenaean Elements in the Homeric Dialect*, *Minoica*, Berlin 1958, 166-122, D. H. F. Gray, *Mycenaean Names in Homer*, JHS LXXXVIII (1958), 43-48, D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad*, Sather Class. Lect. XXXI (1959), 261 ff. and *pass.*, G. P. Shipp, *Essays in Mycenaean and Homeric Greek*, Melbourne 1961, J. B. Hainsworth, *The Homeric formula and the problem of its transmission*, BICS IX (1962), 57-68, G. S. Kirk, *Objective Dating Criteria in Homer*, Mus. Helv. XVII (1960), 189-205, *Dark Age and Oral Poet*, Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc. 187 (1961), 34-48, *The Songs of Homer*, Cambridge, 1962, 105-126 and *pass.* I may add that, whether one takes the positive, the sceptical or the negative view, the importance of many of these studies is of a primarily linguistic nature. Their object is to inquire into the relations between the dialects, not to study the history of specific types of Homeric diction. Nevertheless nearly all these publications contain remarks which are essential for our purpose. They will be referred to in the relevant chapters of this inquiry.*

²⁾ They have been listed by A. B. Lord, AJA L11 (1948), 43f.

they were almost totally ignored,¹⁾ especially in the German-speaking sector of Homeric scholarship; it is significant that as late as 1950 M. Leumann could publish a book dealing for the greater part with modifications of epic phrases without taking into account the results at which Parry had arrived. It was only in the middle of this century that their importance began to be realised in wider circles and since then it has been duly recognised. Perhaps it is because of this curious fate that these studies, which were to prove so essential for Homeric researches, have never been adequately criticised.²⁾ At the time of the publication of *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère*, of *Les formules et la métrique d'Homère* (1928) and of *Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making* (1930-32) Homeric scholars were clearly either too much absorbed by the works of Wilamowitz, Bethe and others, or possessed by a certain narrow-minded aestheticism, concomitant with the revival of unitarism, to which the general tendency of these studies with their emphasising of ornamental and traditional elements was unpalatable. On the other hand the belated discovery of Parry's most important achievements, the central thesis of *L'épithète traditionnelle* and the adducing of analogies provided by living (Yugoslav and other) oral poetry, apparently made so strong an impression upon a later generation that generally things were taken for granted. This is the more curious as these theories do not show an argumentation which is flawless from a scientific point of view. This is not the proper place to subject them to a detailed criticism, but in view of what follows it is necessary to make comments on certain points.

In the field of Homeric studies Parry's foremost achievement is that he proved, definitely and irrefutably, the traditional character of several systems of noun-epithet formulae for all the chief characters of the epics. Of course this does not apply to every single expression (e.g. *σφοδρός, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν*³⁾ and *Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος*⁴⁾ (cf. *Ἀγέλεως*)⁵⁾ might be the poet's own inventions), but the main argument is not affected by what may be instances of individual imitation of a traditional type. From a methodological point of view, moreover, the complementary study *Les formules et la métrique d'Homère* is of outstanding importance because here for the first time it was shown that several prosodical irregularities were not to be explained by alleged metrical rules but by the simple consideration that the singers, when they had the choice between a-

¹⁾ But not by Chantraine (see his review of *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère* and *Les formules et la métrique d'Homère*, *Rev. de Phil.* LV (1929), 294-300) who saw that "la démonstration—renouvelle la philologie homérique" (*ibid.* 299). It is characteristic of Nilsson's sharp-sightedness that he immediately recognised their value, *Homer and Mycenae*, 179 f.

²⁾ To quote a remark of J. A. Davison I once read.

³⁾ below, p. 138.

⁴⁾ v 321 etc. (4 ×).

⁵⁾ χ 131, 247 (never *Μενέλεως*), below, p. 39, 137.

bandoning a formula and violating an established prosodical custom, were forced by their craft to choose the latter alternative.¹⁾

When we leave aside other writings which are not strictly relevant to this aspect of our subject, we see that in the voluminous article in HSCP 1930-32 the author goes much further.²⁾ Here he refers to the publications of Radloff, Murko and others on Turkish, Yugoslav, Russian and Kara-Kirghiz oral poetry. Partly on the strength of the analogies he finds in these works, he now concludes that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are oral compositions.

It is important to observe the gap which in this respect exists between the opinions expressed in *L'épithète traditionnelle* and in *Studies*, and to examine the way Parry bridges it. In the earlier work he is already convinced that the traditional nature of the noun-epithet combinations is to be explained by the exigencies of oral composition.³⁾ Yet, as far as I can see, he always speaks of *les aèdes*⁴⁾ and never explicitly states that Homer himself composed orally. Presumably, as one may conclude from the trend of the argument in the first and fourth chapters of the book, it was the stylistic value of the epithets rather than the manner of composition on which, at this time, his attention was focused.⁵⁾ Similarly his categorical statement about the traditional character of Homeric phrases is confined to the noun-epithet combinations; about the rest of the diction he expresses himself in much more cautious terms.⁶⁾

¹⁾ This is a counterpart of the influence of the epic hexameter on word-formation, which was demonstrated already by K. Witte (in *Singular and Plural*, Leipzig 1907, R.E. s.v. *Homeros*, B *Sprache*, VIII 2213-2247 and in several articles in *Glotta*), to whom Parry often refers.

²⁾ A short sketch of the development of his views is to be found in J. A. Davison, *Die homerischen Gedichte und die vergleichende Literaturforschung des Abendlandes*, Gymnasium LXI, 1-2, (1954), 29 ff.

³⁾ e.g. *E.T.* 70: "On doit toujours se souvenir que le jeune poète, apprenant la composition de la poésie héroïque en entendant la récitation d'autres aèdes, devait conserver dans sa mémoire, quand il lui arrivait de composer lui-même, ces expressions qui lui étaient utiles et pouvaient lui servir en mainte occasion. C'est cette épreuve de l'utilité, faite forcément par chaque nouveau poète, qui a produit enfin la technique complexe que nous voyons dans le style d'Homère."

⁴⁾ e.g. *E.T.* 70, 90, 95, 98 etc.

⁵⁾ e.g. *E.T.* 28 and in the whole chapter *Le sens distinctif de l'épithète dans l'épos*, 146-217.

⁶⁾ *Form.* 64 "— nous ne pouvons pas affirmer catégoriquement que la diction des aèdes soit complètement formulaire". Yet, already at this stage, he seems to have been convinced that "l'hypothèse impossible à vérifier" (*E.T.* 131) was probably correct, for *ibid.* 221 he writes: "La technique de l'emploi de l'épithète est chose si complexe que si nous ne rencontrons rien dans Homère qui s'en écarte, c'est à dire, s'il ne s'y trouve pas de formules nom-épithète qui ne sont pas soumises à l'influence du vers, nous aurons une preuve des plus substantielles que l'*Iliade* et l'*Odyssee* telles que nous les possédons, sont—à l'exception peut-être de quelques vers ou de brefs passages—l'œuvre d'une époque à laquelle la tradition aédique possédait encore toute sa vigueur." The opinion had been stated for the first time by Meillet, *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecques*, Paris, 1923, 61, whom he quotes *E.T.* 10 (see below, p. 11 n. 2).

In *Studies* this has radically changed. The restraint we find in *L'épithète traditionnelle* has been abandoned. Parry now argues that Homer's poetry is wholly formulaic and connects this formulaic character with the now explicitly stated view that it was orally composed.¹⁾ The question whether these opinions are fully supported by argument or evidence will be briefly examined later on. For the moment it may suffice—and this is of crucial importance—that Parry²⁾ could reach this conclusion only by a considerable extension of his previous definition of the *formula* and by dropping in practice the criterion of the traditional character of a given formula, viz. its belonging to “un système caractérisé à la fois par une grande extension et une grande simplicité”. In the analysis which he gives of A 1–25 and a 1–25, this change is obvious. To many of the expressions which in this new phase the author calls formulae, the definition “une expression qui est régulièrement employée, dans les mêmes conditions métriques, pour exprimer une idée essentielle” does not apply, because there is simply no question of Homer using them regularly.³⁾ Moreover, only a small minority of the expressions listed which answer this strict definition belong to a system which is demonstrably “caractérisé à la fois par une grande extension et une grande simplicité”.⁴⁾ Of course all of them *may* be formulaic and traditional (though in each single case the one does not necessarily imply the other,⁵⁾ but this could not possibly be shown by the application of the strict method, the limitations of which Parry himself had indicated in *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère*.⁶⁾ We have to note further that in this analysis the conception of the ‘system’ itself has come to be used in a much wider sense. This is notably the case where expressions are marked with a broken line to indicate that they are “of the same type” as others. It is beyond dispute that the existence of closely related combinations is characteristic of the formulaic diction, but

1) And in *Whole Formulaic Verses in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song*, TAPA LXIV (1933), 179–197.

2) Strictly speaking we cannot say that in this article the latter opinion has been inferred from the former: p. 138 Parry writes: “But in treating the oral nature of Homeric style we shall see that the question of a remnant of individuality in Homeric style disappears altogether”. Probably there has been an interaction of the two factors in which his becoming acquainted with still living forms of oral poetry as well as suggestions made by A. Meillet have played a considerable part (see the quotation from one of his “field-notes” in A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales*, 11–12).

3) e.g. Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή, ἐξ οὗ δὴ, θεῶν ἔριδι (*sic*), Ἀτρεΐδα δὲ μάλιστα (to cite only a few examples). This is not splitting hairs. We may safely suppose that in a general sense Homer's diction is formulaic, but when it comes to proving a definite point—be it oral composition or, as in the inquiry under consideration, the modification of ancient prototypes—evidence of a precise character is required.

4) such as Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος, etc., cf. *E.T.* 71, 116, and *Studies* 126.

5) see below, p. 17 n. 2, 37 ff., 69, 124 ff., 138 ff. In *E.T.* 16 Parry shows himself to be well aware of the difference.

6) *E.T.* 125 ff.

it is equally obvious that the evidence of the material in question diminishes in direct proportion to the extension of the term "related type". So when Parry goes even further¹⁾ and adduces the alleged similarity of *πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς*, *A 3*, *πολλὰς δὲ δροῦς ἀζαλέας*, *A 494*, *πολλὰς δὲ στίχας ἡρώων*, *Y 326*, of *τεῦχε κύνεσσιν*, *A 4* and *δῶκεν ἑταίρω* *P 698*, *Ψ 612*, we have to reject this part of the argument as utterly inconclusive. Nor does it become more convincing by the introduction of the term "verse-pattern", unless this term is more exactly defined.²⁾ Such general "patterns" are much too vague to afford any kind of proof. They can be shown to exist even in the *Hymns* of Callimachus³⁾ and they are apparently inherent in the hexameter itself, whether formulaic or non-formulaic, whether oral or written.

Thus, in contrast with what might be gathered from the manner in which Parry's theory is described by several writers, it appears that we do not have to do with a consistent method. For this reason I am unable to adopt it indiscriminately as a basis for the inquiries I propose to make. It is therefore inevitable to examine the criteria which may enable us to identify a formula and the traditional character of a formula. I am very well aware that this means criticising Parry in what may seem a meticulous and pedantic way. I must state therefore that, whatever may be the value of the following researches, my line of reasoning will be basically a continuation of the methods he so brilliantly designed in his first works and that it is only my desire to get at the bottom of certain questions which has induced me to criticise some of his definitions and inferences.

What is a formula? Parry's first definition has already been quoted.⁴⁾ In his second definition, given in English,⁵⁾ the ambiguous term *expression* has been replaced by a *group of words*; this no doubt marks an improvement, as we shall see when we come to the studies of O'Neill.⁶⁾ Nevertheless some ambiguities remain. First, the term *a given essential idea* (*une certaine idée essentielle*) necessarily introduces some element of vagueness into the argument, from a semasiological point of view it is a precarious conception. This has obviously caused some uneasiness to the author himself,

¹⁾ *Studies* 133: "one could make no greater mistake than to limit the formulaic element to what is underlined."

²⁾ Lord, *The Singer of Tales* 144, and *Homer and other Epic poetry* (in *A Companion to Homer*), 188 speaks of "metrical patterns" and "syntactic patterns".

³⁾ e.g. *Zeus* 82 *οἱ τε δίκησι*, *Art.* 122 *οἱ τε περὶ σφρας*, 140 *αἱ τέ σε ῥεῖα*, etc.; *Zeus* 14 *καλέουσι λεχώιον*, *Art.* 22 *καλέωσι βοηθόον*; *Zeus* 23 *ἤειρεν, πολλὰς δὲ*, *Art.* 27 *ἄψασθαι, πολλὰς δὲ*, etc.

⁴⁾ above, p. 11.

⁵⁾ "a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea", *Studies* 80.

⁶⁾ If I am not mistaken the French word 'expression' also covers single words. These, however, have to be left out of account, see below, p. 14, 20.

hence the stress he lays on the purely ornamental character of the traditional epithet.¹⁾ However, after what we have learned about the formulaic technique we shall readily agree that normally *θεὰ γλανκῶπις Ἀθήνη* simply "means" *Athena* to the poet and his hearers, etc., etc. But does, in Nestor's words *οὐ θῆν δὴ τοῦδ' ἀνδρὸς Ὀδυσσεύος φίλος υἱὸς νηὸς ἐπ' ἰκρίοφιν καταλέξεται*²⁾ the formula *Ὀδυσσεύος φίλος υἱὸς* only mean *Telemachus*?³⁾ The answer must of course be negative; here the poet has used it in a most pointed way. I shall not dwell on this kind of phenomenon⁴⁾ because it does not affect the group of problems I propose to study. In other cases, however, the question of the "essential idea" may have some importance, e.g. when we examine the difficult problem of the equivalents. Do, for example, *εἰπέ τε μῦθον*⁵⁾ (5 ×), *ἄλκιμος υἱός* (9 ×), *μείλινον ἔγχος* (6 ×), *ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὑσμίνῃ* (11 ×), *πίονας αἶγας* (5 ×) express the same "essential idea" as *φώνησέν τε* (34 ×), *ἀγλαὸς υἱός* (18 ×), *χάλκεον ἔγχος* (23 ×) *ἐν αἰνῇ δημοτῆτι* (10 ×), *μηκάδας αἶγας* (3 ×) respectively? In view of the broad scope which Parry allows to the term "essential idea", these and similar questions may well be asked: if the epic technique would turn out to have many more equivalents than is suggested in *Studies* (and uncritically accepted by some of Parry's followers), the argument from thrift, which is fundamental to the theory, might be considerably weakened.

As, however, such cases seem far outweighed by the existing evidence to the contrary,⁶⁾ I prefer to leave them aside for the moment and to point to another ambiguity. It lies in the significance of the term *régulièrement employée, regularly employed*. In the course of his researches Parry has tacitly qualified this element of his definition by pointing out that Homer may rarely have had occasion to use a given traditional formula. This is obviously right. For the purpose of the present inquiry I cite an example which definitely proves the truth of his contention. The expression *θεὰ δασπλήτις Ἐρινός* occurs only once in Homer,⁷⁾ so strictly speaking it does not answer the definition. Yet it belongs to the well-known system

¹⁾ With regard to the purely ornamental character of the epithet in the noun-epithet combinations it even introduces a circular reasoning, because it implies this character, the proof of which must yet be given.

²⁾ γ 352-353.

³⁾ see *E.T.* 87 f., *Form.* 18 f.

⁴⁾ see e.g. W. Whallon, *The Homeric Epithets*, YCS XVII (1961), 97-142.

⁵⁾ The formula must have been created when the digamma was still a living sound: in these 5 cases its observance is 2 × certain (*A* 647, *Ψ* 204), 3 × probable (*ἔχεν* θ 302, *σχεθέν* ξ 494) or possible (*κλυτοτέχνην* Σ 391). It is neglected only once, *H* 277 (below p. 49 f.).

⁶⁾ In fact many more examples might be cited. Most of them, however, can be explained by the very fact that the style is dominated by the formula, see below, p. 48 n. 4, 110 n. 1, 114 n. 4, 127, 135 f., 146 n. 2. In his last article (*TAPA* LXIV (1933), 179-197) Parry, as far as I know, mentions the desire for variety on the part of the singers for the first time.

⁷⁾ ο 234.

of θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη, βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη, etc., etc., and, at the same time, it shows a remarkable archaic element, which was probably no more understood by Homer than it is by modern scholars.¹⁾ The combination of these two facts entitles us to regard this ἀπαξ expression as a very archaic traditional formula. In the present inquiry, therefore, the term *formula* will be used not only for expressions regularly employed in Homer but also for expressions which are very infrequent, *provided that there is sufficient evidence to show* that they must have been regularly employed by Homer's predecessors.²⁾

So far I have discussed certain debatable points of Parry's definition. It remains to draw the reader's attention to what in my opinion are misapplications of it. First, the term "formulaic" is sometimes applied to single words in a given position. Since obviously most single elements of the vocabulary of a language are traditional and since all Greek hexameter poetry from Homer to Theocritus shows "preferred" positions for definite metrical word-types, as has been proved by O'Neill,³⁾ this kind of "formulaic analysis" is virtually a *reductio ad absurdum* of the theory. If we adopt such an extension of the principle, we can easily show that Apollonius and Callimachus wrote "formulaic" poetry. Secondly we have to realise that every language has formulae. They exist in the most divergent sections of spoken and written speech. They may be liturgical, juridical, constitutional, political, they may even be ordinary slogans. Greek has them too. Now of course we do not encounter ἀγαθῆ τύχη or ἔδοξεν τῆ βουλή and τῷ δήμῳ in Homer, but we do find certain combinations of particles and similar elements of current speech, e.g. ἦ μὲν,⁴⁾ μὲν δῆ,⁵⁾ δέ τοι, οὐδέ

1) see e.g. Frisk s.v. δασπλήτης.

2) Provided it is amended in this way Parry's second definition is, I think, a workable proposition. There remains the difficulty inherent in the conception of the "essential (part of the) idea". I suggest that the definition "that which remains after one has counted out everything in the expression which is purely for the sake of style" (*Studies* 80) should be replaced by "that which is most important from a functional point of view". For practical purposes it makes little difference which of the two definitions we prefer to apply. Yet, aesthetics of the kind implied by Parry's wording are of a somewhat dubious nature. Moreover, it can hardly be argued that either Homer or his predecessors ever used an epithet such as ἀπαξ ἀνδρῶν "purely for the sake of style" while already to the singer who created the expression ἀπαξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων the functional value of the noun must have exceeded that of the epithet.

Mr. Hainsworth points out to me that in *Studies* Parry attempts to convert "regular" into "useful" (and that this was done to mark off the refrain as not formulaic). Mr. Hainsworth rightly adds: "I think this is circular, since the utility of the formula is what we are proving".

3) *The localization of metrical word-types in the Greek hexameter*, YCIS VIII (1942), 105 ff., cf. my review of Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans la langue épique*, Museum, LXIX (1958), 20.

4) Denniston, *Greek Particles*², 389.

5) *ibid.* 392.

τοι,¹⁾ etc. If such combinations are not regarded as "a group of words which is regularly employed to express a given idea", they should not be cited as evidence for the formulaic character and still less for the oral composition of Homeric poetry. If, on the contrary we do regard them as such, they may be called formulae, but their evidence is clearly null and void since they appear in every form of Greek.

It would have been superfluous to draw attention to the last two points if not Lord²⁾ and in particular Notopoulos³⁾ had adduced single words and very current combination of pronouns and particles as evidence for the formulaic style and oral composition of the Homeric epics and the oldest Hymns. Lord, for example, lists *ἡρώων, οὐνεκα* and *Ἀτρείδης* at the beginning of a line as formulae, Notopoulos even goes so far as citing *τήν μὲν, Ἀρ.* 16 and referring to E 53 etc. It is obvious that such methods do not provide a basis for discussion.

If we maintain in our definition of the formula a minimum of exactness, if we recognise the inconclusiveness of many of the so-called formulaic expressions and if we are not inclined to apply the criterion of "metrical and syntactic patterns" indiscriminately, it is impossible to prove that Homer's poetry is entirely formulaic.⁴⁾ And even if we water down the conception in the way Parry did in his later writings and Lord and Notopoulos do in their recent publications, lines such as

<i>Σκυρόθεν ἐξαγάγεις καὶ οἱ δειξείας ἕκαστα</i>	T 332
<i>εἰδόσων ὕμμ' ἐρέω πᾶσιν, φίλοι, ὥς ἔτι καὶ νῦν</i>	Ψ 787
<i>Ποντεύς τε Πρωρέυς τε, Θόων Ἀναβησίνεώς τε</i>	θ 113

do not support (not to say flatly contradict) the statement that Homer's poetry was composed "only by putting together old verses and old parts of verses in an old way"⁵⁾ and that "at no time (Homer) is seeking words for an idea that has never before found expression".⁶⁾ Moreover, if it were true that "there could never be more than a few such (*i.e.* more or less original) creations for any one Singer"⁷⁾ it would have taken literally countless generations of bards to develop the diction up to its Homeric

1) *ibid.* 552.

2) *S.T.* 142-43, 291-92.

3) *The Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry*, *AJPh* LXXXIII (1962), 355 ff. Here even *καὶ ἄα, καὶ οἱ, Ἀητώ, ἐρχομένοιο, τόξον* etc. are cited as evidence for formulaic and oral composition.

4) Among the regular shapes typified by *φίλον ἦτορ, κλυτὰ τεύχεα, τεύχεα καλά, δολιχόσκιον ἔγχος, ἱμερόεντα χορόν*. Hainsworth finds 79, 104, 209, 218, 163 unique expressions respectively, a number which he justly calls "disturbingly high in a diction commonly supposed to be entirely formulaic" (*o.c.* 66).

5) *Gr. S.H.S.* 181.

6) *Studies* 146.

7) *ibid.* 147.

form.¹⁾ The origin of the tradition would have to be put many, many centuries before Mycenaean times – which is obviously out of the question. But if the diction was developed within a measurable space of time (let us say in some four centuries, i.e. by approximately a dozen generations of bards)²⁾ why should Homer's contribution to its evolution be regarded as negligible, whereas on this supposition the average singer must have changed it considerably? Of course the extent of Homer's share can by no means be evaluated, but in view of the variety of ideas we find in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, I am not inclined to belittle it. It is hard to imagine how a repertory of traditional formulae "either already adapted or instantly adaptable to the limited range of ideas which the subject matter of the Greek epic may require him (the poet) to express"³⁾ could have covered the subjects of Odysseus' raft-building, the tale about Proteus, the Thersites-episode, etc.

Since, then, the supposition that Homeric poetry is wholly formulaic is at all events unprovable (if not entirely unsound)⁴⁾, it cannot lend support to the view that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, are oral compositions. But even if the assumption should be right, could the oral character be inferred from it? Let us remember what Parry actually proved in the second chapter of *L'épithète traditionnelle*. He proved, by comparing Homer with Apollonius and Virgil, that a single poet, who is at the same time a "pen-poet",

¹⁾ This has to be qualified. It is not inconceivable that for a certain lapse of time the diction remained stagnant—or even impoverished—and that in a later period the pace of its development vastly quickened. There is some reason to believe that actually a rapid expansion started one or two generations before Homer and was still continued in his time, see below, p. 47 ff., 124 ff. Of course some parts of the diction may have been more affected than others, see below, p. 52 f., 137 ff., and on the general aspect of the matter, Hainsworth, *o.c.*, *pass.*

It is impossible to assess even approximately the amount of indubitable Mycenaean formulae which have survived in Homer, but there are some indications that may warn us against overrating their number. First, Kirk is certainly right in arguing that the well known misconception about the use of chariots could not have arisen "if even no more than a few Mycenaean battle descriptions had descended verbatim, or had survived for any length of time in Dark Age poetry," *S.H.* 125. Secondly we have to face the uncomfortable fact that even the passages which describe Mycenaean survivals have linguistically late—and irreducible—forms, below, p. 140 ff.

²⁾ The argument is not affected if, on the strength of the body-shield (Bowra, *H.P.* 395), of the silver-studded sword (Kirk, *S.H.* 114 f.), of *βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη* and *θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη* we feel inclined to date the birth of the diction one or two centuries earlier (L.H. I or II, cf. H. L. Lorimer, *o.c.* 132–135, 166). The boar's tusk helmet does not provide cogent evidence for this dating because recent finds have shown that it was still used as a decoration-motive in L.H. III B, Wace, *Excavations at Mycenae VIII*, BSA XXV (1921–23), 225, Pl. XXXVIIa, *Mycenae 1939–1953*, BSA XLIX (1954), 236 ff, Pl. 35, *Mycenae 1939–1954*, BSA L (1955), 183, Pl. 25c.

³⁾ Page, *o.c.* 222.

⁴⁾ The objections raised by S. E. Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer*, Sather Class. Lect. XV (1938), 15–19, have still to be refuted.

does not *create* a vast system of formulae, let alone a formulaic system almost devoid of superfluous elements.¹⁾ He certainly did not prove—and he did not intend to prove—that only an oral poet can *adopt* a formulaic diction which has previously been created. Nor would he have been able to prove this, for tradition has actually preserved a work which is large enough to show that a literate poet can adopt such a diction. It is the *Posthomeric* of Quintus Smyrnaeus who, in this respect, probably imitated Homer more closely than Homer followed his predecessors.²⁾ So if Greek history were entirely unknown to us up to the fourth century A.D. and if the *Posthomeric* were the oldest surviving piece of poetry, the argument put forth in *Studies* would necessarily lead to the conclusion that this poem was an oral composition.

Every language, as we have said, has a certain number of formulae. Yet the history of European poetry, from Pindar and Aeschylus up to Yeats and Valéry with its growing individualism, its development of lyrical tendencies and its increasing emphasis on the suggestive word and even on “la nuance” had accustomed former generations of Homeric scholars and Parry’s contemporaries to regard the formula as incompatible with true poetry.³⁾ When Parry revealed the existence of the formulaic systems and proved their traditional character, the revolutionary view put forth by Meillet some years before received a measure of support which, under the contemporary circumstances, was apt to look decisive, be it only because of the fact that the new approach contrasted sharply with the trends then prevailing in Homeric study.⁴⁾ Soon afterwards Parry took the next step. Justly realising—but, as it now seems, somewhat over-

¹⁾ Here we find, to some extent, a confusion of the issues. In order to prove his thesis that the system is traditional (*E.T.* 29) Parry had to show that no single poet—whether literate or illiterate—could ever have created such a system. But Apollonius and Virgil are at the same time single poets and pen-poets. Of course the combination of both elements was necessary, since no unquestionably oral poets were available for comparison. Yet, when Parry states, e.g. that Virgil, “se sert de l’épithète pour des raisons tout à fait étrangères à la commodité de la versification” (*E.T.* 41), he has in mind the literate poet.

²⁾ Quintus even works out in a formulaic manner certain expressions which are sporadically found in Homer, e.g. *κατὰ μόθον* (Σ 159, 537, Φ 310) \rightarrow *ἔπεφνε κατὰ μόθον* (VIII 108, IX 227), *ἔδαιξε κατὰ μόθον* (II 295), *ἔλυσα κατὰ μόθον* (V 296), *ἀνὰ μόθον ἀκρυσέοντα* (I 133, 539); he even makes new (if analogical) formulae, e.g. *ἑυμμελής Ἀγαμέμνων* (7 \times), *ἑυμμελήν(-η) Ἀχιλλῆα(-ι)* (3 \times), etc., in which *ἑυμμελής* is treated in the same way as the *épithètes génériques* examined by Parry in *E.T.* 105–110.

³⁾ cf. *E.T.* 93: L’analogie—tendait toujours à amener cette diction vers une simplification constante de l’expression des idées essentielles. En excluant l’expression nouvelle ou originale qui pouvait être traduite par une formule traditionnelle, elle engageait les poètes à exprimer, autant que possible, toute idée nouvelle par des mots ressemblants à ceux qui servaient déjà pour exprimer une idée similaire”. Such statements must have been hair-raising to most of Parry’s contemporaries.

⁴⁾ cf. Chantraine’s remark quoted above, p. 9 n. 1.

rating¹⁾ – the value of the evidence offered by still living forms of oral poetry, he combined this evidence with the recently discovered points of Homeric diction. Starting from the incontestable fact that the origination of the systems was due to the exigencies of improvisation he now set out to prove, by means of an extension of his own definition, that Homer himself had composed orally. Later this line of argument was taken up by Lord and by Notopoulos, who applied it to Hesiod and the earliest Hymns.

Of course the objections I have raised against the argument do not prove that the hypothesis is untenable. Personally I believe that it is not impossible.²⁾ But that does not mean that I imagine that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* originated in the same way as *Marko and Nina* and other Yugoslav songs discussed by Lord in his recently published book. The existence of the formulaic systems is undoubtedly due to the fact that the men who gradually developed these systems had to improvise their songs. But, even if our epics are oral compositions, does that mean that Homer improvised (in the strict sense of the word) about 15.000 lines when creating the *Iliad* and that the *Odyssey* was composed (by the same or another poet) in the same way? It is curious that, so far as I am aware, no objection has ever been made against this equation *oral composition = improvisation*. This may be largely due to the categorical statement put forth by experts on living forms of oral poetry (most recently by Lord³⁾ and Notopoulos⁴⁾ that recitation and oral creation are incompatible with each other. Recitation, they state, only begins when the poem is written down, and memorising fixed texts means death to oral creation. As far as Homer is concerned I am very sceptical about the validity of this statement. This scepticism is only in a small measure based on the commonplace but still very real truth that the value of analogical evidence is limited. It mainly results from a) the consideration that the difference between the memorising of a number of formulae and that of a lengthy passage is not an essential but merely a gradual one; b) the fact that we actually find evidence for recitation in Homer himself. The first point speaks for itself, the second needs some comment.

Apart from the so-called *typische Szenen* – which are certainly to some extent traditional and often show considerable variation⁵⁾ – we find

¹⁾ See now Kirk, *S.H.* 88–101 (especially 89 f.), who rightly emphasises the more “organized” character and the greater “metrical strictness” of the Greek tradition.

²⁾ Mainly because certain anomalies which appear both in composition (Bowra, *s.v. Composition in A Companion to Homer*, 46 ff.) and in diction (below, p. 34, 117) are of such a nature that they are best explained on the assumption of oral creation.

³⁾ *S.T.* 130 ff., 137–138 f.

⁴⁾ *o.c.* 344 ff.

⁵⁾ On the relation between repetition and variation see Bowra, *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*, 91 ff., *H.P.*, 254 ff. and his chapter on *Style in C.H.*, 50 ff.

several repeated passages which describe events so special that it is extremely improbable that the Homeric version was ever part of the tradition. These passages are repeated word for word (or with some trifling variations necessitated by the change of the grammatical subject), some of them after very long intervals. If it were true that every singer only learns a large number of formulae and that he combines them in an ever-changing manner, how can we explain the identity of wording in these passages? If Homer composed only by extemporising, how is it that he tells the story of Odysseus' arrival in Egypt in exactly the same form in the fifteen verses of ξ (258-72) and ρ (427-41) or that he makes Menelaus speak the very same words (a comparison included) in δ (333-50) and in ρ (124-41)? If Homer was always improvising, how could the 35 lines of Agamemnon's offer to Achilles (*I* 122-56) be repeated in exactly the same form (264-98) (with only a few insignificant variations, made necessary by the change of subject) after an interval of some 100 verses?¹⁾ Whether such passages were traditional in this form — which I don't for a moment believe — or not, their presence can only be accounted for by the use of writing or by the fact that simple recitation had a much larger share in the composition of the Homeric poems than the theory of Lord and Notopoulos would have us believe.²⁾

The implications of this fact for the birth of our epics are perhaps not devoid of interest. In a Dutch thesis the hypothesis has been put forth that the poems are not the creation of one man, but of a body of singers, who worked under the supervising direction of "Homer".³⁾ Unfortunately this hypothesis was defended by largely irrelevant argumentation. The features to which I have just drawn attention might perhaps point in the direction of collective creation. However, as far as I can see, there is no other evidence to support this view and in themselves such phenomena are far from conclusive. We are on less slippery ground when we point

¹⁾ I now see that Lord, *Homer and other Epic Poetry* (in *C.H.*, 195) has become aware of the difficulty presented, from his point of view, by the repeated expressions and considers the possibility that some of them may be due to "scribes", to persons, that is, who recorded the text from oral dictation, and who "assume that the repetition will be word for word, and hence — note down simply that at a given point certain lines are to be repeated". This is a somewhat arbitrary way to save the oral dictated text (on the probability of this kind of transmission see now Kirk, *S.H.* 98-101, with a well-balanced criticism).

²⁾ cf. J. Labarbe, *L'Homère de Platon*, 429 f., who, on the one hand writes: "Homère est un improvisateur", but on the other: "Il y a, dans *l'Illiade et l'Odyssee*, des morceaux qu'Homère a pu débiter des centaines de fois. On imaginera que ses premières récitations différeraient entre elles. Notamment il devait substituer, çà et là, aux formules d'abord employées d'autres formules à peu près équivalentes —. Après un certain temps, il arrivait à une forme qui le contentait et qui avait fait l'objet de repentirs trop nombreux pour être encore sujette à variations".

³⁾ S. J. Suys-Reitsma, *Het Homerische Epos als orale schepping van een dichters-geslacht*, Amsterdam, 1955.

out that, if recitation played a certain part in the composition of the poems,¹⁾ this may suggest two rather plausible deductions: 1. The creation of the poems was not a single feat of improvising but was the result of elaborate and well-studied composition, complete with rehearsal and reassertion of the 'thematic unity'—and, perhaps, with the insertion of certain passages. 2. We are not entitled to exclude *a priori* the possibility that recitation played a certain part in the creation of the poems of Homer's immediate predecessors.

In the preceding part of this chapter I have advocated caution with regard to the use of the term *formula*. I have pointed out that, from a methodological point of view, we ought to adhere as closely as possible to the strict definition. I have in particular emphasised that the results arrived at by O'Neill forbid us to speak of a formula when we have to do with single words in fixed positions, since fixation has been shown by this scholar to be a constant feature of every type of hexameter poetry. On the other hand, however, I must point out that wherever we have to do with groups of words, O'Neill's findings do not affect the purport of Parry's theory as it was originally conceived, but that, on the contrary, this theory is confirmed by them in a rather surprising way. It may not be without interest to illustrate this statement because, at first sight, things might look different and one might even get the impression that O'Neill's discovery reduces still further the number of expressions the formulaic and traditional character of which may be regarded as certain. Let us take, for instance, the expression $\kappa\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma \delta\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota$ ($\delta\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\eta$, $\delta\pi\alpha\zeta\epsilon(\nu)$, $\delta\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$). It occurs 10 times at the end of the line and once before the trochaic caesura. Now O'Neill has shown that the "preferred position" for the "functional type" $\cup - -$ is at the very end of the line (position 12 according to his notation: *Il.* 92.1 %, *Od.* 92.9 %) and that the "preferred positions" for the type $- \cup$ are positions $1\frac{1}{2}$, $5\frac{1}{2}$ and $9\frac{1}{2}$ (respective percentages 28.7–27.9 %; 27.8–30.1 %; 35.9–34.3 %). So it might be argued that the rather frequent occurrence of both $\kappa\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma$ and $\delta\pi\acute{\alpha}\zeta\epsilon\iota$ ($-\zeta\eta$, etc.) between the bucolic diaeresis and the end of the line is merely a special manifestation of the rules of what O'Neill calls "inner metric" and that their combination is, therefore, not due to any traditional motive. In this respect one might point to $\kappa\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma \delta\rho\acute{\epsilon}\xi\alpha\iota$ ($-\xi\omega$, $-\xi\eta\varsigma$, 10 ×), $\kappa\upsilon\delta\omicron\varsigma \acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$ ($-\alpha\nu$, 7 ×), $\kappa\tau\eta\sigma\omega \delta\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\epsilon(\nu)$ (2 ×), $\lambda\alpha\delta\acute{\omicron}\nu \delta\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ (*Il.* 38), ($\acute{\eta}\gamma\acute{\gamma}\epsilon\mu\omicron\nu'$) $\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\lambda\acute{\omicron}\nu \delta\pi\alpha\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$ (*o.* 310) and add that the difference between Homer on the one hand and e.g. Apollonius and Callimachus on the other (who show the same system of localisation but have very few

¹⁾ Though Kirk does not suggest this possibility, his argument that "in a stricter tradition like the Homeric one there is no reason why a fairly high standard of verbatim precision in transmission should not have been achieved", (*S.H.* 100) may also be applied to the creation of the epics, see also *ibid.* 319 f.

formulae) is irrelevant since these poets, though they draw largely on Homer's vocabulary, purposely avoid repeating expressions.

It is obviously impossible to make out in each separate case whether the combination of certain words is traditional or merely results from a collocation of definite types which is determined by "inner-metrical" rules. Nevertheless it is possible to show that the latter—to state the case provisionally in purely descriptive terms—are operative only to a limited extent and that exactly this fact can be accounted for by the formulaic and traditional character of the *combination*. Part of this has been vaguely realised by O'Neill himself¹⁾ and by H. N. Porter,²⁾ but, so far as Homer is concerned, both scholars have failed to see that in many cases the departure from the rule is obviously connected with the dominating influence of formulaic and traditional elements³⁾ and that, therefore, this factor may have been equally operative in those cases where the constituents themselves conform to the rule of "inner metric".

I mention only in passing some principles of O'Neill's method which from a philological, prosodical and, therefore, from a formulaic point of view are debatable: 1. "The distinguishing feature of this approach is that it regards words as the ultimately real elements of the verse".⁴⁾ 2. "—prosodical irregularities have to be disregarded entirely".⁵⁾ 3. "—elided vowels must be regarded as completely removed from the verse and the words affected must be measured as though their penults were their finals".⁶⁾ 4. (the words are measured) "by the quantitative space they fill in the verses in which they are found, regardless of their natural quantities".⁷⁾

Because of these underlying principles the results arrived at are only to be used with the utmost circumspection as a corrective of a manner of approach which regards traditional combinations as the foundation

¹⁾ *o.c.* 128.

²⁾ *The early Greek hexameter*, YCIS XII (1951), 9–10.

³⁾ Though Porter refers to Parry in a different context.

⁴⁾ *o.c.* 106, cf. *ibid.*: "One must know how words are used individually before one can study their combinations". Quite apart from the formulaic point of view such a statement may be regarded as a piece of rather naive positivism. Still, O'Neill did not study words. He studied metrical word-types, which is quite another thing. He does not give statistical figures for the position of e.g. *ἦρόν*, *ἀνρά*, *εἰθα*, but for the localisation of the trochees and the spondees by which these words are represented in a widely divergent way: *ἦρόν* about equally by both —U and —, *ἀνρά* in the large majority of cases by —U, *εἰθα* always by —.

⁵⁾ *o.c.* 111. Of course they are essential from a formulaic point of view.

⁶⁾ *ibid.* Thus the fact that they cannot possibly figure at the end of the line is left out of account.

⁷⁾ And, we may add, of the question whether they begin (or once began!) with a consonant, with a vowel, with a double consonant and with *muta cum liquida* making position or not. With regard to the formulaic analysis such differences are essential, cf. Parry, *E.T.* 57 and *pass.*; on the influence of original digamma see below.

of Homeric diction. As this is not the proper place to go further into the matter, let us confine ourselves to examining some cases which do not conform to the scheme and to interpreting the indications which are relevant to the formulaic aspect of the localisation. I must emphasise that the following examples have been chosen at random, so that a truly systematic study of the phenomenon might bring to light much more evidence of the same—and even of a more significant—nature.

1. *ὑπόδρα*. Only in 3½. “Preferred position” of the metrical type $\cup - \cup$: 5½ (75,8–82,4 %); never found (as $\cup - -$) in 12. The departure from the rule is to be explained by the existence of the formula *ὑπόδρα ἰδών* to which the Homeric use of *ὑπόδρα* is confined: *τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδών, καὶ μιν ὑπόδρα ἰδών*, etc., 26 ×. The formula (metrical type: $\cup - \cup \cup -$, preferred positions 9 (67,9–76,5 %) and 5 (28,3–23,5 %) is confined to 5.

2. *ἰσόθεος*. Only in 11. The preferred positions of this metrical type are 3 and 5 (42,2–37,3 % and 37,6–48,6 % respectively). The explanation is obviously found in the fact that Homer did not use *ἰσόθεος* as a single “word”, but as a component part of the formula *ἰσόθεος φῶς*, to which its use is confined. In contrast with isolated *ἰσόθεος* the formula (metrical type: $- \cup \cup - -$) conforms to the scheme (position: 12, 100 %).

If we apply the standards of O'Neill, *ἀντίθεος* (nom.) should be regarded as representing the same metrical type. Yet it does not conform to his scheme: it is found only once in 3, ¹⁾ only once in 5, ²⁾ but four times in 9: *ἀντίθεος Θρασυμήδης*, etc. On the other hand it never behaves in the same way as *ἰσόθεος*. This is due to the fact that the systems in which the two words appear in Homer were created before the digamma had been dropped in spoken Ionic, as may be seen from a comparison of (*ἀν-*, *παρ-*, *ἐφ-*) *ἴστατο, ἰσόθεος φῶς* (*H* 135, etc., 5 ×), *ἄμ' ἔσπετο, ἰσόθεος φῶς* (*A* 472, etc., 3 ×), *κίεν ἰσόθεος φῶς* (*B* 565, *A* 428), etc., with (*τε*) *καὶ ἀντίθεος Γανυμήδης/Θρασυμήδης* (*Y* 232, *γ* 414), (*τε*) *καὶ ἀντίθεον Πάδαμανθον/Πολυμήτην*, etc., 5 ×. From a theoretical point of view, I have already suggested that the import of the facts stated by O'Neill may be seriously qualified by the purely formal character of his starting point, i.e. by his leaving prosodical and linguistic factors out of account. The actual behaviour of *ἰσόθεος* and *ἀντίθεος* appears to confirm this. Besides, it suggests another point which may have some importance for the study of the formulaic tradition. It is certain that at the time of the creation of the Homeric epics the digamma was no longer a living sound, so *ἰσόθεος* and *ἀντίθεος* were words which expressed the same “essential idea” in exactly the same metrical form. Yet both epithets survived. It appears, then, that in *Homer's time* “l'influence du vers” did not act invariably, as regards the choice of words, in a negative way, for this would have led to the complete elimination of one of them. Moreover, they are never

¹⁾ *I* 623.

²⁾ *λ* 512.

interchanged: we do not find *ἀντίθεος φώς* or *ισόθεος Θρασυμήδης*. These phenomena can only be explained on the supposition that, when the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were created, the purely *stylistic* tradition, as opposed to 'thrift' and 'usefulness', had, to some extent, become an independent factor.

The evidence of *ὑπόδρα* and *ισόθεος* is perfectly clear. Let us now examine two different grammatical cases of the same word, which belong to the same metrical type.

3. *μεγαλήτορι*. 1 × in 10, 11 × in 8. The localisation is not strictly in keeping with the scheme (29,9–35,5 % and 70,1–63,2 % respectively), but it points in the same direction.

4. *μεγαλήτορα*. With this form it is the other way round: 16 × in 10 (though 11 × in the same line: *ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε πρὸς δν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν*), 5 × in 8. With a single exception (*μεγαλήτορι θυμῷ*, I 109) the dative is always used with the name of a hero before the bucolic diaeresis: *᾽Οδυσσῆι μεγαλήτορι* (4 ×), etc. It is an *épithète générique*,¹⁾ cf. *μεγαλήτορος Ἀλκινόοιο* (7 ×), *μεγαλήτορος Αἰνείαο* (4 ×), etc. The accusative is used 5 × in the same way (e.g. *᾽Οδυσσῆα μεγαλήτορα*, 3 ×)²⁾ but in the majority of cases³⁾ is found as an epithet of *θυμόν* in 10. It is evident that the position of the word depends on the formula of which it is a constituent.

It would be easy to add to the evidence. It could be pointed out that both *ἔμπεδα* nom. (only in 4; percentages given by O'Neill: 9,6 *Il.*, 7,1 *Od.*) and acc. (only in 8; perc.: 29,4 *Il.*, 27,6 *Od.*) deviate from the rule and, at the same time, from one another. Whereas *οἴκοθι* always stands in 10, *οἴκαδε* (without elision) never appears in 8, only once in 10, but 29 × in 2 (which is in flagrant contradiction with the scheme: 29,4–27,6 %, 35,3–31,5 %, 25,7–33,8 %). The form *δξέα* roughly conforms to the rule, but *δξεί* (47 ×) violates it in the most striking way (only once in 10; 35,3–31,5 % according to the scheme). *ἄμυδις* (15 ×) appears in 3, 5 and 7, which is in accordance with the rule, but *χαμάδις* (14 ×) is found 13 × in 7 and only once in 3.⁴⁾ Both *χρυσῶ* and *χλωρόν* (when measured as spondees) show a greater extent of fixity than the scheme would lead us to expect, but differ from one another: *χρυσῶ* 7 × in 5, *χλωρόν* 10 × in 9. These deviations, on the one hand, occur in expressions the formulaic nature of which is conspicuous, and, on the other, are counterbalanced by correspondences that appear in the formulae (or parts of the formulae) of which the word in question is a component part: *ἔμπεδα πάντα* (*φυλάσσειν* etc.), *οἴκαδε νισσόμενον* (*νοστήσας* etc.), *δξεί χαλκῶ* (*δουρί*, etc.), *χαμάδις βάλε* (*χέε*, etc.), *χρυσῶ τε καὶ ἀργύρῳ*, *χλωρόν δέος*. All this, as I said, could

1) Parry, *E.T.* 80 ff.

2) These cases suggest that the predominant localisation of *μεγαλήτορι* is not due to separation of the constituents of a formula as Hainsworth (*o.c.* 64) thinks, the less so if its ancient complement was *μεγαθύμοιο*, below, p. 24, 69.

3) the repetitions of *ὀχθήσας*—not counted.

4) τ 599.

be further elaborated, but as the evidence cited seems to be sufficiently conclusive, I prefer to wind up this part of the inquiry with an examination of a curious conflict between metrical type and "normal" localisation, which is comparable with the case of *ισόθεος* and may similarly reflect pre-Homeric features of the diction.

μεγαθύμων occurs 31 ×, always in position 8. The difference with the regular localisation of this type (the last syllable of *μεγαθύμων* is never shortened) is extremely remarkable: the *ionicus a minore* appears nearly always in 12 (96,2–100 %).¹⁾ Its character of *épithète générique* is even more conspicuous than that of *μεγαλήτορος* and *μεγαλήτορι: μεγαθύμων Τυδέας υἱός, μεγαθύμων Νέστορος υἱός*, etc.); unlike *ισόθεος* it is not confined to a single formula. Yet the very striking conflict with the rule might be explained on the same lines. The original form in which *ισόθεος* had become part of the tradition appeared to have influenced its location. Now one of the 31 cases of *μεγαθύμων* is found in *υἱέες Ἴφιτον, μεγαθύμων Ναυβολίδαο*²⁾ and from Buttman and Ahrens onwards it has been supposed for reasons quite independent of ours that *υἱέες Ἴφιτον* reflects *υἱες Φιφίτοο*. If this is correct, the epithet may reasonably be assumed to have had the same ending. In this form (**μεγαθύμοο*) it conforms to the scheme (70,1–63,2 %). It may have been created as a counterpart of *μεγαλήτορος*, which has exactly the same meaning and position but is used before proper names beginning with a vowel (28 ×).³⁾ I must point out, however, that *μεγαθύμων* shows the same deviation as the gen. sing., though not quite as consistently: 11 × in 8, 3 × in 12, e.g. *Αἰτωλῶν μεγαθύμων*.⁴⁾

A similar phenomenon is found in the case of *ἀγανού*. This word too always stands in 8 (15 ×), never in 12. In the form **ἀγανόο* it would be in accordance with the scheme. Were the original types **ἀγανόο Δευκαλίδαο, ἀγανόο Λαομέδοντος*, etc.?⁵⁾ The gen. plur. occurs only once, in 8;⁶⁾ *ἀγανού* (5 ×) and *ἀγανούς* (9 ×) always occupy the preferred position.

The results of the preceding inquiry may be summarised as follows:

1. It is practically out of the question that Homer's diction is wholly formulaic and traditional.

¹⁾ *θεοειδής*, for example, which is also an *épithète générique* (*Ἀλέξανδρος θεοειδής, Νεοπτόλεμος θεοειδής*) is never found elsewhere (37 ×).

²⁾ B 518; cf. the well-known cases of **Αἰόλοο, *κακομηχάνοο*, etc., Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 45 and most recently Palmer, *The Language of Homer* (in *C.H.*, 95). On the history of the theory see Van Leeuwen, *Ench.*², 165 f.

³⁾ On this supposition *μεγαθύμων Πρωτεσιλάου* (B 706, Π 286) must at a later stage have been modelled on **μεγαθύμοο Ναυβολίδαο, *μεγαθύμοο Πανθοίδαο*, etc.

⁴⁾ *μεγαθύμω* occurs only once, in 8; *μεγαθύμοις* (4 ×) conforms to the rule; the last syllable of *μεγάθυμοι* is often shortened and the word itself occurs in several positions.

⁵⁾ cf. *ἀμύμονος* (41 ×), always in 8.

⁶⁾ E 277.

2. It is uncertain whether the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were composed orally.¹⁾ If they were, however, recitation based upon oral rehearsal must have played some part in the creation of the poems.

3. It is certain that a large part of Homer's diction is formulaic.

4. It is certain that the vast majority of Homer's formulae are traditional.

5. Single words are not to be called formulae.

6. The fact that every single word which is a component part of a fixed group may conform to the localisation rules expounded by O'Neill, need not prevent us from regarding such a group as a formula.

Now that the principles underlying our approach to Homeric diction have been outlined, a few remarks may be made on the method which will be applied. As has been observed in the preceding part of this chapter, it is only the traditional character of a large proportion of Homer's diction that enables us to draw conclusions concerning its pre-Homeric stages. For this traditional nature guarantees that the evolution must have proceeded on more or less fixed lines.²⁾ If we knew only the Homeric stage of the development, this statement could be made with a certain confidence but would still be hypothetical. Actually, however, we have the testimony of Hesiod's poetry and of the most ancient *Hymns*, which shows that, in the period we may in fact survey, it underwent merely gradual, though not unimportant changes.

Before proceeding to examine this phenomenon I am obliged to make a digression on the subjects of chronology and of the unity of the tradition. Recently an attempt was made by J. A. Notopoulos to show that Hesiod draws on a mainland repertory of epic formulae, that this repertory goes straight back to "the Achaean epic" which survived the Dorian conquest on the mainland and that Hesiod's poetry is likely to be contemporary with the Homeric poems.³⁾ If this were correct, we would not be entitled

¹⁾ This question, however, does not affect the following inquiries.

²⁾ On changes in the formulaic tradition in pre-Homeric times see Hainsworth, *o.c.* 57-68.

³⁾ *Homer, Hesiod and the Achaean heritage of oral poetry*, *Hesperia* XXIX (1960), 177-197. There is much more to be said for the argument put forth by Webster, *M.H.*, 177 ff (cf. also *Homer and Attic Geometric Vases*, BSA, L (1950), 38-50) who holds that "Homer and Hesiod inherited a common poetic tradition, which had only finally diverged into an Ionian and mainland stream in the ninth century" but adopts Miss Lorimer's supposition that Hesiod learned the epic technique in Athens where it had been developed from the transition period onwards. I have asked myself if not *κάλων κακόν Th.* 585 and *κάλων εἶδος E.* 63 might support this theory, since Homer always has *κάλος* and Boeotian has *καλῶς* in the earliest inscriptions. Yet the same treatment of *σ* is found in Homeric *ξενίη, ἐνάτη, ἄνοιτο*, etc. (Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 161 f.). Should we regard these forms as post-Homeric Atticisms or as Attic survivals which were carried (as early as the ninth century!) into Ionia by the emigrants? Both suppositions seem extremely doubtful, so at the present state of affairs I prefer the explanation given by Chantraine (*ibid.* n. 1) and I had rather stick to my own view (*o.c.* 225) that Hesiod learned the epic technique from Ionian singers who had crossed to the mainland in the late eighth century.

to speak of a continuous tradition and to cite Hesiodic expressions as evidence for a more recent development of the diction.

It needs no long argument to refute this hypothesis because it is not supported by a single incontrovertible piece of evidence and is contradicted by the most solid facts. Of course it is very probable that the formulaic repertory on which Hesiod drew was not confined to Homer's.¹⁾ It is possible – but no more than possible – that in Hesiod's time some remnants of the ancient formulaic diction had survived in a non-Ionicised form in mainland inscriptions.²⁾ However, these are two different things and they should not be mixed up. There is not the slightest indication that Hesiod borrowed any expressions from such a mainland formulaic tradition which, if it were still in existence, must have been fast dying out. The few non-Ionic expressions Hesiod uses are either non-formulaic (e.g. *αἴνημι* *E.* 683) or appear in a form that is characteristic of the West-Greek component of the Boeotian dialect (e.g. *τροπὰς E.* 564, *δεινὰς E.* 675) and which seems to result from the declension of a normal epic formula (*τροπαὶ ἠελίοιο, ο* 404, **δεινὰι ἀῆται*, cf. *δεινὸς ἀῆτη(ς), Ο* 626. For the original prototypes of such expressions, even if they are lacking in Homer,³⁾ we have not the slightest indication that they were adopted by Hesiod from a mainland source. But in this respect we need not even point to the lack of positive evidence. We may simply ask: how can the ubiquitous Ionic form of Hesiod's language be explained if we do not accept that his diction goes back to an older Ionic stage? How came expressions such as *ἀπ' ἔργου* and *ἀγορέων τε* (*E.* 28, 30) to be used by a Boeotian poet?

So much for the mainland tradition. As to chronology, it may suffice to refer briefly to the fundamental facts long ago established by Rzach, Devantier and others. In formulaic terms their evidence can be translated as follows: Hesiod adopted the traditional diction at a time when this diction was already considerably more Ionicised and modernised than at the stage represented by Homer.⁴⁾ On the subject of chronological relations between Homer and the most ancient *Hymns*, for which similar possibilities have been suggested, a few remarks will be made in the relevant chapters.⁵⁾

Questions of this kind, then, need not keep us from adducing the testimony of Hesiod and of the oldest *Hymns* as evidence for a more

¹⁾ see A. Hoekstra, *Hésiode et la tradition orale*, *Mnem.* X, 3 (1957), 193–225.

²⁾ *ibid.* 221–225.

³⁾ cf. e.g. *κούρας δμόφρονας Th.* 60, *μεταναιέτας εἶναι, Th.* 401.

⁴⁾ A more detailed discussion on this subject in *Hés.* 201–202. Here I confine myself to quoting a remark made by A. Severyns, *Homère* II, 93: "Donc, Hésiode néglige ou respecte le digamma de la même manière que les poètes épiques. La chose a de quoi surprendre chez un Béotien, dont la langue appartient à la famille éolienne, mais elle devient naturelle si l'on pose en principe qu'Hésiode imite l'épopée ionienne déjà maîtresse de ses moyens d'expression".

⁵⁾ see below, p. 82, 91.

recent development and a gradually increasing decomposition of the formulaic style. Symptoms of this course of things have been incidentally noted by Parry, by Severyns and by the present writer. They are of different kinds but all have this in common that the thought of the poet does no longer run in the age-old traditional channels. Many of the innovations themselves proceed on fixed lines. Others – and these are the most interesting phenomena – are obviously due to the fact that the poet, while composing in a traditional pattern, is not able, for one reason or another, to keep strictly to this pattern, but still clings to it in a general way or mixes it up with another, that, originally, was not designed to link up with it. In that case a clash occurs which manifests itself in a prosodical or linguistic peculiarity or irregularity. ¹⁾ Let me cite some examples of this kind of clash.

One of the most interesting parts of *L'épithète traditionnelle* is the passage ²⁾ in which Parry discusses Hes. fr. 94. 21 Rz.: ἐκ δ' Ἰθάκης ἐμῆτο Ὀδυσσεύος ἱερὴ ἴς. He points out that the expression πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς appears 5 times in the *Iliad* and is never replaced by another, "quoiqu'il soit bien évident que, dans *l'Iliade*, Ulysse n'a pas été plus éprouvé par les souffrances que n'importe quel autre chef achéen. Mais l'auteur du fragment en question sentait qu'il était décidément mal à propos de donner au jeune Ulysse ce titre et, par conséquent, il s'est vu obligé de remplacer l'expression par une autre, *même si celle-ci devait entraîner deux fautes de métrique*" (my italics). I may add that these two anomalies are not caused by mere innovation but by the fact that this innovation has been modelled on the formula ἱερὴ ἴς Τηλεμάχιο (7 ×, cf. ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο, 7 ×), which, for this purpose, had to undergo modification.

Severyns has admirably shown that the neglect of the original digamma of οἶνος in Homer and Hesiod is due to the modification and dislocation of formulae. ³⁾ From our point of view Hes. *E.* 592 πρωτογόνων τ' ἐρίφων ἐπὶ δ' αἶθοπα πινέμεν οἶνον is especially interesting because the fact that "le poète a dessoudé l'élément αἶθοπα οἶνον" ⁴⁾ corresponds to a dislodgement of πινέμεν. In the original formulaic systems infinitives of this type seem to have a traditional function in the fourth (and not in the fifth) foot. ⁵⁾

Another characteristic example of modification is found in Hes. *Th.* 15

¹⁾ On prosodical anomalies resulting from modification or juxtaposition of formulae see Parry, *Form.*, *pass.*

²⁾ *o.c.* 164.

³⁾ *o.c.* II, 86–93.

⁴⁾ *ibid.* 92.

⁵⁾ The cases are listed by Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 490 ff.; see also K. Meister, *Die homerische Kunstsprache* 12 f. As far as I know, Immanuel Bekker was the first to draw attention to the conspicuous frequency of these infinitives in the fourth foot, *Homerische Blätter* (Bonn, 1863), 147.

ἡδὲ Ποσειδάωνα Γαιήογον Ἐρνοσίγαιον.¹⁾ In Homer the use of the various grammatical cases of Γαιήοχος is always impeccable from a prosodical point of view, because the formulae of which it is part are never declined in a way they were not meant to be. For the acc. sing. Homer either employs Γαιήογον Ἐρνοσίγαιον (after the penthemimeris, Ψ 584) or Ποσειδάωνα ἄνακτα (after the trochaic caesura, O 8, cf. Ποσειδάωνι ἄνακτι, 9 ×). In Hesiod the non-traditional declension of a traditional formula has caused the irregular shortening of the syllable γαι-.

It seems, then, that in the period between Homer on the one hand and Hesiod and the earliest *Hymns* on the other, epic style underwent some changes which mark the decomposition of the ancient formulaic diction. In the same period this style was also subject to an increasing Ionicisation and modernisation complementary to the process of decomposition. There is not the slightest indication, however, that this dual development set in only after the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* had reached their final form.²⁾ On the contrary, we have sufficient evidence to conclude that this evolution is already well on its way in Homer. Since we have learned from Parry to explain certain irregularities of the Homeric text not in terms of transmission, grammar or metric, but as resulting from formulaic adaptation and modification, we may be sure that, when the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were created, the same (or similar) causes we find in Hesiod and the *Hymns* were operating, be it on a smaller scale. Taking up, in this matter, the initiative of K. Witte³⁾ and Monro,⁴⁾ Parry himself disclosed some of the relevant phenomena.⁵⁾ Since then more symptoms of the same kind have incidentally been discussed by Severyns,⁶⁾ Chantaine,⁷⁾ Ruijgh⁸⁾ and the present writer. It looks, however, as though their evidence is much more significant than has been realised up to now: on closer inspection it appears that they enable us to identify a number of related phenomena, which, in their turn, not only give us a more adequate idea of the development of epic diction in the period between Homer on the one hand and Hesiod and the earliest *Hymns* on the other, but also throw light on the previous history of Homeric style. On the other hand it will be clear that the particular nature of the evidence I propose to deal with should keep the reader from expecting remarkable results concerning stages of development considerably preceding the Homeric phase. Perhaps the same or similar causes were operating one or two centuries before Homer's time, but the linguistic structure of the formulae

¹⁾ A. Hoekstra, *o.c.* 210 f.

²⁾ see below, p. 33 ff. and *pass.*

³⁾ *R.E.* VIII, 2 (1913), 2223 ff.

⁴⁾ *Homeric Grammar*² 357.

⁵⁾ *Form. pass.*

⁶⁾ *o.c.* 68-69. 88-92.

⁷⁾ *o.c.* 123-140.

⁸⁾ e.g. *E.A.* 114.

which may have been subject to this influence escapes us. Even the study of more recent types of development is seriously hampered by the nature of the evidence. Its results depend primarily on the question if this evidence permits us to establish, beyond reasonable doubt, the prototypes from which Homeric variations can be shown to have developed. This condition is only fulfilled if an incidental variation is counterbalanced in Homer by expressions answering the definition of the formula and which, moreover, are likely to be traditional. But it is obvious that data of this kind may not be expected to appear often in conjunction.¹⁾ Nevertheless the import of the conclusions that may be drawn from the phenomena in question is not necessarily diminished by the fact that they are based on a relatively small number of cases. For if a limited number of detectable clues permits us to determine some of the circumstances under which, for example, *v*-movable was introduced into certain expressions, it is not unreasonable to suppose that the same or similar causes occasioned its use in those cases in which the development of epic diction obliterated any traces of this history.

The nature of the evidence presents still another difficulty. If the inquiry is to be placed on a firm footing and if the hypothetical element is to be eliminated as much as possible, it is imperative that no other evidence shall be admitted than that which is provided by the *textus receptus* of Homer, based as it is on the best authority available of mss., papyri and other sources. Yet it has been generally recognised that this text represents only a relatively late stage of the transmission²⁾ and that it contains several features which throw doubt on the authenticity of some of the data with which we are concerned.³⁾ This is most noticeable in places marked by the loss of the initial digamma. Here the authentic reading is sometimes preserved by one or more mss., by a papyrus or by the scholia, which, in a number of cases, attest that it was known to—and preferred by—Aristarchus.⁴⁾ The individual cases are not to be discussed here,⁵⁾ but the problem as such cannot be left out of account since it may affect the intended inquiry. From our point of view it may be stated as follows: is it possible to make out in each single case of a

1) First, Homer's personal inventions (such as *Ἀναβησινεώς τε*) are not reducible to any prototypes. Secondly—and this involves a much more drastic restriction of possibilities—it looks as though, at a stage not far distant from the Homeric one, the development of epic diction created a fluid mass of modified formulae lacking the fixity of more archaic expressions and giving us nothing to go by for the identification of possible prototypes; see below, p. 50 f.

2) For a modern survey of its history see now J. A. Davison, *The Transmission of the Text* in *C.H.*, 215–233.

3) Of course I leave aside the still hotly debated questions of the Peisistratean recension, the Athenian *μεταγραμματισμός* and the like.

4) Who did not conjecture it but must have known it from sources which have since disappeared.

5) They are to be found in Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 118–152.

unanimously attested reading appearing in a recent form, whether we have to do with interference of a rhapsode (or a copyist) or with an adaptation of a more ancient formula which is due to the poet himself? The answer must of course be negative and under these circumstances I prefer to err on the safe side. Since in a case like Δ 467 part of our mss. have preserved the original reading γάρ ἐρύοντα whereas the other mss. correct this by reading γάρ ῥ' ἐρύοντα, it is reasonable to suppose that in cases such as M 389 ἦ ῥ' ἴδε the suppression of the particle actually restores the authentic reading. The same may be true of the elimination of a τ' (e.g. E 481 τά τ' ἔλδεται), a γ' (e.g. X 216 νότ γ' ἔολπα), a κ' (e.g. Y 250 ὀπποῖόν κ' εἴπησθα), etc., etc. It is clearly impossible, however, to determine the point where emendation has to halt in the broad margin of uncertainty which lies between cases like Δ 467, β 91 (= ν 380 μὲν ἔλπει, a, T^1) μὲν τ' ἔλπει vulg.), κ 190 (οὐ γάρ ἴδμεν schol. on β 1) and those where the authenticity of the transmission (e.g. γ 233 etc.: νόστιμον ἡμαρ ἰδέσθαι) is beyond doubt.²) The same applies to forms created by quantitative metathesis. We may feel inclined to consider the authenticity of the variant Ἄλταο δς (i.e. Ἄλτα' δς)³ in Φ 86, but what are we to do with Ἰδεώ θ' δς in I 558?

Therefore, since we must avoid basing our argument on a text which, on preconceived principles, has been corrected in an archaising manner, it will be wise to make a fundamental distinction, in theory at least, between the pre-Homeric prototype of a given expression and what may, with reasonable certainty, be regarded as the Homeric form of the formula in question, even if we run the risk of ascribing to Homer a form which is due to a rhapsode or a copyist. There is the more reason to do so as in practice this risk will turn out to be a very small one.

¹) Allen's *sigla*.

²) The position is well characterised by Severyns, *o.c.* 91: "—la tradition manuscrite est partiellement responsable de cet état de choses.—Mais le poète lui-même a sa part dans cette disparition".

³) See Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 70; other examples in Van Leeuwen's edition of the *Iliad* (Leiden 1912), XXXIX.

II

QUANTITATIVE METATHESIS

Quantitative metathesis is probably the most recent linguistic feature of Homeric language.¹⁾ As late as the last quarter of the sixth century η coming from \bar{a} is, without exception, noted as distinct from inherited \bar{e} in the Naxian script, both in the island itself and in the neighbouring Amorgos.²⁾ Because of the consistency attested in this respect by the epigraphical material it seems arbitrary to reject the use of Ξ in the metathesised forms of the well-known Nikandre-inscription as evidence for pronunciation;³⁾ it most likely reflects a phonetic reality. Yet in such forms—where $-e\omega$ was soon to become monosyllabic—the peculiar quality of this first element must have been short-lived; it is improbable that the timbre survived the change in quantity for a considerable time.⁴⁾ Therefore we may reasonably suppose that in the second half of the seventh century, to which the Nikandre-inscription probably belongs,⁵⁾ the metathesis itself was still a recent development in Central Ionic. So if we assume that in the regions of Chios and Smyrna the change in quantity was completed no more than a century earlier, that is to say about half of that time (i.e. one or at most two generations of singers) before the composition of the *Iliad*, we shall not be very far from the truth. The state of affairs we find in Homer is in accordance with this approximate dating of the phenomenon.⁶⁾ The linguistic evidence—the *formulaic* aspect of the question must be left aside for the moment in order to avoid circular reasoning later on—is clearly in favour of the view expressed by Karl Meister that the metathesis already existed in the dialect of the singers “als *A, E, A, N, O, II* vollendet wurden”, but that, on the other

¹⁾ “diese jüngsten Schöpfungen der epischen Sprache”, K. Meister, *o.c.* 163. On contraction see below, p. 131 ff. As *elas(v)*, etc., and the genitives in *-ov* of the *o*-stems as compared with *δωσει* and similar cases (below, p. 144) testify, its development covered a much longer period, so it can only rarely be used for our purpose.

²⁾ Buck, *The Greek Dialects* 19, 189–190, L. H. Jeffery, *The local scripts of archaic Greece* 291–293. The distinction is still observed, though not consistently, in some fifth-century inscriptions from Ceos and Andros, Buck, *o.c.* 190–191, Jeffery, *o.c.* 296.

³⁾ as is done with reference to *I.G.* XII, 5, 612, and 8, 360, 395, by K. Latte, *Zur griechischen Wortforschung*, Glotta XXXII (1953), 40.

⁴⁾ On the grave-stele of Demainete (Jeffery, 293), also written in Naxian, we actually find *Λαμπσαγοροε*.

⁵⁾ L. H. Jeffery, *o.c.* 291: “about the middle of the seventh century”; Buck, *o.c.* 189: “seventh or early sixth century”; Schwyzer *Del.*, 366: VI.

⁶⁾ Mr. Hainsworth points out to me that the metathesis is universal in the Milesian and Cumaean colonies. This, he adds, is a little before the most reasonable date for Homer.

hand, there is "kein häufiger gebrauchtes Wort, kein Formans, in dem die Metathesis Regel und nicht Ausnahme wäre." ¹⁾ And in this connection it is significant that the forms with dissyllabic *-εω*, *-εων* occur only very infrequently in the more than 27000 verses: e.g. *πυλέων* H 1, *M* 340; *θυρέων φ* 191; *ξως β* 78; *τέως Ω* 658, *σ* 190 and perhaps *T* 189; ²⁾ *μυγέωσι B* 475, etc.

In order to assess the part which quantitative metathesis played in the development of epic diction we now have to examine the problem of its occurrence in formulae. For this purpose the relevant material may be divided into three groups.

a. The words containing dissyllabic *-εω(ν)*. With the notable exception of *νεῶν* ³⁾ these do not show the slightest trace of formulaic employment. ⁴⁾ The expressions in which they appear are obviously personal creations of Homer himself or of his immediate predecessors.

b. A number of cases marked by monosyllabic *-εω* ⁵⁾ are found in the well-known category of *Πηληιάδew* 'Αχιλλῆος, *Λαερτιάδew* 'Οδυσῆος, 'Ατρείδew 'Αγαμέμνονος (cf. 'Αγαμέμνονος 'Ατρείδew, 12 × at the verse-end), *ἔστewτες περὶ βωμόν* (cf. *ἔσταότες παρ' ὄχεσφι Θ* 565, ⁶⁾ etc. These forms are simply reducible to older prototypes (**Πηληιάδα* 'Αχιλλῆος, etc.). As is shown by the use of 'Αγαμέμνονος 'Ατρείδew here we have to do with plain Ionicisation or modernisation of ancient formulae. ⁷⁾ Traces of the same process have survived in *πνοιῖ Βορέw ἀλεγεινῖ* (Ξ 395, where

¹⁾ o.c. 164; of course Meister argues here from a separatist point of view, but this is immaterial to the problem itself.

²⁾ See the edd. *ad. loc.* and Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 12.

³⁾ On *νεῶν*-formulae see below p. 124-130. In discussing the gen. pl. forms under this heading I have followed the current usage, though, strictly speaking, they do not show 'metathesis' but ante-vocalic shortening.

⁴⁾ On *πυλέων* etc. see above. Extremely significant are 'Ακρόνεως (θ 111) and 'Αναβησίνεως (θ 113). The name of the obscure *Πηνέλεως* gives no clue that it ever occurred in formulaic employment (in the nom. 4 × without an epithet, once, *P* 597, *Πηνέλεως Βοιώτιος*; Ξ 489 in the gen., Ξ 489 in the dat., *N* 92 in the acc.) If it really comes from **Πηνέλαος* (cf. Chantraine *G.H.* I, 197), *Πηνελέω* (v.l. *Πηνέλεω* and *Πηνελέω*) *ἄνακτος* Ξ 489 may be an instance of late archaism based on an archaic type of formula. The form *Πετew* (note the different accent) mentioned along with *Πηνελέω* by Chantraine, is not to be ascribed to quantitative metathesis. It must be emphasised that neither of these genitives can go back to similar forms prior to quantitative metathesis, **Πηνεληφό* (Thumb-Scherer, o.c. 271) being excluded by metre and **Πετew* (?) by the Homeric use of *Πετew*: *υἱός Πετew* *Μενεσθεύς* (2 ×), etc.

⁵⁾ Possibly we have to do with early instances of the phenomenon that "in Ionic verse scansion seems to be ahead of normal pronunciation", Webster, *Notes on the writing of early Greek Poetry*, *Glotta* XXXVIII (1960), 257-263.

⁶⁾ Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 71, 430.

⁷⁾ cf. also (*κλισίην*) *Νηληιάδew ἀφίκοντο A* 618 ~ *Νηληιάδew γέροντος Θ* 100, *O* 378; *Πατρόκλειο - Μενειτιάδew ἀποτίση Σ* 93 ~ *Πατρόκλειο Μενειτιάδew θανόντος Φ* 28 etc. ~ *ὑπὸ Πατρόκλειο Μενειτιάδew δαμέντας (δαμῆναι) Π* 420 etc. On *Μενειτιάδew Πατροκλῆος* see Shipp, *Studies* 126.

the metathesis could only be effected by means of contraction), cf. *πνοιή Βορέας φέρησιν* (κ 507), *πνοιή Βορέας* at the verse-end (*E* 697), and in similar cases.¹⁾

c. The majority of the forms in *-εω*, *-εων*, however, are neither "reducible" nor obvious instances of innovation (such as the forms found in group *a*). Hence it is much more difficult to make a clear distinction between traditional and non-traditional expressions and to establish possible prototypes. Yet in this respect we are apt to be deceived by the terms "reducible" and "irreducible". This distinction, which seems to go back to the dispute raised by the archaizing text-constitution in the manner of Van Leeuwen and others, is only useful nowadays from a purely descriptive point of view. *Τυδείδεω*, for example, is "irreducible" e.g. *Π* 74 (*Τυδείδεω Διομήδεος*) but "reducible" γ 181 *Τυδείδεω ἔταροι*. With the former expression correspond *Τυδείδην Διομήδεα* (*Z* 235, *K* 150) and *Τυδείδη Διομήδει* (*E* 1, 225, 866, *A* 312), always appearing in the same position. For *Τυδείδεω ἔταροι* we have the parallel *Αἰεΐω ἔταρον* (v.l. *Αἰεΐω*), *E* 534, and *Φυλίδεω ἔταρον*, *O* 519. So in all probability we have to do with declension of a more ancient formula in *Π* 74 and in γ 181 with a simple case of Ionicisation (or modernisation) of a genitive-prototype. Both changes however, could only be made after the metathesis had begun to develop in Ionic. The former (*Π* 74) is the more characteristic of the evolution of epic diction. At the same time it shows that we are not entitled to 'correct' *Τυδείδεω ἔταροι*, etc., but that the formulaic prototypes of the two expressions were *Τυδείδην Διομήδεα* (*Τυδείδη Διομήδει*) and **Τυδείδα' ἔταροι* (-*ων* etc.). In the same way *Ζηνός ἐριβρεμέτω* (*N* 624) results from declension of *Ζεως ὑφιβρεμέτης* (*A* 354, etc., 5 ×).²⁾ That the distinction between "reducible" and "irreducible" forms is, from a historical point of view, immaterial, that the transmitted text is not to be altered (or the archaic form to be preferred if a variant is attested) but that, as soon as the metathesis had started in Ionic, the poets themselves began to modify ancient prototypes, all this is clearly shown by comparing *Φ* 85-86: *θυγάτηρ Ἄλταο γέροντος, Ἄλτεω δς*

1) Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 65. Professor Kamerbeek reminds me that in Ionic one out of three vowels occurring in succession is generally dropped (cf. Stein in his introduction to Herodotus, LXXI). In some incidental cases, then, we may have to do with a 'free' employment of a current contemporary form, e.g. in *Ψ* 692 *ὡς δ' ὄθ' ὑπὸ φρικῶς Βορέω ἀναπάλλεται ἰχθῶς*. In view of the parallels κ 507, *E* 697, however, it seems doubtful whether this applies to *Ξ* 395, the more so since *ἐνμμελίω* shows the same treatment and since this adjective is certainly of poetical and archaic origin. (below, p. 37f., cf. also *Ἐρμείω*, *ibid.*). Professor Van Groningen (*Herodotus Historiën*, Inleiding 39) suggests the possibility of contraction in Ionic *Ἐρμέω* etc. In this respect it is to be noted that in *E* 534 we find a v.l. *Αἰεΐω* alongside with *Ἀινεΐω*.

2) cf. Shipp, *Studies* 126, who rejects Parry's guess **Ζηνός ἐριβρεμέτω* (*E.T.* 236-37). It will be shown, however, that sometimes Homer employs recent forms when shortening old prototypes (below p. 61 ff.).

Λελέγεσσι φιλοπτολέμοισιν ἀνάσσει with *I 558 Ἴδεώ θ' δς κάρτιστος ἐπιχθονίων γένετ' ἀνδρῶν*. In *Φ 86* the Laur. 32, 3 has *Ἄλταο δς* so we might read *Ἄλτα', δς*,¹⁾ but in *I 558 Ἴδαο* is of course impossible. Does it follow then, that the resemblance between the two expressions is fortuitous? In the first place it is to be noted that the repetition *Ἄλταο γέροντος, Ἄλτεω, δς*, though similar phenomena are extremely scarce in Homer, looks like an old formulaic device of narrative poetry. In this impression we are confirmed by the observation of Bowra that this form of *ἐπαναστροφή* "is common among Russian singers of traditional lays, who indeed use it so freely that it becomes almost a hindrance to the movement of the story."²⁾ On the principle stated above, viz. that various kinds of anomalies may be explained as modifications of older formulaic prototypes, the well-known *Ἡετίωνος, Ἡετίων, δς ἔναιεν* (*Z 395-96*) may be regarded as another instance of Homer's handling the same device. Moreover, however cautious we have to be in attempting to identify 'metrical and syntactic patterns', I may point out that both *Ἄλτεω, δς* and *Ἴδεώ θ', δς* show a syntactic type of enjambement which is likely to be traditional: *Αἴανθ', δς Α 589; Τυδείδης, δς Ε 362; Τυδείδην, δς Ε 457; Περγασίδην, δν Ε 535; Τευθρανίδην, δς Ζ 13; Πριαμίδην, δς Μ 438, Ἀσιάδην, δς Ν 561; Ἡνοπίδην, δν Ξ 444, Μαστορίδης, δν Ο 438 (Μαστορίδης, δ ω 452); Μαιμαλίδης, δς Π 194; Ἐρμείας, δς Υ 35.³⁾ The use of this type has different effects in different cases: *Z 396* the poet has recourse to the so-called *nominativus pendens*; *Α 58 (Αἴεϊαν θ', δς)* the insertion of *θ'* does not entail any morphological or syntactic change, but *I 558* it necessitates (and is only made possible by) the use of a very recent form. Similarly in "irreducible" *Πριαμίδεω τοῦ* (*Υ 77*), modification presents itself at a more advanced stage than in "reducible" *Ἀρμονίδεω, δς* (*Ε 60*), but both expressions have obviously been developed from the same traditional type (*Πριαμίδης, δς* —, **Πριαμίδα', δς* —, *Πριαμίδην, δς* —, etc.) and are equally part of the system outlined above.*

Monosyllabic *ἕως* and *τέως* appear 6 and 4 (5?)⁴⁾ times respectively, whereas for the same words scanned as **ῆος* and **τῆος* the corresponding occurrences may be approximately assessed at 39 and 5.⁵⁾ Of course Chantraine is right in rejecting the supposition that in Homer "*τέως μὲν* a *été* substitué à *τῆος* en κ 348, ο 231, π 370, ω 162; ou *ἕως μὲν* à *ῆος* en

1) above, p. 30.

2) *Homer and his Forerunners*, 13. "Originally this was meant to help improvisation, to give the poet a moment to think ahead, while he repeated the words mechanically." Bowra refers only to *Υ 371-72 εἰ πυχὴ χεῖρας ἕωικας*, which, from a formulaic point of view, is less significant. See also J. Th. Kakridis, *Homeric Researches* 124 f.

3) see also O. A. Danielsson, *Hesiodica*, *Eranos* I, 3, Parry, *The distinctive character of enjambement in the Homeric verse*, *TAPA LX* (1929), 200-220.

4) *Υ 42* the tradition has several variants: *τόφρα, τέως μὲν, τέως ἄρ, τελως, τέως*.

5) K. Meister, *o.c.* 157. Some cases are dubious.

β 148, τ 530¹⁾. Yet the phenomenon that in 7 cases²⁾ out of 10 the usual (and obviously traditional) scansion can be restored by omitting μέν (and in two more cases by omitting γ' and δ τ')³⁾ is far too significant to be due to chance. Moreover, when we come to examine the neglect of the digamma in Homer, we shall be confronted with a similar phenomenon, e.g. in τήν μὲν ἰδὼν γήθησε (in ε 486 = ω 504), which was clearly modelled on τὸν (τήν, τοῦς) δὲ ἰδὼν γήθησε/ῥέγησε, etc. (15 ×) after the digamma had disappeared from current speech.⁴⁾ In this case the relation between the later expression and the ancient prototypes is perfectly clear because of the fact that in this part of the diction epic style is most conservative.⁵⁾ Pre-Homeric formulae having *ῥος and *τῆρος in other places than the first foot must have been much more subject to change and in these cases the Homeric context is, in fact, far less formulaic. This, however, does not disprove the development outlined above. Obviously some of the expressions may have been created by the poet(s) regardless of the tradition, but the general direction in which the evolution took place after the metathesis had been completed, is made sufficiently clear by the evidence just cited. The higher degree of mobility of the *ῥος/*τῆρος expressions, as compared with the τὸν δὲ ἰδὼν-formulae, makes it more difficult to retrace the prototypes of their ἔως/τέως descendants. Yet in those places where Homer's diction is most formulaic, we seem to catch a glimpse of older types of narrative:

εἶχε βίη, δ δὲ	*τῆρος ἐνὶ μεγάροις	Φυλάκιοι	cf. ο 231
ἀμφίπολοι δ' ἄρα	*τῆρος ἐνὶ μεγάροισι	πένοντο	cf. κ 348
αὐτὰρ δ	*τῆρος [ἐτόλμα] ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν	εἴοισιν	cf. ω 162
ῥσθιε δ'	*ῥος [ἄοιδός] ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν	ἄειδεν	cf. ρ 358 ⁶⁾

The cases of ἔως/τέως clearly show that the Homeric material is far from sufficient for the retracing of the prototypes of all the expressions marked by monosyllabic -εω or -εων.⁷⁾ Of many of the combinations in question the parallels are so few and so vague or insignificant that it is impossible to identify the ancient formulae from which they have descended. Some of the expressions may have no formulaic ancestors at all and, just as ἐκτός θυρέων ἔσαν, may be personal creations. It is fairly certain that Ἄιδεω, ᾠτειλέων, μελαινέων and ἀγκυλομήτεω are due to

1) G.H. I, 42.

2) P 727 included.

3) ἔως δ γε (ε 386), ἔως δ τ' ἀοιδός (ρ 358).

4) below, p. 56 ff.

5) Chantraine, *Sur un trait du style homérique* (review of E.T., Rev. de Phil. LV (1929), 229), Hainsworth, o.c. 59.

6) The situation described by these combinations is likely to have recurred in oral heroic poetry and this probably caused the prototypes to survive, be it in a slightly modified form, cf. below, p. 50, 54 ff., 100 ff., 114 ff.

7) Here the limitations are the same as those to which the search for systems of common noun-epithet formulae is subject, see Parry, E.T. 127-31.

modification (either by declension or by insertion of other elements, or by a combination of both) of *Ἄϊδαο δόμους, ἐξ ᾠτειλῆς, μελαινάων ὀδονάων* and *Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης* respectively.¹⁾ The form *θυμοραιστέων* in *δηίων ὑπὸ θυμοραιστέων* (*Π* 591, *Σ* 220) is probably due to declension of *θυμοραιστής* but it is unlikely that the prototype of the expression is to be found in *θάνατος χύτο θυμοραιστής* (*N* 544, *Π* 414 = 580), the only expression in which the nom. sing. appears. Other cases are, to a still higher degree, subject to doubt and in trying to detect the possible origins we find ourselves rapidly entering the realm of sheer hypothesis. *E* 818 *σέων* (*v.l.* *σῶν*) *μέμνημαι ἐφετμέων* may be explained on the same lines as *ἐξ ᾠτειλέων*, for *περὶ πασέων* (*δ* 608, *v* 70) we may refer to *περὶ πάντων* (17 ×), for *πολλέων ἐκ πολλίων* (*B* 131, *I* 544) we may suggest as a possible prototype *πολλάων πολλίων*²⁾ (which is actually found, though in a different position, *B* 117 = *I* 24). Since the story of Antheia and Meleagros is likely to have been told in an earlier epic, *ἐξ ἀρέων μητρὸς κεχολωμένος* *I* 566 may reflect an ancient **ἀράων ματρὸς κεχολωμένος* (cf. *ἐπέων κεχολωμένος* *A* 703).³⁾ *αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἐδρέων* (*v* 56) may be supposed to result from declension of *αὐτόθεν ἐξ ἔδρης* (*T* 77) and from contamination of this expression with *(πάντες) ἀφ' ἐδράων* (*Ap.* 4),⁴⁾ but it is clear that the path we have followed so far is quickly petering out. Nevertheless one firm foothold remains amidst all. It is the solid fact that, with a few very dubious exceptions, all these expressions show in *their recent forms* no traces of formulaic employment. Most of them are used only once, e.g. *ἄκρον Ἀθηνέων* (*γ* 278) contrasting sharply with the archaic-looking *ἐς γουνόν Ἀθηνάων ἱεράων* (*λ* 323),⁵⁾ *οὐδ' ἀγορέων* (*I* 441),⁶⁾ *ὑπὲρ αὐτέων* (*M* 424 probably of very recent origin), *πρωτέων* (*O* 656), the famous *καιρουσέων* (*η* 107), etc., etc. In this group we find but three substantial combinations which are used more than once only, but they all appear in repeated lines: *ἀφ' ἱππέων ὀπλέων* (*A* 536 = *Y* 501), *ἐκέτω περιδήσεται ἀνδρός* (*Ω* 158 = 187), *συβώτεω πειρητίζων* (*ξ* 459 = *ο* 304).

So far, then, we have found little or no evidence of formulae in which quantitative metathesis is original. A few cases remain to be examined.

¹⁾ See *Hésiode et la tr. or.* 203 f. and, especially on *Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτω*, 213 f. On the origin of this expression I must disagree with Shipp, *Studies* 125–126, who propounds a rather complicated explanation. It is worth mentioning, in this respect, that Homer has an equivalent (*πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε* 27 ×) which is older, cf. *βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη* ~ *θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη*. It is notable too, that though the remains of actual cult of Kronos are scanty (Guthrie, *The Greeks and their Gods* 53, Nilsson, *Geschichte der Griech. Religion* I, 511 ff.), he has a unique and certainly ancient place in myth, Nilsson, *ibid.*, cf. below p. 121.

²⁾ *τάων ἐκ πασέων* (!) *I* 330 < **τάων πασάων*, modified by insertion of *ἐκ* as in *B* 131 = *I* 544?? *ἐκ πασέων* (*Σ* 431) < *ἐκ πάντων* (*A* 96, *B* 433)?? cf. p. 54ff.

³⁾ cf. Chantrains, *G.H.* II, 65.

⁴⁾ On the possibility that formulae have survived in an older form in later poetry see *Hésiode et la tr. or.*, 212–214.

⁵⁾ On the appearance of ancient formulae in *λ* see below p. 51 ff., 105.

⁶⁾ below, p. 40 f.

1. *παρειῶν* always occurs (in a contracted form) at the end of the line and is used three times in what may be regarded as a formulaic combination: *Ω* 794 *θαλερόν δὲ κατεΐβeto δάκρυ παρειῶν*, *δ* 198 *βαλέειν τ' ἀπὸ δάκρυ παρειῶν*, *δ* 223 *βάλοι κατὰ δάκρυ παρειῶν*. The question of the relation between *παρήμιον* (*Ψ* 690, τ 208) and *παρειά* has been discussed by Bechtel,¹⁾ Wackernagel²⁾ and Meister,³⁾ especially in connection with the curious variant *παρειά* in *Γ* 35 which is regarded by the schol. as neuter plur.⁴⁾ Does *παρειῶν* reflect *παρήμιον*? Meister suggests that *παρήμιον* *Ψ* 690, τ 208 is due to catachresis (cf. *Δ* 142) and that it never had the meaning 'cheek' in actual usage.

2. *χρεώ* (10 × *Il.*, 5 × *Od.*)⁵⁾ is found several times at the end of the line in the combinations *τίπτε δέ σε χρεώ*; (*K* 85, α 225), *οὐδέ τί μιν χρεώ* (*Φ* 322, δ 707), *ἦ τι (τόν δέ, τῶ με) μάλα χρεώ* (*I* 197, *Δ* 409, *Σ* 406). It is remarkable that in the same systems we find an equivalent: *οὐδέ τί σε (με) χρεή* (9 × *Il.*, 8 × *Od.*), *νῦν σε μάλα χρεή* (3 × *Il.*). In view of the fact that *χρεώ* winds up the sentence in *K* 85, α 225, *δ* 707, *I* 197, the question presents itself whether there developed a tendency to use it instead of *χρεή* once the latter began to be felt as a verbal form⁶⁾ and was, therefore, considered to be out of place without an infinitive following. If so, the substitution was not carried through consistently, (as e.g. α 124 *ὄττεό σε χρεή* shows) and, on the other hand, it must have been extended beyond its original range.

2a. Though, strictly speaking, the vexed question of *ῥέα* is not one of metathesis, we may compare the use of the monosyllabic form in *οὐδέ κέ μιν ῥέα* (*M* 381) and *οὐ κε (v.l. με) μάλα ῥέα* (*Y* 101)⁷⁾ with that of *χρεώ* in the expressions just quoted. K. Meister plausibly argues that *ῥέα* once belonged to current speech in Ionia.⁸⁾ If it did, the same might be true of the type *οὐδέ* ∪ ∪ *ῥέα*. And if this should be regarded as a colloquialism, a similar origin might be considered for *οὐδε* ∪ ∪ *χρεώ* etc. It may belong to the same category as certain formulaic combinations of particles.⁹⁾

3. *ἐνμμελίω* occurs only in the repeated line *καὶ Πριάμοιο καὶ λαὸς ἐνμμελίω Πριάμοιο* (*Δ* 47, etc. 4 ×) which Shipp is inclined to regard as "an interpolated addition to *Ἴλιος ἰρή*, which always precedes"¹⁰⁾. Be this

1) *Lexilogus zu Homer* 270 ff.

2) *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* 60.

3) o.c. 23-24.

4) see Leaf *ad loc.*, Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 202.

5) "constitue un trait ionien et relativement récent du dialecte épique", Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 70.

6) In some cases "*χρεή* est peut-être déjà senti comme un verbe", Chantraine, *G.H.* II, 40.

7) "Certaines prononciations monosyllabiques paraissent particulièrement artificielles", Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 66.

8) o.c. 193.

9) above, p. 14 f., cf. below, p. 116 n. 2.

10) *Studies* 126-127.

as it may, his reference to *Ἑρμείω* (O 214), also appearing in a context which contains "important references to the future destruction of Troy", is interesting since there is some independent (though not decisive) evidence that the form is a remnant of an abbreviated formula *Ἑρμείω διακτόρου* (**διακτόρο*?).¹⁾ If this surmise should be correct, we would not have to do with an instance of quantitative metathesis followed by contraction, but with a case of direct contraction, of *-ao*. The same then, might be true of *ἔνυμμελίω*. The word itself belongs to an ancient category of compounds²⁾ and the use of *μελίη* as *spear* (probably even *thrusting-spear*) equally points to an archaic origin.³⁾ So we have to reckon with the possibility that, in the same way as *Ἑρμείω*, the genitive *ἔνυμμελίω* is a survival of an old formula built upon **ἔνυμμελίω*. Originally the noun may have preceded (cf. *Πάνθου νίεσ ἔνυμμελίαι* (*νίος ἔνυμμελής*) P 23, P 9) or followed the epithet (e.g. **ἔνυμμελίω Γάνακτος*, cf. *ἔνυμμελίην Εὐφορβον* P 59 and *ἽΟδυσοῖα μεγαλήτορα – μεγαλήτορα θυμόν*).⁴⁾

It appears, then, that the evidence for the existence of formulae originally built upon quantitative metathesis is extremely slight. This strongly suggests after the metathesis had begun to develop in East Ionic, oral composition came to an end so soon that hardly any substantial expression created out of the new material provided by the evolution of the spoken dialect had time to attain a formulaic fixity. If this inference should be correct there is little reason to suppose that at the stage in question the formulaic repertory should have been substantially enriched in any other field. The occurrence of expressions such as *πυλέων ἐξέσσυτο* shows that Homer and his immediate predecessors did not only modify ancient formulae but also introduced new elements into epic language. The creation of the truly *formulaic* diction, however, seems to be almost entirely due to earlier generations of singers.

In examining the cases of modification conditioned by quantitative metathesis we have, up to now, been able to identify two sorts of causes. First, we have found several instances of declension of ancient formulae which was made possible by the existence of metathesised forms (*Τυδεΐδω Διομήδεος*, etc.). Secondly, we have seen that modification was caused by the insertion of particles in old formulae (*τέως μὲν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι*, etc.). In *Ἴδω θ' ὅς* these two kinds of modification were found together in a

¹⁾ above, p. 24.

²⁾ On the type of word-formation see Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I, 451, on *μελίη* Frisk *s.v.*, on the relation of the two words Ruijgh (review of Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad*, Mnem. XIII (1960), 4, 344). Shipp, *Essays* 54, denies the archaic nature of the formula.

³⁾ Trümpy, *Kriegerische Fachausdrücke im griechischen Epos* (Basel-Freiburg 1950), 57.

⁴⁾ So all things well considered it seems more probable that Δ 47=165 etc. is a case of late innovation than an interpolation.

single expression. Moreover it has been tentatively suggested that the existence of recent forms may have made the shortening of an ancient formula by one *mora* possible (not by metathesis but by contraction) in *Ἐρμείω* and *ἔνυμμελλω*.

In the course of the present inquiry we shall come across phenomena similar to those outlined above, but first of all we have to examine the question whether modification may be due to yet other causes. As far as I can see, the material available shows a few instances of modification which may be ascribed to a somewhat different treatment of ancient prototypes. One of them is very plain (χ 131=247): *τοῖς δ' Ἀγέλεως μετέειπεν ἔπος πάντεσσι πιφαύσκων*. Elsewhere the same suitor is called *Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος* (3 x). It is entirely uncertain if this formula is traditional,¹⁾ but it obviously belongs to the traditional type represented by *βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος* etc., etc. Accordingly it is used in exactly the same way as all the other formulae of this well-known category:

<i>ἔψε δὲ δὴ μετέειπε</i>	}	<i>πρῶτος τὴν γ' ἐνέειπε</i>	<i>Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος</i>	<i>v</i> 321
<i>μηστῆρας δ' ὤτρυνε</i>		<i>χ</i> 212	<i>χ</i> 241	

As soon, however, as Homer departs from the traditional course, this man's name is either accompanied by a slight but significant metrical irregularity²⁾ or it appears in its metathesised form. But this is not all. The traditional type of the complementary formula is represented by *τοῖσι δὲ καὶ μετέειπε, τοῖς δ' αἰτις μετέειπε, ἔψε δὲ δὴ μετέειπε* (17 x *Il.*, 10 x *Od.*). It is curious that this type is disrupted only twice: once in the lines χ 131=247 by the form *Ἀγέλεως* and once in ξ 459 = *o* 304 where the name of Odysseus crops up in the same position and the latter part of the line is marked by the metathesised expression *συβώτεω πειρητίζων*.

In χ 131=247, then, the modification is of a much more drastic kind than in the cases discussed so far. The whole type *Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος* (cf. *πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς*) has been dropped, the name of the suitor (as well as that of Odysseus in the corresponding lines) has been stripped of its epithet and inserted in another type of formula that originally was not intended to contain it and which, moreover was created to express other modalities of thought. The quantitative metathesis enabled the poet to use it (by omitting *καὶ* or *αἰτις*) for a different purpose.

In χ 131=247 the process outlined above is so evident that to analyse it may seem indulging in a partiality to truisms. I must point out, however,

¹⁾ It may have been invented by Homer, just like that of *Ἀγχισιίδης Ἐχέπωλος*, who gave a *horse* to Agamemnon, Ψ 296. On the names of the suitors and the strong presumption that many of them are non-traditional, see below, p. 137 f.

²⁾ X 327 *κείμενον, δ ἔ' Ἀγέλαος ἀποπροέηκε χαμάζε*. Though the lengthening of vowels by following *ρ* is common in Homer (and certainly traditional, below, p. 73 n. 2.), in the combination *δ ῥ'* it seems to be exceptional. I know no other example of it.

that in this case it could only be ascertained because of the material available. We have to envisage the possibility that there may exist instances of a similar development which can only be identified by what may seem a hypothetical kind of argument. Yet the process we observe in χ 131 = 247 shows that the assumption itself is by no means gratuitous. The difficulty of the identification is due to the fact that the ancient background, against which the significance of such cases might stand out, has almost completely disappeared in the course of epic diction. This may be true of two examples which, if the foregoing analysis should prove to be correct, would throw more light on the development of that diction.

1. In the *Hymn to Aphrodite* we find:

ἀθανάτου δὲ ἔκητι διακτόρου ἐνθάδ' ἰκάνεις	147
Ἐρμέω, ἐμῆ δ' ἄλοχος -	148

It would be strange if no traces of an ancient genitive formula for Hermes should have survived in Homer. If they did, however, Ἐρμείω must have been a constituent of such a formula¹⁾ and so Ἐρμείω διακτόρου — though found only once and in a dubious context at that²⁾ — is likely to be the formula in question. Now if this assumption is correct, the lines *Aphr.* 147–148 show an extreme case of dissociation. Yet the supposition that ἔκητι διακτόρου ἐνθάδ' ἰκάνεις Ἐρμέω ultimately goes back to Ἐρμείω διακτόρου is supported by the existence of an intermediate form Ἐρμείω ἔκητι διακτόρου in *o* 319. Now if we remember the handling of ancient formulae observed in χ 131 (247), we shall not a priori reject the possibility that ancient Ἐρμείω διακτόρου(-ρο?) (used in position δ , after the first foot, cf. μ 390) was divided (perhaps on the model of the equally ancient Ἐρμείας ἀκάχητα (*II* 185, ω 10) into Ἐρμείω ἔκητι διακτόρου (*o* 319) and that, owing to the possibilities offered by the quantitative metathesis, the poet of the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, was able to change the latter expression into a more recent and non-traditional form.

2. νήπιον, οὗ πω εἰδόθ' ὁμοίου πτολέμοιο *I* 440
οὐδ' ἄγορέων 441

The ancient form ἄγοράων appears twice in Homer. *B* 275 $\delta\varsigma$ τὸν λωβητῆρα ἐπεσβόλον ἔσχ' ἄγοράων teaches us nothing. It only suggests that ἄγοράων may originally have been used preferably at the end of the line. An Odyssean verse, δ 818, νήπιος οὐτε πόνων εἶδ' εἰδὼς οὐτ' ἄγοράων, while confirming this shows, at the same time, a striking similarity with *I* 440–41. Because of the scarcity of material there can be no question of retracing

¹⁾ from *Ἐρμάδας (proto-Aeolic? below, p. 150f.), see K. Meister, *o.c.* 154f., who cites Ἐρμαῖον (*G.D.I.* 1300, Hoffmann *Dial.* II, 36. Kern, *I.G.* reads Ἐρμαῖον (?), but Ἐρμαῖον seems certain, Lolling, *Ath. Mitt.* VIII (1883), 123), Lejeune, *Traité*² 155? Or from *Ἐρμάδας (Myc. E-ma-a₂, *Docs* 126, 288)? cf. Frisk, *s.v.*

²⁾ μ 390: η δ' ἔφη Ἐρμείω διακτόρου αὐτῆ ἀκοῦσαι.

any possible prototypes. Yet it is extremely probable that, when creating *I* 440–41, the poet had in mind a verse such as δ 818,¹⁾ but that he was forced by his use of *ὄμοιον πτολέμοιο* ²⁾ to put the genitive plural of *ἀγορά* in enjambement.

It is a remarkable phenomenon that *Aphr.* 147–48 and *I* 440–41 both show the dividing of a formula and the use of one of its elements in the following line. We have found that the type *Ἄλτης δς, Τυδείδης δς*, etc. was traditional and, as such, was likely to occasion definite types of modification. In *Aphr.* 147–48 and *I* 440–41 we have to do with a different type of enjambement, or at least with a different motive on the part of the poet. These two cases point to a more advanced stage of evolution and decomposition of the formulaic diction.

Unless supported by corroborative evidence they are far from conclusive. At the present stage of the inquiry the explanation suggested is merely a preliminary hypothesis. If, however, in other fields of epic diction we should find similar phenomena which can be accounted for on exactly the same lines, all such cases may be regarded as characteristic of the decomposition of the formulaic tradition and of the way in which epic style developed into its Homeric form.

¹⁾ cf. ε 215: *ἀγριον, οὔτε δίκας εἶδ' εἰδότα οὔτε θέμιστας*, where the hiatus is probably due to modification. On the supposition that the tendency to avoid hiatus even in a caesura is very old see below, p. 74.

²⁾ that is "by the competition between two formulae" as Hainsworth, *o.c.* 65 puts it; *ὄμοιον πτολέμοιο* always occurs between the trochaic caesura and the verse-end (8 ×).

III

INITIAL DIGAMMA

It goes without saying that the problem of discovering how far modification of ancient formulae is apparent from so-called neglect of digamma is seriously complicated by our lack of knowledge about the original presence of the sound in a number of Homeric words.¹⁾ The problems may be of a purely linguistic order, the etymology of the words in question being unknown or controversial (e.g. in the case of *ἔλωρ*, *ἦνοψ*, *ἱφθιμος*, *ὄρθος* ²⁾) and the testimony of epigraphy either lacking or for one reason or another subject to doubt. Since such cases cannot afford a basis for the present inquiry, they will be simply left aside in the discussion. Things are different, however, if on the one hand original digamma is indicated by a plausible etymology and/or by lexicographic and inscriptional evidence and, on the other, contradicted by the Homeric data. In that case, even if the sound is constantly neglected in Homer, we cannot rule out the possibility that we have to do with modification of ancient formulae (e.g. in the case of *εἰλίπους*) ³⁾, in particular if the number of occurrences is relatively small.⁴⁾ On the other hand the verb *ῥύομαι* will have to be left out of account, though according to the cautious and authoritative judgment of Frisk it must originally have had initial digamma. In this case modification has been carried to such a point and the forms have been so inextricably blended (by singers and rhapsodes) with those of *ἔρύω* that for our purpose nothing is to be gained by an investigation of the formulaic combinations in which the verb appears.

Our problem is made even more difficult by the fact that we are almost completely in the dark about the chronological aspect of the disappearance of the sound in East Ionic. If, for the present, we confine ourselves to the period in which the Homeric epics were composed, we are faced with an awkward contradiction. The general evidence seems to rule out the possibility that at this stage the sound was still a phonetic reality.⁵⁾ Upon this most Homeric scholars seem to be agreed nowadays and it is

¹⁾ see Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 123–157.

²⁾ see Frisk *s.v.*; on *ἱφθιμος* also Ruijgh, *E.A.* 155 n. 2.; on *ὄρθος* Chantraine, *ibid.* 125, but, on the other hand, *Morphologie Grecque*², 8 where the word is connected with Skt. *urdvah*.

³⁾ see below, p. 67 f.

⁴⁾ e.g. in the case of *ἦλος* (cf. *ἀργυρόηλος* and Chantraine, *ibid.* 155). Since *F* is excluded only once (*A* 29), it is superfluous to examine the behaviour of the word in the following part of this chapter. *ἀργυρόηλος* is traditional and may go back to the Mycenaean stage of development, cf. Kirk, *S.H.* 114 f.

⁵⁾ see, for example Severyna, *o.c.* 68 f., 90 ff., Chantraine, 155, 157; *contra* Pisani, *Spuren von geschriebenem Digamma im homerischen Text*, Rh.M.XCIII (1954), 166 ff.

indeed difficult to see how the numerous cases of neglect could be satisfactorily accounted for in another way. It would follow, then, that the cases of observed digamma represent pre-Homeric formulae. Upon this too there is almost general agreement and for the vast majority of the expressions concerned it is certainly true. There are, however, a number of cases which make it difficult to generalise this theory. How are we to explain, for example, the striking frequency of the observance in such extremely mobile words as the pronoun '(F)ε? ¹⁾ Of course it may be ascribed, to some extent, to the enclitic character of the word, since this probably favoured formulaic employment, inconspicuous though some of the 'formulae' may be, and since the accentuation of the preceding element (e.g. in *ὄς οἱ, δέ οἱ*) may have contributed to preserve the memory of the original digamma. It is also to be noted that sometimes this formulaic nature becomes more apparent when we look at the systems of which such insignificant combinations as *δέ οἱ* are part, e.g. *νεκρός (δαλός, τόξον, σκήπτρον, σκῦτος, δέπας) δέ οἱ ἔκπεσε χειρός (7 ×), τόφρα δέ οἱ (2 ×) ∼ τόφρα δέ μοι (3 ×), etc.* Yet there are also more isolated cases. The message that Iris is instructed to take to Priam (*Ω* 146–58) and which is delivered word for word *Ω* 175–87 contains several details so trifling from a point of word-texture that we should have to assume a surprising elaboration of detail in the tradition if we are to regard them as formulaic: *τίς οἱ (149), μηδέ τί οἱ (152), τοῖον γάρ οἱ (153)*. In the delivery of the message these combinations are exchanged for *τίς τοι (178), μηδέ τι τοι (181), τοῖος γάρ τοι (182)*. If the order were reversed we might suppose that the constant observance of the *F* was due to a transposition into the third person, but in the present case this possibility is obviously excluded. The most striking feature, however, is *ὄς ἄξει (154)*, which corresponds to *ὄς σ' ἄξει (183)*. Though Greek syntax often leaves the grammatical object to be understood from the context, here both metric and the exact parallelism of the other expressions strongly suggest that *ὄς ἄξει* reflects *ὄς F' ἄξει*.²⁾ I am uncertain about the inference to be drawn from this puzzling passage. Does it show that, after all, the *F* was still heard in the pronoun in Homer's time? ³⁾ Or do we have to consider a plurality of authorship? Yet in terms of structural analysis *Ω* is recent and at the same time it bears the stamp of a very personal creation. Do we have to suppose, therefore, that an older poet, who was more familiar with old-fashioned phrases than the singer who first said *ὀχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἴπε πρὸς δν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν (Α* 403, etc., 11 ×) contributed this splendid

¹⁾ This was already observed by v. Hartel, *Homerische Studien* III, 72 ff. and by v. Christ, *Die Interpolationen bei Homer*, SbKBA, München, 1879, 147. See further K. Meister, *o.c.* 200 and Chantraine, *o.c.* 153 f.

²⁾ The conjecture is Brandreth's, as is stated by Van Leeuwen *ad loc.*

³⁾ It was regarded by Van Leeuwen as definite proof of the authenticity of *F* in Homer, *Ench.*² 124.

episode to the Iliad? And does this point in the direction of collective composition? ¹⁾

Perhaps it is safest to argue like this: it is easy to see how the original presence of digamma in *ἀνάσσω, οἶκος, ἕκαστος* etc. came to be reflected in Homer: *ἴφι ἀνάσσειν, ᾧ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ, ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος* etc. But it is hardly conceivable that such a vaguely outlined, incidental and easily variable expression as *ὄς F ἄξει* could survive the loss of the sound for a considerable time. Its presence in *Ω*, then, tends to show that in the pronoun **(F)ε* the disappearance of the digamma was either not complete in Homer's time or – and this explanation I prefer – that it preceded the composition of the Iliad by so short a lapse of time that the poet was able to remember such expressions as *ὄς F ἄξει* from similar passages told by older fellow-singers. In this connection it is significant that the same poet, as *Ω* 159 = 187 shows, was already familiar with quantitative metathesis: *ἰκέτω πεφιδήσεται ἀνδρός* is 'irreducible'.²⁾

This indication probably typifies the chronological relation between the creation of the *Iliad* and the final phase of the disappearance of *F* in East Ionic. About the earlier stages of this process the available evidence independent of the Homeric one is so slight, that its relations with the development of epic diction cannot be traced back to a more or less distant past. The difficulties may be illustrated by referring to a discrepancy which is found in some words beginning with *o*. It is generally assumed that before this sound (except in certain conditions)³⁾ the digamma was dropped very early. Now we do not find any formulae based upon loss of digamma in *ὄψ*.⁴⁾ On the other hand *ὦνος*, except in one indifferent case,⁵⁾ always shows neglect, even in the formulaic combination *ὦνον ἔδωκε* (*Φ* 41, etc., 4 ×). Admittedly the phenomenon may be due to modification: the formula is always found after the bucolic diaeresis, which is a natural switch-point. Yet such an explanation is not to be found for neglected digamma in *ὄν* (*παρ'*, etc.) *ἵπποισιν καὶ ὄχεσφιν* (*Δ* 297, etc., 9 ×),⁶⁾ where the phenomenon is all the more striking since its formulaic component *ἵπποισιν* may have been substituted anywhere for

¹⁾ above, p. 19. For general reasons I am disinclined to admit influence of aspiration.

²⁾ Professor J. C. Kamerbeek suggests the following explanation, which may well be the right one: In Sappho and Alcaeus *F* is incidentally transmitted (e.g. D 19 b L.P.). On the other hand in literary Ionic the tradition always has *oi, é*, never *oi, é*. Now, since with regard to the digamma and psilosis, historical Ionic and Aeolic behave, generally speaking, in the same way, the evidence of the Lesbian poets suggests that in Ionic the digamma of the pronoun survived much longer than that of other words.

³⁾ Lejeune, *Traité de phonétique grecque*², 146 Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 123 f.

⁴⁾ see below, p. 56.

⁵⁾ *o* 463.

⁶⁾ cf. also *παρ'* (*ὄπ'*, *ὄν*) *ὄχεσφιν* (11 ×); *ἐξ ὄχέων* (21 ×) might be a modernised form of **ἐκ Φοχέων*.

the ancient dual ἱπποῖν¹⁾ with its Mycenaean ending.²⁾ How are we to explain this discrepancy?³⁾ Is the difference between the treatment of δψ and ὄχος only to be accounted for by the not very convincing supposition that the singers—presumably those of the Dark Age—were more inclined to innovation in the case of *chariots* than in the case of *voice*? Or should the difference be explained by assuming that the digamma was dropped earlier in ὄχος than in δψ? And which of these explanations is more likely to account for the difference between the behaviour of εἶρος in the repeated expression (F!)ιοδνεφές εἶρος (ἔχουσα, ἔχοντες, δ 135 ι 426) and that of ἔργον, which, with the exception of obviously modified formulae,⁴⁾ never shows neglected digamma in formulaic combinations?

It is especially problems of this kind that prevent us from following up the trail of modification into a more distant past. Yet for the more recent stages of pre-Homeric development we are better off. Relative chronology shows that the loss of the digamma was a late development in Attic-Ionic⁵⁾ and the behaviour of ε, οἰ in the epics makes it unlikely that its disappearance in the more usual epic words (e.g. in οἶκος, ἔργον) was accomplished more than at most one or two generations before Homer. The scarcity of compounds such as ἀπειπόντος, ἐκκατιδών and εἰσιδέσθαι points in the same direction. Yet the change in pronunciation must have sufficiently preceded the composition of the epics to allow such expressions as πρὸς ἐν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν (*Il.* 7 ×, *Od.* 4 ×) and μένος καὶ θυμόν ἐκάστου (*Il.* 10 ×, *Od.* 1 ×) to become firmly incorporated into Homeric diction. The end of the process may be roughly assessed at the period when quantitative metathesis had begun to develop. In the case of Fε, Fοι, Fός it probably overlapped the latter evolution, in general it may have been slightly anterior to it.

In the following part of this inquiry an attempt will be made to detect the ancient prototypes of a number of expressions which, on account of the neglect of their original digamma, cannot be ancient in their Homeric form. In order to lay a firm foundation we shall start from a number of very simple examples, which will provide the basic evidence required. These cases will appear to be of an even more distinct nature than those

¹⁾ attested in *E* 107 etc.

²⁾ On Mycenaean cf. e.g. Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 499, *M.H.G.*² 41, Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch der griechischen Dialekte*, II² 339 and on Arkadian -οιν *ibid.* 128.

³⁾ On the assumption, that is, that the derivation of ὄχος from *Fεχ- (Chantraine, *o.c.* 125, Frisk, *s.v.* ἔχω 2) is correct. Hesychius' ἔχεσφιν ἄρμασιν (Boeotian? cf. M. Schmidt *s.v.*) does not provide evidence to the contrary since it is obviously of poetic origin.

⁴⁾ see Hoekstra, *o.c.* 214 f.; early dissimilation in εἶρος, ἔριον? (Chantraine, *ibid.* 156).

⁵⁾ see Risch, *Die Gliederung der griechischen Dialekte in neuer Sicht*, *Mus. Helv.* 12 (1955), 68.

discussed in the chapter on quantitative metathesis, so in its initial stages this method will produce results even less spectacular and speculative. If, however, we pursue this same line of research much further, a point may be reached where the sceptical reader will ask if this basic conception of original prototypes is not very much in the air and if the presupposed continuity of evolution is not a phantom. For this reason it may be of some use to draw attention to a phenomenon the only satisfactory explanation of which is to be found in the modification of very ancient prototypes.

In historical times the inhabitants of the region which was once bounded on the South by ancient Pylos, called their country *Fāλις*.¹⁾ If this name entered Ionic poetry through an Aeolic medium, the original formulae must have contained this form. The same must be true, however, if Homeric **Ηλις* should be due to a purely Ionic tradition. For in that case we may reverse the *Māδοι-Mῆδοι* argument²⁾: the name must have been known in Ionia before the change from *ā* to *η* was completed and, as this development was prior to the loss of the digamma, its form must have been *Fāλις* in ninth or tenth century Ionia. Since, moreover, contact of the Ionic colonies with such an outlying district as Elis is out of the question at that time, the name and all that is associated with it in Homer is likely to have come to Asia Minor as part of the heroic saga.³⁾ Since moreover such detailed information as is found in *B* 615 ff. can only have survived in a traditional poetic form, the name of the district must have been transmitted in formulae. These formulae, then, must have been based on the form *Fāλις*.⁴⁾

Now the surprising fact about the Homeric data is that the word **Ηλις* nowhere requires the digamma and that the metrical conditions of its employment exclude the sound in 9 out of the 11 occurrences:

<i>οἱ δ' ἄρα Βουπράσιόν τε καὶ *Ηλιδα δῖαν ἔναιον</i>	<i>B 615</i>
<i>τοῦς ἴμεν, οἴσι χρεῖος ὀφείλετ' ἐν *Ηλιδι δόγη</i>	<i>A 686</i>
<i>καὶ γὰρ τῶ χρεῖος μέγ' ,, ,, ,, ,,</i>	<i>A 698</i>

1) To my knowledge the word itself is not attested in inscriptions but there is ample evidence for *Fαλειοί*: Schwyzler, *Del.* 11, 27 (Sparta, ±479), 409, 1 (Olympia, sixth (or seventh) century, cf. Buck, *Gr. Dial.* 61 f.), 413, 1 (Olympia, fifth century (see now, however, Miss Jeffery, *o.c.*); see also *Suppl. Ep. Gr.* XV (1958), 214, 4.

2) advanced for the first time, as far as I know, by H. Weir Smyth in 1894 and since then generally accepted, cf. Lejeune, *o.c.* 17, Risch, *o.c.* 65.

3) No other name for the region is known, but it is of course possible that the name does not antedate the Dorian invasions. If so, it must be of Dark Age origin and is likely to have come to Ionia through Aeolic poetry. If the name is of pre-migration origin, the Ionians may have brought it with them, cf. Webster, *M.H.* 145 and *pass.*

4) I should like to point out that the argument is not founded upon the supposition that the "Homeric description of Greece" goes back to a Mycenaean order of battle (Page, *H.H.I.* 118-154).

ἦ εἰς Ἡλιδα δῖαν, ὅθι κρατέουσιν Ἐπειοί	ν	275
ἦ δὲ παρ' " " " " " "	ο	298 (Ap. 426)
ἦ καὶ ἐς " " " " " "	ω	431
ἔσθλόν Ὑπειροχίδην, ὅς ἐν Ἡλίδι ναιετάασκε	Λ	673
οὐδ' ὄσσοι νήσοισι πρὸς Ἡλίδος ἱπποβότοιο	φ	347
νήσων, αἱ ναίουσι πέραν ἄλός Ἡλίδος ἄντα	Β	626
Ἡλιδ' ἐς εὐρύχορον διαβήμεναι, ἔνθα μοι ἱπποί	δ	635
ὡς ὅποι' Ἡλείοισι καὶ ἡμῖν νεῖκος ἐτύχθη	Λ	671

Does this mean that the mss. tradition is at fault in these 9 places and that in *B* 615, for example, we have to omit *τε*? Besides, what are we to do with *B* 626, *ο* 298, *φ* 347, *ω* 431? We shall see that the use of the phrase *καὶ Ἡλιδα δῖαν ἔναιον* can be paralleled with many other instances of the same type that for the greater part cannot be emended, but which seem to have been developed from an ancient type beginning with *καὶ* and designed to serve after the *penthemimeris* before the digamma was dropped.¹⁾

Since, then, the name of the district must originally have been transmitted in the form *Fālics* and since this form is nearly everywhere impossible in Homer, the only way to reconcile these conflicting data is to postulate the previous existence of certain prototypes based upon *Fālics* and their subsequent modification. Some of these prototypes can be easily isolated, especially so because many of the Homeric expressions are used in an 'exposed' position.²⁾ In the expressions:

*καὶ *Fάλιδα δῖαν ἔναιον*
 *ὅς *Fάλιδι ναιετάασκε*
 *προτὶ *Fάλιδος ἱπποβότοιο* } originally used after the *penthemimeris*,

the introductory part was variable.³⁾ The type

**Fάλιδα δῖαν*

**Fάλιδι δῖαι*

was also apt to serve after the bucolic diaeresis.

A. DECLENSION OF FORMULAE

The most conspicuous instances of this phenomenon were already noted by Severyns,⁴⁾ Chantraine⁵⁾ and others: *Ποσειδάωνος ἀνακτος* < *Ποσειδάωνι(-α) ἀνακτι(-α)*, *ἠδέος οἴνου* < *ἠδέι οἴνω*, *καὶ μιν φωνήσας' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα* < *καὶ μιν φωνήσας ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα*, and so on. Since the explication of these and similar examples is definitely established

1) below, p. 61 ff.

2) see e.g. Parry, *Form.* 60.

3) below, p. 65 ff.

4) e.g. *o.c.* 67 ff., 86 ff.

5) e.g. *G.H.* I, 143.

I refrain from adducing more evidence of this kind.¹⁾ Instead I should like to draw attention to a particular indication which is provided by some of the cases in question. Though we shall find it elsewhere, it is best examined in this place because, owing to the fixity of the formulaic material available, its significance can be shown most clearly in the category of declined prototypes.

The expression *ἡδέος οἴνου* was obviously created by declension of *ἡδέι οἴνω* (< **ἡδᾶέι Φοῖνωι*).²⁾ But how could the idea 'sweet wine' be expressed under the same metrical conditions in the gen. sing. before the very late period when the digamma was dropped in spoken Ionic? It is evident that no such expression could have been formed by using *ἡδύς* and *Φοῖνος* nor could it have been created with *μέθυ* and *γλυκύς* or *γλυκερός*.³⁾ In addition to *ἡδέος οἴνου* we find the gen. sing. *μελιηδέος οἴνου*,⁴⁾ developed by declension from *μελιηδέα οἴνον* (< *μελιῖαδέα Φοῖνον*).⁵⁾ Again we may ask: how could the same idea be expressed after the hephthemimeris during the period when *F* was a living sound? In this case it might have been done by **μέθυος γλυκεροῖο* or by **γλυκέος Φοῖνοιο*,⁶⁾ but there is no trace of this in Homer. Instead we find, in the same position, the expression 'of dark wine', *μέλανος οἴνοιο*, which, however, emphatically seems to denote the undiluted beverage that was used in the special circumstances of Odysseus' voyage and the blinding of the Cyclops.

The fact that in the gen. sing. the idea 'sweet wine' could not be expressed after the bucolic diaeresis until a very late date⁷⁾ suggests that in a period not too distant from Homer's the formulaic diction may have had a more poor and stereotyped character than its Homeric descendant.⁸⁾ As yet this is only an impression, but some examples we shall meet in discussing other types of modification seem to show that the elaborate nature of Homer's diction is due, to a great extent, to no more than a few

1) *ἀνά θ' ἰστία λευκὰ ἐρύσαντες* (ι 77 ≈ μ 402) is likely to be the formulaic plural of *ἀνά θ' ἰστία λευκὰ πετάσσας* (κ 506) or — what comes to the same thing — a formulaic conjugation of *ἀνά θ' ἰστία λευκὰ πέτασσαν* *A* 480, δ 783 = θ 54, in the same way as *Ἀχιλλῆα πολλίπορθον* (θ 372 etc.) is the accusative of *ποδάργης δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς*, as *νῆες εἶσαι* is the nom. plur. of *ποντοπόρος νηῦς*, etc.

2) κ 519 = λ 27, υ 69.

3) Besides, the gen. of *μέθυ* does not occur in Homer.

4) γ 46, Σ 545.

5) ξ 78, etc., (7 ×).

6) cf. *μέθυ γλυκερόν* ξ 194, *ὕδατος γλυκεροῖο* μ 306.

7) Nor, for that matter, could the accusative before the singers had developed the habit of forming it (in the case of eu/u stems) on the analogy of the dative, cf. the well-known example of *εὐρέα πόντον*, K. Witte, *R.E.* VIII 2225 and Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 97. This may explain the existence of the 'equivalent' *οἴνον ἐρυθρόν* (ε 165 etc., 5 ×). It need not be said that this stage must considerably antedate the period in which the loss of the digamma was completed.

8) *Ποσειδάωνος ἀνακτος*, for example, has been created by declension of *Ποσειδάωνι ἀνακτι* or *Ποσειδάωνα ἀνακτα*. But what was the older formula for the god in the gen. sing. after the trochaic caesura? Homer does not show a single trace of it.

generations of poets. With regard to the expression of the idea 'sweet wine' after the hephthemimeris before the digamma had been dropped and the possible substitution of *μελιηδέος οίνου* for **μέθνος γλυκεροίο* or **γλυκέος Φοίνιοι* we are confronted with the unsolvable problem of the disappearance of formulae from the singers' repertory at different stages of development. As far as I know the question has only been raised by Hainsworth.¹⁾ He tackles it from "the rate at which formulae are being fed in", i.e. from the evidence of the unique expressions, and is inclined, rightly perhaps, to put the rate of replacement rather high. In the present inquiry the emphasis is rather on increasing elaboration, but generally speaking the two points of view do not necessarily exclude one another.

B. CONJUGATION OF FORMULAE

If we leave aside the readings for which more or less plausible variants are attested,²⁾ some 60 cases remain, the authenticity of which is either certain or not open to reasonable doubt.³⁾ On the whole this material is remarkably different from the data provided by the instances of declined formulae. Though the frequency of neglect of *F* after verbal forms is much greater, the evidence for distinct prototypes is proportionally slight. However, in a few cases it shows up quite clearly:

ὄτρυνον, ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγάμεμνον Ψ 49⁴⁾

< ὄτρυνε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας Ο 560

„ βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος Ο 568, etc.⁵⁾

μήσεαι ἔργον λ 474 < μήδετο (-σατο) ἔργον (-α) Β 38 etc., 9 x.

σχέθον εἰπέ τε μῦθον Η 277 < σχέθε(ν) εἰπέ τε μῦθον ξ 494, cf.:

ἔχε(ν) „ „ „ θ 302,

ἀνάλνετο (ἀνήνατο) „ „ „ Λ 647, Ψ 204

and, on the other hand: καὶ ἔσχεθε(ν) ἰεμένον περ φ 129

„ „ ἰεμένην „ χ 409

„ „ ἰεμένους „ π 430

„ „ ἰεμένω „ δ 284

The third example deserves special notice because the modification has

¹⁾ o.c. 66. Mr. Hainsworth points out to me that instead of declined formulae of the type *Ποσειδάωνος ἀνακτος* and *ἠδέος οίνου* the older epic may have used substantivised epithets and periphrasis, especially after the diaeresis. He suggests that their removal is a personal touch of Homer's. As regards periphrasis he aptly remarks that *κύδιμος Ἐρμῆς*, *Herm.* 46, etc. (cf. *κύδιμον Ἐρμῆν*, 4 x and 5 x respectively) "has swept to the front as soon as it became available at the expense of *Ἀργειφόντης*". I have no doubt that the change is symptomatic indeed of what happened to several pre-Homeric formulae.

²⁾ e.g. *A* 444 *ἱασσόμεθ' ἀνακτα*, v.l. *ἱασσόμεσθα ἀνακτα*; σ 418 *ἀλλ' ἄγετ'*, *οἶνοχόος*, v.l. *ἀλλ' ἄγε* (but in the identical line φ 263 no variant is attested).

³⁾ On the question in how far emendations are justified, see above, p. 30.

⁴⁾ *ὄτρυνε* Bentley.

⁵⁾ cf. Parry, *E.T.* 11 ff., *Form.* 48 ff. and *pass.* ("artifice d'échange").

been caused by a change of subject which in itself points to a non-traditional treatment and because this innovation has entailed enjambement.¹⁾ The prototype **σχέθε Φεῖπέ τε μῦθον*, *he (she) prevented him (her, etc.) and spoke*: ∞ **ἔσχθε Φιέμενόν (-ην, etc.) περ*, *he (she) prevented him (her, etc.), though he (she, etc.) wanted to do it* is likely to be very ancient: the aorist *σχέθειν* is found in both Arcadian and Aeolic.²⁾ The same is true of the type *ᾠτρυνε μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας*, etc., etc. and the fixed character of *μήδετο(-σατο) ἔργον(-α)* points in the same direction. In these cases, then, the evidence for clear-cut and archaic prototypes is well-established. In the vast majority of cases, however, it is not nearly so conclusive. It is reasonable to suppose that *εἴσομ' ἐκάστην* (τ 501) has been developed from *οἶδα(-ε, etc.) ἕκαστα* (cf. σ 228, ν 309) and that *ἐξερέεινον ἕκαστα* (ρ 70, τ 463) is a conjugation of (*ἐξ*)*ερέεινε(ν) ἕκαστα* (δ 137, κ 14, μ 34). However, most of the instances of neglected digamma in the different grammatical cases of *ἕκαστος* cannot be paralleled likewise. This is of course closely bound up with the fact that they are preceded by a large variety of verbal forms: *διασκοπιᾶσθαι ἕκαστα(-ον)* K 388, P 252, *δείξειας ἕκαστα* T 332, *πρήσσεσκον ἕκαστα* θ 259, *τελείειν ἕκαστα* ι 127, *ἐπιτρέφειας ἕκαστα* ο 24, *ἔειπες ἕκαστα* ω 339, *ἐφοπλίσσαντες ἕκαστοι* Ψ 55, *θάπτον ἕκαστοι* ω 417, *ἔμβαλ' ἐκάστῳ* Α 11 ∞ Ξ 151, *νεῦον ἐκάστῳ* ι 468, *εἴση, ἐκάστου* π 313. Similarly the ancient formula *Ἰφι μάχεσθαι* is preceded by *εἶδ εἰδότες* B 720, *ἀνώγετον* Δ 287, *ὀτρύνετον* Μ 367, *μενεαινέμεν* Ε 606. It is most unlikely that all these expressions were created without the poets using older prototypes. In that case, however, the prototypes themselves must have shown considerable variety. The underlying cause of this phenomenon is partly to be found in the fact that, even at early stages of development, the formulaic relation between verbal forms and other parts of the sentence was less close than the connection between the constituents of noun-epithet formulae. In certain traditional phrases, e.g. *ἔβαν οἰκόνδε ἕκαστος* the verb is an integral part of the formula, but such combinations are comparatively rare. Very often the verb is separated from a formula by a caesura, as is shown by the examples given by Parry and, in the present case by the use of *Ἰφι μάχεσθαι*.³⁾ Even when it is not followed by a caesura, the combinations in which it appears do not show anything like the stereotyped character of so many noun-epithet formulae and similar expressions. In the matter of verbal forms the formulaic diction clearly allowed a comparatively great extent of free choice to the singers. That this feature already existed before the digamma was dropped is apparent from the large variety of verbs preceding *ἕκαστος* in cases marked by observance of the digamma: *δεδμήμεσθα ἕκαστος* Ε 878, *σημαίνουσι(ν) ἕκαστος* Ρ 250, *ἐσημήναντο ἕκαστος* Η 175, *ἐπετελλε(ν) ἕκαστος* Α 47 =

¹⁾ below, p. 101 ff., 121 ff., 132; cf. above, 40 f.

²⁾ Arcadian: Ruijgh, *E.A.* 137; Aeolic: not only in Sappho and Alcæus but also in an inscription from Eresos, Schwyzer, *Del.* 632 Α 40: *ὑπὸσκε(θ)ῆν*.

³⁾ cf. π 313; *δέδασται, ἕκαστος* Ο 189.

M 84, ἐργήγορθε ἕκαστος *H* 371 = Σ 299, εἰ γνῶτε ἕκαστος *T* 84, ἤγειρα ἕκαστον *P* 222, οἶδα ἕκαστα σ 228 = ν 309, ὠτρυνε(ν) ἕκαστον β 392, etc., etc. This phenomenon contrasts most sharply with the fixity of such nominal types as παρ' ἄρμασι(ν) οἷσι(ν) ἕκαστος *B* 775 = Θ 544, ἄνδρα(-ὶ) ἕκαστον(- ω) *H* 424, etc. (8 \times), φῶτα(-ὶ) ἕκαστον(- ω) *B* 164, etc. (7 \times). The flexibility of a given verb must generally have been greater than that of noun-epithet formulae and similar combinations. The flexibility of the latter expressions was much restricted by their case-endings and most of them contained non-functional elements (ἄνδρα/φῶτα ἕκαστον = \pm ἕκαστον) which little invited innovation. It was quite a different thing with the traditional use of verbal forms. Because of their dynamic character verbs were under heavier pressure and technically they could be changed much more easily. First, they were mostly less closely connected with other words (see above); secondly, owing to their more elaborate inflection, they presented a much larger variety of forms; thirdly these forms could be supplemented with adverbs, particles and prepositions which, being indeclinable themselves, could be used without upsetting whole metrical structures (cf. ὠτρυνε(ν) ἕκαστον, εἰ γνῶτε ἕκαστος).

Yet, notwithstanding the comparatively great liberty allowed to the poets on the point of verbal forms, we have to realise that in the period when the digamma was still a living sound, the possibilities for conjugation were much more limited than in Homer's time.¹⁾ Before ἕκαστος (-ον, -οι etc.) all the verbal forms listed in the former group were excluded. None of the verbal forms which precede ἴφι μάχεσθαι in Homer were possible before the loss of the digamma had occurred. Before οἶκαδ' the forms ἀπήνυσαν η 326, ὤπασαν ν 121, 305, ἐέλδεται \omicron 66, εἰρύεται π 463, ἐλεύσεται ν 232, κατακείμεν σ 419 were excluded as well as ὑποδέχομαι before οἶκω π 70 and βούλεται before οἶκον ὀφέλλειν \omicron 21. Now the forms represented most conspicuously in this sample are present and future tenses, 3 p. plur. of past tenses, 1 and 2 p. sing. and plur. of several moods. Hence the share of the 3 p. sing. of imperf. and aor. is likely to have been proportionally even more prominent before *F* was dropped than it was in Homer's time. And if this was true of the narrow field covered by the examination of the phenomenon of neglected digamma, there is no reason to suppose that it should have been otherwise in other parts of the formulaic diction. This tends to show that in the period prior to the loss of the digamma the narrative aspect and, to some extent, the descriptive element²⁾ of

¹⁾ As soon as the digamma vanished from current speech Homer's immediate predecessors must have made an extensive use of the increased possibilities and in one or two generations the already flexible prototypes were so drastically changed that we have no means of retracing most of them.

²⁾ cf. λ 304 (ἄλλοτε δ' αὖτε) τεθνᾶσιν · τιμὴν δὲ λελόγγασιν(ν) ἴσα θεοῖσι. The traditional character of the latter hemistich is borne out by the striking archaism λελόγγασιν as well as by the fact that the poet of λ 304 had to force the grammatical construction of the sentence in order to use it (see below, p. 105; on τεθνᾶσιν as a symptom of relatively late composition, *ibid.*).

the style was more predominant than it is found to be in Homer.¹⁾ If this inference is correct, it may also affect our view of certain Homeric phenomena. Since I. Bekker, for example, it has been held by many scholars that in the repeated line ἦλθον εἴκοστῶ ἔτει εἰς πατρίδα γαῖαν (π 206 = τ 484 = φ 208 = ω 322) we should read ἦλθον ἐεικοστῶ, a parallel of which is found in ψ 102 = 170 ἔλθοι ἐεικοστῶ. This conjecture may be right, at all events it may constitute the prototype of the Homeric expressions. Yet it is equally possible that the archaic form of the aorist is original in this line and that the first hemistich once belonged to an ancient *Nóστος* in the form ἦλυθε *Φεικοστῶ Φέτει*.²⁾ Likewise the prototype of εἰς Ἴλιον εἰληλούθα E 204 which is actually found in Homer (εἰς Ἴλιον [i.e. **Φίλιον*] εἰληλούθει A 230) is incompatible with ὦς λίπον in the first hemistich.³⁾ Was the older epic primarily concerned with 'Mythenerzählung' and much less with dialogue?⁴⁾ In an article entitled *Mycenaean Names in Homer*⁵⁾ Miss D. Gray arrived at the conclusion that these names are thickest in "family histories and passages which may be called feudal", including genealogies; she adds that this is an indication of the subject-matter of the Mycenaean poetry which was the ancestor of our epics. Of course

1) This is not to say, of course, that the Greek tradition ever lacked speeches nor that the development suggested was necessarily a quantitative one. That even at very early stages dialogue existed alongside narrative is indicated by the archaic nature of such lines as

ἐν τ' ἄρα οἱ φῦ χειρὶ ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε Z 253, etc.
and ὦς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσι(ν) ἐαδῶτα μῦθον εἶπε I 173, σ 422
and of the types

τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' ἔπειτα	} ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη etc.	
καὶ μιν λισσόμενος		
„ οἱ ἐπενχόμενος	} ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα	ψ 73
etc.		II 829, etc.

(on more recent types see below, p. 137 f.). Yet it is a far cry from the archaic simplicity of these formulae to Homer's speeches, the refined nature of which—it need hardly be said—is primarily due to the poetical genius of the poet himself. In this sort of poetry, moreover, refinement presupposes *elaboration*, so at earlier stages of the development dialogue was doubtless much more rudimentary. In 'modern' oral poetry, Bowra states, "the characters speak in the first person, often at some length, and much time is given to speeches" (*The Comparative Study of Homer*, AJA LIV (1950) 185), yet "when heroic poetry uses the first [person], it is a sign not of primitive character, but of advanced art" (*Heroic Poetry*, 32).

²⁾ perhaps originally followed by a noun-epithet formula such as *πολλικροθός* Ὀδυσσεύς (5 ×). The hiatus in π 206, etc., is suspect from a formulaic point of view.

³⁾ see below, p. 64.

⁴⁾ Professor Kamerbeek points out to me that the evolution of dialogue as outlined above has a parallel in the development of the short comparison (which may have been borrowed from Eastern epic poetry, cf. e.g. Webster, *M.H.* 82 f., 322 ff.) into the elaborate form of the simile found in Homer.

⁵⁾ JHS LXXVIII (1958), 43–48.

our own inquiry is bound to halt long before Mycenaean times are reached, but it may be interesting to note that the evidence just examined is in accordance with Miss Gray's conclusions. Travelling backwards we have covered a small distance of what may be the other end of one and the same road.

C. AN ARCHAIC CONSTITUENT OF A FORMULA IS REPLACED
BY A MORE FAMILIAR FORM

A post-Homeric example is perhaps found in
*δέος ἔμβαλ' ἐκάστῳ Ἀρ. 447, cf. σθένος ἄρα(ν) ἐκάστῳ B 451.*¹⁾

In retracing prototypes of this kind we are given very little help by the archaising emendations which, since Bentley, have been proposed in order to purge the Homeric text of cases of neglected digamma. In *ἄρα' εἶπω*²⁾ (9 ×) the second element *may* have replaced **ἔσπω*. However, since Fick's conjecture is not supported by any reliable evidence, we have to reckon with the possibility that *ἄρα' εἶπω* is one of the rare instances of a formula built upon the loss of the sound in spoken Ionic.³⁾ There is a better case for Schulze's **FFάχε*⁴⁾ instead of *ἴαχε* in the formulae *μεγάλ' ἴαχε* (4 ×), *ἐπὶ δ' ἴαχε* (3 ×) etc. Yet, once the digamma had been dropped the singers may have associated the present-imperfect formulae *μέγα ἴαχον* (2 ×),⁵⁾ *μέγα ἴάχων* (2 ×),⁶⁾ *σμερδαλέα ἴάχων* (7 ×)⁷⁾ etc., with the aorist-formulae *μακρὸν ἄρασε(ν)* (5 ×) *μακρὸν ἄρασε* (14 ×), *σμερδαλέον δ' ἐβόησε(ν)* (3 ×) and have regarded the forms with short initial syllables as aorists, the more so as they knew the archaic aorist *ἔβραχε* from *μέγα δ' ἔβραχε*,⁸⁾ *δ δ' ἔβραχε*,⁹⁾ and possibly from other ancient pre-Homeric formulae. They may consequently have created the type *μέγα δ' ἴαχε*, *μεγάλ' ἴαχε*, *ἐπὶ δ' ἴαχε* on this ancient pattern.

It is quite possible that Homer has many cases of archaisms, replaced by forms which presuppose loss of *F*, but the evidence I am able to find

¹⁾ cf. however *A 11 ∞ E 151 μέγα σθένος ἔμβαλ' ἐκάστῳ* (below, p. 54).

²⁾ Van Leeuwen (*Ench.*² 291) sought support for the form in Elean *ἐπειποι* etc. (Schwyzer, *Del.* 409, with several equally hypothetical explanations).

³⁾ see below, p. 59 ff. It is the same with *ἄρα' εἰδήσ* though here there may be some evidence for analogical development from *ἄρα ἰδής*, Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 141.

⁴⁾ *Kleine Schriften* 343 f.: **Fαχεῖν* (afterwards associated with **FιFάχεῖν*) should be regarded as an isolated aorist of the root *svegh*, Goth. *swēgnjan* ("sausen, prasseln"), so **FFάχε* < **σFάχε* ∞ ἀπό **FFέο* < ἀπό **σFέο*, cf. ε 459 ἀπό ἔο λύσε. See also Chantraine, *o.c.* 139 f., 313, and Frisk *s.v.*

⁵⁾ *A 508 = P 317.*

⁶⁾ *P 213, Σ 160; μέγα λάχουσα E 343; μέγα λάχοντες E 421.*

⁷⁾ *E 302 = Θ 321 = Y 285; Π 785, T 41, Y 382, 443.*

⁸⁾ *E 838, Π 566.*

⁹⁾ *E 859 = Π 468.*

amounts to very little.¹⁾ As far as I can see there are only two probable instances of this kind of modification. In χ 318–19 *ἀνταρ ἐγὼν μετὰ τοῖσι θυοσκῶς οὐδὲν ἔοργῶς / κείσομαι* Bentley proposed *οὐ τι* for *οὐδὲν*. It is reasonable to suppose that *οὐ τι ἔοργῶς*—if it does not constitute the authentic reading itself!—reflects an ancient prototype, for the system *πολλὰ ἔοργε(-ῶς)*, *δοσσα ἔοργας* etc. is certainly traditional²⁾ and *οὐ τι* is older than *οὐδὲν*.³⁾ In *Ἀχαιοῖσιν δὲ μέγα σθένος ἔμβαλ' ἐκάστω* (Λ 11–12 \approx Ξ 151–52) it is probable that ancient *ῶρσε* was ousted by *ἔμβαλ'* through the contamination of two formulae: *σθένος (*μένος?) ῶρσε (ν) ἐκάστω / καρδίη* (B 451) and *ἔμβαλε θυμῶ* (Γ 139 etc., 5 \times), the latter of which was impossible because of the following *καρδίη*.⁴⁾

D. A FORMULA IS SPLIT BY THE INTRODUCTION OF ANOTHER WORD

Post-Homeric examples of this phenomenon are found in e.g.:
Ἀπόλλωνά τ' ἄνακτα $Ap.$ 15, cf. *Ἀπόλλωνι ἄνακτι* A 36, *ἐπὶ τ' αἰθροπα πινόμεν οἶνον* $Hes. E.$ 592, cf. *αἰθροπα οἶνον* Λ 259 etc. (22 \times , e.g. *ἐπὶ δ' αἰθροπα οἶνον* A 462= γ 459).

In general, as we have seen above, the transmitted text is to be left as it stands. Of the conjectures which have been proposed from Bentley onwards, several are to be regarded as restorations not of Homeric but of pre-Homeric expressions, e.g. *ἀντιθέοιο ἄνακτος* for *ἀντιθέον γὰρ ἄνακτος* ξ 40.⁵⁾ A few emendations may be supposed, for one reason or another, to present the authentic reading, for example, Bentley's emission of μ' in X 347 (*οἶά μ' ἔοργας* mss.), cf. *δοσσα ἔοργας* in $Ambros.$ 1019 and $Laur.$ 32, 15, Φ 399. Of course such cases reduce to a slight extent the incontrovertible evidence available for modification of Homer's part. Yet, whether the mss. reading is genuine or due to the vicissitudes of oral or semi-oral transmission by rhapsodes,⁶⁾ they may still allow us to retrace the basic formulaic prototypes, provided they are part of a system. This is actually the case with *ἔοργα* (-ας, -ε, -ῶς):

¹⁾ *ἔσθι' ἐκηλος*, ρ 478, (for **ἔσθι (F)ἐκηλος*, Chantraine, *ibid.* 292), *ἔργ' εἰδυῖαν* (-ας) (6 \times) (for *ἔργα (F)ιδυῖαν(-ας)* which is commonly adopted) are of course simple cases of modernisation, comparable with *Πηληιάδεω Ἀχιλῆος* for *Πηληιάδα' Ἀχιλῆος* etc. Not even the latter seems to be post-Homeric, cf. P 5 *οὐ πρὶν εἰδυῖα τόκοιο*.

²⁾ below, p. 55.

³⁾ On *οὐ τι-οὐδὲν* see Leumann, *Homerische Wörter*, 13, Chantraine, *ibid.* I 281, Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer*, 116, *Vorlesungen über Syntax* II, 268 f.

⁴⁾ *καρδίη* occurs only in B 452= Λ 12= Ξ 152: *καρδίη, ἄλληκτον πολεμιζέμεν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι*.

⁵⁾ "Criticus apud Nauckium", Van Leeuwen *ad loc.*

⁶⁾ For X 347 as for some other cases mentioned by Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 116–157), this supposition is much more plausible than the assumption of a graphical corruption.

	ὄσσα	ἔοργας	Γ	57; Φ	399 (see above).
	οἶά	μ ³	„	X	347 mss., μ ³ del. Bentley.
	ἔσθλα	ἔοργε	B	272	
(κακά)	πολλά	„	E	175 = Π	424; Θ
	„	ἔοργός	I	320	
cf.	οὐδέν	„	χ	318 mss., οὐ τι	Bentley.
	κάκ ²	ἔοργε	Γ	351.	

Sometimes, however, the corrections proposed are not only unconvincing in themselves but also tend to mask the evolution of epic diction from its more ancient formulaic stages to Homeric variations. In discussing

	πάντων μὲν κρατέειν ἐθέλει,	πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν	A	288
	πᾶσά τοι ἔσθ' ὑποδεξίη,	πολέεσσι δ' ἀνάσσεις	I	73
	Νιρῆός, Ἀγλαΐης νίδος	Χαρόποιό τ' ἄνακτος	B	672

Chantraine, in defiance of his own well-founded view that "il faudrait — distinguer entre la langue des formules épiques et celle des aèdes qui les ont combinées",¹⁾ writes: "il est — aisé d'entrevoir sous la vulgate des formes à digamma: A 288, pour πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν, πᾶσιν δὲ (F)αν.; I 73 pour πολέεσσι δ' ἀνάσσεις, πολέσιν δὲ (F)αν.; B 672 pour Χαρόποιό τ' ἄνακτος, Χαρόπου τε (F)ἄνακ."²⁾ In the light of the relations between the prototypes and modifications outlined above this is wrong.³⁾ Not only is the transmitted text to be left as it stands, but, what is more important from our point of view, the neglect of the digamma has to be explained by the Homeric modification of the formulaic and probably very ancient prototypes *πάντεσσι Φανάσσειν (-εις, etc.), *πολέεσσι Φανάσσειν (-εις, etc.), *Χαρόποιο (Πριάμοιο etc.) Φάνακτος, cf. e.g.:

	πολέεσσ ²	ἄνδρεσσιν	ἄνακτα	E	546
	πολέεσσ ²	„	„	N	452
	„	„	ἀνάσσων	P	308
	Κιλίκεσσ ²	„	„	Z	397
		πλέονεσσιν	ἀνάσσει	A	281 ⁴⁾
and:		Πριάμοιο	ἄνακτος	B	373 etc., 9 ×
		Ἐλένοιο	„	N	758 etc., 3 ×

and so on.

No useful purpose would be served by a simple enumeration of the cases which can be explained on the same lines. The conditions, however, in which the most conspicuous of these phenomena appear, deserve a closer inspection, since they may give us some indications as to the trends

¹⁾ *ibid.* 157.

²⁾ *ibid.* 126–27. The conjectures are Bentley's.

³⁾ This applies in particular to the introduction of the forms πᾶσιν and πολέσιν with *v*-movable making position, below, p. 73 n. 3, 107 f.

⁴⁾ It goes without saying that in this type of formula *v*-movable is not original; on the hybrid form πολέεσσ², which is equally due to modification of an ancient type, below, p. 117 f.

which, after the digamma had been dropped in spoken Ionic, may have been operating in epic style.

It is clear that some of the alterations have been caused by modifications of a very simple, connective type. In addition to *πολέεσσι* (*πάντεσσι*) *δ'* *ἀνάσσει* (-ειν) and *Χαρόποιο* *τ'* *ἀνακτος* *I* may cite *εἰ δ' οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι* *A* 19¹⁾ (*οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι* 8 × at the end of the line) and *ὄλοφυρόμενος δ' ἔπος ηὔδα* (*O* 114 = 398 = ν 199), the prototype of which is clearly exemplified by *εὐχόμενος ἔπος ηὔδα* (*K* 461 etc., 7 ×), *παριστάμενος ἔπος ηὔδα* (*P* 119) etc.²⁾ Corresponding to **ἔπος ηὔδα* there must have existed a complementary formula **Ἔοπ' ἄκουσε*(-σαν, etc.)³⁾ — cf. *κῦδος ἀρέσθαι* ∼ *κῦδος ὀρέξαι*, *μνήσαντο δὲ χάρμης* ∼ *λήθοντο δὲ χάρμης* —, for we find: *ἔγὼν ὅπ' ἄκουσα* *H* 53, *νωίτερον ὅπ' ἀκούσης* *μ* 185, *ἀπὸ στομάτων ὅπ' ἀκούσαι* *μ* 187, *τερπόμενος ὅπ' ἀκούσης* *Σειρηνοίην* *μ* 52. Hence the neglect of the digamma in *ἀμειλικτον δ' ὅπ' ἄκουσαν* (-σε) *A* 137, *Φ* 98, is to be explained as resulting from the insertion of *δ'*.⁴⁾ Here, however the particle is not used as a simple connective but has an adversative sense.⁵⁾ This brings us to the first element of antithetical expression, the particle *μέν*.

In discussing the origination of *ἕως* and *τέως* we have seen that there are some signs that the presence of very recent forms may be ascribed to insertion of *μέν* in older prototypes.⁶⁾ Attention has already been drawn to *τὴν μὲν ἰδὼν γήθησε* (*ε* 486 = *ω* 504), where an ancient paratactical type of narrative has been turned into the first clause of an antithesis.⁷⁾ In the same way — but with a different meaning⁸⁾ — *μέν* has penetrated into an old prototype *B* 233 *οὐ μὲν ἔοικε* and *I* 374 *οὐδὲ μὲν ἔργον*, cf. *οὐδὲ ἔοικε* (-ν, *ἔφκει*) *A* 119 etc., 14 ×, and *οὐδέ τι ἔργον* (-ων) *τ* 323, *ν* 378, *ἦέ τι ἔργον* *δ* 163. On the strength of these cases we may reasonably suppose that intrusion of *μέν* (and not of *ἄρ'* or *γ'*⁹⁾) is the primary cause of the neglect of digamma in expressions of the type *τὴν*

1) cf. Webster, *Early and Late in Homeric Diction* 45, Severyns, *o.c.* 91 f. (*πλησάμενος δ' οἴνοιο δέπας*, *I* 224).

2) On other aspects of this type of modification see below, p. 65 f.

3) Evidence for *F* is found in the ancient formula *ἀμειβόμενοι ὅπι καλῆ* (*A* 604, *ω* 60, cf. Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 124), and in *θεοῦ δια φωνήσαντος* (*Y* 380, cf. *θεᾶς δια φωνησάσης* *B* 182, etc., 3 ×). In *δοιδίονος ὅπι καλῆ*, *ε* 61, the neglect of the digamma has been caused by the use of the "impressionistic" neologism *δοιδίονος* (cf. K. Meister, *o.c.* 79) before 'exposed' *ὅπι καλῆ*.

4) cf. also the treatment of *σάφα* (*τάχα*) *εἰσομαι*(-εαι) (*H* 226, *Ξ* 8) > *τάχα δ' εἰσαι* *β* 40, *π* 246. If *ὦς* *postpositivum* originally had a digamma (cf. Chantraine, *ibid.* 126), the neglect of the sound in a number of formulae, may be regarded as typical of the evolution (*θεός δ' ὦς τίετο δήμω*, etc.). Since the *F* must have been dropped very early, the odds are that the prototypes (*θεός ὦς τίετο δήμω*, etc.) are indeed a Mycenaean survival (cf. Webster, *M.H.* 108, 258).

5) likewise in *A* 470 *ὦς τὸν μὲν λίπε θυμός, ἐπ' αὐτῷ δ' ἔργον ἐτύχθη*.

6) above, p. 35.

7) above, p. 35.

8) Denniston, *G.P.* 362.

9) Nineteenth-century conjectures usually omit *ἄρ'*, *γ'*.

μέν ἄρ' Ἴρις (*E* 353), τοὺς μὲν δ' γ' Ἀστυνόω (*O* 455), οἱ μὲν ἄρ' οἶνον ἔμισγον (*a* 110) and that the prototype is the usual οἱ (τοὺς, τῆν, etc.) δ' ἄρα¹⁾— . A similar development may have entailed the neglect of the digamma in *ε* 234 δῶκε μὲν οἱ the (paratactical) prototype of which is found *Z* 193, *Ψ* 390 (δῶκε δέ οἱ, cf. *ι* 203 δῶκε δέ μοι), and in *ν* 430 κάρψε μὲν οἱ. In this connection the extremely recent accusative νέα (*ι* 283) may be mentioned. It is used at the beginning of the line in conditions comparable with δῶκε μὲν οἱ, κάρψε μὲν οἱ: νέα μὲν μοι κατέαξε Ποσειδάων Ἐνοσίχθων. Of course Ahrens' conjecture νῆ' ἀμῆν is to be rejected; the mss. reading is certainly authentic and in the light of the preceding observations it seems to be symptomatic of the evolution of epic diction. Probably the prototype may be reconstructed on the same lines as in the cases just mentioned: *νᾶφα δέ Φοι κατέφαξε Ποσειδάων Ἐνοσίχθων.²⁾ It may have belonged to an ancient *Nostos*, cf. *ἤλυθε Φεικοστῶ Φέτει [πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς].³⁾

The pointed expression of an idea may involve neglect of digamma in the second limb of a co-ordinated antithesis. Such is the case, as we have seen, in *A* 288 πάντων μὲν κρατέειν ἐθέλει, πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν. Here the antithesis is only a formal one and is used to give point to the anaphora. This rhetorical employment is not likely to have been very old in Homer's time. It is perhaps symbolic that its first appearance in Greek poetry is marked by a recent feature of the diction. A similar phenomenon is found in *P* 279 ∞ λ 550 Αἴας (-νθ') ὅς περὶ μὲν εἶδος, περὶ δ' ἔργ' ἐτέτυκτο, cf. ἔργα τέτυκται (-το) *X* 450, *Ω* 354, λ 610, ἔργον ἐτύχθη *Δ* 470, an 'exposed' prototype.⁴⁾

Thus far expressions have been examined in which the particles μὲν and δέ were inserted in contexts which show every sign of being traditional. There are, however, a few cases where neglect of digamma has been brought about by the employment of μὲν in a different environment. As is well-known, Homeric messages are usually repeated verbatim, except for minor variations necessitated by the circumstances. When, however Agamemnon relates the message of the σῆλος Ὀνειρος in *B* (60–70), he does not finish it. Nor does he conclude it with the customary ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας or ὡς εἰπὼν, but, breaking off in the middle of a line he winds up his report with ὡς δ' μὲν εἰπὼν | ὄχρετ' ἀποπτάμενος, ἐμὲ δὲ γλοκῆς ὕπνος ἀνήκεν (70–71). The expression ὡς δ' μὲν εἰπὼν does not appear elsewhere. Used as it is instead of ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας or ὡς εἰπὼν it is characteristic of the growing liberty in poetic composition and of a correspondingly increasing preference for antithetical expression. The same applies to the neglect of the digamma in π 338 Πηνελοπείη δ' εἶπε συμβῶτης ἄγχι παράστας,

¹⁾ Of course this does not mean that corresponding formulae must at one time have existed for every individual expression. The emphasis is on *type*.

²⁾ On the presumably greater (proportional) frequency of the 3rd. pers. sing. in earlier phases see above, p. 51.

³⁾ above, p. 52.

⁴⁾ On *Δ* 470 see above, p. 56 n. 5.

which is preceded by a one line-long report (!) of a messenger, introduced with *κῆρυξ μὲν*.

The three lines β 52–54

οἱ πατρός μὲν ἐς οἶκον ἀπερρίγασι νέεσθαι
 Ἰκαρίον, ὅς κ' αὐτός ἐεδνώσαιο θυγάτρα
 δοίη δ' ᾧ κ' ἐθέλοι καὶ οἱ κεχαρισμένος ἔλθοι

were regarded as spurious by Hartman and Van Leeuwen. The latter is certainly right in pointing out that *ἀπερρίγασι* (a *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον*) is an exaggerated way of saying that the suitors do not like Penelope to return (or do not like to go themselves?) to Icarios' house¹⁾—in fact, it shows some resemblance to *ἐν δ' αὐτοῖς ἔριδα ῥήγγοντο βαρεῖαν* (Y 55) and similar expressions which Kirk calls “anti-traditional”.²⁾ Still, in my opinion the evidence is insufficient to regard β 52–54 as post-Homeric. But let us look at *ἐς οἶκον*. The usual and doubtless traditional way to express “his (her, etc.) father's house” is *δῶματα πατρός* (Σ 141 etc., 7 ×, sometimes preceded by *πρός*). The words for “homeward” (without any qualification) are the ancient adverbs *οἴκαδε* and *οἰκόνδε*. It is not unlikely, therefore, that *εἰς οἶκον* (a 356 = φ 350) is an innovation. Anyhow, *ἦγεν ἐς οἶκον* (ξ 318, ρ 84) certainly is, and a very recent innovation at that. In β 52 too the use of antithetical *μὲν* appears in a very recent context.

Of course antithesis as such³⁾ is very ancient and largely represented in traditional formulae (e.g. *ὧς οἱ μὲν τοιαῦτα πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἀγόρευον / τῶ δὲ* (E 274), *τῶν δ'* (Θ 213), etc. Yet in the phases of epic diction slightly prior to or roughly contemporary with Homer it seems to have been expanding. The cases cited above seem to foreshadow the steadily increasing role of antithetical expression in classical Greek literature.

E. A FORMULA IS REMOVED FROM ITS TRADITIONAL POSITION

A post-Homeric example of this phenomenon is found in *Aphr.* 232:

σίψ τ' ἀμβροσίη τε καὶ εἶματα καλὰ διδοῦσα

cf. *εἶματα καλὰ* at the end of the line *Aphr.* 171 and, in Homer, ζ 111, etc.,
 5 ×, without exception.

A similar handling of formulae may have caused several cases of neglect in Homer but their identification is made problematic for lack of corresponding evidence. In a few cases, however, the development is clearly recognisable.

1. *λύγρ' ἔχω' οἶσθα καὶ αὐτός ἐπει σέ πρῶθ' ἰκέτευσα* ρ 573

The formula *οἶδα* (*οἶσθα*) *καὶ αὐτός* (*αὐτή*) is found 7 times at the end of the line, e.g. Y 201 = 432

ἔλπεο δευδίξεσθαι· ἐπεὶ σάφα οἶδα καὶ αὐτός.

The other cases are O 93, Ω 105, ε 215, κ 457, ξ 365.

¹⁾ ad loc.: *violentius quam pro sententia*.

²⁾ S.H. 205 f.

³⁾ i.e. apart from rhetorical anaphora.

2. οἴκαδέ τ' ἐλθέμεναι καὶ νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ ιδέσθαι γ 233 = ε 220 = θ 466.

This is one of the rare cases of formulaic use of an expression built upon previous loss of digamma. It can be shown, however, that, here too, we have to do with a modification of a more ancient type. The formula νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ is elsewhere confined to the end of the line (7 ×) and in the majority of cases it appears to be part of a system:

ἀφείλετο	}	νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ	α	9, τ 369
ἀπώλετο			ρ	253
ᾤλετο			α	168
ᾤλεσε			α	354

The other cases are π 149, ρ 571. It seems that, perhaps on the analogy of ἐλεύθερον ἡμᾶρ ἀπούρας (3 ×), the probably very ancient formula νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ was ousted from its traditional position after the digamma had been dropped in Ionic. The modification is also due to the fact that the regular position of ιδέσθαι is at the verse-end (38 ×, 2 × with neglect of F).

3. οὐδέ τί πω παρὰ μοῖραν ἔπος νηκερδὲς ἔειπες ξ 509

Here we have an unusually clear instance of "competition between two formulae which would naturally fall into the same part of the verse." ¹⁾ On the one hand we find:

τοῦτο ἔπος νημερτές	}	ἔειπες	Γ	204
,, ,, θυμαλγές			π	69, ψ 183
and on the other:				
,, ,, κατὰ μοῖραν	}	ἔειπε(ν)	Ο	206, θ 141
,, ,, ,, ,,			φ	278
οὐ τι ,, ,, ,,			θ	397

and we may add that the formula κατὰ μοῖραν ἔειπε(-ν, -ς) appears altogether 16 × in this position. In ξ 509 παρὰ μοῖραν has been shifted into position 5^{1/2} (before the trochaic caesura), in which κατὰ μοῖραν is actually found T 256, ο 170 = 203, ρ 580, but where, of course, its use is dependent on the following hemistich beginning with a vowel.

It goes without saying that the combination παρὰ μοῖραν ἔπος νηκερδὲς ἔειπες may be looked at from a different angle. Though κατὰ μοῖραν is much less frequent in 5^{1/2}, we may start from its employment in this position and regard the combination of the two expressions as an instance of juxtaposition of formulae which was only made possible by the loss of the digamma. This phenomenon is well-known in Homeric diction. It appears, for example, in H 108, where ἔπος is in the same ('exposed') position:

δεξιτερῆς ἔλε χειρὸς ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε,
cf. ἐν τ' ἄρα οἴ(μοι) φῦ χειρὶ ,, ,, ,, ,, ,, Z 406 etc., 11 ×²⁾.

¹⁾ Hainsworth, *o.c.* 65.

²⁾ cf. also γ 374 Τηλεμάχου δ' ἔλε χεῖρα ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζεν.

Since it may be supposed that nowadays there is general agreement on the part juxtaposition has played in the formation of Homeric diction, let us confine ourselves to examining a repeated phrase which, at first sight, might be taken for a formula created after the digamma had been dropped. We find:

ἀλλ' ἄγε, νῆα μέλαιναν	ἐρύσσομεν, ἢ τις ἀρίστη	π	348
νῦν δ' " " "	"	A	141 = θ 34
νῆας μὲν	ἐρύσσαμεν	} εἰς ἄλλα δῖαν	δ 577
νῆα " ἄρ	"		λ
" " "	ἐρύσσομεν	} ἠπειρόνδε	κ 423
" " "	ἐρύσσετε		κ

Of course it is easy to 'correct' δ 577 etc. by reading *πάμπρωτα*,¹⁾ but, once again, this appears to be a doubtful expedient. For what are we to do with A 141, θ 34 and π 348? In all probability the neglect of the digamma is connected with the position of the verbal forms: they always occur after the trochaic caesura, in a place, that is, in which the digamma is particularly 'exposed', the caesura being one of the natural switch-points in the formulaic diction. That this view is correct is shown by the fact that the digamma of the same verb is never neglected in the following lines, in which the verb is not employed after a caesura:

αἶψα δὲ νῆα	} μέλαιναν	} ἐπ' ἠπειροῖο	} ἔρυσσαν	π	359	
νῆα μὲν οἷ γε				} ἄλως βένθοσδε	A	485 = π 325
" " " "					θ	52
" " οὐν πάμπρωτον					δ	780

Since the position of the ancient infinitive in *-έμεν* and of the equally ancient short-vowel-conjunctive in *-ομεν* is traditionally before the bucolic diaeresis, it is clear that the verses of the first series have been built upon the two old prototypes

$$*Φερυσσέμεν (Φερύσσομεν) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{εἰς ἄλλα δῖαν} \\ \text{ἠπειρόνδε} \end{array} \right.$$

which are complementary to each other in the same way as

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} *ἄλως βένθοσδε \\ *ἐπ' ἠπειροῖο \end{array} \right\} Φέρυσσαν$$

and that the former type was originally designed to be used after an hemistich ending in a vowel, whereas the latter was meant to serve after a consonant. Obviously the neglect of the digamma in the first series has been caused by its employment in conditions which, before the digamma was dropped, only fitted the second type (*πάμπρωτον, νῆα* [υ-υ] *μέλαιναν*). The type of hemistich which originally corresponded with **Φερυσσέμεν (-ομεν) εἰς ἄλλα δῖαν (ἠπειρόνδε)* has disappeared in Homer,

¹⁾ The conjecture was already made by Bentley.

yet the opportunities to use the two expressions may have been frequent and we can easily imagine earlier singers composing such verses as

**νηα πολυκλήϊδα Φερυσσέμεν εἰς ἄλα δῖαν <*
**νᾶφα πολυκλάφιδα Φερυσσέμεν ἐνς ἄλα δῖφῆαν.¹⁾*

At the stage represented by Homer the formulae in question were not modified themselves, it is only their employment which was changed. After Homer, however, the evolution of epic style and the corresponding decomposition of the age-old formulaic diction must have gathered momentum. Thus in the (Pythian) *Hymn to Apollo* we read *ἐκ δ' ἄλός ἠπειρόνδε θοὴν ἀνὰ νῆϊ ἐρύσαντο*, 506. Indeed, so much have the original prototypes changed that, if we did not have Homer, we would never suspect that ultimately this line goes back on *νηα—ἐπ' ἠπειροῖο ἔρυσσαν* and/or on *νηα—ἐρύσομεν (*-έμεν) ἠπειρόνδε*. There is all the more reason, then, to consider the possibility that in far less extreme cases certain Homeric expressions marked by neglect of digamma reflect older prototypes, especially so when the lines on which the modification must have proceeded can be retraced beyond reasonable doubt. This applies in particular to the group of closely related phenomena we are now going to examine. Here the juxtaposition of formulae seems to have occurred in very special conditions.

Permutation of P₂ and T₂ formulae²⁾

A post-Homeric example of this phenomenon is found in *Aphr.* 85: *εἶδος τε μέγεθος τε καὶ εἴματα σιγαλόεντα.³⁾*

In the case of *Aphr.* 232 we have taken *εἴματα καλά* rather than *καὶ εἴματα καλά* for our starting-point, because the latter expression does not occur in Homer. Of course this distinction is a purely formal one, because a traditional combination may be extended so as to become a more complex formula. It is equally inessential whether in *Aphr.* 85 we prefer to examine *εἴματα σιγαλόεντα* or *καὶ εἴματα σιγαλόεντα* from a formulaic point of view. In this case, however, it seems better to take *καὶ εἴματα σιγαλόεντα* for our starting-point, because before the composite form of the expression a caesura is possible, whereas in the middle of the line there obviously is not. Again, for our inquiry the distinction makes no difference whatever.

Severyns has shown that the singers could very easily turn a P₁ formula into a T₁ formula and vice versa.⁴⁾ After the loss of the digamma had taken

¹⁾ cf. *νηι πολυκλήϊδι* at the beginning of the line *H* 88, etc. (4 ×), *νησι πολυκλήϊσι* (in another position) 6 ×.

²⁾ This notation, borrowed from Severyns, *o.c.* 49, indicates formulae which were originally designed to serve after the penthemimeris and the trochaic caesura respectively.

³⁾ Of course the omission of *τε* (after *μέγεθος*) (Allen) makes the line nonsensical.

⁴⁾ The mechanism is demonstrated with several examples *o.c.* 96 f., see also Chantraine, *Remarques sur l'emploi des formules dans le premier chant de l'Iliade*, XLV (1932), 129 (*μή νύ τοι οὐ χραίσμη | χραίσμωσιν A* 28, 566), 134 (*ἠγόησεν ἰδοῦσα ' | ἰδοῦσα A* 537, ε 78).

place, this process could be applied on a larger scale. That the singers did apply it is shown by the development of *ὡς ἄρα φωνήσασ' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα*, cf. *ὡς ἄρα φωνήσασα* Θ 432 etc., 9 ×. The same is true of P₂ and T₂ formulae: already at an early stage expressions such as *ἐμίγη φιλότῃτι καὶ εὐνή* (ψ 219) and *μίγη φιλότῃτι καὶ εὐνή* (Ζ 25 = ε 126)¹⁾ must have existed along with each other. The loss of the digamma offered new possibilities for this kind of permutation, especially in expressions beginning with connective particles and conjunctions. Originally *καὶ εἴματα σιγαλόεντα* belonged to the same category as *καὶ Τηλέμαχος θεοειδής, καὶ Νέστορος ἀγλαὸς νῖός, καὶ Τρωάδας ἐλκεσιπέπλους*, etc. After the digamma had been dropped it could be made to serve—unlike the corresponding formulae of the type *καὶ Τηλέμαχος θεοειδής*—after the trochaic caesura. In its P₂ form it is not found in Homer, but we do find *καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα* (ζ 38 etc., 5 ×), *ῥθι εἴματα σιγαλόεντα* (Χ 154) and in *Aphr.* 164 *ιδέ εἴματα σιγαλόεντα*.²⁾ The older expressions have one *mora* more than the form found in *Aphr.* 85, the employment of which may be partly due to the existence of the formula *καὶ ἥνία σιγαλόεντα* (Ε 226 etc., 4 ×). After the digamma had been dropped in Ionic it was only natural that the singers, certainly unconsciously, changed the long type *ιδέ* (*ῥθι*, **καὶ*) *εἴματα σιγαλόεντα* (∞ *καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα*) into the short type *καὶ εἴματα σιγαλόεντα* (∞ *καὶ ἥνία σιγαλόεντα*); the latter could be used after the trochaic caesura. So if we find comparable Homeric expressions of the short type in which the digamma is neglected, there is reason to believe that their prototypes are to be found in formulae of the long type in which the sound has been 'observed'.

Before proceeding to an inquiry into a number of cases in which the neglect of the digamma may be due to a similar treatment of P₂ types I may point to the value of the testimony presented by *Aphr.* 85 and 232 with regard to textual criticism. In *Aphr.* 169 *βοῦς τε καὶ ἴφια μῆλα νομῶν ἐξ ἀνθεμοέντων*, where we find a transposition of the formula *βόες(-ας) καὶ ἴφια μῆλα* (Ε 556, etc., 10 ×), it is extremely easy to 'restore' the digamma by deleting *τε*. Such an expedient, however, is clearly impossible in *Aphr.* 85 and 232. The last-mentioned places show that even in cases such as *Aphr.* 169 the text is not to be corrected, but that its form is to be explained as resulting from modification of ancient prototypes.³⁾

Now for the expressions typified by *καὶ εἴματα σιγαλόεντα*. To this category belong, first, some well-known combinations in which, from

¹⁾ Severyns, o.c. 54.

²⁾ ἡδέ Μ.

³⁾ An example of a similar development is found in ξ 75: *εἰσέ τε μίστυλλον τε καὶ ἀμφ' ὀβέλοισιν ἔπειραν* (Chantraine, *ibid.*, 126), when compared with *A* 465 = *B* 428 = γ 462 = μ 365 = ξ 430: *μίστυλλον τ' ἄρα τᾶλλα καὶ ἀμφ' ὀβέλοισιν ἔπειραν*. In ξ 75 the insertion of *τε* was made necessary by the application of *A* 465 etc. to the special circumstances of preparing a pork-meal. It seems that the ox-formula constitutes the prototype; the appearance of *v*-movable is noteworthy, below, p. 80, 90 f., 100 f.

Bentley onwards, the particle *τε* has been omitted in order to 'restore' the digamma, e.g.:

<i>οἱ δ' ἄρα Βουπράσιόν τε καὶ Ἥλιδα διὰν ἔναιον</i>	<i>B</i>	615
<i>οὐδ' εἴ μοι δεκάκις</i>	„ „	<i>I</i> 379
„ „ <i>κεν</i> „ „	„ „	<i>X</i> 349
<i>ἐκ δὲ Σάμης πύουρες</i>	„ „	<i>π</i> 249
<i>καίοντο πετέλαι</i>	„ „	<i>Φ</i> 350
<i>δαῖτ' ἀγαθὴν κρεῖων</i>	„ „	<i>ν</i> 507
<i>δή ῥα τότε ὤμωξέν</i>	„ „	<i>M</i> 162

cf.: *ὤμωξέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα* „ „ „ „ *O* 397 = *ν* 198

Again, the elimination of *τε* (inconsistently carried through by Allen, cf. *I* 379 and *π* 249) is a very doubtful expedient, as a comparison of *M* 162 with *O* 397 = *ν* 198 clearly shows. On the other hand we have seen that the transformation of ancient P_2 prototypes into T_2 formulae was so natural a process that, once the digamma had been dropped, the singers may often have accomplished it unconsciously. Hence there is reason to believe that it must have been more wide-spread in Homer than the available evidence suggests. If anywhere, it is here that we should beware of taking things at their face value. Since the corresponding P_2 prototypes are often lacking in our epics, the evidence is to be sought in the character of the constituents of the formulae. Some cases, e.g. *τε καὶ ἰτεαὶ ἠδὲ μυρῖκαι*, leave us in the dark, but others show significant features. The detailed information about Elis must go back to a pre-Homeric source and the prototype of *B* 615b certainly was **καὶ (ιδέ) Φάλιδα διὰν ἔναιον(-ε)*.¹⁾ The verse *π* 249 has an Aeolic form. The presumable prototype **πύουρες καὶ Φεῖκοσι φῶτες* may originally have served between the penthemimeris and the verse-end. The lines *M* 162 \sim *O* 397 = *ν* 198 show the ancient form *πεπλήγεται*. The presumable prototype **καὶ (ιδέ)*²⁾ *Φῶ πεπλήγεται μηρῶ* must also have been designed to fill the space between the penthemimeral caesura and the verse-end and could consequently be interchanged with $\cup - \text{πεπλήγεται μηρῶ}$, represented by Homeric *θαλερῶ πεπλήγεται μηρῶ*, *O* 113. Its original complement can only be guessed at. There is a large variety of possibilities. It may have been a noun-epithet formula of the type **Ἄσιος Ὑρακίδης* (*M* 163!) as well as a P_1 hemistich ending in a verb, e.g. **αὐτὰρ ὄ γ' ὤμωξεν*, cf. *M* 162 and *σ* 398 *αὐτὰρ ὄ γ' οἰμώξας* or something of this kind.

¹⁾ see above, p. 46f.

²⁾ *ιδέ* is certainly one of the most ancient elements of epic diction, (Ruijgh, *E.A.* 55-57), though, strictly speaking, it cannot be proved that it came from Mycenaean poetry (Kirk, *O.D.C.* 199 f). It is regularly used after the trochaic caesura before a double consonant. Ruijgh, who was the first to observe this, might have added that under these special conditions the archaism was bound to survive but that, if followed by a single consonant and used after the penthemimeris, it could be replaced—and possibly often was—by *καὶ*. Its employment in *σ* 161 *ιδέ τιμήσσεια (γένοιτο)* may be a survival of an older tradition (< *ιδέ τιμάσσεια*!), cf. Myc. Komawens etc. (*Docs.* 190) and, for the fem. form, pi-ti-ro₂-we-sa (*Docs.* 341).

Thus far we have examined cases in which an original P_2 formula was transformed into a T_2 formula by shortening *καί* before a previously digammated word. The following examples show that such a transformation could also be carried out under other conditions.

Initial digamma in **Ιλιος* is only to be inferred from Homeric facts, since the identification of the town with Hittite *Wilusija* is still subject to doubt.¹⁾ Homeric evidence, however, is strongly in favour of original F .²⁾ Among the cases which seem to contradict it we find

ὦς λίπον, ἀντάρ πεζός ἐς *Ιλιον εἰλήλουθα *E* 204

As long ago as 1879 this line was compared with

ἀντάρ δ πεζός ἐὼν εἰς *Ιλιον εἰλήλουθει *A* 230

by v. Christ, who, in accordance with the views then prevailing, explained the neglect of the digamma as resulting from "Nachahmung".³⁾ Ruijgh, on the other hand, when studying the formulaic use of *ἀντάρ*, observed that spondaic *ἀντάρ* is often due to omission of δ and that in *E* 204 the modification of traditional *ἀντάρ δ* as well as the neglect of the digamma was forced on the poet by his putting the type *A* 230 in the 1st. pers. sing. and by his insertion of *ὦς λίπον*.⁴⁾ From our point of view it is interesting to find that, here again, we have to do with an original P_2 -formula, the use of which after the trochaic caesura became possible after the digamma had been dropped. The phenomenon also lends some support to the suggestion made above with regard on the proportionally greater frequency of the 3rd pers. sing. in earlier phases of development: here too the tradition had the third person instead of the first.

All these symptoms illustrate the truth of Severyns' remark that some P_2 and T_2 formulae could be easily interchanged by the singers. Though this process has so far been ascertained only for the period posterior to the loss of the digamma, there is no reason to suppose that it originated at this very late stage. And in fact we find such simple and obviously traditional examples as:

P_2	}	τήν οἱ πόρε Φοῖβος Ἄπόλλων	<i>A</i> 72, <i>A</i> 353
		,, ,, ,, δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς	<i>I</i> 667
		cf. τόν τοι ,, πότνια μήτηρ	Ψ 92

along with:

T_2	}	τά οἱ ,, χάλκεος Ἄρης	<i>H</i> 146
		,, ,, ,, δία Καλυψώ	ϵ 321, 372
		ᾄ ,, ,, παρθένος ἄδμής	ζ 228
		cf. ὄ τοι ,, Φοῖβος Ἄπόλλων	<i>O</i> 441
		τό σφιν ,, πότνια Κίρκη	κ 394

¹⁾ Page, *H.H.I.* 106.

²⁾ Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 152, Page, *o.c.* 292.

³⁾ *o.c.* 169.

⁴⁾ *E.A.* 42.

Now if we look from this angle at *E* 338

ἀμβροσίον διὰ πέπλον, ὃν οἱ Χάριτες κάμον αὐταί

and if we compare the two lines

(P₂) *δύσσετε δῶρα θεοῦ, τά οἱ Ἥφαιστος κάμε τεύχων* *T* 368

(T₂) *χάλκεον, ἑπταβόειον, δ* ,, *Τύχιος* ,, ,, *H* 220

we see that there is no reason to consider emendation.¹⁾ The phenomenon can be regarded as an instance of declension of a T₂ type, but this declension itself was probably influenced by the existence of a P₂ type. Or vice-versa. Both kinds of modification were only possible after the digamma had disappeared.

We have seen that after the digamma had been dropped in Ionic, existing formulae were sometimes joined to other elements of the sentence by the introduction of a connecting particle and that this applies in particular to the employment of δ'.²⁾ Now the lines containing *πεπλήγεται μηρῶ*:

<i>ὡς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ Ἄρης θαλερῶ</i>	}	<i>πεπλήγεται μηρῶ</i>	<i>O</i> 113
<i>ῥῶμωξέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα καὶ ᾧ</i>		<i>πεπλήγεται μηρῶ</i>	<i>O</i> 397 = ν 198
<i>δὴ ῥα τότ' ῥῶμωξέν τε</i> ,, ,,			<i>M</i> 162

are in three out of the four cases followed by

χερσὶ καταπρηγέσσ', ὀλοφυρόμενος δ' ἔπος ηῦδα *O* 114 = 398 = ν 199.

Unfortunately the origin of *χερσὶ καταπρηγέσσ'* escapes us altogether.³⁾ Did it develop from *χείρεσσι καταπρηγέσσι τ* 467? Or is Leumann right in assuming the sequence *κατὰ πρηγές [βαλέειν]* *B* 414 > *χειρὶ καταπρηγεί* *Π* 792 > *χερσὶ καταπρηγέσσ'*?⁴⁾ Anyhow, the elision of *-έσσι* in the penthemimeris is suspicious since one of the most essential functions of the ending is to establish a smooth trochaic caesura, cf. *μειλιχίοις ἐπέεσσι* (< *μειλιχίοισι Φέπεσσι*) (10 ×), *οἷς ἀγανοῖς βελέεσσι* (< *Φοῖσ' ἀγανοῖσι βέλεσσι*) (6 ×), etc.; it suggests that we have to do with a non-traditional juxtaposition of formulae. In that case, however, *ὀλοφυρόμενος δ' ἔπος ηῦδα* must have taken the place of a traditional formula that expressed the same 'essential idea' after the trochaic caesura and in which there was no neglect of *F*.

Since, as we shall see, such a formula was actually at the disposition of the singers—including Homer—, we must attempt to find an explanation for its being ignored in *O* 114, 398, ν 199. And once again the explanation is to be found in the proximity of both caesuras and in the

¹⁾ From this point of view it may in fact be called a 'particularly difficult case' (Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 148).

²⁾ above, p. 55f.

³⁾ This depends, first, on the etymology of *πρηγής*—which is uncertain, see Frisk *s.v.* *ἀπρηγής*—and secondly on the equally unsolvable question whether, if the derivation from **ἄνος* is correct, the sense of *καταπρηγής* cannot be accounted for as resultant from a normal levelling down-tendency.

⁴⁾ *o.c.* 77-79.

existence, side by side, of closely related P₂ and T₂ types. The expression *όλοφυρόμενος δ' έπος ηΰδα* occurs nowhere without δ' in Homer, so we probably have to do with an innovation. The ultimate origin of the phrase may be found in *καί μ' (ῥ' < F?) όλοφυρόμενος(-η, -οι) έπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα(-ων)* (12 ×), but this gives us little help. We have to look for the connecting link. Now Homer has two series of expressions containing *έπος ηΰδα* which show the same relation as *καί ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα*, etc., on the one hand and *καί ήνία σιγαλόεντα*, etc., on the other:

P ₂			T ₂
<i>καί όμοκλήσας</i>	Z	54	<i>έπος ηΰδα</i> <i>καί εΰχόμενος έπος ηΰδα</i> <i>K 461 etc., 7 ×</i> <i>cf. βῆ δέ θέειω, εΐθαῖ δέ παριστάμενος έπος ηΰδα</i> <i>P 119</i>
„ <i>άλαστήσας</i>	M	163	
„ <i>φωνήσας</i>	Ω	307	
<i>δ' δέ δακρύσας</i>	K	377	

After the digamma was dropped in Ionic the existence of these two types in oral technique appears to have entailed the creation of an expression modelled on *καί εΰχόμενος έπος ηΰδα*—itself a T₂ formula—but serving as a P₂ formula in the exceptional circumstances of elision.

That, further, the proximity of the two caesuras not only facilitated the modification of ancient formulae but also favoured the falling into disuse of some of them is borne out by the fact that—as I have said above—a T₂ formula of identical sense is actually still extant in Homer. It appears in a context similar to *O 114 etc.*:

χερσί τε συμπλατάγησε(ν), έπος δ' όλοφυρόνόν έειπεν Ψ 102,
in δάκρυα δ' έκβαλε θερμά, „ „ „ „ τ 362,

and with neglect of F in:

Σαρπηδών, Διός υίός, έπος δ' όλοφυρόνόν έειπεν Ε 683.

The adjective *όλοφυρόνός* is built upon archaic *όλοφυς* (Aeolic?!)¹⁾ and is probably a very ancient formation itself, cf. *άκιδνός, άιδνός, σμερνός, 'Αριάδνη* etc.²⁾

The instances of modification betrayed by neglect of digamma have, thus far, been examined from a purely technical point of view. It stands to reason that this approach is one-sided. It can do no more than bring out the associations which induced the singers to avail themselves of the possibilities opened by the linguistic evolution. The ultimate cause by which they were prompted to do this lies, of course, in their striving to confer a greater flexibility on the formulaic technique and in a desire for more graphic expression. The influence exerted by the latter motive is well-illustrated by the substitution of the more vivid *όλοφυρόμενος δ' έπος ηΰδα* for older *έπος δ' όλοφυρόνόν έειπε*.

¹⁾ Still extant in Sappho 21, 3 L.P. and transmitted by Hesychius (*όλοφυς. οϊκτος, έλεος, θρηῆνος*) see W. Schulze, *Kleine Schriften* 398, who parallels *όλοφυ-δνός, όλοφυ-ρό-* (> *όλοφύρομαι*) with *γοε-δνός, γοε-ρός*.

²⁾ Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I, 489.

The relatively frequent neglect of the digamma in *Φείκοσι*, *Φέπος*, *Φιδεῖν*, *Φοῖνος* has never induced scholars to reconsider their views on the original forms of these words. So we may ask: if the digamma, which is presupposed by a not unsatisfactory etymology, is always neglected in Homer, does this constitute a sufficient reason to reject the etymology in question? To take an example from Hesiod: should we question the relation of *Ἑσπερίδες* with *Φέσπερος* and *vesper* because of the fact that in both the relevant occurrences its digamma is neglected? In view of the type of development outlined above, we may be sure that both

ἔσχατιῇ πρὸς νυκτός, ἴν' Ἑσπερίδες λιγύφωνοι Th. 275
and *πέρασιν ἐν γαίης πρόπαρ Ἑσπερίδων λιγυφώνων* Th. 518

show the modification of an ancient prototype **ἴνα (ἴθι, ἴδέ, καί) Ἑσπερίδες λιγύφωνοι*, **πρωτὶ Ἑσπερίδων(-ας) λιγυφώνων(-ους)* or something like it.¹⁾

The answer to the question, then, depends primarily on the conditions under which such a word is used. As to the most curious phenomenon of this kind, the epic adjective *εἰλίπους*,²⁾ I agree with Frisk's remark³⁾ (on a hypothetical connection with Lith. *selù* etc.): "diese mit Hilfe auszergriechischen Wörter gewonnene Erklärung ist aber in Prägnanz und Anschaulichkeit den innergriechischen Anknüpfungsmöglichkeiten kaum überlegen" and at the present state of affairs I think it would be best to stick to the traditional explanation *διὰ τὸ εἰλίσειν τοὺς πόδας κατὰ τὴν πορείαν* (Hes.), 'rolling in their gait' (L.S.J.) and to derive the form from *εἰλέω = ἴλλω*.⁴⁾ By this epithet, cows are expressively pictured and, as has often been observed, specifically described as opposed to the *ἵπποι ἀερόποδες* and the *μῆλα ταναόποδα*. Since Frisk, however, is inclined to think that the constant neglect of *F* tells against this derivation, let us look at the expressions *εἰλίποδας βοῦς* (2 ×), *εἰλίποδας ἔλικας βοῦς* (6 ×), *βουσίην ἐπ' εἰλιπόδεσσι* (Z 424) and *ἐν εἰλιπόδεσσι βόεσσι* (II 488).

The expression *εἰλίποδας (ἔλικας) βοῦς* is found three times under conditions which are obviously non-traditional: *Φοῖβε, σὸ δ' εἰλίποδας ἔλικας βοῦς βουκολέεσκες* (Φ 448), *δ δ' ἄφρα μὲν εἰλίποδας βοῦς | βόσκι' (O 547), δύο δ' εἰλίποδας βοῦς (θ 60): δ', μὲν, δ'*. The full-length formula occurs

¹⁾ Hoekstra, *o.c.* 220.

²⁾ see e.g. Risch, *o.c.* 175 (Lith. *selù*!), Shipp, *Studies* 60 (recent compound, with no tradition of *Φεἰλίποδες*).

³⁾ *s.v.*

⁴⁾ cf. Ap. *Lex.*: *διὰ τὸ ἐλιγμὸν ἀποτελεῖν ἐν τῇ πορείᾳ τοὺς πόδας*. Hippocrates *Περὶ ἀρθρῶν ἐμβολῆς* 8 seems to have taken it in the same sense. Mr. C. J. Ruijgh points out to me that if it came from *Φέλλω* ('zusammendrängen'), *-σι-* would have remained intact since it probably goes back on *-τι-*, cf. *Κασ-τι-άνειρα, τερεπ-σι-μβροτος, ἀερ-σι-ποδες* (see also Schwyzler, *Gr.Gr.* I, 442 f.). The same applies of course to a connection with *εἰλέω* 'to roll', but in this case analogical transformation (on the model of *ἀργιόδους*) is more plausible: *ἔλσαι* and *ἐελμένος* still exist in Homer but with the possible exception of ε 132 = η 250 *ἔλσας* (*v.l.* *ἐλάσας*), *συστρέφας* schol., there is no trace of *ἐλ-*forms of the homonym, whereas secondary *εἰλύνω* is rather frequent (*εἰλέω* 'to roll' in Hippocrates).

five times after the trochaic caesura and here its employment does not show any signs of recent modification:

πολλά δὲ ἴφια μῆλα	}	καὶ εἰλιπόδας ἔλικας βοῦς.	I 466 = Ψ 166
μῆλ' ἄδινά σφάζουσι			a 92 = δ 320
ἔσφαζον παρὰ θῖνα			i 46

Yet in view of the development which could be ascertained for *καὶ Φείματα καλά, καὶ Φὼ πεπλήγετο μηρῷ, καὶ Φεσπερίδες λιγύφωνοι* etc., there is no reason to suppose that the metrical form found in Homer is the original one and that it may not have undergone the same treatment as the other expressions.¹⁾

The dative appears in

βουσὶν ἐπ' εἰλιπόδεσσι καὶ ἀργεννῆς δέεσσι	Z 424
αἴθωνα μεγάρυμον, ἐν εἰλιπόδεσσι βόεσσι	Π 488.

It seems that *βουσὶν ἐπ' εἰλιπόδεσσι* is related to *ἐν εἰλιπόδεσσι βόεσσι* in the same way as *τρητοῖς (<-οισ')* ἐν *λεχέεσσι* (*γ* 399 = *η* 345) to *ἐν τρητοῖσι λέχεσσι* (*κ* 12, at the verse-end). If—as seems probable—the replacement of the organic form *λέχεσσι* by *λεχέεσσι* is due here to the fact that the formula was shifted into the first hemistich, the dialectical heterogeneity of *βουσὶν ἐπ' εἰλιπόδεσσι* may have resulted from a similar treatment.²⁾ If this is true, both expressions are reducible to the same P₂ prototype: *ἐπι (ἐνι etc.) *Φειλιπόδεσσι βόεσσι*, which could be used parallel with *ἐπι (μετὰ etc.) *Φειλιπόδας ἔλικας βοῦς*.³⁾

In the preceding chapter we have seen that very few new formulae, if any, were developed from the forms engendered by the process of quantitative metathesis. This phenomenon is obviously to be explained by the fact that the end of genuine oral composition—whether it coincided with the creation of the Homeric epics or was slightly anterior to it—followed so closely on the metathesis that expressions with *πυλέων, θυρέων*, etc. did not have sufficient time to become fixed elements of epic diction.

¹⁾ It may have been used as a complement of P₁, formulae containing words for horses and sheep, e.g.:

ἵππους ἀκύνποδας (E 732)	}	εἰλιπόδας ἔλικας βοῦς
οἱ δ' ἰέρενον δις (ρ 180 = υ 250) *ιδέ		

²⁾ See, however, below, p. 150 ff.

³⁾ In view of the etymology of *ἔλκος* 'wool' (< **Φέρφος*) which is now proved by Mycenaean *we-we-e-a* 'woollen', *Docs* 412), it is tempting to postulate a corresponding formula for *sheep*: *ἐπι (μετὰ, etc.) *Φερφοπόκοισ' δέεσσι*. It is to be noted that the metrical structure of one of the two lines in which *ειροπόκος* appears, is definitely odd: *ὄν δά τε ποιμην ἀγρῶ ἐπ' εἰροπόκοις δέεσσι*, E 137. The opportunities to use the expression after the penthemimeris could have been many, e.g.:

ὄν δά τε μηλοβοτήρ *ἐπι	}	ειροπόκοισ' δέεσσι.
ποιμένες ἀγραυλοὶ (Σ 162) *παρὰ		

The other case is *ὄς οἱ ἐπ' εἰροπόκων δίων στέροισι δέδεντο*, ι 443 (< *ὄπό *Φερφοπόκων δίων*!).

What is, in this respect, the testimony of the material marked by neglect of digamma? Here again we have to leave out of account the expressions in which it resulted from the simple and natural modifications of older prototypes which have been identified so far. Only those formulae which show a more complex treatment of ancient elements and, for that reason, may be regarded as more or less new contributions of singers who no longer knew the sound from current speech, are to be treated as evidence. As far as I can see there are only two substantial and fully developed combinations of this kind to be found in Homer, viz. the T₂ formulae:

[*ὄχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε*] *πρὸς δὲ μεγαλήτορα θυμόν*¹⁾

[*ὡς εἰπὼν*²⁾ *ᾧτρυνε*] *μένος καὶ θυμόν ἐκάστου*.³⁾

The first hemistich of both lines is also used independently⁴⁾ and *ὄχθήσας* (*εὐχόμενος*) *δ' ἄρα εἶπε*,⁵⁾ at any rate, is older than its complementary formula. With regard to the former line we may point to the presence, in Homer, of a P₂ formula:

[*κινήσας δὲ (ῥα) κάρη*] *πρὸτι δὲ μυθήσατο θυμόν*⁶⁾

which expresses the same 'essential idea' in a more ancient form. In connection with the position of *μεγαλήτορα* (in position 10) we have to consider the possibility that the use of this epithet for persons (in position 8)⁷⁾ is older. Perhaps we have to do with an advanced stage of the indiscriminate employment of *φρήν*, *θυμός*, *ἦτορ* and their compounds, a process which is found continued in Pindar and Aeschylus.⁸⁾ A similar phenomenon is to be observed in the use of *μένος* in the latter formula. With the exception of *E* 563⁹⁾ the word is always the object of such verbs as *δρυνμι*, *ἐγείρω*, *ἐμπνέω*, *ἐμβάλλω*, *βάλλω*. It is only combined with *δτρύνω* in *ὡς Ἀχιλῆῷ ᾧτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμός ἀγήνωρ* *Y* 174, but here it is (together with *θυμός*) the subject of the verb. Did *μένος καὶ θυμόν ἐκάστου* ultimately develop from such a subject formula? So much is certain, at any rate, that the combination of linguistic and stylistic features marks both formulae as genuine specimens of late formulaic development. If only for this reason emendation is *a priori* to be rejected.

As to relative chronology, the inquiry into the formulaic material marked by neglect of digamma leads to the following conclusion: Vague though it be, the available evidence fits in with the—equally vague—

1) *A* 403, etc. (7 + 4).

2) *εἰποῖς* *E* 792, θ 15.

3) *E* 470, etc. (10 + 1).

4) *ὄχθήσας δ' ἄρα εἶπε*(ν) also in *Ψ* 143; *ὡς εἰπὼν ᾧτρυνε* also in *A* 73, etc. (10 + 1).

5) *εὐχόμενος* (*εὐξάμενος*) *δ' ἄρα εἶπε* η 330, *II* 513.

6) *P* 200, etc. (2 + 2).

7) above, p. 23.

8) There is no evidence for **πρὸτι* (*μ*)*μεγαλήτορα θυμόν*, whereas e.g. *ἐνὶ* (*μ*)*μεγάρουσι*(ν) *ἐμοῖσι* (*ἐοῖσι*, *τεοῖσι*) and *ἀνά* (*κατὰ*) (*μ*)*μέγαγα σκίοντα* are frequent. All this suggests that we have to do with a case of late and somewhat artificial formula-making.

9) *σεῖων ἐγχελην τοῦ δ' ᾧτρυνεν μένος Ἄρης*.

indications of a linguistic and non-formulaic nature mentioned in the introductory part of this chapter. The loss of the digamma in East Ionic seems to have occurred so shortly before oral composition came to an end, that only an extremely small number of newly created expressions had sufficient time to develop into formulae. Perhaps it may be put down a little earlier than the development of quantitative metathesis. The fact is that the evidence for repeated expressions based upon loss of digamma—whether due to simple modification or resulting from a more original contribution—is a little less flimsy than in the case of metathesised forms. Repeated expressions such as *ἄφρ' εἶπω, καὶ μιν φωνήσασ' ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα, πρὸς δὲ μεγαλήτορα θυμόν, καὶ ᾧ πεπλήγεται μηρῷ, καὶ εἰλλπόδας ἔλικας βοῦς, ἀνά θ' ἰστία λεύκ' ἐρύσαντες*, seem more frequent in Homer than *Τυδείδew Διομήδεος, ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ στέωμεν* and a sprinkling of similar expressions. Again, the indications are of the slightest and the difference may just as well have stylistic grounds. Several of the repeated expressions marked by neglect of digamma (*ἄφρ' εἶπω, καὶ μιν φωνήσασ', εἶπε πρὸς δὲ μεγαλήτορα θυμόν, καὶ ᾧ πεπλήγεται μηρῷ, ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμόν ἐκάστον*) are part of introductory and concluding formulae, which ipso facto invited repetition.

IV

N-MOVABLE

It is clearly impossible to treat the expressions containing *ν*-movable in the same way as those marked by quantitative metathesis and neglect of digamma. Any attempt to give even a summary analysis of a similar kind—supposing that such an inquiry would be useful—is doomed to failure because of our profound ignorance about the most fundamental elements of the problems raised by the ubiquitous presence of the sound in Homer.¹⁾ This almost total lack of knowledge is especially embarrassing on the following points:

1. We are unable to ascertain beyond doubt whether we have to do with *ν*-movable or with etymological *ν* in *κεν*.²⁾

2a. Even in those cases in which the sound is certainly 'paragogic' we are almost completely in the dark about its history and its possible presence in other dialects than Attic-Ionic.

2b. Supposing that originally the sound was not confined to Attic-Ionic in so far as plural datives are concerned, the implications of the fact that it seems to be inherent in many ancient verb-formulae become even more obscure from a dialectal point of view.

3. We do not know to what extent the Homeric data reflect similar functions of the sound at earlier stages of the development of epic diction.

With regard to these uncertainties and the limitations they impose on the present inquiry the following remarks may be made.

1. The phenomena connected with *κε-κεν* do not provide any reliable evidence. They will have to be left out of account altogether.

2a. It is not beyond all doubt whether the presence of *ν*-movable in Homer is exclusively to be ascribed to the Ionic stage of development. In this respect I may refer to the cases noted by Buck and point to the remarkable phenomenon that the plural datives ending in *-σιν* all appear

¹⁾ For Parry the matter was quite simple since he regarded the presence of *ν*-movable in verbal forms in "some Cyprian inscriptions" as proof of its being original in this dialect (*Studies* II, 32). Thus he had no difficulty in assuming that the formulaic diction was essentially a creation of Arcado-Cypriot and Aeolic singers. It need not be said that the presumable dates of the inscriptions in which verbal forms ending in *ν*-movable first appear (see Schwyzer, *Del.* 682, 15 (± 361?), *ἔδδμεν*, *ibid.* 16 (± 372?)) *ἔδδμεν κας ἀνέθεκεν* do not warrant this far-reaching conclusion. On (earlier) epigraphical evidence for *ν*-movable in plural datives see below.

²⁾ The question was recently reexamined by Palmer (*C.H.* 90 ff.), who argues that the *ν* is etymological. Professor F. B. J. Kuiper was so kind as to give me his opinion by letter on the equation *νύ κεν* = Skt. *nu kam* proposed by Delbrück. He points out that, apart from other objections, Vedic *kam* and O.Ch.Sl. *kr* can only go back on **kom* and that, consequently, there is no reason to assume a pre-Greek origin of *κεν*. Frisk too is sceptical (*s.v.*).

in dialects which normally have *-εσσι*.¹⁾ If these datives are really due to West Greek (including Doric),²⁾ the only way to account for the presence of *ν*-movable is to assume a marked influence of epic (i.e. Homeric, Cyclic or 'Hesiodic') poetry³⁾ on official phraseology, since in view of the early date⁴⁾ and the geographical origin of the inscriptions in question, all other forms of Ionic and/or Attic influence are virtually inconceivable. If, on the other hand, we regard this supposition as improbable, we are compelled to accept the alternative that these forms are survivals of another dialect—in this case 'Achaean'.⁵⁾

2b. Whatever may be truth of this, the fact remains that, at an early period, *ν*-movable in verb-forms is only found in Attic-Ionic. This is all the more remarkable since some of the formulae built upon this sound look very ancient; see below.

3. In this respect we may be sure of two things: first that *ν*-movable is very late when used to obviate hiatus caused by loss of digamma; secondly that it is wholly inessential at the end of a line. Beyond this we have to be satisfied with more or less probable suppositions. At a time when the dialectal origin of the Homeric language looked less complicated than nowadays, Schwyzer made an attempt to reduce the importance of *ν*-movable in our epics.⁶⁾ First, he assumed that before vowels *ι* did not bring about hiatus. As the evidence for internal 'glides' has since been corroborated by Mycenaean⁷⁾ and as there seems to be an instance of a glide between two words in Pamphylian,⁸⁾ the assumption is worth considering for early stages of epic diction. On the other hand it may

1) *G.D.* 84: Thess. *χρήμασιν* (Sotairos-inscr.), Locr. *ἀνδράσιν, γονεῦσιν, παμάρτεσιν* (no. 59 B), Sicyon. *φέρονσιν, Φοικέουσιν* (no. 96 B).

2) cf. Ruijgh, *Les datifs pluriels*, 104.

3) as is supposed by Ruijgh, *ibid.*

4) The inscriptions from Sicyon and Locris (or rather from eastern Aetolia) are dated by epigraphists about 500 (the latter somewhat earlier by Miss Jeffery, *o.c.* 105). The Sotairos-inscription does not seem to be much later than the middle of the fifth century, Jeffery, *o.c.* 98.

5) The supposition was put forward by Bechtel, *Gr. Dial.* I, 180 with regard to *χρήμασιν* in the Sotairos inscription (though for the *ν* this scholar considered a different explanation). In this connection it is worth noting that in the Locrian inscription *γονεῦσιν* and *ἀνδράσιν* are found together with *ἄματα πάντα*. If Bechtel (*ibid.* 387) and Ruijgh (*E.A.* 120) are right against Leumann (*H.W.* 276) in regarding *ἄματα πάντα* as a (non-Homeric) survival in Arcadian and other dialects, the same possibility might be considered with regard to *γονεῦσιν* and *ἀνδράσιν*. Not far from Polis an (early-) Mycenaean settlement was recently discovered at Kirrha (I saw this in the review of L. Dor, J. Jannoray, H. et M. van Effenterre, *Kirrha, Étude de préhistoire phocidienne*, Paris, 1960) by H. Gallet de Santerre in *REA* LXIV (1962), 149 ff.

6) *Gr.Gr.* I, 406.

7) see e.g. *Docs* 44 (i-ja-te, Ko-no-si-ja, i-je-re-u, etc.).

8) Schwyzer, *Del.* 686, 11 (Silyon) *ἰ πόλι ἐπιέλοδν*, cf. Thumb-Scherer, *Handbuch d. Gr. Dial.* II², 156-57.

be asked why, if this theory is correct, hiatus is not more often found after singular datives. Secondly Schwyzer suggested that ν -movable making position might have been brought about by "Konsonantendehnung mit nachfolgender Geminatenauflösung". With regard to nasals and liquids¹⁾ this seems to be in accordance with the well-known facts of Homeric prosody,²⁾ but it covers only a small proportion of the cases in question³⁾ and it would be arbitrary to extend the supposition to occlusives, which are sometimes found under the same formulaic conditions, e.g. in:

¹⁾ and perhaps also in the case of f and σ , see e.g. Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 140, 146, 179.

²⁾ on the doubling of liquids in mss. and pap. (e.g. ἐνὶ μεγάροισι *A* 396, etc., ἕδασι λλιαρῶ (pap.) *A* 830) see e.g. Schwyzer *o.c.* 310 f. Of course there is "kein Anlass sie in der äusseren Wortfuge Homer abzusprechen" (Leumann, *o.c.* 52). The prosodical lengthening goes back to an ancient stage of development: ὤς τε λις ἠγνέειος, ποσσι δ' ὑπὸ λιπαροῖσι, ἐνὶ μεγάροισι (above, p. 35), Ὀδυσση(-ι) μεγαλήτορα(-ι) (above, p. 23), etc.

³⁾ From a formulaic point of view, however, the condition under which ν -movable appears in πολέσι (dat. pl. of πολύς) in the *Il.* (8 ×) and the *Od.* (2 ×!) may be significant. It is found only once without ν , in *v* 30:

μόνος ἐὼν πολέσι· σχεδόθεν δέ οἱ ἦλθεν Ἀθήνη.

Among the other cases β 166:

πάντεσσιν· πολέσιν δὲ καὶ ἄλλοισιν κακὸν ἔσται

is an obvious instance of drastic modification (see below, p. 102). In the remaining cases πολέσιν always appears after the penthemimeris. Now on the one hand we find:

θρέψεν ἀμαιμακέτην, πολέσιν κακὸν ἀνθρώποισιν *Π* 329

ῥινοῦ ποιητήν, πολέσιν δ' ἔντροσθεν ἱμάσιν *K* 262

and on the other:

<table style="border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="padding-right: 5px;">τάρβει, μόνος ἐὼν</td> <td rowspan="5" style="font-size: 3em; padding: 0 10px;">}</td> <td rowspan="5" style="padding: 0 10px;">πολέσιν μετὰ</td> <td style="padding: 0 10px;">Καδμείοισι</td> <td style="padding: 0 10px;">Δ</td> <td style="padding: 0 10px;">388</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ξείνος γάρ οἱ ἔην</td> <td>Παφλαγόνεσσι</td> <td>N</td> <td>661</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ἀλλ' ἔταρον πέμπω</td> <td>Μυρμιδόνεσσι</td> <td>Π</td> <td>240</td> </tr> <tr> <td>κεῖτο βαρὺ στενάχων</td> <td style="text-align: center;">,,</td> <td>Ψ</td> <td>60</td> </tr> <tr> <td>ἦ ἔν' ἔχει τιμήν</td> <td style="text-align: center;">,,</td> <td>λ</td> <td>495</td> </tr> </table>	τάρβει, μόνος ἐὼν	}	πολέσιν μετὰ	Καδμείοισι	Δ	388	ξείνος γάρ οἱ ἔην	Παφλαγόνεσσι	N	661	ἀλλ' ἔταρον πέμπω	Μυρμιδόνεσσι	Π	240	κεῖτο βαρὺ στενάχων	,,	Ψ	60	ἦ ἔν' ἔχει τιμήν	,,	λ	495					
τάρβει, μόνος ἐὼν	}			πολέσιν μετὰ	Καδμείοισι	Δ	388																				
ξείνος γάρ οἱ ἔην					Παφλαγόνεσσι	N	661																				
ἀλλ' ἔταρον πέμπω					Μυρμιδόνεσσι	Π	240																				
κεῖτο βαρὺ στενάχων					,,	Ψ	60																				
ἦ ἔν' ἔχει τιμήν		,,	λ		495																						

In *Π* 329 the epithet (ἀμαιμακέτην) has been separated from its noun (cf. *Z* 179 *X*(μαιραν ἀμαιμακέτην), so here too, modification is probable (note the archaic nature of the epithet). About *K* 262 we can only say that the description of a Mycenaean object does not guarantee the antiquity of the line in question, as is shown by the verses in which the tower-shield and Nestor's cup appear. (below, p. 140 f.) Weighing the evidence we should give preference to the view that the original prototype is reflected in πολέσι (μ)μετὰ Καδμείοισι / Μυρμιδόνεσσι (the relatively late date of *N* 661 seems to be indicated by the mention of the Paphlagonians). This is in accordance with the facts observed by Miss D. Gray (above, p. 52) and with the testimony of the formulae *πάντεσσι Φανάσσειν (above, p. 55), *πολέσσι Φανάσειν (*ibid.*), πολέσσ' ἄνδρεσσι Φανάκτα, etc., which suggest that, much more than detailed descriptions of particular objects and fighting-practices, data of general geographical, dynastical and legendary kind were apt to survive in ancient formulaic phrases. And if the original type was πολέσι (μ)μετὰ Καδμείοισι etc. (cf. ἐνὶ (μ)μεγάροισι(ν) εἴοισι etc.), it would seem indeed that *Π* 329, *K* 262, β 166 are instances of gradual and analogical spreading of ν -movable. Hence it seems that, in so far as the older stages of the formulaic diction are concerned, Schwyzer may well be right.

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ	λοῦσέν τε	καὶ	ἔχρισεν	λίπ'	ἐλαίῳ	γ	466,	κ	364
„	„	νίψεν	„	„	ἤλειψεν	„	„	τ	505
ἐνδουκέως	λοῦσέν	„	„	ἔχρισεν	„	„	κ	450	

In this respect the structure of the formula *ἦυσεν δὲ διαπρύσιον* (*Δαναοῖσι γεγωνός*) (Θ 227 etc. 6 ×) is worth noticing. The original presence of the *ν* is guaranteed by the onomatopoetic nature of the expression. Since, on the other hand, *διαπρύσιον* is highly archaic and almost entirely confined to this formula,¹⁾ the structure of the formula shows that *ν*-movable became a feature of the formulaic diction at an early stage of its development.²⁾

If only for this reason, it would be arbitrary to suppose that in *φώνησέν τε* (34 ×), *δοῦπησεν δὲ πεσών* (21 ×), *ξίφρσίν τε καὶ ἔγχεσιν ἀμφιγύοισιν* (6 ×), *οὐδ' ἔρρηξεν χαλκός* (3 ×), etc. the *ν*-movable which lengthens the preceding syllable is not original. The same applies to its use before vowels: *βάλεν ἰῶ* (5 ×), *βάλεν εἶδαρ* (2 ×),³⁾ *πέσεν ἔπτιος* (4 ×, once, O 647, used for the Mycenaean Periphetes, tripping over the rim of his body-shield!), *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ ζέσσεν ὕδωρ ἐνὶ ἦνοπι χαλκῶ* (2 ×), *γυῖα δ' ἔθηκεν ἐλαφρά* (3 ×), etc. Unless we are prepared to consider the possibility that originally hiatus was extremely frequent—a supposition which seems to be contradicted by the structure of the *Φάναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων*-system,⁴⁾—we have to assume that after *ν*-movable had entered heroic poetry the formulaic diction was elaborated on a vast scale. We are able to visualise the form epic diction had attained when quantitative metathesis began to develop and *Ϝ* disappeared in East Ionic. That we cannot possibly do the same with regard to the phase anterior to the introduction of *ν*-movable testifies to the presence of the sound at a far earlier stage of development and also lends some support to the supposition that its

1) With a single exception (*P* 748 *πεδίοιο διαπρύσιον τετυχηκός*) it is never used in another expression. It may be Aeolic (cf. Chantraine *G.H.* I, 25) and/or Achaeian (if from *διαπρό*, cf. *Myc.* a-pu, etc.). See further Frisk s.v.

2) With regard to relative chronology the *terminus ante quem* is given by the existence of such formulae as *οἴμησεν δὲ (Ϝ)αλείς* (*X* 308, ω 538), *πάπτηγεν δὲ (Ϝ)έκαστος* (*Ξ* 507, *Π* 283, χ 43).

3) Both *ίος* and *εἶδαρ* are archaisms, the former probably of Achaeian origin (Ruijgh, *E.A.* 94). It is worth noting too that *αὐδή* which is also likely to be an Achaeian survival (Ruijgh, 149 ff.) and is at all events very ancient (see A. Bartoněk, *Die Wortparallelen αὐδή und φωνή in der archaischen epischen Sprache*, Sborník fil. fak. Brno E 4 (1959), 67–76) is preceded by the archaism *ἐκλυε* in the expressions *θεοῦ ἐκλυεν αὐδὴν* (O 270, β 297) and *θεὰ δέ μεν ἐκλυεν αὐδῆς* (κ 311, 481), cf. *ἐκλυεν αὐδήσαντος* (δ 505). Is this a case of conjugation? (cf. *ἐκλυον αὐδὴν*, N 757, ξ 89, *ἐκλυον αὐδήσαντος* (-σάσης), K 47, *Π* 76, γ 377 and below, p. 90 f).

4) If at the very early stage represented by this system hiatus was permitted after the trochaic caesura, it is difficult to see why the vast majority of the formulae begin with a consonant (see Parry *E.T.* 11 f.). It would have been much easier from the point of view of oral verse-making to create expressions beginning with a vowel since in that case the ending of the preceding hemistich would not have been predetermined.

original Achaeoan-Aeolic form was a fairly simple and elementary one.¹⁾

Under these circumstances the limitations which the nature of the evidence imposes on the present inquiry are clearly indicated. There can be no question of tracing back the development to a more or less distant past. With regard to the latest stages, however, a not too tenuous lead seems to be offered by certain Homeric data. The employment of *v*-movable to obviate hiatus caused by neglect of digamma points to its growing influence in epic diction. On the other hand we have seen that at the same stage modification of formulae was rapidly increasing. Hence the question presents itself if the two phenomena are somehow related.²⁾ If there appears to be reliable evidence for such a relation, the presence of the sound may be expected to indicate certain tendencies in verse-making which contributed to the development of older formulaic elements into their Homeric form. In examining this problem we shall do well to leave some of the phenomena noted above out of account since, from our point of view, they are either irrelevant or inconclusive. They are:

1. the combinations in which *v*-movable obviates hiatus before a previously digammated word.
2. the combinations containing *κεν*.
3. the combinations in which *v*-movable ends a word in *ι* and is followed by a vowel.³⁾
4. the combinations in which, originally at any rate, a liquid or a nasal may have made position.

In the cases 2, 3 and 4 I prefer to err on the safe side. From 1 nothing new is to be learned.

THE GROWING INCIDENCE OF *v*-MOVABLE IN EARLY POST-HOMERIC DICTION

I. *The Hymn to Aphrodite*

If we are right in assuming that the infiltration of more recent elements into epic diction goes hand in hand with the decomposition of the ancient formulaic structure, we may expect to find after Homer an increasing use of *v*-movable. Generally speaking this supposition is confirmed by the statistics compiled by F. Isler for the whole of Greek hexameter

¹⁾ see above, p. 51 ff.

²⁾ We already came across what, for independent reasons, seemed to be a symptom of this development in ξ 75 *εἰσέ τε μίστυλλέν τε*, p. 62 n. 3.

³⁾ Of course many of them (e.g. Z 231 *γνώσιν ὅτι*, K 485 *μήλοισιν ἀσημάντοισιν ἐπελθών*, cf. Shipp, *St.* 75) originated long after the period when a 'glide' may have bridged the hiatus, (if it ever did, see above, p. 72 f). Nevertheless, in order to be on the safe side, I have preferred to leave this whole group out of consideration. The same applies to the category mentioned *sub* 4.

poetry, from Homer up to Nonnus.¹⁾ Yet the problem is more complicated than it may look at first sight. First, the proportions established by Isler are largely determined by the subject-matter of the poems in question. It is obvious that in a work like the *Theogony* of which *magna pars in nominibus est occupata*,²⁾ the number of cases of *v*-movable must necessarily be lower than the average. From our point of view, therefore, the value of the statistical evidence is limited. Secondly, the data assembled by Isler show that, from a certain point onwards, the more frequent use of *v*-movable obviating hiatus is to a certain extent counterbalanced by a decreasing employment of the same sound as a position-making factor, and that this trend is to be observed from Hesiod up to Oppianus and Nonnus, though there are some notable exceptions. Lastly the question is complicated by the lack of reliable data on the subject of both absolute and relative chronology.³⁾

If, for the moment, we leave aside the poetry of Hesiod, we find the following proportions for the number of lines containing one case of *v*-movable.⁴⁾

<i>v</i> -mov. obviating hiatus		<i>v</i> -mov. making position
Hom.	8,6	21,8
H. in Aphr.	5,7	18,5
H. in Cer.	6,8	20,7
H. in Ap.	8,4	26,6
H. in Merc.	6,1	41,4
Ap. Rh.	4,8	27,8
Call.	7	42,8
Oppianus	4,3	99
Quintus Sm.	5,1	51,4
Nonnus	5,9	4514

Of course these figures, especially those in the right-hand column, have, in themselves, no chronological significance whatever. If they had, the author of the *Hymn to Hermes* would be a contemporary of Callimachus,⁵⁾ but Apollonius would not; the *Hymns to Aphrodite* and *to Demeter* would both have to be dated before Homer;⁶⁾ and what about Nonnus?⁷⁾ As has been observed, the proportions for a given poem are to a great extent

¹⁾ *Quaestiones Metricae*, Greifswald 1908.

²⁾ Quintilianus *Inst. Or.* X, 1, 52.

³⁾ To say nothing of the question of divided authorship we are confronted with in the *Hymn to Apollo*.

⁴⁾ The proportions have been established by converting the figures given by Isler.

⁵⁾ On metrical correspondence between *Merc.* and the hymns of Callimachus see H. N. Porter, *o.c.* 34 with note.

⁶⁾ On the dating of *Aphr.* see below, p. 82.

⁷⁾ Cases such as *λόγεν ξενήρια*, I 511, not counted, Isler (*o.c.* 48) finds only a single instance of *v*-movable making position in the whole of the *Dionysiaca*: I 335.

determined by its subject-matter. However, the numbers in the right-hand column, especially those for Apollonius and Callimachus, show that they are also determined by its style. For our purpose this point is to be emphasised because of the stylistic character of the *Hymn to Hermes*. For even the most casual reading of this poem may teach us that there we have to do with a diction which widely diverges from that which is found in Homer and in the other three long hymns. Therefore its relatively infrequent use of ν -movable making position need not trouble us, the less so as we have enough independent evidence to assume that it is much later than the hymns *in Aphr.*, *in Ap.*, *in Cer.*¹⁾ For these reasons we may safely leave it out of account.

The other major hymns, on the contrary, all show approximately the same type of style as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. As, moreover, the correspondence of several completely unrelated types of evidence points, for all three hymns, to a date not too distant from Homer's,²⁾ these poems constitute a suitable object of comparison for our inquiry. For this comparison, however, the value of the statistics compiled by Isler, though on the average they do not contradict the assumption put forth above, is necessarily limited, because they had to be based on relatively scanty material. Besides, it is not the numerical increase of ν -movable itself with which we are primarily concerned. For our purpose it is much more important to make out if this feature manifests itself in the conditions outlined above, viz. in types of expression characterised by modification of ancient formulae or by the breaking up of such formulae. The 3p. pl. of *οἶδα*, for example, occurs only once in the three earliest hymns, viz. *Ap.* 163

μμεῖσθ' ἴσασιν φαίη δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος³⁾

and this single occurrence⁴⁾ is marked by ν -movable making position. At the same time we notice that exactly this line has two instances of neglected digamma; if the line has been developed from older formulaic prototypes, this feature is an unmistakable symptom of 'decomposition'. Is it a coincidence that in these circumstances the *ἄπαξ λεγόμενον ἴσασιν* appears in its present prosodical form⁵⁾ or is the phenomenon to be regarded as an indication of the way the formulaic diction was handled by the poets at its final stage? It is principally this sort of question that we must try to answer.

In the case just cited we may suppose that the appearance of ν -movable is actually due to breaking up of ancient formulaic prototypes, but, if

1) see e.g. Allen-Halliday-Sikes CVI (and 275 f.) Humbert 114-115 ("composé dans le dernier tiers du VI siècle"), Porter *o.c.* 34.

2) see e.g. Porter, *ibid.*

3) μμεῖσθ' Barnes, μμεῖσθαι mss.

4) For Homer the totals are *Il.* 4, *Od.* 13.

5) 2 × in Homer: *Ψ* 312, *β* 283; these cases are examined below, p. 90 f.

we want to keep the 'strict' definition of the formula these prototypes cannot be retraced. If they ever existed they must have been drastically changed in the course of the evolution. In this case therefore, the assumption put forth at the beginning of this chapter is—at the moment, at least—incapable of proof.¹⁾ It is only in a poem the diction of which does not yet diverge too much from Homer's, that we may be able to verify it. For this reason it seems best to choose for our starting-point the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, for it is certainly by far the *δμηρικώτατος*—as Allen-Halliday-Sikes call it—and, at the same time one of the oldest of the whole collection. Admittedly the arguments advanced in support of this view are not strong, but the scepticism which Notopoulos derives from his "formulaic analysis"²⁾ does little to shake these slender foundations. Porter, on the other hand, when claiming that "there is no real evidence whatever for dating the hymn later than the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*" pays too little attention to the arguments of his predecessors.³⁾ It will be seen that, particularly from a formulaic point of view, the balance of the evidence is in favour of the traditional dating.⁴⁾

When we leave aside the expressions coming within the categories noted above⁵⁾ we still have some 20 cases of *ν*-movable left. In 13 of them the sound seems to lengthen the preceding syllable (a), in the other 7 it is used to prevent hiatus (b).

a.

- 6 πᾶσιν δ' ἔργα μέμηλεν
 25 ἦ δὲ μάλ' οὐκ ἔθελεν, ἀλλ'
 31 πᾶσιν δ' ἐν νηοῖσι θεῶν
 54 ἐν ἀκροπόλοισι δρῶσιν πολυπιδάκον Ἰδης
 55 βουκολέεσκεν βοῦς
 84 θανάμαινέν τε
 102 ὤρησιν πάσησι
 126 παραὶ λέχεσιν καλέεσθαι
 140 πέμψουσιν, σὸ δὲ
 181 ὡς δὲ ἴδεν δειρῆν
 212 εἶπεν δὲ ἕκαστα
 225 ἔχεν πολυήρατος ἦβη
 284 φασίν τοι

1) However, see below, p. 90 f.

2) see above, p. 15.

3) *Repetition in the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*, AJP LXX (1949), 250.

4) below, p. 75.

5) and, moreover, the combinations which appear in the same form in Homer: 20 whole verses (Allen-Halliday-Sikes, CVI) and a large number of hemistichs and shorter expressions, e.g. *ἔτραπεν ἄλλη* (*E* 187). These, of course, have been left aside without comment.

b.

- 6 μέμηλεν ευστεφάνου Κυθρελής
 15 ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θεῖσα ἐκάστη
 83 ταρβήσειεν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσι νοήσας
 114 τροφὸς τρέφεν, ἦ δὲ διὰ πρὸ
 128 δεῖξε καὶ ἔφρασεν, ἦτοι δ' γ' αὐτίς
 199 ἔσχεν ἄχος
 231 ἀτίταλλεν ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔχουσα.

Not all these cases are equally significant. We shall do well to leave aside 25 ἔθελεν, ἀλλ',¹⁾ 83 ταρβήσειεν ἐν,²⁾ 114 τροφὸς τρέφεν, ἦ δέ.³⁾ The evidence of 84 θαύμαινεν τε, of 199 ἔσχεν ἄχος, of 231 ἀτίταλλεν ἐνὶ and of 15 ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θεῖσα ἐκάστη is very weak.⁴⁾ In *Aphr.* 6: πᾶσιν δ' ἔργα μέμηλεν ευστεφάνου Κυθρελής *v*-movable in the trochaic caesura may have been brought about by transposition of ἔργα μέμηλε(-ει), a deviation from Homeric usage,⁵⁾ which, in its turn, may be due to the non-traditional employment of πᾶσιν δ' in the same line,⁶⁾ but this is as yet a mere hypothesis.⁷⁾

¹⁾ The nearest parallels are, as far as I can see, ἀλλ' ἐγὼ οὐκ ἔθελον, δείσας (η 305), οἳ δ' ἔθελον Διομήδει πολλοὶ ἐπεσθαι (*K* 227), but these expressions are reflected only in the vaguest outline by *Aphr.* 25; lengthening of the last syllable without a consonant following is never found with ἔθελεν in Homer, though *v*-movable lengthens the form *Z* 165, *Φ* 580 (but in position 3) and *A* 217 (in the same position, but with a different caesura).

²⁾ ταρβήσειεν only *P* 586 (at the verse-end).

³⁾ cf. the next line, σμικρὴν παῖδ' ἀτίταλλεν and n. 4. Is this a case of drastic modification by dislocation? cf. above, p. 39 f., below, p. 90 f.

⁴⁾ It is remarkable that θαυμάνειν occurs only once in the whole of Homer (ἀέθλια θαυμαίνοντες, θ 108), but θαύμαινεν τε may have been modelled on φώνησέν τε (34 ×), etc. The expression ἔσχεν ἄχος (cf. 225 ἔχεν πολυήρατος ἦβη) shows an idiom which is not as strikingly developed in Homer as it is in Herodotus (φάντις μιν ἔχει VII, 3, λόγος, αἰτή, εὐεργεσίαι), so the fact that it has no Homeric counterpart might reflect the growth of a mode of expression corresponding with the spreading of *v*-movable. The difference, though, may be due to chance. The evidence of 231 αὐτόν δ' αὐτ' ἀτίταλλεν ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔχουσα is not altogether destroyed by Homeric αὐτὸς ἔχων ἀτίταλλεν ἐυξέστη ἐπὶ φάτιν (Ω 280) for in this very short hymn ἀτίταλλεν(*v*) (2 ×) is found only before the trochaic caesura, whereas in Homer the preferred position of the verb is at the end of the line (ἐν τρέφον ἦδ' ἀτίταλλον, Ξ 202 = 303, etc.) and here actually we find ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν (< μεγαροῖς?) ἀτιτάλλω (ο 450). Nevertheless, even if such cases should have retained some traces of the breaking up of ancient formulaic connections their worth as evidence is very slight.

⁵⁾ always at the verse-end, *B* 614, etc., 5 ×.

⁶⁾ On πᾶσιν δ' see below p. 81 f., 107 f.

⁷⁾ That the development referred to in n. 4 has caused intrusion of *v*-movable in *Aphr.* 15 ἀγλαὰ ἔργ' ἐδίδαξεν ἐπὶ φρεσὶ θεῖσα ἐκάστη would at first sight seem a hazardous proposition, for here the Homeric evidence is far less unambiguous than in the case of ἔφρασεν, 128. The form ἐδίδαξε (without *v*) occurs three times before the trochaic caesura (*Μοῦσ'* ἐδίδαξε, φίλησε δέ, θ 481, *Μοῦσ'* ἐδίδαξε, Διὸς παῖς, θ 488; *Χείρων* ἐδίδαξε, δικαιοτάτος *Κενταύρων*, Α 832); ἐδίδαξεν is wanting in Homer

Other phenomena, however, are far more revealing. Let us first look at the remaining instance of ν -movable obviating hiatus. In *Ap̄hr.* 128 we have *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ δεῖξε καὶ ἔφρασεν*, but in the whole of the *Il.* and *Od.* there is only a single instance of the sigmatic aor. ind. of *φράζω*: *ῥομεν, ὄφρ' ἐς χῶρον ἀφικόμεθ' ὃν φράσε Κίρκη* (*λ* 22). This state of affairs becomes even more significant when we compare *φράσε Κίρκη* with *ἐπέφραδε πότνια Κίρκη* (κ 549), which represents an ancient system, cf. *ἐπέφραδε πότνια μητιήρ* (*Α* 795 = *Π* 37 ∞ 51). It appears, then, that here we have a clear instance of what must have happened, even before Homer, in the later stages of epic diction. The disruption of the ancient formulaic structure involved the intrusion of more recent forms (and, of course, was made possible by the origination of such forms).

The same development appears to have entailed use of ν -movable in a number of cases where the sound exercises its strongest influence, viz. the expressions in which it lengthens the preceding syllable. One of them (*ῶρησιν πάσῃσι* 102) has no counterpart in Homer and will be discussed later on, but of the following combinations we find parallels in the *Il.* and the *Od.*

54. *ἐν ἀκροπόλοις ὄρεσιν πολυπιδάκον Ἰδης*. The form *ὄρεσιν* is not found in Homer. Parallels: *ἐν (ἐπ') ἀκροπόλοισιν ὄρεσσι(ν)*, τ 205, *Ε* 523, between troch. caes. and verse-end. The transposition is obvious, above, p. 59 ff.

55. *βουκολέεσκεν βοῦς*. The rhythm is very unusual. One Homeric parallel: (*Φοῖβε, σὺ δ' εἰλίποδας ἔλικας*) *βοῦς βουκολέεσκες*, Φ 448. The inversion is obvious.

126. *παρὰ λέχεσιν καλέεσθαι*. The form *λέχεσιν* too is wanting in Homer. Parallel: *παρὰ λεχέεσσι κλιθῆναι*, α 366 = σ 213. The Homeric expression has a perfectly natural sense, *παρὰ λέχεσιν καλέεσθαι*, on the contrary, is odd. The substitution is obvious.

181. *ὡς δὲ ἴδεν δειρῆν*. In Homer ν -movable in *ἴδεν* never makes position, for the lengthening in *P* 198 *ἴδε(ν) νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς* and *Α* 151 *ὡς δὲ ἴδε(ν) νεῦρον*¹⁾ is determined by phonetical²⁾ and probably by

and *ἐδίδαξαν* is found only once at the end of the line, *ἱπποσύνας ἐδίδαξαν*, Ψ 307) Thus, the direct evidence is very weak. I may point out however, that though *ἀγλαὰ ἔργα* is not found in Homer in combination with a form of *διδάσκω*, it occurs 4 times in the *Od.* (*ἀγλαὰ ἔργα πέλονται*, κ 223; *ἀγλαὰ ἔργ' εἰδυῖα(-η)* ($< \dot{\alpha}$. *F. Fid*) \circ 418, ν 289 = π 158) as a formula of relatively ancient origin (note the observance of the digamma) in position $\mathfrak{P}^{1/2}$. The isolated Homeric instance *ὄμφαί, τὰς μὲν τ' ἔργα διδάξαμεν ἐργάζεσθαι* (χ 442) is clearly a modification of old formulae. Here the loss of the digamma in current speech has caused the insertion of τ' but obviously **ἔργα διδάξαμεν ἐργάζεσθαι* can not be regarded as an ancient formulaic prototype. Probably the expression has been formed by juxtaposition of two prototypes which originally could fill up the verse after the bucolic diseresis, viz. ---*ἐργάζεσθαι* and **ἔργα διδάξε(-αν)* and by conjugation of the latter. Then, however, the ν -movable in *Ap̄hr.* 15 is due to the transposition of the formula* *ἀγλαὰ ἔργα διδάξε(-αν, etc.)*, which was originally created to fill the space between the trochaic caesura and the verse-end.

etymological³⁾ factors. *Ap̄hr.* 181 seems to have been modelled on the latter expression (or on a prototype of the same kind). If so, this too is an example of substitution.

212. *εἶπεν δὲ ἕκαστα*. In Homer *εἶπεν* behaves in exactly the same way as *ἴδεν*: its *ν* never makes position. The nearest parallels, as far as I can see, are *εἶπω τε ἕκαστα* (γ 361) and *ἔρέω δὲ ἕκαστα* (κ 292). Probably *Ap̄hr.* 212 is derived from an ancient prototype *εἶπω* (*-ης, -η) *δὲ (τε) ἕκαστα*, **εἶπον δὲ (τε) ἕκαστα* (cf. ζ 223 *εἶπον δ' ἄρα κόουρη*) or something like it, used after the bucolic diaeresis; *εἶπεν*, then, might result from conjugation.

225. *ἔχεν πολυήρατος ἦβη*. The Homeric parallels must be quoted at length:

<i>ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν Θήβῃ πολυηράτῳ ἄλγεα πάσχων</i>	λ 275
<i>αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ ᾗ ἦβην πολυήρατον ἰκόμεθ' ἄμφω</i>	ο 366
<i>νῦν δ' ἐπεὶ ἀμφοτέρω πολυήρατον ἰκόμεθ' ἐδνήν</i>	ψ 354
<i>μνημ' Ἐλένης χειρῶν πολυηράτου εἰς γάμου ὄρην</i>	ο 126

In view of the conservative tendency of narrative poetry,⁴⁾ of the fact that *ἄμφω* is older than *ἀμφοτέρω*, and of the structure of ο 366 we may ask ourselves if ψ 354 may not be regarded as the modification of a more ancient line, viz. of the type exemplified by ο 366 and λ 275 and if these four lines may not therefore show traces of an ancient formulaic system *Θήβῃ | ἦβη | ὄρη | ἐδνή | (γάμος) πολυήρατος*⁵⁾ which could be used in the four grammatical cases of the singular. So much seems certain at any rate, that Homeric *πολυήρατος* was created to make the fourth foot dactylic.⁶⁾ On the other hand the use of the expression at the verse-end may be traditional too, so it must remain dubious whether *ν*-movable in *Ap̄hr.* 225 is due to a transposition.

140. *πέμψουσιν, σὺ δε*. There is one Homeric parallel: *πέμψουσιν δ' ἐν νηϊ* (ε 37). Elsewhere *πέμψουσι(ν)*, *πέμπουσι(ν)*, *πέμπωσι* (cf. *πέμπουεν*) are found before the trochaic caesura (7 ×) and *ν* does not make position.

We have 3 combinations left which have two features in common: 1. the component parts are very usual words that must have belonged to common speech and which show no trace of any archaism; 2. they contain a trochaic word in the first foot with *ν*-movable making position. The lines in question are

<i>φασίν τοι νύμφης καλυκώπιδος ἔκγονον εἶναι</i>	284
<i>πᾶσιν δ' ἐν νηοῖσι θεῶν τιμᾶσχος ἔστιν</i>	31
<i>πᾶσιν δ' ἔργα μέμηλεν ἐυστεφάνου Κυθερείης</i>	6

1) cf. *ἀπὸ νευρῆς* Α 476.

2) above, p. 73.

3) Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 176.

4) see above, p. 51.

5) On the phenomenon of sound-association (here *Θήβῃ πολυηράτῳ* ∼ *ἦβην πολυήρατον*) see Parry, *E.T.* 92.

6) cf. Hes. *Th.* 404 *πολυήρατον ἦλθεν ἐς ἐδνήν*, 908 *πολυήρατον εἶδος (!) ἔχουσα*, *E.* 739 *πολυηράτῳ ὕδατι λευκῷ*.

Homer has *φασί(ν)* (without elision) 35 times but only in two cases *ν*-movable makes position: in *τὸν δέ τ' ἐμὸν φασὶν πατέρ' ἔμμεναι* (δ 387, in the tale about Proteus) where it probably results from a modification of *φασ' ἔμμεναι* (5 × before the bucolic diaeresis) and in *οὐ πά μιν φασὶν φαγέμεν καὶ πιέμεν*, π 143. Here, in view of the tendency of the singers to end a formulaic unit at the bucolic diaeresis, it may be due to a transposition, cf. *σ 3 ἀζηγῆς φαγέμεν καὶ πιέμεν*. In *Aphr.* 284 we obviously have to do with an innovation on the part of the poet.

A similar, but less striking innovation may be seen in 31 and 6. A survey of *πᾶσιν* will be given when we come to discuss the Homeric use of the word; here it will suffice to note that *πᾶσι* and *πᾶσιν* occur respectively 71 (72?) and 68 (67?) times in Homer (2 × and 3 × in *Aphr.*), that in 11 of the 68 cases the *ν* makes position (in 2 of the 3 cases in *Aphr.*), and that only two of these cases appear in the first foot: *πᾶσιν Κυκλώπεςσι* (α 71) and *πᾶσιν δ' ἱμερθείς ὑπέδν γόος* (κ 398). *Aphr.* 31 the form goes with *νηοῖσι* (not in Homer) and *Aphr.* 6 the non-traditional use of the dative is in accordance with the deviations from Homeric usage which we have found in the case of *μέμηλεν*.¹⁾

Let us sum up the evidence. In the 293 lines of the hymn²⁾ we have found 3 certain³⁾ and 3 (2?) probable⁴⁾ cases of transposition and modification of Homeric expressions, the prototypes of which did not have *ν*-movable in the words in question. In 1 certain case, moreover, the presence of the *ν* coincides with the introduction of a relatively recent form,⁵⁾ which appears only once in Homer. Besides, there are 4 cases which show a combination which is either wanting in Homer,⁶⁾ or highly unusual in this place of the line.⁷⁾ If we postpone discussing *πέμψουσι*⁸⁾ there are 8 (9?) cases left. Of these the evidence is in a greater or less degree subject to doubt.

The reader will agree that a total of 4 certain and 7 probable cases is a remarkable high number in this short hymn, which is the most 'Homeric' of the whole collection, and of which, for this reason, 20 lines had to be left wholly out of account. However slight the evidence of this proportion for its date of composition may be deemed—and there is always a theoretical possibility that the poet knew *ἐν ἀκροπόλοις δρεσσι* etc. from one of Homer's predecessors—it certainly does not favour contemporaneity with *Il.* and *Od.* On the other hand, its stylistic evidence is striking. We are justified in concluding that the intrusion of *ν*-movable goes

1) above, p. 79 and n. 7.

2) 291, if 274–75 are deleted.

3) *ἐν ἀκροπόλοις δρεσιν; βουκολέεσκεν βοῦς; παραὶ λέχεσιν καλέεσθαι.*

4) *ὧς δὲ ἴδεν δειρῆν; εἶπεν δὲ ἑκαστα; (ἔχεν πολυήρατος ἦβη?).*

5) *ἔφρασεν.*

6) *δρησιν πάσησι; φασὶν τοι.*

7) *πᾶσιν δ'* at the beginning of the line, 2 ×.

8) see below, p. 85 ff., 101 ff.

hand in hand with the decomposition of the formulaic style and that the forms in which this decomposition is realised are 1. the transposition and modification of ancient formulae, 2. the admission of contemporary elements and 3. a more direct and less formulaic arrangement of familiar words. Now if epic diction appears to have developed in this direction during a period which can without much speculation be put after Homer, we may reasonably assume that the same tendencies were at work (though on a smaller scale) when the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were composed. But before we examine how these tendencies operate in Homer, we have to establish whether phenomena of the same type occur in the poetry of Hesiod.

II. *Hesiod's Erga and Theogony*

In the following enquiry I shall only deal with the *Works and Days* and *Theogony*. The reason for this is simply that these are the only poems of which it is absolutely certain that they were composed in a period not too far distant from Homer's, with the possible exception of minor passages.¹⁾ Upon this everyone will be agreed, whether or not he may share the doubts about the authorship of the *Theogony* expressed by Pausanias' Delphic informants.

In this part of the investigation the same categories as in the former have been omitted.²⁾ The remaining material is rather scarce, which is no doubt due to the fact that the *Theogony* has so many proper names and that in the moralising and agricultural parts of the *Erga* imperatives and infinitives are the dominant verbal forms. Still, this material is not completely listed, for a large part of it is made up of elements from which very little is to be learned. This applies especially to cases where *v*-movable prevents hiatus. The variations of e.g. τέκ', τέκε, τέκεν (*Th.* 133, 125, 131 etc.) are, at the present stage of our knowledge, completely uninformative. Only one detail may, though with due caution, be mentioned. The archaism ἔλλαβε³⁾ occurs altogether 18 times in Homer (*Il.* 13, *Od.* 5), but appears only once in the form ἔλλαβεν: σ 394 σφέλας ἔλλαβεν, before the bucolic diaeresis and the beginning of a new sentence (ἀντάρ' Ὀδυσσεύς), i.e. at a 'switch-point' of the line.⁴⁾ This state of affairs is perhaps characteristic of the stage of epic diction represented by Homer. The only time

¹⁾ A very recent discussion on this subject can be found in Van Groningen, *La composition archaïque grecque* (Amsterdam, 1958), 256-303.

²⁾ e.g. ὡς φάτο, γήθησεν δὲ (*Th.* 173); ἔχουσιν ὄρος (*Th.* 2); σφιν λιπαροί (*Th.* 63); ἔλεν δέος (< ἔλε δ'έος) *Th.* 167, not in Homer, who has δέος εἰλε(ν) or ἔχε τρόμος. For the principle and the reserves it calls for see p. 72 f., 75 n. 3 above.

³⁾ see e.g. Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 176.

⁴⁾ where formulae are particularly exposed to innovation, see e.g. Parry, *Form.* 60 and *pass.*

the word occurs in Hesiod's *Erga* and *Theogony* it has *v*-movable: ἔλλαβεν ἄρπην | μακρὴν καρχαρόδοντα, *Th.* 179–80. Because it is hardly credible that the old oriental myth which is reflected in the story of the mutilation of Uranos had not been put into epic verse before it reached Hesiod,¹⁾ this curious fact might suggest the following alternatives: either the story came to Boeotia in relatively late Ionic verse or the expression reproduces a more ancient formula, e.g. *ἔλλαβε δεξιτερῆφι | ἄρπην καρχαρόδοντα, cf. *Th.* 175 ἄρπην καρχαρόδοντα at the beginning of the line and τ 480 λάβε δεξιτερῆφι at the end.²⁾

Concerning *v*-movable making position we have more solid facts at our disposal. They have been noted by Rzach³⁾ and may be divided for the sake of clearness⁴⁾ into the following categories.

I. Combinations which have no comparable counterparts in Homer:

Th. 424 ὄσσ' ἔλαχεν Τιτῆσι

Th. 570 τεῦξεν κακόν

Th. 602 πόρην κακόν

Th. 700 κάτεχεν Χάος⁵⁾

The only fact to which these expressions testify is that Hesiod's use of *v*-movable making position is not restricted to Homer's. Taken by themselves they tell us nothing about a possible expansion of the phenomenon.

II. Combinations which have more or less comparable counterparts in Homer:

Th. 398 σὸν σφοῖσιν παίδεσσι ∼ σὸν σφῆσιν κεφαλῆσιν Δ 162

(∼ ,, σφοῖσιν τεκέσσι *Ap.* 148

in the version transmitted by Thuc.)⁶⁾

Th. 871 ἐκ θεόφιν γενεῆ ∼ ἐκ θεόφιν γένος ψ 347

Th. 1016 πᾶσιν Τυρσηνοῖσιν ∼ πᾶσιν Κυκλώπεσσι α 71.

In Homer the counterparts occur only once and therefore it seems doubtful if Hesiod borrowed them from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Besides

¹⁾ see e.g. H. G. Güterbock, *The Hittite Version of the Hurrian Kumarbi Myths*, AJA LII (1948), 123–134, and the recent discussion by P. Walcot, *Hesiod's Theogony and the Hittite Epic of Kumarbi*, CQ N.S. VI (1956), 198 ff. Güterbock thinks the myth reached the Greeks by way of Ugarit.

²⁾ That Hesiod drew from a formulaic repertory which was larger than the Homeric one seems fairly certain, see A. Hoekstra *o.c.* 193 ff. On ἄρπη (a Semitic word: ḥrb, a sword) see R. D. Barnett, *The Epic of Kumarbi and the Theogony of Hesiod*, JHS LXV (1945), 101.

³⁾ *Der Dialekt des Hesiodos* 388.

⁴⁾ but with all proper reserves. The process, however, though necessarily somewhat arbitrary, is not risky, because it cannot in any way prejudice our eventual conclusions.

⁵⁾ cf. *Th.* 844 κάτεχεν λαιδέα πόντον, where the digamma is observed.

⁶⁾ αὐτοῖς σὸν παίδεσσι cdd.

we may draw attention to the fact that the likeness between *πᾶσιν Τυρσῆγοισιν* and *πᾶσιν Κυκλώπεσσι* is very faint, that *σὸν σφοῖσιν παιδεσσι* is ungrammatical (*σφοῖσιν* being said of a singular subject, the Styx) and that, irrespective of priority, the resemblance with *Ap.* 148 as transmitted by Thucydides is much closer. The evidence, even with the addition of *ἔλλαβεν* and the expressions of group I, is slight, but it seems to point to the further spreading of *ν*-movable in the period between Homer and Hesiod, rather than to imitation. Such an evolution would be in keeping with the increasing Ionicisation and modernisation that we find in the case of *metathesis quantitatis* and neglect of the digamma.¹⁾

III. *Th.* 777 *πρεσβυτάτη νόσφι δὲ θεῶν* ∼ *νόσφι θεῶν* *M* 166. The expression *νόσφι θεῶν* too appears only once in Homer, yet in this case we may have to do with a formulaic combination, because the idea is likely to have occurred frequently to the singers of heroic poetry and because (*ἀπ*)*άνευθε θεῶν* is not equivalent from a metrical point of view (*νόσφι νεῶν* *Θ* 490, *Ψ* 365, must be very late and may have been modelled on it).²⁾ Be this as it may, we seem to perceive here another factor which has favoured the introduction of *ν*-movable: the use of a particular type of enjambement. This brings us to the last and most significant category.

- IV. *Th.* 398 *σὸν σφοῖσιν παιδεσσι*
E. 198 *λευκοῖσιν φάρεσσι*
Th. 778 *μακρῆσιν πέτρῃσι*
 cf. *Aphr.* 102 *ῶρησιν πάσησι*
Th. 329 *γουνόισιν κατένασσε*
E. 431 *γόμφοισιν πελάσας*
Th. 898 *ἤμελλεν τέξεσθαι*
E. 616 *δύνωσιν, τότ' ἔπειτ'*
E. 531 *φεύγουσιν, καὶ πᾶσι*
Th. 735 *ναίουσιν φύλακες*
E. 391 *ναίουσιν γυμνόν*
Th. 769 *ἔστᾶσιν δεινός*³⁾
 cf. *Aphr.* 140 *πέμψουσιν σὸν δὲ*

These 11 (13) combinations too are lacking in Homer, though all the words do occur there in one form or another. The reason why I have set them apart is that they all show enjambement. Of course enjambement is not the only factor which, in these 13 cases, has caused the use of *ν*-movable making position, as is shown by *E.* 235 *τίκτουσιν δὲ γυναῖκες*, *E.* 236 *θάλλουσιν δ' ἀγαθοῖσι*, cf. *Aphr.* 284 *φασίν τοι*, where the present

¹⁾ see A. Hoekstra *o.c.* 201-214.

²⁾ On *νεῶν*-formula see below, p. 126 f.

³⁾ In view of the fact that the *E.* and the *Th.* do not provide any instance of *δεινός* lengthening the preceding vowel, influence of original *Ϝ* is extremely doubtful.

tenses in the same position also have it. On the other hand *ἔσταισι* (2 ×) and *ναίουσι* (9 ×) never have *v*-movable making position in Homer. (*τίκτουσι*, *θάλλουσι*, *φεύγουσι*, *δύνωσι*, *ἡμελλε* do not occur there), so the present tense of the verb-forms does not solely account for its appearance. Nor is there any evidence worth mentioning of transposition or superficial modification of formulae. The expressions *μακρῆσιν πέτρῃσι* and *γόμφουσιν πελάσας* bear only the faintest resemblance to *μακρῆσιν τε πίτυσσι* (ι 186) and *γόμφουσιν δ' ἄρα τήν γε* (ε 248) respectively;¹⁾ *λευκοῖσιν φάρεσσι*, *ῶρησιν πάσῃσι*, *ἡμελλεν τέξεσθαι* and *γουννοῖσιν κατένασσε* have no comparable Homeric counterparts.²⁾ In this respect we find a marked difference with the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, which has in a sixth part of the total of lines of *Erga* and *Theogony* 3 certain and 3 (2?) probable cases of this phenomenon.³⁾ This is in accordance with the general impression made by the two styles. In his handling of the ancient formulaic repertory the poet of the *Hymn to Aphrodite* shows himself the more skilful and 'evolutionist' of the two and more disposed to compromise, whereas Hesiod is either conservative or self-willed in steering a new course. This does not mean, of course, that his use of *v*-movable has nothing to do with the formulaic tradition. For the cases of group I and II I am unable to mark a definite traditional starting-point. Obviously they belong to a fluid mass of not very distinct elements which the long evolution of epic diction had created at the time of Hesiod. Case III speaks for itself, as will be seen when we come to the Homeric parallels.⁴⁾ Concerning group IV, which is by far the most representative with regard to the use of *v*-movable in Hesiod, the following remarks may be made:

1. In using *τίκτουσιν δέ*, *θάλλουσιν δε* Hesiod reproduces the Homeric type exemplified by *δούπησεν δέ* (*πεσών*) 21 ×, *ἦυσεν δέ* (*διαπρύσιον*) 6 ×, *μάστιξεν δ'* (*ἑλάαν*) 8 ×, *ῥίγησεν δ'* (*τ'*) *ἄρ'* (*ἔπειτα*) 2 ×, *γῆθησεν δ'* *ἄρ'* (*ἔπειτα*), 2 ×, *πάπτηγεν δέ* (*ἕκαστος*), 3 × etc. In Homer, as one may expect in a mainly narrative style, such forms are nearly always in a past tense.

2. There is, however, a significant difference with regard to the majority of the 11 Hesiodic examples. In Homer the type *δούπησεν δέ* etc. is mostly employed to introduce a new sentence, cf. *τίκτουσιν δέ*—, *θάλλουσιν δέ*—, in Hesiod. In the *Erga* and the *Theogony*, however, the use is predominantly in enjambement.

3. If in Hesiod the spreading of *v*-movable making position can be explained partly by the increasing occurrence of the runover word of the type *ναίουσιν*, this may also apply to Homer, where this particular type of enjambement (3 p. pres. plur. forming a molossus) is relatively

1) Note that these expressions too are *ἄπαξ λεγόμενα* in Homer!

2) For *σὸν σφοῖσιν παιδεσσι* *Th.* 398 see above, p. 84 f.

3) Of course there are modifications in Hesiod, e.g. *Th.* 15 (see above, p. 26 ff.), but they cannot be shown to have influenced the use of *v*-movable.

4) *εἰρύεται*, *πᾶσιν δέ* etc., below, p. 107 f.

infrequent.¹⁾ The instances found in Hesiod suggest that here too we have to do with the breaking up of older formulaic prototypes. An inquiry into a number of Homeric examples will show if this impression is confirmed by the facts.

4. The same applies to the nominal forms in Homer, cf. *γονοῖσιν κατένασσε*, etc., in Hesiod.

¹⁾ For the moment I leave aside the vexed question of the emphatic nature of the runover word, though in my opinion Bassett (*o.c.* 154 and *The so-called emphatic position of the Runover Word in the Homeric Hexameter*, TAPA LVII (1926), 116-148) denies it too categorically.

THE GROWING INCIDENCE OF ν -MOVABLE IN HOMERIC AND
PRE-HOMERIC DICTION

A. DECLENSION OF FORMULAE

We have seen above that because of the nature of noun-epithet formulae, declension was subject to very strict limitations in epic diction. This applies in particular to the case we are concerned with just now: that of the plural datives. Because of the requirements of improvisation the singers had to keep to the traditional types as closely as possible, but the forms in *-αισι*, *-οισι*, *-εσσι*, were metrically inequivalent to nearly all the other grammatical cases, the genitives in *-αο* and *-οιο* being the most notable exceptions. Since in the case of noun-adjective formulae both constituents were subject to these conditions, declension could not normally be extended to plural datives without upsetting the whole metrical structure of the traditional types. The effect of these restrictions on the formulaic diction is well-known: with *νηα μέλαιναν / νηι μελαίνη*, for example, corresponds *νησι θοῆσι*. It was only in the athematic (3rd) declension that the singers could turn certain formulae into dat.-pl.-expressions without being hampered in their technique.¹⁾ Yet even in this case the possibilities were restricted, for forms in *-σω* were obviously impossible before a consonant if the ending was preceded by a trochee (e.g. *κτήμασιν*). The very fact that our examination must be confined to the cases of ν -movable making position—the instances of its obviating hiatus in dat. pl. being inconclusive because of prosodical uncertainty—makes it impossible to expect substantial results. Indeed, as far as I can see, reliable data are virtually wanting in Homer in so far as ν -movable resulting from declension is concerned. It is not impossible that *χερσίν τε ποσσίν τε* (Y 360, λ 595) is due to declension of *χεῖράς τε πόδας τε* ($4 \times$)²⁾ and the formula (*ἐνὶ*) *νησι μελαίνησιν* (*πεσέεσθαι*) ($4 \times$)³⁾ (*πεσέονται* A 824) unless originally based on a * $\pi\tau$ -form of *πίπτω*,⁴⁾ might perhaps be regarded as having resulted from declension of *νηι(-α) μελαίνη(-αν)*.⁵⁾ Since, however, here we do not have the basical certainty which enabled us to identify *Ποσειδάωνος ἄνακτος* etc. as a case of recent modification, phenomena of this kind should not be used as evidence for spreading of ν -movable.

1) In the light of the evidence made available by later researches, Parry's statement "on ne doit pas attribuer aux aèdes le désir d'avoir à tous les cas d'un substantif des formules nom-épithète d'une même mesure" (*E.T.* 75) seems somewhat exaggerated. The tendency to decline formulae did exist, but it was only rarely allowed to interfere with oral verse-making, cf. Witte, *Glotta* IV (1913), 8 ff.

2) λ 497, μ 50 ∞ 178, χ 478.

3) I 235=M 107=126=P 639. It is to be noted that both the Ionic forms *πεσέεσθαι*, *πεσέονται* (Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 451) and *νησι μελαίνησιν* are confined to this line and to A 824 *ἔσσεται, ἀλλ' ἐν νησι μελαίνησιν πεσέονται*.

4) see Boisacq *s.v.* *πίπτω* and *πτοία*.

5) 30 × dat., 18 × acc.

B. CONJUGATION OF FORMULAE

When examining the cases of digamma neglected after verbal forms, we found that in most of them no prototypes could be established with certainty, but that the general course of the development could nevertheless be made out and accounted for. This was largely due to the circumstance that other cases provided incontrovertible evidence for conjugation of clearly defined prototypes.¹⁾ With regard to *v*-movable we are in a much more difficult position.²⁾ It is not unreasonable to assume that its presence is often to be ascribed to a similar development. In the same way as *μήσαι ἐργα* was developed from *μήσατο (μήδετο) ἐργα(-ον)* after the *F* had been dropped in East Ionic, the formula *ἴδεν ὀφθαλμοῖσι(v)* (*E* 770 etc., 7 ×) may have been derived from *ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσι(v)* (*I* 169 etc., 12 ×), *λοῦσεν καὶ χρίσεν ἐλαίῳ* from *λοῦσαν καὶ χρίσαν ἐλαίῳ*, etc. For the working of analogy (which is observable inter alia in the ancient systems *βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος | Διομήδης, μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας | κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ, δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς | Ἀχιλλεύς, ἀμύμονος Αἰακίδαο | Ἀντιλόχοιο*, etc.) also influenced the verbal element at the earliest stages: *βῆ δ' (ῥ') ἔμεν(αι)* (33 ×) ∼ *βάν δ' (ῥ') ἔμεν(αι)* (12 ×), *ὦς ἄρ' ἔφη* (19 ×) ∼ *ὦς ἄρ' ἔφαν* (12 ×), *ἔστη δ' ἐν προθύροισι* (*θ* 304) ∼ *ἔσταν δ' ἐν προθύροισι* (*θ* 325, κ 220), *ἔβη κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας* (*H* 381) ∼ *ἔβαν κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας* (*H* 432, *K* 525, *ω* 50). Yet in trying to follow the course of the evolution we are given very little help by such reflections. First, many of the relevant expressions cannot be explained in the same way since an original plural is, for one reason or another, out of the question (e.g. in *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ ζέσσαν ὕδωρ ἐνὶ ἥνοπι χαλκῷ*, *Σ* 349 = κ 360). Secondly, owing to the fact that *v*-movable came into use in an early period³⁾ and because of the greater mobility of verbal forms as compared with nominal constituents of a formula, very few identifiable cases of this evolution

¹⁾ (*ᾠτρυνε*) *μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας*, etc., *μήσατο ἐργα*, etc.

²⁾ above, p. 74. The point is well illustrated by the conditions under which a relatively ancient form such as *ᾠρσε(v)* appears: *ᾠρσε* (cases of pos. in 12, of *v* before original *F*, etc. included): 19 × (20?) *Il.*, 12 × *Od.*; *ᾠρσεν* 12 × *Il.*, 3 × *Od.*, occurring in the pos. 1½, 3½, 5½, 9½, 12 and 1½, 2, 5½, 9½ respectively and only rarely in a distinctly formulaic context: *ὑφ' ἔμερον ᾠρσε γόοιο* (6 ×, see below, p. 105 f). *ᾠρσεν Ἀχαιοῦς* (?) 2 ×. It is even more remarkable that the form *ᾠρορε(v)* (Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 397) is extremely scarce (4 ×) and the evidence for its having survived as a constituent of a formula is very slight (*θεὸς ᾠρορε(v)* δ 712, ψ 222). In the case of *ἔκλυε(v)* the form without *v* is found in a distinctly formulaic system: *τοῦ δ' ἔκλυε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων/μητιετα Ζεύς*, etc. (12 ×), but on the other hand we find *ἔκλυεν αὐδὴν* (*O* 270, β 297), *ἔκλυεν αὐδῆς* (κ 311, 481, cf. *ἔκλυες αὐδῆς*, v.l. *αὐδὴν*, δ 831), see above p. 73 n. 3. As to *πόρε(v)* the weight of Homeric evidence is definitely in favour of ancient prototypes without *v*: *τὴν οἱ πόρε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων*, etc. (9 ×, see above p. 64), *ἐπεὶ πόρε μυρία ἔδνα* (3 ×) against *πόρεν δέ ε' Φαίδιμος ἦρωος* (δ 617 = ο 117), *πόρεν δέ οἱ ἀγαθὸν υἱόν* (*Π* 185) and several isolated cases.

³⁾ above, p. 74.

can be expected to have survived. Some symptoms even suggest that any inquiry into this matter is fore-doomed to failure. Since we are dealing with a formulaic diction it may be assumed that generally speaking archaisms have been preserved by their being constituents of a formula. Let us now take, for example, *ἔραζε* (9 ×). It appears 5 × in the formula *χεῦεν* (*κατέχευεν*) *ἔραζε*.¹⁾ This is rather a remarkable fact in itself, since according to the theory of 'thrift' we could expect *χαμᾶζε* (29 ×)²⁾ to have been used instead of *ἔραζε*. Still, we never find **χεῦε χαμᾶζε*. Nor does the presence of *ν*-movable do anything to reduce the discrepancy, especially so since *ἔραζε* seems to be highly archaic.³⁾ It is true that in the remaining cases *ἔραζε* appears in a different combination: *πίπτον ἔραζε* (*M* 156, *Σ* 552), *πίπτε δ' ἔραζε* (*χ* 280), *πίπτει ἔραζε* (*P* 633). The discrepancy, then, might *perhaps* be explained by supposing that, in an early period, the formulaic diction had **χεῦε χαμᾶζε* and **χεῦαν ἔραζε* (≈ *πίπτον ἔραζε*) and that their mixing up dates from the time when *ν*-movable began to play a part in epic diction. This, however, is a mere hypothesis which is not supported by any Homeric evidence.

Yet, notwithstanding the general lack of evidence and the even more embarrassing discrepancies, the *Il.* and the *Od.* seem to have preserved some reliable indications that the spread of *ν*-movable is, among other things, due to conjugation of ancient prototypes.

Perfect-forms in *-ασι* are relatively rare in Homer and even the more usual of them, *γεγάσσι* and *μεμάσσι* are far from having connections as distinctly formulaic as *γεγαῶτες* and *μεμαῶτες*. The 3rd pers. pl. of *πέποιθα* occurs in *Δ* 325:

ὄπλοτεροι γεγάσσι πεποιθασίν τε βίηφι

With this line we may compare

<i>ὧς ἄρα τῶ, χεῖρεσσι πεποιθότες ἠδὲ βίηφι</i>	<i>M</i> 135
<i>τοῦ περ δὴ τεράεσσι</i>	,, ,, ,, <i>M</i> 256
<i>λαοῖσιν καθύπερθε</i>	,, ,, ,, <i>M</i> 153

Elsewhere *πεποιθότες* is always found in the same position and the recollection of a similar type of formula, however much disintegrated in *η* 34 *νηυσὶ θεῆσι τοί γε πεποιθότες ὠκείησι*⁴⁾ may have brought about the curious tautology in that line.⁵⁾ In *Δ* 325, at all events, *πεποιθασιν* is

¹⁾ *P* 619, *ο* 527, *χ* 20, 85, *Π* 459.

²⁾ e.g. in *ἄλο χαμᾶζε* *Γ* 29, etc. (12 ×), the ancient character of which is proved by the form of the aorist.

³⁾ On its etymology see Friisk *s.v.*

⁴⁾ Apart from this place *νηυσὶ θεῆσι* is only found *δ* 173 at the beginning of the line. On post-Homeric disintegration of formulae see above, p. 27 f., 40, 61, 80, and below, p. 91.

⁵⁾ Of course it is true that an epithet "may lose its force and need reinforcement" (Stanford *ad loc.*) but it is doubtful whether the phenomenon is sufficiently accounted for in this way.

probably due to the conjugation of a formulaic element *λαοῖσι* (*χειρέσσι*, *τεράεσσι*) *πεποιθότες ἤδὲ βίηφι*, which, in its turn, may have developed from *λαοῖσι* (*χειρέσσι*, *τεράεσσι*) *πεποιθᾶσι(ν) ἤδὲ βίηφι*.¹⁾ A similar phenomenon is to be observed in the two cases of *ἴσασι(ν)* (or *ἴσσασι(ν)*) in which *ν*-movable makes position:

<i>πλείονα ἴσασι(ν) σέθεν αὐτοῦ μητίσασθαι</i>	Ψ 312
<i>οὐδέ τι ,, θάνατον καὶ κῆρα μέλαιναν</i>	β 283

For *πλείονα ἴσασι(ν)* Homer provides us with the parallels *πλείονα οἶδα* (*T* 219 ∞ *Φ* 440), *πλείονα ἦδη* (*N* 355), *πλείονα εἰδώς* (*μ* 188), always at the end of the line; *οὐδέ τι ἴσασι(ν)* is counterbalanced by *οὐδέ τι οἶδα(-ε)* (6 ×), *οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν* (3 ×), *οὐδέ τι ἦδη* (*N* 674), with a single exception (*A* 343) also appearing at the verse-end. On the other hand the well-known Homeric formula *νήπιος, οὐδέ τὸ (τὰ) ἦδη (οἶδε)* (6 ×), always used before the trochaic caesura, has a parallel in Hesiod: *νήπιοι, οὐδέ ἴσασι(ν)*, *E.* 40. This points to an interplay of the formulaic types *πλείονα ἦδη / οὐδέ τι (τὸ) ἦδη (οἶδε) / οὐδέ ἴσασι(ν)*, and it is significant that Ψ 312 is preceded by *οὐδέ μὲν αὐτοῖ*. The first hemistich of β 283 enables us to observe several stages of the evolution: *οὐδέ τι οἶδε* in pos. 12 > *οὐδέ τι οἶδε* in pos. 3 (*A* 343) > *οὐδέ τι ἴσασι(ν)* (β 283) > *μμεῖσθ' ἴσασι(ν)*, *Ap.* 163. The employment of *ἴσασι(ν)* in the hymn marks the final phase: it is characterised at the same time by neglected digamma and by a non-traditional contraction.²⁾

C. AN ARCHAIC CONSTITUENT OF A FORMULA IS REPLACED BY A MORE FAMILIAR FORM

Already in the earliest East Ionic inscriptions the dual is lacking. Did it ever exist in older forms of this dialect or is its presence in Homer solely to be accounted for as being an Achæan and/or Aeolic survival? ³⁾ Whatever the answer to this question may be, we have to face the fact

¹⁾ cf. the survival *λελόγγασι* (*F*)*ῖσα θεοῖσι*, λ 304.

²⁾ It is very doubtful whether the long initial syllable of *ἴσασι(ν)* (sometimes expressed by *-σσ-*) in *B* 283 etc. (11 ×) is etymological. The explanation suggested by Chantraine *o.c.* 179 n. 2, Schwyzler, *o.c.* 773 is difficult to reconcile with the development of *ἴσασι* from **F/δασι* (Chantraine, *o.c.* 471, Schwyzler, *ibid.*). In my opinion the lengthening is primarily due to modification. If we were to look at the number of occurrences only, we might assume that **ἴσασι(ν)* is traditional. Yet if we analyse the material in question, we find that its use often suggests modification. 4 cases are found in the prophecy of Teiresias and occur in pairs: λ 122, 124 = ψ 269, 271. The variants attested in λ 124 may point to **οὐδ' ἄρα τοί γε ἴσασι* being the original form and here, as well as in ψ 271, the hemistich is followed by the late form *νέας*. In ξ 89 the variants *τοί, τι, τε* equally suggest a metrical irregularity caused by modification (*< *τοί γε ἴσασι?*). What we have left is *I* 36 *ἴσασι* 'Αργείων ἡμὲν νέοι ἠδὲ γέροντες, θ 559 *ἀλλ' αὐταὶ ἴσασι*, immediately followed by θ 560 *καὶ πάντων ἴσασι*, and ω 188 *οὐ γάρ πω ἴσασι*. From a formulaic point of view these cases seem to be extremely dubious.

³⁾ cf. Chantraine, *G.H.* II, 22.

ἀλλ' ἀναχωρήσας πρόσθ' ἵπποιον καὶ ὄχεσφι *E* 107

With this expression we may compare on the one hand

πρὶν γ' ἐπὶ νῶ τῷδ' ἀνδρὶ σὸν	}	<i>E</i> 219
τόν ῥ' ἦτοι μὲν ἔπεμψε ,,		<i>Σ</i> 237
εὖρε δὲ τόν γε ἀνακτα παρ'		<i>E</i> 794

ἵπποιον καὶ ὄχεσφι	}	ἀγαλλόμενος, παρὰ νηῶν	<i>M</i> 114
		ἀεικέα μερμηρίζων	δ 533

and on the other

ἱππῆας μὲν πρῶτα σὸν	}	<i>Δ</i> 297
ἀνέρες ἐξοιχνεῦσι ,,		<i>I</i> 384
ἐκ πεδίου νίσσοντο ,,		<i>M</i> 119

In the second group the formula is used to denote a number of chariots, but in the first the reference is to a single one.¹⁾ The relation between *E* 107, *E* 219 etc. then, seems to be as follows. The original formula (πρόσθ', σὸν, παρ') ἵπποιον καὶ ὄχεσφι was designed to denote the vehicle of a single hero, just as —παλάσσετο μαρναμένονιν was coined for a single combat. It could be employed in the dative as well as in the genitive, as an instrumental (at the beginning of the line) and with a preposition (after the penthemimeral and the trochaic caesuras). After *v*-movable had come into use, the dative was applied to mass-scenes in a new form: σὸν ἵπποιον καὶ ὄχεσφι(ν), etc. In this form it supplanted the old single team-formula, but the genitive could not be altered without upsetting the whole formulaic structure. So here ἵπποιον remained intact. A similar substitution seems to have occurred in the case of ὄμιον, ὀφθαλμοῖν, βλεφάρων, πόδων, etc. Let us take for example ὄμοισι — ὄμοισιν — ὄμιον. It is hard to see why Homer should have deliberately chosen the form ὄμοισιν in (P₁)

ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὄμοισιν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον, *B* 45 etc., 5 ×,
and cf. *A* 29, *E* 738,

and the form ὄμιον in (P₁)

οἱ δ' ἄρ' ἀπ' ὄμοιων Σαρπηδονός ἔντε' ἔλοντο, *Π* 663, cf. ἀπ' ὄμοιων
Διομήδεος (*Θ* 194) etc., 4 ×.

if it were not from formulaic necessity: the dative could be replaced without more ado by ὄμοισιν, but for the genitive the singers could not substitute ὄμων without disturbing entire formulaic systems. On the other hand ὄμοισι (without *v*-movable) must have been a fixed component part of some T₁ formulae at a very early stage, for it is sometimes found in a highly archaic context, e.g. in

¹⁾ The question is not affected by the view we prefer to take of the problem of the original grammatical number of ὄχεσφι (cf. Shipp, *Essays* 37) for the employment of the plural (e.g. in ἦριπε δ' ἐξ ὀχέων) to denote a single chariot must be very ancient. The same applies to the use of ὄχεσφι as a locative (cf. θύρησφι) and as an ablative genitive (cf. παρὰ ναῦσφι).

ἦ ῥα, καὶ ἀμφ' ὤμοισι θέτο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον θ 416, cf. B 45 etc. It was probably the influence of such T₁ formulae which made later singers change

*ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' ὤμουν βάλετο ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον

into: „ „ „ ὤμοισιν „ „ „

In κ 261–62, owing to the structure of the sentence, the influence of T₁ formulae did not work, so here Homer kept the older form:

ὧς ἔφατ', αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ περὶ μὲν ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον
ὤμουν βαλόμην—.

D. A FORMULA IS SPLIT BY THE INTRODUCTION OF ANOTHER WORD

When dealing with quantitative metathesis and neglected digamma we found several indications of modification caused by the introduction of a new element into the body of a formula. There is nothing to suggest that the tendency to separate the constituents of a traditional expression only began to develop at the late stages marked by these linguistic phenomena, and the analysis of the process given by Hainsworth¹⁾ makes it clear indeed that here we have to do with a development inherent in the formulaic diction as such. I may add that in my opinion it was one of the strongest forces causing this style to become much less stagnant and stereotyped than it could have done.

So much may be stated without excessive fear of contradiction, but it is quite a different thing to try and identify individual cases in which this kind of modification played a part. Again, Hainsworth is fundamentally right in thinking that in general “separation is a reaction to a particular difficulty in composition and not a use of words normal and traditional in the separated form”. Since, however, both employment of *v*-movable and “separation” are relatively ancient features of the formulaic diction, most attempts to disengage particular threads of word-texture are bound to yield rather doubtful results. Let us take, for example, the expression *δέπας λάβεν ἀμφικύπελλον*, *ο* 102. On the face of it it might look as though the use of *v*-movable is to be connected with modification, for *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον* is the predominating combination in Homer (11 \times)²⁾ and is divided only three times (*ο* 102 included).³⁾ Yet mere difference in frequency is a doubtful criterion⁴⁾ and the sequence noun-verb-epithet may be just as ancient as the noun-epithet combination. In *O* 479 and χ 122, for example, we find *σάκος θέτο τετραθέλυμον* which cannot have developed from **σάκος τετραθέλυμον* since this combination is impossible

1) o.c. 64.

2) A 584, Z 220, I 656, Ψ 219, 656, 699, γ 63, ν 57, ο 120, θ 89, χ 86.

3) *δέπας οἴσεται ἀμφικύπελλον*, Ψ 663, 667.

4) cf. e.g. *πρὸς δὲν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν*, 11 \times , against *πρὸτι δὲν μυθήσατο θυμόν*, 4 \times .

in a dactylic metre. On the other hand, both the context ¹⁾ and the constituents ²⁾ of this expression look impressively archaic, so we may have to do with an ancient formula in which the sequence noun-verb-epithet is original.³⁾ Yet, in spite of these difficulties I think that several Homeric expressions can actually be traced back to older and undivided prototypes and that for this reason we are justified in speaking of a gradual spreading of *v*-movable at a stage which is not necessarily as late as the development of quantitative metathesis and loss of the digamma in East Ionic. In the following part of this chapter we shall come across a symptom of this development in the line

οὐνεκα πολλοῖσιν τε καὶ ἰφθίμοισι(ν) ἀνάσσεις ω 26.

There it will be examined from the point of view of extension of prototypes,⁴⁾ but it goes without saying that the shifting of *πολλοῖσι* is caused by the introduction of the particle. A different instance of the process is found in *O* 249. Among the noun-epithet formulae the type *βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος* / *Διομήδης* is certainly one of the oldest.⁵⁾ It is found three times in a modified form, viz. in

Πάμμονά τ' Ἀντίφρονόν τε βοῆν ἀγαθόν τε Πολίτην Ω 250
εἰ δέ που Αἴαντός γε ,, ἀγαθοῖο πνθοίμην P 102

where the use is obviously occasional ⁶⁾ and in

οἷς ἐτάρους ὀλέκοντα βοῆν ἀγαθὸς βάλεν Αἴας O 249

where the epithet is also applied in a non-traditional way to the hero whose normal and ancient formula is *μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας*. The modification involves the employment of *v*-movable in order to obviate hiatus. Since *O* 249 proves that the tendency to split up ancient prototypes was not only strengthened by the development of quantitative metathesis and the loss of the initial digamma but also by the fact that, at a given stage of the evolution, Ionian singers introduced verbal forms ending in *v*-movable into the epic dialect, the analysis of a few difficult cases is not so hazardous an undertaking as it might look at first sight. I have already referred to the uncertainty we are confronted with in the case

¹⁾ body-shield, no corslet; *ἐγχος*; see e.g. Miss Lorimer, *H.M.* 188, Kirk, *S.H.* 195 f.

²⁾ On *σάκος* see e.g. Trümper, *o.c.* 25 ff., Ruijgh, *E.A.* 95 f.; on *τετραθέλυμνος* as a formulaic survival, Page, *H.H.I.* 270, Kirk, *ibid.*

³⁾ The same may be true of *κυνέην θέτο τετραφάληρον* *E* 743 = *A* 41 (see below p. 99) and of *χλαῖναν βάλε (θέτο) φοινικέεσσαν* (*ξ* 500, *φ* 118), in which *φοινικέεσσαν* reflects older **φοινικέεσσαν*, see Ruijgh *Son.V.* 215 f., Palmer in *C.H.*, 105.

⁴⁾ below, p. 100.

⁵⁾ see Page, *H.H.I.* 243; 21 and 20 occurrences respectively; *βοῆν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον* 5 ×.

⁶⁾ *Polites* is very unlikely to be a traditional figure of heroic saga. Elsewhere he is only mentioned among the rank and file of the Trojans; accordingly he has no definite formula. In *P* 102 the incidental character of the situation is self-evident.

of *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον*. Still, when examined more closely, the scanty evidence actually seems to point to a development similar to the one that was found, for example, in *Ἴδεώ θ' ὅς, τέως μὲν ἐνὶ μεγάροισι, Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω, πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν, οἶα μ' ἔοργας*, Hes. *αἶθοπα πινέμεν οἶνον*, etc. The initial hemistichs of the lines in which *οἴσεται* is found between the noun and the epithet:

αὐτὰρ ὁ νικηθεὶς δέπας οἴσεται ἀμφικύπελλον Ψ 663

ἄσσον ἴτω ὄστις „ „ „ Ψ 667

are both marked by features which suggest recent modification: *ὁ* used as an article in 663 (a very late instance of this development), hiatus after *ἴτω* in 667. Are these indications to be connected with the actual form of the second hemistich? In this respect I may point to the structure of

ἄφρα δὲ Τυνδείδης μετὰ δούρατος ὄχετ' ἐρωήν Λ 357

The genitive *δούρατος*, though in itself a very old formation possibly belonging to *Urgriechisch*,¹⁾ seems to have entered the tradition at its Ionian stage.²⁾ In the history of the formulaic diction *δοῦρός ἐρωή(ν)* (O 358, Φ 251, Ψ 529) almost certainly represents an earlier phase.³⁾ If this formula later developed into *μετὰ δούρατος ὄχετ' ἐρωήν* there is little doubt that the phenomenon observed in Ψ 663, 667 also resulted from separation of the component parts of a formula and that the disproportion of the respective occurrences of *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον* and *δέπας οἴσεται (λάβεν) ἀμφικύπελλον* (11:2+1) is not due to chance. The introduction of *ν*-movable, then, is to be ascribed to a similar secondary development.⁴⁾

If *δέπας λάβεν ἀμφικύπελλον* did develop from *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον* after *ν*-movable had begun to appear in the formulaic diction, the treatment undergone by what, on this supposition, should be regarded as the original formula might throw light on the relations between a set of Homeric passages which are rightly judged irreconcilable from a factual point of view. At the same time, moreover, the argument advanced above might also tip the scales of probability in favour of an archaological interpretation which in the recent past was suggested for reasons independent of ours.

It is beyond doubt that the well-known confusion that exists in the Homeric employment of *φάλος*, *τροφάλεια*, *φάλαρα*, *τετραφάληρος* etc.⁵⁾ is

1) cf. Chantraine, *Morphologie*² 80, 96.

2) This view is not inconsistent with the antiquity of *δορF-ν-τ-ος* cf. Palmer (in *C.H.* 93 f.): "But this [ancestral linguistic] community doubtless showed dialect differentiation which may be mirrored in the descendant dialects". On the Ionian origin of Homeric *δούρατος* see Trümpy, *o.c.* 247.

3) *ἐρωή* 'rush', 'throw' also seems a highly archaic survival.

4) Professor Kamerbeek suggests that perhaps there was an intermediate stage *δέπας ἔτ' ἀμφικύπελλον*, since in verbs of taking the Middle originally played an important part, cf. *λάζομαι*, *αἰννμαι*.

5) see e.g. Trümpy, *o.c.* 43 ff., Stubbings, *Arms and Armour* (in *C.H.* 514 ff.).

due to *Umdeutung* of some of these terms on the part of the singers and Miss Lorimer was certainly right in assuming that such a misunderstanding must have played a part in the passages in which *φάλοι* are mentioned: ¹⁾

1. ψαῦον δ' ἰππόκομοι κόρυθες λαμπροῖσι φάλοισι	<i>N</i> 132 = <i>Π</i> 216
νευόντων ὡς πυκνὸν ἐφέστασαν ἀλλήλοισιν.	133 = 217
2. πλῆξεν ἀνασχόμενος κόρυθος φάλον ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρ' αὐτῆ	<i>Γ</i> 362
τριχθὰ τε καὶ τετραχθὰ διατρυφὲν ἔκπεσε χειρός.	363
3. ἰπποκόμου κόρυθος φάλον ἤλασεν ἀμφὶ δὲ καυλὸν	<i>Π</i> 338
φάσανον ἐρραίσθη, δ' ὅπ' οὐατος ἀχένα θεῖνε,	339
4. ἦτοι δ' μὲν κόρυθος φάλον ἤλασεν ἵπποδασείης	<i>N</i> 614
ἄκρον ὑπὸ λόφον αὐτόν, δ' δὲ προσιόντα μέτωπον	615
5. τὸν ἔ' ἔβαλε πρῶτος κόρυθος φάλον ἵπποδασείης,	<i>Δ</i> 459 = <i>Z</i> 9
ἐν δὲ μετώπῳ πῆξε· πέρησε δ' ἄρ' ὀστέον εἴσω	460 = 10
αἰχμὴ χαλκείη.	461 = 11

Miss Lorimer herself explained the incompatibility between 1-3 and 5 as resulting from a confusion of *φάλος* ²⁾ and *φάλαρα* ³⁾ in *Δ* 459 = *Z* 9 and suggested with regard to 4 that "the author of these lines" might have ascribed to *φάλος* the meaning "stilt or holder of the crest". Though such a development is conceivable, the argument has several weak points. a). Kirk recently argued that *N* 132 f. = *Π* 216 f. refer to hoplite fighting. ⁴⁾ Though, as he admits himself, this is not absolutely certain, ⁵⁾ the argument is pretty strong indeed and for this reason these passages are not a very good starting-point ⁶⁾ for proving that *φάλος* originally denoted a Mycenaean 'horn'. b). One may wonder whether a blow delivered at a curved horn like the one shown on the 'Warrior-vase' could possibly have had the effect described in *Γ* 362 f. and *Π* 338 f., the only other passages in which, according to Miss Lorimer, the description is wholly accurate. It is next to inconceivable that the same poet who visualised the *φάλοι* of *N* 132 as 'horns' could have made this line. c) This is even more true of the verses *Δ* 459 f. = *Z* 9 f. Apart from the difficulty raised by *Γ* 362 f. we have to assume at least a dual (and in view of *N* 614 f. perhaps a triple) authorship — as Miss Lorimer was inclined to do indeed. She had to postulate, anyhow, two different kinds of re-interpretation, one in *Δ* 459 f. and another in *N* 614 f. d). It would seem a curious coincidence that *τροφάλεια* and *τετράφαλος* on the one hand and *τετραφάληρος* on the other

¹⁾ *H.M.* 239 ff.

²⁾ in the generally accepted sense of 'horn, projection'; see also Trümper, *o.c.* 43.

³⁾ 'metal plates', *H.M.* 242. Trümper reserves judgment.

⁴⁾ *S.H.* 187 f., cf. also Miss D. H. F. Gray, *Homeric Epithets for Things*, CQ XLI (1947), 116: "a context unusually redolent of hoplite tactics".

⁵⁾ *τυκῆσι βόεσσι* *M* 105 may be an archaistic creation or — more probably — a genuine archaic formula which has been preserved by chance. Yet the well organised Mycenaean palace-states are likely to have had some kind of orderly tactics on the battle-field.

⁶⁾ The accusative *κόρυον* is found only here (*N* 131, *Π* 215).

should refer to 'four horns' (*φάλοι*) and 'four plates' (*φάλαρα*) respectively.

In view of these improbabilities I would suggest an explanation on the following lines. *a*). The term *φάλος* was misapplied by the poet in the passages 1-4, *but was re-interpreted in the same sense everywhere*. It was probably used to denote the fore and aft curving crest-holder ¹⁾ known not only from archaic but also from Geometric representations.²⁾ In this sense the word may have supplanted the term *κύμβαχος* which had become antiquated in Homer's time and was shown by Leumann to have been misunderstood in either *E* 586 or *O* 536. In my opinion the latter line has preserved the original meaning and here it is found in connection with *κόρυθος* - *ἵπποδασείης* (!) and with *λόφος*, just as in *N* 614 f.:

τοῦ δὲ Μέγης κόρυθος χαλκήρεος ἵπποδασείης
 κύμβαχον ἀκρότατον νύξ' ἔγχει ὀξυόεντι
 ἔῆξε δ' ἀφ' ἵππειον λόφον αὐτοῦ

Probably Homer's immediate predecessors found in the tradition two formulae: *κόρυθος φάλον ἵπποδασείης* and *κόρυθος χαλκήρεος ἵπποδασείης / κύμβαχον - ∪ ∪ -*.³⁾ Because of the contemporary military fashion the proximity of *φάλον* and *ἵπποδασείης* in the former of these formulae led the singers to re-interpret the expression as 'the *λόφος*-holder of the helmet bushy with horse-hair', cf. *K* 258 *ἄφαλόν τε καὶ ἄλλοφον*. In *N* 132 f. it is much more likely that, when the heads of the warriors nodded, *forward and backward curved* crests (and crest-holders) should have touched one another than that *upturned* horns should have come into contact as a result of this movement. *b*). The effect of the blow described in *Γ* 362 would be much more natural if a 'Bügel' ⁴⁾ was meant by the poet. *c*). It is the same with *Π* 338 f. and *N* 614 (*ἄκρον ὑπὸ λόφον αὐτόν*). As to *Δ* 459 ff. = *Z* 9 ff., it is perfectly conceivable that a poet who mistook *φάλος* for 'crest-holder' employed a traditional formula in these lines. There is no need to recur to the hypothesis of a plurality of authorship. *d*). If *κόρυθος φάλον ἵπποδασείης* is the original formula, the original meaning of *φάλος* is likely to have been 'plate'.⁵⁾ In that case the word is closely

¹⁾ This view was vigorously defended by Helbig, *H.E.*³ 299 f. who, of course, did not think in terms of 'Umdeutung'. The testimony of the scholia is fluctuating and has practically no value for problems of this kind (Helbig referred to schol. *N* 132).

²⁾ See e.g. the representations in *H.M.* 234 ff. and Pl. XVII, 2, 3a, Webster, *Homer and Attic Geometric Vases* 40, fig. 1 ('Agora Jug'), J. Boardman, *Painted Votive Plaques*, BSA XLIX (1954), 183 ff. ("hardly later than 720-10"; "late Geometric manner").

³⁾ *H.W.* 231 ff. Helbig regarded the *κύμβαχος* as a special sort of crest-holder, a 'Röhre' instead of a 'Bügel'.

⁴⁾ Ameis-Hentze-Cauer *ad loc.*

⁵⁾ cf. the use of the epithet *χαλκήρης* in
κόρυθος χαλκήρεος ἵπποδασείης O 536
κόρυθος χαλκήρεος ἵπποδασείας N 714
κυνέας " " χ 111 ~ 145
ἐν κυνέη χαλκήρει T 316 = *Ψ* 861 ~ * 206.

related to *φάλαρα*, and *τετραφάληρος*, *τετράφαλος* and *τρυφάλεια* all refer to the same part of the helmet. The strange coincidence that a helmet has at once four *φάλοι* ('horns') and four *φάλαρα* ('plates') exists no longer.¹⁾

As far as I see there are two objections to this explanation. First, we have to assume a linguistic link between *φάλος* on the one hand and *φάλαρα*, *φάλαρος*, *φαλαρίς*, *φαληριώντα*²⁾ on the other. It must be pointed out, however, that a similar problem is raised by the coexistence of *φάλαρα* and *φάλαρος* etc. This suggests that all the forms in question may go back on a non-Greek word which was treated in several ways.

Secondly it is difficult to explain *ἀμφίφαλος* in *E* 743 = *A* 41

κρατι δ' ἐπ' ἀμφίφαλον κινέην θέτο τετραφάληρον.

The use of this epithet alongside with *τετραφάληρος* appears to be in favour of Miss Lorimer's theory.³⁾ Could the word mean 'with plates fore and aft'?⁴⁾ or 'with a crest-holder running for and aft'?⁵⁾ The sense 'horizontale Schicht des Helmes' was proposed by F. Krischen in 1948.⁶⁾ The occurrence of four o-pa-wo-ta in *Sh* 737 made Ventris and Chadwick tentatively suggest 'plate' for *φάλος*.⁷⁾ Since then more Linear B evidence has emerged from Knossos.⁸⁾ The crucial question is whether the four o-pa-wo-ta are reflected not only in *τετραφάληρος* but also in the archaic term *τρυφάλεια*. If so, the relation between the passages 1-4 and 5 is clear and the 'Umdeutung' has a counterpart in the sequence *κόρυθος φάλον* *ἴπποδασείης* - *κόρυθος φάλον ἤλασεν ἴπποδασείης* (cf. *κόρυθος χαλκήρεος ἴπποδασείης*) - *κόρυθος φάλον ἤλασεν, ἀμφι δ'*: it runs parallel with the splitting of a formula, which was made possible when *ν*-movable had entered the formulaic diction.

¹⁾ Robert, *Studien zur Ilias* 48, considered them identical (in the sense of "horn-artige Vorrangungen").

²⁾ cf. *H.M.* 242 and on *φάλαρος* Gow on Theocr. V 103.

³⁾ Trümper regards the interpretation 'zu beiden Seiten leuchtend' (W. Schulze, *Q.E.* 463 f., Bechtel, *Lexilogus s.v.*) as probable.

⁴⁾ On neckguards in Mycenaean representations see *H.M.* 223 ff., Stubbings, *o.c.* 516. I regard "dog's skin" for *κινέη* (cf. *κινῆ* Anaxandrides, Kock, *C.A.F.* 65; on Homeric *κινέη* see the testimonies in Ebeling *s.v.*) as a piece of popular etymology. Because of its metrical value the word is always replaceable by **σκινέη* in hexameter verse; it may well have had this form in early epic poetry. It must be connected with *ἐπι-σκίνιον*, *P* 136, and originally meant "head-gear" (hence *κινέην ταυρεῖην*, *K* 257, (*ἰ*)*κτιδέην κινέην*, *K* 335, *α**γ**εῖην κινέην*, *ω* 231). For *σκ-/κ-* there are many parallels in Greek, all of them ancient (Schwyzer, *Gr.Gr.* I, 234), cf. e.g. *σκεδάννυμι/κεδάννυμι*, *σκιδανμαι/κιδανμαι*, *σκάπτω/κάπετος*, *σκερβόλλω*, *σκερβόλος* (*O.H.G.* *sceran*, *Dutch* *scheren*)/*κείρω*, cf. Frisk *s.v.*, *θυνο-σκόος* (*O.H.G.* *scouwon*, *Dutch* *schouwen*)/*κοίω*, cf. Frisk *s.v.*

⁵⁾ see *H.M.* 233 f.

⁶⁾ *Homeric Helme*, *Philologus* XCVII (1948), 184 ff. When suggesting a side-ward movement by which the 'Schichten' should have touched one another in *N* 132 f. Krischen overlooked *νεόντων*.

⁷⁾ *Docs.* 378.

⁸⁾ see the survey in Palmer, *Mycenaean and Minoan* 178 f.

E. A FORMULA IS REMOVED FROM ITS TRADITIONAL POSITION

In Ψ 312 and β 283 conjugation was only possible if the prototypes were dislodged from their traditional place in the line. Hence the question presents itself whether there is a connection between the spread of ν -movable and the dislodging-process as such. Since the latter evolution appears to have entailed the use of metathesised and neglect of digamma, it is to be expected that it contributed to an increasing use of ν -movable too. This supposition seems to be confirmed by the facts.

The dative $\text{πολλοῖσι}(\nu)$ occurs 16 times in Homer. It is not confined to a definite type of formula, which is only natural in view of its sense. Yet the word has the value of a palimbacchius in 14 cases, some of which suggest that for a considerable time it must have belonged to heroic poetry—unless it gradually replaced πολέεσσι , a possibility which does not affect the part of the inquiry we are concerned with just now.¹⁾ The only lines in which πολλοῖσιν has the value of a molossus are:

$\text{πολλοῖσιν γὰρ ἐγὼ γε ὀδυσσάμενος τόδ' ἰκάνω τ 407}$
 $\text{ὄννεκα πολλοῖσιν τε καὶ ἰφθίμοισιν ἀνάσσεις ω 26.}$

It is clear that in τ 407 the form is used under very special conditions and, accordingly, in an occasional way: the 1st. pers. sing., the allusion to the name of Autolykos' grandson and the hiatus all point in this direction. In this case possible prototypes, if any, have been so much modified that nothing can be inferred from the line. It is different with ω 26. Here we have to do with a modification of $\text{πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισι}$ (* Φάνασσε , $-\epsilon\iota\upsilon$, $-\epsilon\iota$, etc.) cf.

$\text{ἀνδράσιν ἐν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισι}(\nu) \text{ ἀνάσσω τ 110}$
 $\text{ἄνδρες δύο ,, ,, ,, μάχεσθαι π 244.}$

The alteration is related, moreover, to some phenomena which we observed when examining the cases of neglected digamma.²⁾

A similar transposition of a general type into an expression required

¹⁾ The figures for $\text{πολέεσσι}(\nu)$ and $\text{πολλοῖσι}(\nu)$ tend to show that this development is almost certain. For the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* they are respectively: $\text{πολέεσσι}(\nu)$ 5, $\text{πολλοῖσι}(\nu)$ 6 (all replaceable by $\text{πολέεσσι}(\nu)$); $\text{πολέεσσι}(\nu)$ 4, $\text{πολλοῖσι}(\nu)$ 10 (of which only τ 204 and ω 26 have irreplaceable forms, see below). In "la concurrence entre une déclinaison athématique et une déclinaison thématique" (Chantraine), the Ionic form was obviously gaining ground. Perhaps this process of modernisation was to a certain extent counterbalanced by the tendency to avoid an accumulation of spondees. cf. $\text{πᾶσι δὲ θῆκε πόνον, πολλοῖσι δὲ κῆδε' ἐφῆκεν, Φ 524}$, against $\text{τεῖχος ἐγυμνώθη, πολέεσσι δὲ θῆκε κέλευθον, M 399}$.

The form πολλοῖσι is found in ancient-looking surroundings in $\text{πολλοῖσιν ἀνάσσω Μυρμιδόνεσσι/ἀνάσσοντ' Ἀργείοισι (Φ 188, ο 240)}$, $\text{πολλοῖσι καὶ ἰφθίμοισι}(\nu) \text{ ἀνάσσω/μάχεσθαι} (\tau 110, \pi 244)$, cf. the certainly ancient expressions * $\text{πολέεσσι Φάνασσεις} (-\epsilon\iota, -\epsilon)$ (above, p. 55), * $\text{πολέεσσ' ἀνδρεσσι Φάνακτα (E 546)}$, cf. below, p. 117 f.

²⁾ e.g. in $\text{τε καὶ ᾧ πεπλήγετο μηρῶ, M 163}$, etc., etc., see above, p. 63 ff.

by special conditions is found in *M* 153.¹⁾ The prototype seems to be exemplified by:

$\left. \begin{array}{l} \text{χειρῆσαι} \\ \text{τεράεσαι} \\ \text{θεοῖσι} \end{array} \right\}$	πεποιθότες	$\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ἡδὲ βίηφι} \\ \text{,, ,,} \\ \text{ἀθανάτοισι} \end{array} \right.$	$\begin{array}{l} M \ 135 \\ M \ 256 \\ \iota \ 107 \end{array}$
--	---------------------	--	--

Since the position of *λαοῖσι* is chiefly before the trochaic caesura, it is likely that, in order to describe the situation in the Battle at the Wall, an original **λαοῖσι πεποιθότες ἡδὲ βίηφι* was changed into *λαοῖσιν καθύπερθε πεποιθότες ἡδὲ βίηφι*. This may sound rather speculative, because in the case of *M* 153 it is only the system which provides us with the relevant indications. An instance of the same kind, however, is found in

Ἴπποισίν τε πέποιθε καὶ ἄρμασι κολλητοῖσιν Ψ 286

and here we do not have to rely on the indirect evidence of a 'system', the direct prototype being available in

ἑσταότ' ἐν θ' Ἴπποισι καὶ ἄρμασι κολλητοῖσιν Δ 366 = Δ 198.²⁾

F. ENJAMBEMENT

As we have seen above, the *Hymn to Aphrodite*, the poetry of Hesiod and the Homeric epics provide some evidence that at recent stages of development the freedom in verse-making was steadily increasing. One of the forms in which this tendency manifested itself appeared to be enjambement. We have also found that this stylistic evolution entailed modification of ancient prototypes such as (*οὔτε πόνων*) *εἰ εἰδῶς οὔτ' ἀγοράων*.³⁾ As to *v*-movable we have so far identified a few cases (Ψ 312, Ψ 286) in which a rather striking form of enjambement seems to go hand in hand with modification. Let us now see if these indications are corroborated by further evidence.

In *N* 75 the lesser Aias says to his namesake that he is eager for battle:

μαιμώνωσι δ' ἐνερθε πόδες καὶ χεῖρες ὑπερθε.

Shipp, though recognising that *μαιμάω* is an old epic word,⁴⁾ thinks that the verb "would naturally have the weak grade *ᾶ*"⁵⁾ and that verbs of this kind "indifferently contract or lengthen the vowel".⁶⁾ As to the quantity of the *a*, the weight of evidence is rather in favour of original

¹⁾ see above, p. 90f.

²⁾ cf.:

<i>ἀλλ' ὅς μὲν θ'</i>	<i>Ἴπποισι καὶ ἄρμασι(ν)</i>	<i>οἷσι πεποιθῶς</i>	<i>Ψ 319</i>
<i>ἀλλ' ἀπτοῖς</i>	" "	" <i>ἄσσον ἴοντες</i>	<i>Ψ 8</i>
<i>τὴν ἄρ' ὃ γ' ἐνθ'</i>	" "	" <i>πέμπε νέεσθαι</i>	<i>δ 8.</i>

Modification is also found in:

<i>Ἴπποισι προύπεμψε</i>	"	"	<i>κολλητοῖσιν</i>	<i>ε 117</i>
<i>Ἴπποισι(ν) μ' ἐκέλευε</i>	"	"	<i>ἐμβεβαῶτα</i>	<i>E 199.</i>

³⁾ above, p. 40f.

⁴⁾ *Studies* 116.

⁵⁾ *ibid.* 115.

⁶⁾ *ibid.* 116.

had to be employed in enjambement. This explains the unique and surprising fact of ν -movable turning πάντεσσι(ν) into a molossus.¹⁾

In the introductory part of the fifteenth book of the Odyssey Telemachus makes ready for his return journey:

σπερχόμενος ῥα χιτῶνα περι χροῖ σιγαλόεντα ο 61
δύνεν καὶ μέγα φᾶρος ἐπὶ στιβαροῖς βάλετ' ὤμοις 62

The use of the preposition ἐπὶ in 62 betrays modification: a φᾶρος and a χλαῖνα are not thrown upon but round a person or round one's shoulders. This is clearly shown in Homer and the expressions in question are certainly to a great extent formulaic: ἀμφὶ δέ μιν φᾶρος καλὸν (χλαῖναν καλήν) βάλον(-εν) (5 ×),²⁾ ἀμφὶ δ' ἄρα χλαίνας οἴλας βάλον(-εν) (4 ×),³⁾ περι δέ μέγα βάλλετο φᾶρος (B 43), etc. On the other hand the imperf. of δύνω is rarely used without augment: apart from ο 62, the only occurrences are δύνε δὲ πόντον ἰών (O 219), δύνε δ' Ἐρεχθῆος πυκινὸν δόμον (η 81), θεὰ δύνε σπέος (ν 366), δ δ' ἄμβροτα τεύχεα δύνε (P 194, τεύχε' ἔδυνε?), whereas ἔδυνε seems to be traditional at the end of the line: θώρηκα περι στήθεσσι ἔδυνε (4 × and cf. P 194).⁴⁾ We cannot say for certain why in ο 61 περι χροῖ σιγαλόεντα was used instead of περι στήθεσσι ἔδυνε (cf. χιτῶνα περι στήθεσσι δαΐζει, 2 ×).⁵⁾ Was it because of the reminiscence of the formula περι χροῖ εἴματα ἔστο (5 ×, ἔχοντα, 5 ×) and the association of such words as εἴματα, χιτῶνα and ῥήγεα with σιγαλόεντα? ⁶⁾ At any rate the contamination of several formulae brought about the enjambement as well as the slightly inadequate use of ἐπὶ.

1) It is no valid objection that both ο 178 and ρ 159 contain the Ionic form ἀτάρ. As has been said above, the method of the present inquiry can only yield results in unravelling the latest stages of pre-Homeric development. This does not mean of course that lines such as ο 178 and ρ 159 were not developed, in their turn, from still earlier prototypes. This is probable in the case of the former line, and certain of the latter, which begins with ἔστιν, ἀτάρ (below, pp. 104 and 107), only, for lack of reliable data, we are unable to trace back the prototypes with anything like the certainty we had in the case of *πάντεσσι Φανάσσειν, etc. Yet we need not go beyond the bounds of Homeric evidence to imagine how such an evolution might have progressed. In β 395 we find ἐνθα μνηστήρεσσι, so an ancient Aeolic Νόστος of a chronicle-type might have contained the verses:

ἦλυθε Φεικοστῶ Φέτει πολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεὺς (above, p. 52)
Φοῖκον ἐν ὑπόροφον καὶ ἐάν ἐν πατρίδα γαίαν, (heῖδ Schwyzer, Del. 564)
ἐνθα μναστήρεσσι κακὸν πάντεσσι φύτευσε.

This Fickian suggestion is of course fanciful; it is only intended to illustrate that, though earlier phases of development cannot be traced by our method, their previous existence may be masked by the elaborate form of Homeric diction.

2) Ω 588 etc.

3) δ 50 etc.

4) A 19 etc., cf. ἐντέ' ἔδυνεν Γ 339 ~ τεύχεα δύνεν P 194, probably both traditional (ἐντεα καλά 5 ×, τεύχεα καλά 18 ×).

5) B 416, Π 841.

6) χλαῖναι(-ας) καὶ ῥήγεα σιγαλόεντα, 4 ×, cf. moreover X 154, ζ 26, 38, τ 232, and above p. 61 f.

The formula *βρωσίν τε πόσιν τε* (only in the *Od.*, 5 ×) normally ends the phrase of which it is part at the end of the line. It is the same in *κ* 176, where the formula is used in the nominative:

ἀλλ' ἄγετ', ὄφρ' ἐν νηὶ θοῆ βρωσίς τε πόσις τε,
μνησόμεθα βρώμης—

Though strictly speaking we do not have to do with a nominal clause,¹⁾ the absence of *ἔστι* is natural, as is often the case in epic diction.²⁾ Above we have seen that enjambement generally goes hand in hand with adaptation of general types to special circumstances. This also seems to apply to the use of *ἔστιν* in *μ* 321:

ὦ φίλοι—ἐν γὰρ νηὶ θοῆ βρωσίς τε πόσις τε
ἔστιν—τῶν δὲ βοῶν ἀπεχώμεθα, μὴ τι πάθωμεν.

In the next chapter we shall see that many features which result from modification as appears from neglect of digamma and use of *ν*-movable have parallels in the employment of hybrid and artificial forms under the same conditions. The reader will permit me to anticipate this part of the inquiry when I point out that in the three cases in which *ῆην* is well attested, it appears in enjambement and that, moreover, adaptation of a general type is suggested by its use in *ψ* 315–16: *οὐδέ πω αἶσα φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἰκέσθαι / ῆην*.

It is not my purpose to give a systematic and exhaustive survey of all the cases in which the employment of *ν*-movable can be explained as resulting from a modification which entailed enjambement. Probably it would be possible to add to the evidence discussed so far.

In *γ* 421 one of Nestor's sons, who is not even named, is instructed to go in search of a cow:

ἀλλ' ἄγ', ὁ μὲν πεδίονδ' ἐπὶ βοῦν ἴτω, ὄφρα τάχιστα
ἔλθῃσιν, ἐλάση δὲ βοῶν ἐπιβουκόλος ἀνήρ.

The non-traditional nature of this unceremonious address is also borne out by the late use of the preposition *ἐπὶ* (instead of *μετά*) in the sense of 'in order to fetch', a meaning of which, as far as I can see, only a single—and not quite exact—parallel is to be found in Homer: *ἐπὶ τεύχεα ἔσσεύοντο*, *ω* 466.³⁾ Now the regular position of *ἔλθῃσι(ν)* is before the trochaic caesura,⁴⁾ and probably goes back on a formulaic type exemplified by *αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν ἔλθῃτε* (< *ἐπεὶ κ' ἔλθῃτε*) (*O* 147), *αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν ἔλθῃσι* (< *ἐπεὶ κ' ἔλθῃσι*, cf. *ξ* 398) (*λ* 192, *ξ* 515 = *ο* 337).⁵⁾ On the other hand it is noteworthy that *ὄφρα τάχιστα*, when used at the end of the line, is regularly

1) Chantraine, *G.H.* II, 1 ff.

2) *ibid.* 2 ff.

3) cf. Chantraine, *G.H.* II, 111 and Stanford *ad loc.*

4) In addition to the cases cited below: *T* 191, *α* 77.

5) Chantraine, *G.H.* II, 258 f. There is, moreover, abundant evidence to show that the forms in *-ῃσι* (as constituents of the formulae *αἶ κ' ἐθέλῃσι* etc.) are traditionally employed either here or at the verse-end.

followed by an expression which extends as far as one of the main caesuras.¹⁾ Apart from γ 421–22, the only exceptions are N 326–27 (*εἶδομεν ἤε—*), which probably reflects an originally independent clause (X 130, γ 18) and ζ 33–34 *ὄφρα τάχιστα / ἐντύνεαι*, which provides a significant parallel with *ἔλθησιν* γ 422: it is occasional too and it is marked by synizesis.²⁾ Both cases are likely to be due to innovation.

In describing the fate of the Dioskuroi the poet of the catalogue of λ , be it Homer or not, says:

τεθναῖσιν τιμὴν δὲ λελόγγασιν Ἴσα θεοῖσι λ 304.

Here *Ἴσα* has come to function as an adverb because of the fact that the archaic expression *λελόγγασι* *Ἴσα* *θεοῖσι* was adapted to *τιμὴν δὲ*. The first hemistich, therefore, is certainly not traditional, and this inference is in accordance with the position and the form of *τεθναῖσιν*. Similar cases might turn up in a truly systematic study of the phenomena in question, but since the evidence quoted so far seems to be decisive, I prefer to wind up this part of the investigation by pointing to the poetical aspect of the evolution outlined above. Up to now, the instances of enjambement resulting from modification have been discussed from a purely technical point of view. I must insist, however, that I do not regard them as symptoms of a mechanical process. The very comparison, for example, of β 166 with its older prototype, very clearly brings out the emphatic and expressive character of the runover word. In this respect I do not agree with Bassett and Parry, who dealt with the same subject from different points of view but came to similar conclusions. In order to illustrate my own opinion I may quote one more case in which enjambement is due to modification but where the poetical motive underlying this change is clearly visible.

The expression (*ὧς εἰπὼν*) (*μητρὶ φίλῃ*) (*Ἀρήτη*) *δ' ἐν χερσὶ τίθει* ($9 \times$) is distinctly formulaic and (with **τίθη* instead of *τίθει*) probably very old: it is followed $3 \times$ by *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον* and once by *ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον*.³⁾ It is always used before the hephthemimeris. In Ψ 152–153

ὧς εἰπὼν ἐν χερσὶ κόμην ἐτάροιο φίλοιο
θῆκεν, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἡμερον ὤρσε γόοιο

it has been adapted to a special situation. The same passage, moreover, provides us with a still more significant indication, for Ψ 153 reflects yet another traditional system:

$\omega\varsigma$ φάτο	{	<i>τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν</i> <i>τῷ δ' ἔτι μᾶλλον</i> <i>τῇ " " "</i> <i>τῷ δ' ἄρα πατρὸς</i>	}	<i>ὑφ' ἡμερον ὤρσε γόοιο</i>	Ψ 108 = δ 183 ψ 231 τ 249 Ω 507 = δ 113.
------------------------	---	--	---	------------------------------	---

¹⁾ e.g. *τεύχεα συλήσειε* Δ 466, *ὄσαι' Ἀργείους* E 691, etc.

²⁾ On its relation with modification see below, p. 116, 118.

³⁾ On the formula *φάσανον ἀργυρόηλον* see now Kirk, *S.H.*, 111, 114; *ξίφος* also seems to be Mycenaean (Ta 716, if *qi-si-pe-e* is correctly interpreted *Docs.* 346).

Normally this type is used after the person who is the subject of *ὡς φάτο* has wound up his speech, and for this general purpose the system was obviously designed. After *Ψ* 151, however, Achilles' dramatic gesture was foremost in the poet's mind, so *ὡς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὕφ' ἱμερον ὤρσα γόοιο* could not immediately follow the hero's words. The poet first remodelled the general type *ὡς εἰπὼν ἐν χερσὶ τίθει* plus object into an expression which could express the pathos of the scene—however discreetly—by mentioning *Patroclus'* hands. Only then did he return to the traditional way of saying that "all the bystanders mourned".

Here the sceptical question may be asked whether the indirect influence of the formulaic diction was so strong that it should be regarded as responsible for the change of aspect in the verb, *τίθει* (**τίθη*) becoming *θῆκεν*. The answer is emphatically in the affirmative. Already K. Meister has drawn our attention to such expressions as *θεὸν ὡς τιμήσαντο* (*τ* 280 = *ψ* 339) and to the fact that in the fourth foot "Verben der Bedeutung die ihnen an der desbetreffenden Stelle innewohnt, sonst aktivisch flektiert zu werden pflegen":¹⁾ *ἀκούετο Δ* 331, *διώκετο Φ* 602, *σ* 8, (*ἐξ*)*εξεείνετο Κ* 81, *ρ* 305, *ἰθύνετο χ* 8, etc. Writing several years before Parry's first publications, Meister did not connect these phenomena with *θεός ὡς τίετο δήμῳ* and with the influence of archaic prototypes containing *ἀκονέμεν, διωκέμεν, ἰθυνέμεν*, cf. *Α* 547, etc. Generally speaking these prototypes must go back to a period in which epic composition was certainly oral²⁾; their remnants determined the change of voice in the verbs just cited.³⁾ In the same way the existence of older formulae entailed the change in verbal aspect. The formula *λοῦσαν(-εν) καὶ χρίσαν(-εν) ἐλαίῳ* (7 ×) is always supplemented by verbs describing the act of clothing in the aorist: *φᾶρος καλὸν (χλαῖναν καλήν) βάλον(-εν) ἥδὲ χιτῶνα, εἴματα ἔσσαν(-εν)*, etc. Accordingly we find in *δ* 253 *ἀμφὶ δὲ εἴματα ἔσσα*. Yet here the preceding formula appears in the form

ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μιν ἐγὼ λόσον καὶ χρίον ἐλαίῳ.

The explanation of the difference between the imperfects and the following *ἀμφὶ δὲ εἴματα ἔσσα* is only to be found in the impossibility of changing the third person-formula of the aorist into the first person of the same tense. In *Ψ* 153 too the modification entails change of aspect: here the imperfect is replaced by an aorist. Yet this alteration detracts from the expressiveness of the verses no more than the other innovations do. Indeed, the contrary seems to be true.

It has often been said that the fact that Homer uses a traditional language should not prejudice our opinion of the poetic quality of his work. But we should recognise too that sometimes his greatness stands

¹⁾ *o.c.* 19.

²⁾ even when allowance is made for analogical spreading, as may be the case in *ἐξεξεείνετο*.

³⁾ cf. also *ἀνάσασθαι γ* 245, which may be a remnant of a prototype based upon **φανασσόμεναι*.

out even more clearly when seen against the background of this admirable tradition. The way he adapted old prototypes to his own dramatic vision in Ψ 152-53 shows this most convincingly.

The behaviour of πᾶσιν in connection with enjambement

The cases examined so far tend to show that there is a connection between specific sorts of enjambement and use of ν -movable. Now if expressions of this kind replaced older formulaic types (e.g. $\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon\nu, \tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota \delta\epsilon \pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu < \acute{\omega}\varsigma \varphi\acute{\alpha}\tau\omicron, \tau\omicron\iota\sigma\iota \delta\epsilon \pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$), it is to be expected that they should also have determined the structure of some of the initial hemistichs and in particular the choice and the form of the words that immediately follow the runover words. It is likely that, because of the breaking up of more ancient types, some of the following elements will also show symptoms of innovation. Now, with regard to the intrusion of ν -movable it seems that such signs can in fact be observed.

When examining the employment of $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\iota$ and $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ in the *Hymn to Aphrodite* we found that there appeared to be a slight difference in the proportions of occurrences between this Hymn and the Homeric poems: *Aphr.* 2:3, *Homer* 71 (72?):68 (67?). A more significant difference however, is found in the occurrences of ν -movable making position: *Aphr.* 2/3, *Hom.* 11/68. These proportions in themselves may be regarded as inconclusive because the hymn is very short, but they were found to be in accordance with corresponding phenomena observed in the same poem. Now, if the behaviour of $\pi\alpha\sigma\iota\nu$ may be considered typical of the general development which has been established for early post-Homeric and late pre-Homeric stages, it may be worth while to have a look at the 11 cases in which ν -movable makes position. Leaving aside α 71 and κ 398,¹⁾ we have the following lines left:

τοῖος πᾶσιν θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γένοιτο	Δ	289
ἢ τις ἀλεξίκακος πᾶσιν Δαναοῖσι „	Κ	20
εἰδόσιν ἔμμ' ἐρέω „ , φίλοι, ὥς ἔτι καὶ νῦν	Ψ	787
ἰάνθη, πᾶσιν δὲ νεμεσσηθεῖσα μετηύδα	Ο	103
τάρβησαν, „ „ παραὶ ποσὶ κάππεσε θυμὸς	Ο	280
δάπτουσαν, „ „ παρήιον αἵματι φοινον	Π	159
ἐχθραὶ ἔσαν, „ „ νεμέσσα μνηστήρεσσι	φ	147
μνησάσθω, „ γὰρ ἐπίστατο μείλιχος εἶναι	Ρ	671
εἰρύαται, „ „ ἐπίστιόν ἐστιν ἑκάστω	ζ	265

It is not significant that 6 out of the 9 verses are marked by a runover expression in position 3, for so are the lines beginning with *Ἀτρεΐδης, καρπαλιμῶς*, etc. Yet, whereas the latter group shows a simple type of paratactic extension which is certainly traditional, the notable fact about

¹⁾ see above, p. 82.

the six lines which have *πᾶσιν γάρ* and *πᾶσιν δέ* before the trochaic caesura is that they all show a verbal form in enjambement, just as in the case of *δύνεν ο* 61, *ἔστιν μ* 321, *θῆκεν Ψ* 153, etc. Two of the forms have late characteristics. Ionic *εἰρόνται* may of course have replaced *εἴρονται* (<**Φέρονται*), but *ἴανθη* in this position is certainly due to recent modification.¹⁾

Again, I wish to emphasise that the available evidence does *not* show that the employment of *ν*-movable originated shortly before Homer's time. Nevertheless it would seem that its use in the cases discussed above points distinctly to a spreading of the usage at late pre-Homeric and early post-Homeric stages of the development of epic diction.²⁾

The behaviour of Ionic ἀτάγ in connection with enjambement

With regard to certain prosodical or linguistic anomalies which are to be observed in early post-Homeric poetry and about the explanation of which there is not a shadow of doubt, I put the case as follows: the poet, while composing after a traditional pattern, is not able, for one reason or another, to keep strictly to this pattern, but still clings to it in a general way or mixes it up with another that, originally, was not designed to link up with it.³⁾ It is exactly this situation which we find in the instances discussed so far. Yet the difference is that here we do not have to do with Hesiod's poems or with a *Hymn*, but with Homeric poetry itself.

The cases discussed above have been explained as resulting from a relatively late development which broke up the structure of older prototypes. Is this argument supported by evidence from other elements of epic diction? In this respect we cannot possibly refer to enjambement as such since this stylistic element is almost ubiquitous in Homer. Some of its types, especially those dividing the line at the penthemimeris and

¹⁾ see below, p. 122.

²⁾ Similar features are shown by *Ἀχαιοῖσιν* (12 occurrences of which 8 in enjambement). *ἔρκος Ἀχαιοῖσιν πέλεται* (*A* 284) seems to come from *ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν* (after the bucolic diaeresis *Γ* 229 = *H* 211, *Z* 5). With *στάς ἐν Ἀχαιοῖσιν ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευε* (*X* 377) we may compare the ubiquitous paratactic system:

<i>καί οἱ</i>	}	<i>ἔπεα πτερόεντ'(α)</i>	}	<i>ἄγορευε</i>	Φ 121
<i>ἦ δ' ἄρ'</i>				<i>ἔπενχόμενος (-η)</i>	Φ 427
<i>τοῦ δ' δ γ'</i>				<i>ἐπιμνησθεῖς</i>	δ 189
<i>ἀγχού δ' ἰστάμενος</i>					ρ 349
" " " (-η)					Δ 203 etc., 12 ×
<i>καί ε' (μ')</i>				<i>ὀλοφυρόμενος (-η)</i>	Ε 871 etc., 10 ×
" <i>οἱ ἐπενχόμενος (-η)</i>	}	<i>προσηύδα</i>	Π 829 Φ 409		
" <i>μιν λισσόμενος</i>			Φ 73		
etc., etc.					

In the lines *A* 11–12 ∼ *E* 151–52 *ἦκεν (δοθί')*, *Ἀχαιοῖσιν δέ μέγα σθένος ἐμβάλ' ἐκάστω / καρδίῃ* remodelling has already been shown to have occurred, above p. 53f.; the indications were independent of the enjambement-argument.

³⁾ above, p. 27.

the trochaic caesura (e.g. Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, Τρώων ἵπποδάμων, νῆας ἐυσσέλωμος; οἶνον ἐν ἀμφιφορεῦσι, *μειλιχίοισι Φέπεσσι, νισσόμενον πόλεμόνδε) are likely to be very old and indeed we cannot imagine a diction devoid of such elements. Even if the examination is narrowed down to the single runover word,¹⁾ we find that the attributive type which qualifies or elaborates a preceding expression (Ἄτρείδης δς; οὐλομένην ἦ) probably has to be assigned to a rather ancient form of the formulaic tradition. Yet it is to be noticed that the cases examined above represent quite a special type²⁾ and with regard to them the question can be answered in the affirmative. Ruijgh has convincingly demonstrated that Ionic ἀτάρ is a much later and accordingly a far less formulaic element in epic diction than 'Achaean' αὐτάρ.³⁾ Now how does ἀτάρ behave towards the runover word? Of its 133 occurrences 54 are found after the first trochee⁴⁾ and 50 of these appear after a runover word,⁵⁾ accounting for 37,6 % of the total. This figure far exceeds the numbers indicating the use of ἀτάρ in other positions. Thus it appears that in Homer the word is primarily used to loosen the strict formulaic structure by means of enjambement. This point becomes all the more obvious when we compare the use of ἀτάρ after the first trochee with that of αὐτάρ after the first foot, whether dactylic or spondaic. Even if we include attributive extensions of the type χάλκεον, αὐτάρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε (Γ 335 = Π 136 = Τ 373) and μυρτοί, αὐτάρ δ τοῖσι τάφον μενοεικέα δαίνω (Ψ 29) which are of quite a different nature, the absolute number is found to be still lower than that for ἀτάρ:47. As αὐτάρ appears 768 times in Homer,⁶⁾ it turns out to be used after a runover word occupying the first foot in only 6,1 % of the cases. We have to infer, then, that after the formulaic diction had reached Ionia, the use of the runover word became much more frequent.⁷⁾ The cases in which ν-movable appears under the same conditions in verbal forms present a closely related aspect of the same development. In their actual Homeric form the expressions in question are not traditional; nor is the presence of ν-movable to be regarded as resulting from doubling

¹⁾ Figures are given by Bassett, *Emphatic Position*, 119 ff.

²⁾ Of course there are many other types. Parry labelled them all with the same formulaic tag, but from an evolutionary point of view the problem of their respective relations to the formulaic tradition would require a detailed study.

³⁾ *E.A.* 31-48.

⁴⁾ *ibid.* 45.

⁵⁾ the four exceptions being: Ἔκτορ, ἀτάρ σὺ (Ζ 86, 429), Ἔκτορ, ἀτάρ πῶν (Χ 331), ἔρχεν ἀτάρ τοι (ζ 69).

⁶⁾ Ruijgh, *ibid.* 31.

⁷⁾ Probably this tendency also asserted itself in the creation of expressions such as εἰπέμεν, αὐτάρ ἔπειτα (ψ 265) after the pattern of χάλκεον, αὐτάρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε and similar older types. Bassett, *o.c.* 145, notes the important part played by the "runover adjective, participle and adverb". Generally speaking these elements of the sentence, together with proper names and infinitives of the type ἔμμεναι, seem to reflect the more ancient types of runover patterns. The use of ἀτάρ after runover words is obscure. There is very little evidence for the modifi-

of consonants and subsequent "Geminaten-auflösung". Instead we have to do with a loosening of the formulaic structure, which took place at a relatively late and certainly Ionic stage of the development.¹⁾

G. MODIFICATION OF A NARRATIVE TYPE OF FORMULA?

The cases reviewed so far provide sufficient evidence to show that already at the stage of development represented by Homer (and probably at earlier stages too) spreading of *v*-movable was furthered by the gradual decomposition of older formulaic types. On the other hand we have found a few indications suggesting that the latter evolution was marked by elaboration of comparatively simple types—expressing elementary facts of heroic saga—into much more detailed and incidental descriptions. Hence the question presents itself whether some relation can be established between this tentatively identified phenomenon and the increasing use of *v*-movable. In view of the high degree of elaboration which is characteristic of the Homeric epics it is not to be expected that much evidence of this kind is to be found. Anyhow, whatever indications may have survived, an inquiry into this matter would require a separate and very thorough and systematic study. Therefore I confine myself to drawing attention to a single case which might reflect such a development.

Unless it is used to produce a specific stylistic effect, short-distance repetition of a single word is little more frequent in Homer, it seems, than in other poetry and prose. This is all the more remarkable since we have found that certain types of repetition must have been inherent in older phases of the formulaic and oral composition. It follows, then, that in those places in which repetition does not appear to be due to a particular stylistic motive, its presence results from the influence of existing formulae. This means that in such passages at least one of the elements is part of a traditional formula. Thus we find for example: *οἱ δὲ δὴ ἄλλοι / ᾤχοντ' ἄλλυδις ἄλλος* (ξ 24–25, cf. *ἄλλυδις ἄλλος* (-ον, -α, -η) *Λ* 486 etc., 12 ×), *ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ σὸν δὴ ἔργα κάκ' ἔμμαθεν, οὐκ ἐθελήσει / ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι* (ρ 226–27 = σ 362–63, cf. *ἔργον ἐποίχεσθαι* *Ζ* 492 ∼ *α* 358 ∼ *φ* 352) and *πλήξε κυβερνήτεω κεφαλῆν, σὸν δ' ὅστέ' ἄραξε / πάντ' ἄμυδις*

cation of prototypes and most of the cases may be ascribed to "free" innovation, the poet expressing an exegetic or elaborating addition in a form more recent than the types employed by earlier poets (*Ἀτρείδης, δς; χάλκειον, αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα* etc.), cf. Kirk *S.H.* 323 ff., and the case of *ἦην*, below p. 122 f.

¹⁾ Though it is impossible to trace the spreading of *τοῖσω δ'*, there is evidence to show that in this case too we have to do with a comparatively recent evolution, see below, p. 137 f. Here it will suffice to point out that the formulae

$$\omega\varsigma \epsilon\varphi\alpha\tau' \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{'Αλκίνοος} \\ \text{'Αμφίνομος} \\ \text{'Αντίνοος} \end{array} \right\}, \text{ τοῖσω } \delta' \text{ ἐπιήνδαε μῦθος} \begin{array}{l} \nu \text{ 16} \\ \pi \text{ 406, } \nu \text{ 247} \\ \sigma \text{ 50, etc., } 4 \times, \end{array}$$

come within a relatively recent category (below, *ibid.*; it is noteworthy that they

κεφαλῆς (cf. *M* 384–85, θλάσσε δὲ τετράφαλον κενέην, —) in *μ* 412–13, where the poet elaborates on an obviously recent and non-traditional expression (πλήξε κυβερνήτεω κεφαλῆν) by using a probably formulaic combination (σὸν δ' ὄστ' ἄραξε πάντ' ἄμυδις (Aeolic?) κεφαλῆς). On the other hand we have seen that at an earlier stage of the tradition anaphoric repetition of a preceding noun by means of the type **Αλτης δς*, **Ιδης δς*, **Νιφειδς δς*, **Ηετίων δς* must have been familiar to the singers. Now let us look at *τ* 391–93:

μή εἰ λαβοῦσα

οὐλήν ἀμφράσσαιτο καὶ ἀμπαδὰ ἔργα γένοιτο.
 νίξε δ' ἄρ' ἄσσον ἰοῦσα ἀναχθ' ἑόν, αὐτίκα δ' ἔγνω
 οὐλήν, τήν ποτέ μιν σῦς ἤλασε λευκῶ ὀδόντι.

The poet does not say: “Eurycleia too sat down, took her master's feet and washed them” — as was to be expected in Homeric style — but simply states: *νίξε δ' ἄρ' ἄσσον ἰοῦσα ἀναχθ' ἑόν* —. It is unlikely that here we have to do with an abbreviated version of the tradition. It is much more probable that once the saga was transmitted by the singers in the form of an enumeration of the main events and that one of these older formulaic versions is reflected in 391–93. This, for the reasons just mentioned (*οὐλήν* — *οὐλήν, τήν*) seems true, at any rate, of 394. Now the story of the scar is mentioned in a slightly different form in the lines:

οὐλήν, τήν ποτέ με σῦς ἤλασε λευκῶ ὀδόντι *φ* 219
 τήν ἐν Παρνησιῶ μ' ἔλασεν σῦς “ “ *ω* 332
 ὧς μιν θηρεύοντ' “ “ “ “ *τ* 465

Here, however, it is narrated by Odysseus himself, who tells it in direct speech in *φ* 219, *ω* 332, and is described reporting it in *τ* 465. It is extremely unlikely that in their actual form these three lines are traditional. They all seem to have developed from *οὐλήν, τήν ποτέ μιν σῦς ἤλασε λευκῶ ὀδόντι*. The modification of this verse is very slight in *φ* 219 but is nevertheless revealed by the irregular lengthening of *με*. In the other two lines it has been carried much further and in view of the phenomena discussed above it does not seem a coincidence that in these very lines the transposition of *σῦς ἤλασε λευκῶ ὀδόντι* into *ἔλασεν σῦς λευκῶ ὀδόντι* is accompanied by the use of *ν*-movable.¹⁾

are confined to the *Odyssey*). It seems that Homer's predecessors (note the observance of the digamma) created this type in order to be more specific than their non-Ionian forerunners, thus almost relegating to oblivion the 'equivalent' formula

ὧς φάτο· τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσι **Fe*Φαδὸτα μῦθον ἔειπε *I* 173, σ 422

(on *εαδὸτα* see Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 20, 423, on formulae rivalled by more recent combinations above, p. 36, 38, below, p. 127, 135 f., 146 with notes.

¹⁾ cf. *βουκολέεσκεν βοῦς*, *Αφρ.* 55, *ἔχεν πολυήρατος ἦβη*, *Αφρ.* 225 (above, p. 80 f.).

LINGUISTIC, PROSODIC AND STYLISTIC PECULIARITIES
RESULTING FROM A CORRESPONDING TREATMENT OF
FORMULAIC PROTOTYPES

If we were right in ascribing the development of more recent expressions from older prototypes to specific tendencies which asserted themselves in the course of the evolution, it is to be expected that the same trends should have left traces in other features of epic verse-making. If such symptoms can indeed be shown to exist, the development suggested by the examination of some expressions marked by quantitative metathesis, loss of digamma and use of ν -movable will receive independent confirmation. In this chapter, therefore, I propose to deal with certain phenomena which present themselves under the same or similar conditions as the cases discussed in the foregoing part of this inquiry. I should like to confess at the outset that I have not set myself the task of studying the whole of Homeric poetry from this point of view. Hence the expressions that will be examined below are probably only samples of the relevant material.

The phenomena in question will be dealt with under the same headings as those examined in the preceding chapters. It is superfluous to say that it is in the nature of things that some of them come within two or more categories, so that the classification has no intrinsic value whatever.¹⁾ As to declension and conjugation it will suffice to refer to some examples given by Witte and Parry, since the effect of these two types of change is generally recognised. Of an anomaly caused by (C) the substitution of a more familiar word for an older component of a formula I have not been able to find a wholly convincing example.

A. DECLENSION OF FORMULAE

εὐρέα πόντων (Z 291, I 72, ω 118) < *εὐρέι πόντω* (a 197, etc., 6 \times),

see Witte, *R.E.* VIII, 2 (1913), 2225, 2236 f.

μέρορες ἄνθρωποι (Σ 288) < *μερόπων ἀνθρώπων* (A 250, etc., 9 \times),

see Witte, *ibid.* 2223, Parry, *Form.* 11,

etc.

B. CONJUGATION OF FORMULAE

ἐρύσσετε ἠπειρόνδε (κ 403) < *ἐρύσσομεν* (\sphericalangle **Φερυσσέμεν*, above, p. 60 f).

¹⁾ *θανεῖν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν*, H 52, may have been developed from *θάνων καὶ πότμον ἐπέσπον* (λ 389 = ω 22) by conjugation or from *θανέειν καὶ πότμον ἐπισπεῖν* (δ 562, ϵ 308 \sphericalangle μ 342 \sphericalangle ξ 274) by permutation. On the other hand the ending-*εῖν* of the thematic acrist *ἐπισπεῖν* (Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 489) suggests that this P₂ formula itself is a secondary creation. Does it go back to *θάνων καὶ πότμον ἐπίσπη* (B 359, O 495, Y 337), / **ἐπέσπον*, / **ἐπέσπε*? (cf. γ 134, etc.).

ἤπειρόνδε (κ 423), cf. ἐρύσσαμεν (∞ *Φερυσσέμεν) εἰς ἄλα δῖαν, δ 577, λ 2 (above, p. 60 f.), see Parry, *Form.* 11 f., Witte *ibid.* 2236 f., etc.¹⁾

C. AN ARCHAIC CONSTITUENT OF A FORMULA IS REPLACED BY A MORE FAMILIAR FORM

δοκεῖ εἶναι ἄριστα (I 103, etc., 5 ×) < *δέατ'(ο) ἔμμεν ἄριστα?

see below, p. 144.

ἔξετο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνῳ (O 150, σείσατο Θ 199) < *ἔξετο δ' ἐν θρόνῳ?

οἱ < ,, ,, ,, κλισμῶ (Ω 597, δ 136)?

see below, p. 144 f.

D. A FORMULA IS SPLIT BY THE INTRODUCTION OF ANOTHER WORD

It is well-known that the original sense of κορύσσω, 'to furnish with a helmet' ²⁾ has become outworn in Homer and that the word is often used in the general sense of 'to arm', e.g. in *T* 397–98: *δπιθεν δὲ κορυσσάμενος βῆ Ἀχιλλεύς / τεύχεσι παμφαίνων*. This is of course a normal development, which is also found with *θωρήσσω* and other verbs. Yet in one place in the *Odyssey* we are confronted with a kind of employment showing an aspect of this evolution which is peculiar to the formulaic diction and can only partly be explained as resulting from 'normal' extension of meaning and by figurative use. The original narrower sense of the verb has, significantly enough, been preserved in the linguistically

¹⁾ The complicated case of *δέσσαμεν* etc. seems to provide us with some indications about the extent to which the formulaic diction was altered in its closing stages and of the tendencies that were operating in Homeric times (cf. **ισασιν*, above, p. 77, 90 f.):

νύκτα μὲν δέσσαμεν, χαλεπὰ φρεσὶν ὀρμαίνοντες	γ 151
οὐποτ' ἐπ' ἠπείρου νύκτ' ἄσσαμεν, ἀλλ' ἐνὶ πόντῳ	π 367, v.l. δέσσαμεν
πολλὰς γὰρ δὴ νύκτας ἀεικέλιω ἐνὶ κοίτῃ / ἄσσα	τ 341–42

Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 70, lists *δέσσαμεν* among the cases of so-called metrical lengthening (*ἀκάματος*, etc.) and explains *ἄσσα* as resulting from analogy. In τ 342, however, *ἄσσα* is a runover word of the type *ἀεῖδει*, *λανθῆ* (below, p. 122), *ἔλθησιν*, *τεθνήσων*, etc. (above, p. 104 f.), so the treatment of the archaism seems to be due to modification. The same applies to the contraction in *ἔσσαμεν*, π 367, cf. *μαμῶσιν* (above, p. 102), *λανθῆ* (below, p. 122), *ἵππους ἀρσίοδας* (below, p. 133), etc. Yet it is very unlikely that *νύκτ' ἄσσαμεν* comes from *νύκτα μὲν δέσσαμεν*; at any rate the latter phrase itself seems to be a secondary creation (on introduction of *μὲν* see above, p. 55 ff.). Owing to the scarcity of the Homeric data the prototype(s) of the three expressions cannot be established, but a few possibilities may be suggested, e.g. 1. (*ἔνθα δὲ*) *νύκτ' ἄεσαν(-σαι)* (γ=490=ο 188; ο 40); 2. in view of the archaic nature and the etymology of the word (Bechtel, *Lex. s.v.*) and of the v.l. in π 367 (Bechtel, *ibid.*): a) **νύκτας* (**νυκτα δ'*) *δέσσαμεν* (< **δέσσεμέν?* **δέσσεμέναι?* cf. *νῆα ἐρύσσαμεν*, **Φερυσσέμεν*, above, p.60 f.); b) **νύκτας ἄεσαν(-ε)*, cf. *νύκτας ἰανων* (I 325, 470, τ 340), **νύκτα*—*ἄεσαν(-ε)*. If this argument should be correct, conjugation (in addition to shifting, separation and enjambement) is likely to have brought about some of the modifications. On the disappearance of ancient formulae see below, p. 140 f.

²⁾ cf. e.g. Trümpy, *o.c.* 47 f.

ancient formula (*δοῦρε δύω κεκορνθμένα χαλκῶ*¹) and is probably at the root of the equally ancient formula (*βῆ δὲ διὰ προμάχων, ἦσαν ἐς πόλεμον κεκορνθμένους(-μένοι) αἴθοπι χαλκῶ*²), which may go back to the period when the body-shield and the helmet were the only pieces of armour worn by a warrior.³) At all events the heroes described by the latter expression (Hector (3 ×), Aeneas, Menelaus, Odysseus, Idomeneus and Meriones) are all prominent (and probably even Mycenaean) figures and in Homer the bronze-plated (*χαλκήρης*) helmet is an essential (and perhaps even the most conspicuous) part of a hero's accoutrement when he is going into battle. In *φ* 431–434, however, Telemachus does not put on a helmet. He takes only his sword and his spear and then posts himself beside his father's seat *κεκορνθμένος αἴθοπι χαλκῶ*. Elsewhere *κορύσσειν* always includes putting on a helmet, here it does not. Does *φ* 434 only show an extreme but 'normal' extension of its meaning? If we did not know that *κεκορνθμένα χαλκῶ* and *κεκορνθμένος αἴθοπι χαλκῶ* were ancient formulae referring to 'helmet', this would be a natural assumption. As it is, the verse contains what might be called an involuntary metonymy, brought about by the employment of an old formula which was designed for other circumstances.

It would require a separate study to examine the part this phenomenon plays in Homer.⁴) The foregoing example has only been quoted because it is typical of a relatively late stage of development. Let us now look at *P* 504:

πρίν γ' ἐπ' Ἀχιλλῆος καλλίτριχε βήμεναι ἵππω.

The use of *ἵπποι* for 'chariot' seems to have originated from military terminology rather than from a stylistic tendency towards metonymy as is found in choral lyric, in tragedy and in Augustan Latin poetry. It is likely to come within the same category as M.H.G. 'rant' (= shield), modern E. 'rifle', 'rifles', 'tank', Fr. 'pantalon rouge' and many similar terms. At all events such formulae as *ἀφ' (ἐξ, καθ') ἵππων ἄλτο χαμᾶζε* (4 ×) were certainly created before Homer's time so that in the *Iliad* the trope could hardly have been more striking than *βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη* and suchlike archaisms. *P* 504 is something quite different, however. Here the wording is queer and from a purely literary point of view K. Meister is right in calling *καλλίτριχε* a "störendes Beiwort".⁵) Yet the

¹) *Γ* 18, *Α* 43, *Χ* 125.

²) *Δ* 495 etc., 7 ×; *Ν* 305. Here *χαλκῶ* may refer to the Mycenaean o-pa-wo-ta (cf. Homeric *χαλκήρης*), see above p. 99.

³) Trümpy's mentioning of *H* 206 and *T* 397 in this connection (o.c. 48 "ist überhaupt nur Schild und Speer gemeint) is an oversight, cf. *H* 207, *T* 398.

⁴) cf. e.g. *ἐπὶ ζείδωρον ἄρουραν* in *μ* 386, *τ* 593 as contrasted with *φέρει ζείδωρος ἄρουρα*, *δ* 229, *ι* 357, *θρέψε ζείδωρος ἄρουρα*, *λ* 309. This employment is the more notable as the poet had at his disposal an equivalent formula *ἐπὶ (ἀνά) χθόνα πολυβότειραν*, *Γ* 265, *Α* 619, *τ* 408, *ἐπὶ χθονὶ πολυβοτείρη*, *Γ* 89, etc., 7 ×. On similar cases suggesting a secondary development see below, p. 127, 135f.

⁵) o.c. 28.

strained character of the phrase is not primarily due to the poet joining an adjective in its proper sense to a noun used figuratively as in Sophocles' *ἐγὼ σκοτώσω βλέφαρα καὶ δεδορκότα*, *Ai.* 85, and in innumerable similar expressions of Attic tragedy. In *P* 504 the poet broke up the formula *καλλιτριχας Ἴππους* (*E* 323 etc., 11 ×) by inserting *βήμεναι*. From a literary point of view he obtained the same result as Sophocles did, but it goes without saying that his poetic impulse differed *toto caelo* from the tragedian's conception. The metonymy created in *P* 504 is as 'involuntary' as that found in *φ* 434, and is also due to the influence of pre-Homeric formulae. Both cases are late and in *P* 504 the recent development manifests itself, just as in *Ἰδεῶ θ' δς, πάντεσσι δ' ἀνάσσειν, δέπας λάβεν ἀμφι κύπελλον*, etc. in the separation of the component parts of a formulaic prototype.

Our analysis of the phenomenon observed in *P* 504 throws some light on another aspect of the evolution of epic diction. In the form of Ionic which is known to us, the dual is lacking, and it is sometimes contended that its absence was characteristic of this particular dialect. However this may be, it is uncertain whether at the late stage marked by the splitting up of *καλλιτριχας Ἴππους*, the dual still existed in spoken East Ionic. Yet *P* 504 shows that in Homer's time the singers would use it spontaneously themselves (and did not merely adopt it from tradition) when its employment was conducive to epic verse-making. Thus we are confronted with the problem of archaisation in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. In the cases discussed so far we ran little risk of mistaking archaising expressions for authentic ancient formulae. The problem becomes relevant, however, when we turn to what may prove to be another instance of recent separation of the component parts of a formula.

Whatever may be the explanation of *-ει* in singular datives of *i*-stems in Homer, I do not see any reason to recur to an Indo-European hypothesis.¹⁾ Most of them do not occur in any traditional connection whatever (cf. e.g. *λ* 430 *κουριδίῳ τεύξασα πόσει φόνον*) and in those which may be considered to do so *-ει* may have replaced *-υ* (i.e. *-ι-γ'*), cf. *ἐν πόλει ἄκρη* (*Z* 88, 297, 317; *H* 345), *ἄρος πόλει ἀμφικαλύψαι* (*-ειν, -η*) (*θ* 569, *ν* 152, 158, 177, 183).²⁾ Moreover the possibility is not to be excluded that *-ει* (cf. *ἐπὶ Δυνάμει*, Teos, after 479 B.C., Miletus, 450 B.C.)³⁾ is genuine Ionic and relatively recent (< *-η?*).

¹⁾ The possibility is considered by Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I, 572, n. 2 and by Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 217, n. 2.

²⁾ These 'formulae' do not look particularly ancient. It may be significant, moreover, that they occur in a part of the *Iliad* which is at the same time 'recent' and characteristic of Homer's own treatment of the Trojan saga (the same applies to *X* 172 *ἐν πόλει ἀκροτάτῃ*) and in the Odyssean story about Poseidon surrounding the island of the Phaeacians with a mountain-range, a tale which, though certainly an integral part of our *Odyssey*, also seems to be very late.

³⁾ Schwyzer, *Del.* 710, 726.

Let us now compare the following passages:

a.	<i>ἐν δ' οἶνον ἔχευε</i> ¹⁾	γ 40
	<i>χρυσείῳ δέπαι</i> ^P , <i>δειδισκόμενος δὲ προσηύδα</i>	41
b.	<i>οἶνον ἔχουσ' ἐν χειρὶ μελίφρονα δεξιτερῆφι</i>	Ω 284
	<i>χρυσέῳ ἐν δέπαι</i> ^P , <i>ῥφρα λείψαντε κιοίτην</i>	285
	<i>στῆ δ' Ἰππων προπάροιθεν</i> ^T , <i>ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε</i>	286
c.	<i>οἶνον ἔχων ἐν χειρὶ μελίφρονα δεξιτερῆφι</i>	ο 148
	<i>χρυσέῳ ἐν δέπαι</i> ^P , <i>ῥφρα λείψαντε κιοίτην</i>	149
	<i>στῆ δ' Ἰππων προπάροιθε</i> ^T <i>δειδισκόμενος δὲ προσηύδα</i>	150

The cause of the shortening of *δει-(*δη-)* in ο 150 is perfectly clear. The archaic P₂ formula *δειδισκόμενος δὲ προσηύδα* (< *δηδισκόμενος δὲ ποταύδα?)²⁾ was originally meant to link up with *χρυσείῳ δέπαι*(*-ει?) (or with the possibly more recent formulae *χρυσέῳ ἐν δέπαι*, *ἐν δέπαι χρυσέῳ*). The insertion of the two hemistichs *ῥφρα λείψαντε κιοίτην* / *στῆ δ' Ἰππων προπάροιθε* did not entail any prosodical anomaly in Ω 286, because it was rounded off with the T₂ formula *ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε*. However, in ο 150 where the use of the two hemistichs is somewhat careless and mechanical,³⁾ the employment of the archaic formula after the trochaic caesura brought about the deformation of an ancient word which had vanished from current speech.⁴⁾

It is generally recognised that *πολέσει* as opposed to *πολέεσσι* and *πολέσι* is an artificial form.⁵⁾ It is found only in the *Iliad* (3 ×). Two of the hemistichs in which it appears are closely related:

<i>Δευκαλίων δ' ἐμὲ τίκτε, πολέσσ' ἄνδρεσσι(ν) ἄνακτα</i>	N 452
<i>οἰκία ναιετάασκε</i> , , , <i>ἀνάσσων</i>	P 308,

and the presence of the form is all the more surprising because it occurs in what may be safely regarded as an ancient formulaic type. However, if we remember the way in which P₂ and T₂ formulae were found to have been interchanged and adapted in the process,⁶⁾ the solution of the problem lies in:

¹⁾ On this instance of neglected digamma see above p. 57.

²⁾ Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 108, Ruijgh, *E.A.* 150.

³⁾ Actually no libation takes place. After Telemachus has answered Menelaus' address, the eagle appears. It is worth noting that, in contrast with Priam in Ω 281 ff., Telemachus and his companion have already mounted their chariot. Was T. really meant to perform the libation under these circumstances? Of course it is easy to delete 149b-150a, but *στῆ δ' Ἰππων προπάροιθε* is obviously intended to visualise the scene. Hence the passage is probably to be regarded as a rather carelessly abbreviated version of a traditional theme of leave-taking. In Ω the same motif is worked out in detail. Note that, here too, an eagle appears, this time, however, at Hector's special entreaty. Do we have to do with the effects of oral composition in ο? In their present form neither the Ω-passage nor the ο-version seems very old.

⁴⁾ Bechtel, *ibid.* L. Meyer's conjecture *πάροιθ' Ἰππων* is characteristic of the purely philological approach of former generations.

⁵⁾ cf. Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 207.

⁶⁾ above, p. 61 ff.

δς τέκετ' Ὀρσίλοχον, πολέεσσ' ἀνδρεσσι(ν) ἀνακτα *E* 546,
 cf. Θήβη Ὑποπλακίη, Κιλίκεσσ' ,, ἀνάσσω *Z* 397.¹⁾

Just as in the cases of *τε καὶ Ἥλιδα διὰν ἔναιον* (*B* 615), (*τε*) *καὶ ὦ πεπλήγετο μηρῶ* (*M* 162, *O* 397, *v* 198), *δεδισκόμενος δὲ προσήυδα* (*o* 150) etc., the poet appears to have adapted an original P₂ formula in order that it could serve after the trochaic caesura.

In *P* 236

νήπιοι ἦ τε πολέεσιν ἐπ' αὐτῶ θυμὸν ἀπηύρα

the particle *τε* might be regarded as a later addition. Yet in view of the parallels for *ἦ τε* given by Denniston, it is safer to assume that the expression is authentic and that here too we have to do with modification of an ancient prototype, which had the form **πολέεσσι(ν) ἐπ' αὐτῶ θυμὸν ἀπηύρα*.

It seems, however, that we can pursue the search still further. The gen. plur. of *πολύς* is found 12 × in Homer. It occurs 7 × before the penthemimeris (e.g. *ἀνθρώπων πολέων*, *Σ* 467, *ι* 352) and in all the remaining cases always follows it, viz. in:

<i>κτεῖνε μεταίσσων^P,</i>	<i>πολέων δ' ἀπεινύτο ποιήν</i>	<i>Π</i> 398
<i>πάντοσε δινεῖσθην^P,</i>	<i>,, κατὰ ἔθνος ἐταίρων</i>	<i>P</i> 680
<i>ἔσθλὸν Ὀτρυντείδην^P,</i>	<i>,, ἡγήτορα λαῶν</i>	<i>Υ</i> 383

and in:

<i>ᾧσαιτ' Ἀργείους^P,</i>	<i>,, δ' ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο</i>	<i>E</i> 691
<i>ᾧσαιτο προτὶ ἄστν^T</i>	<i>πολέων ,, ,, ,, ,,</i>	<i>Π</i> 655

The combination *προτὶ ἄστν* (23 × *Il.*, 7 × *Od.*) is certainly traditional and appears mostly before the trochaic caesura (26 ×).²⁾ In *Π* 655 it has replaced a constituent of a P₁ expression and this has entailed synzesis in *πολέων*. So here again we find an adaptation of an original P₂ formula of the same kind as in the case of *πολέεσσι* becoming *πολέεσι*. In view of the structure of *E* 546 etc., and of what we have found about separation of the constituents of a formula, we may well ask, moreover, if *P* 236, *E* 691 and *Π* 655 do not ultimately go back to an elementary prototype

*πολέεσσι δὲ θυμὸν *ἀπέφρα*

which, by means of conjugation, could be turned into

πολέων δ' ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο.

¹⁾ The presence of *Ὀρσίλοχος* (*Ὀρτίλοχος* Zen., cf. *γ* 489, *o* 187, where the older form *Ὀρτίλόχοιο* is found as a variant) and of the Cilicians may be significant. They are likely to belong to the oldest strata of the heroic legends that found their way into Homer. For the Cilicians we may compare Nilsson's illuminating argument about the Lycians (*H.M.*, 261 f.). Cilicia too was a centre of Mycenaean colonisation (*ibid.* 97).

²⁾ e.g. *ἄφορρον προτὶ ἄστν* (*M* 74, *Π* 376), *ἀλλ' ἴομεν προτὶ ἄστν* *Σ* 266, etc., cf. *περὶ ἄστν, ἀνά ἄστν* etc. On synzesis see p. 32 ff., 105, 116, cf. Witte, *Die Vokal-kontraktion bei Homer*, Glotta IV (1913), 211 ff.

If this inference should be correct, the testimony of *πολέεσσ' ἄνδρεςσι *Φάνασσε* (-ειν, -ων etc.) and *πολέεσσι δὲ θυμὸν ἀπέφρα would tend to show that part of the Aeolic element did not enter the diction piecemeal and occasionally, but that some Aeolic forms at least belong to early and basic strata.¹⁾ This is perhaps not devoid of interest, since most of the combinations in which ἄμμες, ἄμμε, ὕμμες, ὕμμε etc., appear do not look impressively formulaic and because a line such as

εἰδόσιν ὕμμ' ἐρέω πᾶσιν, φίλοι, ὡς ἔτι καὶ νῦν Ψ 787

clearly shows that Homer (and probably his Ionian predecessors too) could 'Aeolise' as well as archaïse.²⁾

So far we have identified a number of cases in which original P₂ formulae were turned into T₂ formulae after spoken Ionic had lost the digamma (καὶ εἶματα σιγαλόεντα, καὶ ὦ πεπλήγετο μηρῶ, etc.) and certain forms had become strange to the singers, (δεδισκόμενος δὲ προσήυδα, πολέεσσ' ἄνδρεςσιν ἀνάσσων).³⁾ We have also found an original T₂ formula (ἔπος δ' ὄλοφυνδόν ἔειπε) replaced by a more recent combination (ὄλοφυνδόμενος δ' ἔπος ηὔδα).⁴⁾ A development of the latter kind is to be observed in the creation of a few expressions beginning with βαθέην and βαθέης. Whether τρηχέην, etc., in Herodotus and Hippocrates⁵⁾ are really hyper-ionicisms I do not feel competent to decide, but in *II* 766 Nauck's conjecture βήσσησι βαθὺν for βήσσης βαθέην is certainly to be rejected.⁶⁾ The development becomes perfectly clear when we compare

	οὔρεος ἐν βήσσης βαθέην πελεμιζέμεν ὕλην	<i>II</i> 766
with	οὔρεσι μαίνηται, βαθέης ἐν τάρφεσιν ὕλης	<i>O</i> 606 ⁷⁾
and with	ἐτραφέτην ὑπὸ μητρὶ βαθείης	„ „ <i>E</i> 555
	οὐ μὲν γὰρ τι φύγεσκε	„ βένθεσιν „ ρ 316, etc. ⁸⁾

Here the process, which up to now could only be ascertained by deduction is, as it were, developing before our eyes. After the development of East Ionic had created genitives with a short penult, the older locative-type βαθείης τάρφεσιν (βένθεσιν) ὕλης was turned into βαθέης ἐν τάρφεσιν ὕλης in order to serve after the penthemimeris and the latter expression was, in its turn, declined in *II* 766.⁹⁾

1) On this question see below, p. 148 ff.

2) above, p. 115, below, p. 135.

3) above, p. 117 f.

4) above, p. 66.

5) Schwyzer, *Gr.Gr.* I, 474 n. 2 cites inscriptional **Hδέη*.

6) *βαθέαν* (v. Leeuwen) is acceptable, but not necessary, see below.

7) The forms in -έης and -έη are of course authentic Ionic, cf. e.g. Thumb-Scherer, o.c. 253, where some epigraphical evidence is given.

8) cf. also *βαθέης ἐξάλλεται ἀλῆς E* 142, *βαθέης δ' ἐφθέγγατο δίνης Φ* 213, and, on the other hand, *βαθείης ἐντοθεν ἀύλης ι* 239, 338, *βαθείης βένθεσι λίμνης Ν* 32.

9) It may or may not be significant that the older type is never divided by a verbal form (but ζ 116: *βαθείη δ' ἔμβαλε δίνη*), whereas the recent form of the formula shows separation in three out of the four instances (*E* 142, *Φ* 213, *II* 766).

II. *Indications of other kinds of shifting*

The first line of the passage *K* 292-94 = γ 382-84

σοὶ δ' αἶ ἐγὼ ῥέξω βοῦν ἦνιν, εὐρυμέτωπον
ἀδμητήν, ἦν οὖ πω ὑπὸ ζυγὸν ἤγαγεν ἀνήρ·
τήν τοι ἐγὼ ῥέξω, χρυσὸν κέρασιν περιχεύας

has raised much controversy from several points of view. Chantraine thinks that we have to do with a stem in *-ī* and prefers to adopt the reading *ἦνιν* proposed by Tyrannion.¹⁾ Yet Sommer, referring to Herodian's own view (*τάχα οὖν καὶ τὸ ἦνιν ἐκτείνει ὁ Τυραννίων διὰ τὸ μέτρον*) rightly remarks: "Nach Gutdünnen zu akzentuieren, durfte er (T.) sich bei einem Wort ohne weiteres gestatten, das im Gebrauch der lebendigen Sprache schon seit vielen Jahrhunderten ausgestorben war".²⁾ Does it follow, then, that this kind of *στίχος λαγαρός* was not an exceptional phenomenon in epic verse, as Sommer would have it? Reviewing the whole problem of the prosodical form of the fourth foot Miss Th. Stifter³⁾ came to the conclusion that the only unambiguous instances of a trochee in this position are *ἦνιν* in *K* 292 = γ 382 and *βλοσυρῶπις* (*ἔστεφάνωτο*) in *A* 36. We would have to leave it at that, if Schwyzer had not convincingly shown that in *Z* 94 = 275 (∞ 309) (*βοῦς*) *ἦνις ἠκέστας ἱερουσέμεν, αἶ κ' ἐλεήση(ς)* the initial hemistich must have developed from [*βοῦν?*] *ἦνιν νηκέστην ἱερουσέμεν κτλ.*⁴⁾ This does not definitely prove that the *ι* in *ἦνις* was short but it does show that we have to do with declension of an earlier prototype designed for the singular. Now a general type like [*βοῦν?*] *ἦνιν νηκέστην ἱερουσέμεν(-ομεν) αἶ κ' ἐλεήση(ς)* with its ritual associations is certainly much older than the context in which *ἦνιν* appears in *K* and γ : the first person singular and the *v*-movable making position in *K* 294 = γ 384 do not look impressively traditional. Moreover, the Homeric expressions for 'ox(en)' after the penthemimeris are: *καλαὶ βόες εὐρυμέτωποι* (μ 262 ∞ 355), *ἔλικας βόας* ($<$ *βοῦς?*) *εὐρυμετώπους* (λ 289) and, with a special meaning, *βόας* ($<$ *βοῦς?*) *ἄρσενας εὐρυμετώπους* (*Y* 495), cf. *βοῦν ἄρσενα πενταέτηρον* (τ 420). What, then, is likely to have happened? For one reason or another—probably because he had no singular-formula of the same metrical value as *ἔλικας βοῦς εὐρυμετώπους* at hand⁵⁾—the poet combined *βοῦν εὐρυμέτωπον* and *ἦνιν* in the same line. The prosodical anomaly, it seems, is to be ascribed to an alteration of the old sacral prototype **ἦνιν νηκέστην ἱερουσέμεν(-ομεν)* as a result of which *ἦνιν* came to be used as an adjective in γ 382.⁶⁾

1) Herodianus *Rel.* II, 71, 11, Lentz.

2) *Zur griechischen Prosodie*, Glotta I (1909), 210.

3) *Das Wernickesche Gesetz und die bukolische Dihärese*, Philol. LXXIX (1929-24), 342.

4) *Drei griechische Wörter*, Rh. M. LXXX (1931), 213; see also Leumann *o.c.* 53.

5) *καλὸν βοῦν εὐρυμέτωπον* would have the right measure (J. B. Hainsworth).

6) On the connection of *ἦνις* with *ἐνιαυτός* see Schwyzer *Gr. Gr.* I, 463 and Friisk *s.v.*

Of the origin of the closely related phenomenon found in *Γοργῶ βλοσυρῶπις ἔστεφάνωτο* (A 36) we can only say for certain that here, at any rate, a long *ι* is definitely out of the question (cf. *γλανκῶπις Ἀθήνη*, etc.). The verse is *λαγαρός* beyond any possible doubt. Further evidence is not available, so we can only indulge ourselves in speculation, but we are given some lead by two facts which, at first sight, look irreconcilable. On the one hand it has long since been recognised that in the description of Agamemnon's shield the couplets A 34–35 and 36–37 are inconsistent with one another.¹⁾ Moreover, the Gorgoneion was shown to be late *as a blazon* by Miss Lorimer.²⁾ The same scholar, however, was careful to add that the Gorgon as a mythical figure may be much older; it might even go back to the Bronze Age.³⁾ Now if this is correct, the Gorgon is likely to have been familiar to pre-Homeric singers and to have had a formula. It need not be stressed that the archaic nature of the epithet points in the same direction.⁴⁾ Again, this is only a surmise, but if it is correct the inference is clear: *Γοργῶ βλοσυρῶπις* has to be ranged with *γλανκῶπις Ἀθήνη*, *νεφεληγερέτα Ζεός*, *ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων*, *λευκώλενος Ἥρη* etc., etc. If so, the formula was originally devised to be used after the hephthemimeris. In the late passage A 33–37, be it Homeric or not, the formula was shifted from its original position and its shifting entailed a trochee in the fourth foot.

F. ENJAMBEMENT

1. According to their point of view scholars have either discussed the form *αἶδει* in ρ 519 as an instance of metrical lengthening or have connected it with the problems raised by the existence of *στίχοι ἀκέφαλοι* and, consequently, with the original prosodical structure of the hexameter.⁵⁾ The former explanation is a purely formal one and the latter is not relevant here. The development found in ρ 518–19 has a significant parallel in θ 514, where the verb is also detached from its formulaic context: *ἤειδεν δ' ὡς ἄστυ*—. Both *αἶδει* and *ἤειδεν* (with *ν*-movable making position) are due to the same kind of innovation and ρ 518–19 falls into line with β 166 (*πάντεσσιν*), etc. The older employment is exemplified, on the one hand, by

<i>Μουσάων, θ' αἶ ἄειδον</i>	<i>ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπι καλῆ</i>	A 604
<i>τοῖσι δ' αἰοδός αἶειδε</i>	<i>περικλυτός, οἱ δὲ σιωπῆ</i>	α 325
<i>ταυτ' ἄρ' „ „ „</i>	<i>„ „ „</i>	θ 83 = 367 = 521

¹⁾ cf. e.g. Leaf *ad loc.* and Miss Lorimer, *H.M.* 190.

²⁾ *ibid.* 481 f.

³⁾ See also Nilsson, *G.G.R.* I, 227 (who points out that the *πότνια θηρῶν* is represented a few times bearing a Gorgon's head).

⁴⁾ "Sehr altertümlich", Frisk, *s.v.*; cf. also Leumann, *o.c.* 147 f. (vulture-faced?).

⁵⁾ cf. K. Meister, *o.c.* 44 and Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 103, who ranges the phenomenon with the cases which "relèvent plutôt de la théorie du vers".

Φήμιος, ὅς ᾽ ἤειδε	παρὰ μνηστῆρσιν ἀνάγκη	α	154
Φημίω, ,, ,, ,,	μετὰ ,, ,,	χ	331

and, on the other, by such types as:

δ δ' Ἀχαιῶν νόστον ἄειδε	α	326
,, οἴτον ἄειδεις	θ	489
Δαναῶν κακὸν ,, ἄειδεν	α	350

and:

ἦτοι δ φορμίζων ἀνεβάλλετο καλὸν ,,	α	155 ~ θ 266
λίνον δ' ὑπὸ ,, ἄειδε	Σ	570

and perhaps by:

*ῆος ἀοιδὸς ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ,,	cf. ρ	358.
-------------------------------	-------	------

2. εἰς ὃ κε σὸν κῆρ /'ιανθῆ, χ 58-59. Again we find parallels: *O* 103, *Ψ* 598. In *O* 102-03 οὐδὲ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὀφρύσι κτανέησιν /'ιανθῆ the use of the verb in enjambement is entirely in accordance with its strained and non-traditional employment with *μέτωπον*: the phrase is a conspicuous instance of a drastic innovation. The other parallel, *τοιοῦτο δὲ θυμὸς /'ιανθῆ* (*Ψ* 597-98) shows how χ 58-59 came to be developed from its traditional prototype; it represents an intermediate stage between this phrase and the formulaic type found in

ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἰάνθη	Ω	321 = ο 165
μετὰ ,, ,, ,,	Ψ	600,
cf. ἰδοῦσά κε θυμὸν ἰάνθης	ψ	47

and in the variants

φίλον δέ οἱ ἦτορ ἰάνθη	δ	840
σὸ δὲ φρένας ἔνδον ἰάνθης	ω	382
,, ,, φρεσὶ σῆσιν ἰανθῆς	T	174. ¹⁾

3. ἦην, τ 283, ψ 316, ω 343.²⁾ It is completely immaterial whether this form is regarded as an artificial rhapsodic invention³⁾ or as a graphic alteration of ἦεν⁴⁾. Its use as a runover word may be due to "free" innovation in τ 283 and ω 343, but the starting-point of the development can still be discerned in ψ 315-16 οὐ δέ πω αἴσα φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἰκέσθαι / ἦην, since in phrases with αἴσα no form of εἶμι is required.⁵⁾ Nor do the prototypes contain it. They are represented by:

(before the trochaic caesura)	ἐπεὶ νύ τοι αἴσα	A	416
	,, ,, μοι ,,	ο	276
	ᾄσσα τοι ,,	ν	306
	ᾄσσα οἱ ,,	η	197

¹⁾ In χ 59 and T 174 the contraction is due to conjugation, cf. Witte, *Vokal-kontraktion* 216.

²⁾ It is perhaps significant that in A 808, where the form is not used as a runover word, a variant ἦεν is attested.

³⁾ Palmer in *C.H.* 120 n.

⁴⁾ The possibility is considered by Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 289.

⁵⁾ see above p. 104.

(between the bucolic diaeresis and the verse-end)	<i>οὐ νό τοι αἴσα</i>	<i>Π</i>	707
	<i>ῥσσα</i>	„ „	<i>ε</i> 206
	<i>ἔνθα οἱ</i>	„ „	<i>ε</i> 288
	<i>εἰ δέ μοι</i>	„ „	<i>Ω</i> 224

The case of *ψ* 315–16 is typical of the coexistence in Homer of highly archaic types (cf. *νό τοι αἴσα*)¹⁾ and most recent forms of development. Yet here again it should be remembered that the use of *ἔστιν* (with *ν*-movable making position)²⁾ as a runover word, though perhaps of older origin, marks a development which is essentially the same. It is equally characteristic of the evolution, just as *ἦειδεν* and *ἴανθη* are no less typical than *ἄείδει* and *ἴανθη̄*.

¹⁾ see Ruijgh, *E.A.* 56–65, 118 ff.

²⁾ discussed above, p. 104.

APPENDIX

The testimony of νεῶν, νεός, etc.

In the second chapter we found that the evidence for formulae originally built upon quantitative metathesis is extremely slight and from this we have inferred that, after the metathesis had begun to develop in East Ionic, oral composition came to an end so quickly that hardly any expression created out of the new material had time to attain a formulaic fixity.¹⁾ We noted, however, that the closely related phenomenon of antevocalic shortening of η in several forms of νηϋς presents a different picture. Even if we leave aside the expressions προπάρουθε νεῶν (*O* 746 etc., 3 ×) and ἀπάνευθε νεῶν (*A* 48 etc., 4 ×), there remain some substantial combinations which doubtless come within the definition of the formula accepted in the first chapter:

}		νεός ἀμφιέλσσης	η 252, etc., 5 ×
		νέας ἀμφιέλσσας	<i>P</i> 612, etc., 5 ×
}	cf.	νέες — ∪ ∪ ἀμφιέλσσαι	<i>N</i> 174 = <i>O</i> 549, η 9
		νεός κvanoπρωροιο	<i>O</i> 693, etc., 9 ×
}	cf.	νέας κvanoπρωρείους	γ 299
		νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων	<i>B</i> 91, etc., 7 ×
}	cf.	κατὰ (ποτι) κλισίας τε νέας τε	<i>A</i> 487, <i>Ξ</i> 392
		ἐπὶ πρόμνησι νέεσσι	<i>N</i> 333, etc., 4 ×
		ἐν ποντοπόροισι νέεσσι	<i>Γ</i> 46, 444
}	cf.	νέεσσ' ἐν ποντοπόροισι	<i>Γ</i> 240

Shipp thinks that "νεός, etc., is so common in Homer that it must be old, perhaps representing ναός, etc."²⁾ As far as I can see, however, there is no evidence for an early date of such an evolution apart from the frequency of the forms in Homer and one would suppose, moreover, that the original presence of intervocalic *F* should have counteracted this development. Therefore it seems much more probable that the cause of the difference in frequency is to be found in the fact that dissyllabic forms such as νηός, νηῶν, etc. lent themselves much more to innovation in hexameter poetry (cf. *ἦος, *τῆος)³⁾ than ἀγοράων, στήγομεν and the like. Yet this explanation, if correct, only accounts for the much greater frequency of the forms in question. We are still left with the problem of the disproportion in formulaic fixity which is found to exist between the νεῶν-, νεός-, νέας- expressions on the one hand and the combinations which contain metathesised forms on the other. Do we, after all, have to modify our approximate dating of the end of true oral composition?

¹⁾ above, p. 38, 69f.

²⁾ *Studies* 25.

³⁾ above, p. 34f.

The answer to this question depends on what evidence we can find for the existence of more ancient formulae from which the late forms listed above could have developed. If no such indications can be found, it will be safest to assume that these expressions were, so to say, created *ex nihilo*, and in that case we will have to revise the view put forth above.

It is best to start with the combinations of which *νέας* is a constituent, since this form seems to be even more recent than *νεός* and *νεῶν*.¹⁾ Now at an earlier stage the epithet *ἀμφιελίσσας* (in pos. 12) could, for metrical reasons, not immediately be preceded by 'ships'. Yet there is no reason whatever to regard the epithet itself as recent and since it is only applied to 'ships'²⁾ we have to consider the possibility that at an older stage vessels were called *ἀμφιελίσσας* in a more complex formula. Now we find

<i>ἐλπόμενος νῆας αἰρησέμεν</i>	<i>ἀμφιελίσσας</i>	Σ 260
<i>μηδὲ ἔα</i>	„ <i>ἄλαδ' ἐλκόμεν</i>	„ B 165 = 181.

Here the irregular lengthening of the ending suggests modification. Do we have to do with the remnants of such a complex formula in *P* 612 etc.? The elements *νῆας* and *ἄλαδ' ἐλκόμεν* are found together in:

<i>νῆας ἐνστέλμους ἄλαδ' ἐλκόμεν</i> ,	<i>ὄφρ' ἔτι μάλλον</i>	Ξ 97
„ „ „ „	<i>νῆας Ἀχαιῶν</i>	Ξ 106
„ „ „ „	<i>ἀμφιελίσσας</i>	I 683.

Since the bucolic diaeresis is a natural switch-point of formulae, it would seem that these lines testify to the pre-Homeric existence of a type

<i>νῆας ἐνστέλμους ἄλαδ' ἐλκόμεν</i>	a { $\overline{\cup\cup} - \cup$
	b { <i>ἀμφιελίσσας</i>

and that the type b is likely to have done duty as the plural of a formula we have already identified as a pre-Homeric prototype:

<i>νῆα</i> { $\cup - \overline{\cup\cup} - \cup$ }	* <i>Φερυσσέμεν εἰς ἄλα διαν</i> . ³⁾
--	--

Hence it is not necessary at all, to say the least of it, to presume that *νέας ἀμφιελίσσας* was created *ex nihilo* in a very late period and subsequently came to be employed as a formula. Both this expression and those found in Σ 260, B 165, 181 may be regarded as modifications of an ancient prototype; *νεός ἀμφιελίσσης* and *νέες - ἀμφιελίσσαι* are likely to be ascribed to declension of the derivative formula.

The expression *νέας κvanoπρωρέους* (γ 299) must be due to declension of *νεός κvanoπρόρωιο*, and the latter combination presents us with a similar problem as *νέας ἀμφιελίσσας*. Though with a single exception (*O* 693) it

¹⁾ On *νέες* see Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 225, Lejeune *o.c.* 225; the shortening in *νέας* is likely to be very late too, if we may judge from the extreme rarity of *νέα* (ι 283, see above, p. 59).

²⁾ *P* 612, γ 162, κ 91, ξ 258 = ρ 427.

³⁾ above, p. 60 f.

appears only in the *Odyssey*, it is found $9 \times$,¹⁾ so its formulaic nature is indisputable. Did Homer or one of his immediate forerunners create it and archaize in the process? This possibility cannot be ruled out, but after what we have found with regard to permutation of P_2 and T_2 formulae, things may be looked at from another point of view. The fact is that there actually exists a P_2 formula in Homer which is made up of the same words:

ιστόν δ' ἔστησεν	νηός κvanoπρώροιο	Ψ 852
ιστῶ ἐφεζομένη	„ „	Ψ 878
ιστόν ἀμαιμακέτην	„ „	ξ 311.

Is it a coincidence that in Ψ as well as in ξ we find the older form of the expression combined with *ιστός*? Ψ 878 is certainly occasional but the two other lines, and especially ξ 311, where *νηός κvanoπρώροιο* is preceded by an age-old archaism, may well be regarded as evidence for the formulaic nature of this combination at a time long before Homer. Do such expressions as *ἴθυσε* (*ἔκοφα, ἐξαπαάσσα, προπάροιθε, μετόπισθε, κατόπισθε*) *νεός κvanoπρώροιο* represent various kinds of late elaboration and do they show similar modifications of original P_2 formulae as were found to have brought about *καὶ εἶματα σιγαλόεντα, καὶ Ἥλιδα δῖαν ἔναιον, καὶ ὦ πεπλήγετο μηρῶ, ἠ' Ἐσπερίδες λιγύφωνοι*, etc.?

Such a development is all the more probable since we have found indications of the modernising influence exerted by the relatively great flexibility of verbal forms²⁾ and because the use of recent forms such as *νεός*³⁾ conferred a greater suppleness upon the hexameter. Further than this we cannot go, but so much is clear that there is no cogent reason to ascribe the frequent occurrence of *νεός κvanoπρώροιο* to a very late formulaic creativity.

The plural genitive *νεῶν* is found especially in *νεῶν ἀπο καὶ κλισιάων*, a formula which, in contrast with *νεός κvanoπρώροιο*, is confined to the *Iliad*. Do we have to do with an expression created—either by Homer or by one of his older contemporaries—by joining a brand-new form to a highly archaic one? If so, the latter is probably due to archaizing, for apart from the formula in question, *κλισιάων* appears only twice in the whole of Homeric poetry, and in one of these cases we find it preceded by an equally recent expression:

βάλλον, ἀμνόμενοι σφῶν τ' αὐτῶν καὶ κλισιάων *M* 155.⁴⁾

The structure of the other line in which *κλισιάων* appears points in a different direction:

ἔνθα κε λευγαλέως νηῶν ἀπο καὶ κλισιάων *N* 723.

¹⁾ ι 482 ~ 539, κ 127 = μ 148, λ 6, μ 100, 354, χ 465.

²⁾ above, p. 50f.

³⁾ above, p. 108f.

⁴⁾ This is the mss. reading; i.e. *σφέων αὐτῶν*? cf. Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 63.

But there is more. In the foregoing part of this inquiry it was tentatively suggested that the tendency to 'thriftiness', which is in the nature of oral composition, may, among other things, have been counterbalanced by the trend to use existing formulae in a slightly different context so that they became equivalents of other formulae.¹⁾ The same may apply to change of *form* and in this way φώνησέν τε and ποσὶν ταχέεσσι διώκων may have become rivals of Φεῖπέ τε μῦθον and ποσὶ κραιπνοῖσι μετασπών after ν-movable had entered the formulaic diction.²⁾ Now with regard to νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων it may be relevant that in the line

φεύγοντας προτὶ ἄστν νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων Ξ 146

the Trojans are described as *fleeing from the Achaean encampment* and that this is also the case in

προτροπάδην φοβέοντο μελαινάων ἀπὸ νηῶν Π 304.

Besides, it is difficult to see what difference it would have made, from a formulaic point of view, if in

αἴτις ἐπεσσεύοντο νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων Β 208

the poet has used μελαινάων ἀπὸ νηῶν, as he did in

ὄτρυνων πόλεμόνδε μελαινάων ἀπὸ νηῶν Ρ 383

and in πέμπων μ' ὦδ' ἐπέτελλε „ „ „ Ω 780,

especially since in Ω Priam has been received in Achilles' hut. It is noteworthy, moreover, that in 4 of the 7 lines in which the formula is used, the initial hemistichs have (ᾠσαισθε, ᾠσαιμεν, φεύγοντας, ἀφορρον) προτὶ ἄστν and that after this very expression an original P₂ formula was found to have been changed into a T₂ formula in

ᾠσαιτο προτὶ ἄστν, πολέων δ' ἀπὸ θυμὸν ἔλοιτο Π 655.³⁾

So, all things considered, preference should be given to the view that before the shortening of the η in νηῶν took place, the oral poets had at their disposal a P₂ formula νηῶν ἀπὸ καὶ κλισιάων and a T₂ formula μελαινάων ἀπὸ νηῶν for descriptions of the kind exemplified by Ξ 146 etc., and that, in Homeric or late pre-Homeric times, the latter was ousted, to a large extent, by a modification of the former. Something of this kind may also have happened to νηῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι (Π 239). The sense "gathering-place" is original⁴⁾ and it is much more likely that νεῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι (Ο 428 = Π 500, Τ 42, cf. μετ' ἀγῶνα νεῶν Υ 33) resulted from

¹⁾ above, p. 114 n. 4.

²⁾ With the hybrid expression ποσὶν ταχέεσσι compare ταχέεσσι πόδεσσι (Υ 189, Φ 564, ν 261), which is Aeolic in both elements; cf. also ἠδέα οἶνον ∼ οἶνον ἐρυθρόν, above, p. 48; Κρόνου παῖς ἀγκυλομήτεω ∼ πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, above, p. 35f; τάρφθησαν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτήτος ∼ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο, below, p. 135; ἐπι τ' ἤλυθεν ἀμβροσίη νύξ ∼ ἐπι τ' ἤλυθε νύξ ἐρεβενή, below, p. 146.

³⁾ above, p. 118.

⁴⁾ Schwyzer, *Gr. Gr.* I, 488, Frisk *s.v.* ἄγω.

modification of the former expression than that *νεῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι* was created out of two chronologically widely separated elements by a late singer. Besides, there are indications how this modification may have proceeded. Two out of the three occurrences of the recent form are found in

τεύχεα συλήσωσι, νεῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι πεσόντα *O* 428 = *Π* 500

and with its initial hemistich we may compare:

τεύχεα συλήσας	{	φερέτω κόλλας ἐπὶ νῆας	<i>H</i> 78
		οἶσω προτὶ Ἴλιον ἱρήν	<i>H</i> 82
,, συλήσων	{	Τρῶες δ' ἐπὶ δούρατ' ἔχευαν	<i>E</i> 618
		ἀλλ' οὐ λάθην Ἔκτορα δῖον	<i>O</i> 583
,, συλήτην	{	κεφαλὴν δ' ἀπαλῆς ἀπὸ δειροῆς	<i>N</i> 202

and on the other hand:

τεύχεα συλήσειε· μίνυθα δέ οἱ γένεθ' ὀρμή. *Δ* 466.

In *O* 428 = *Π* 500 the employment of the recent form seems, therefore, to be due to conjugation of a P_1 formula.

Just as *νεῶν ἀπὸ καὶ κλισιάων* is employed with no perceptible difference of meaning alongside *μελαινάων ἀπὸ νηῶν*, the expression *νέεσσ' ἐν ποντοπόροισι* (*Γ* 240) has an equivalent in *μελαινάων ἐπὶ νηῶν* (*E* 550 etc., 4 ×). Besides, in *Γ* 46 and 444, where the subject (Paris) is in the singular, *ἐν ποντοπόροισι νέεσσι* is used after the penthemimeris. On the other hand we find

ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήεσσι κορωνίσαι ποντοπόροισι	<i>B</i> 771 = <i>H</i> 229
ἡμεῖς δ' ,, ,, νεώμεθα ,,	<i>Γ</i> 283

and *ποντοπόρος νηῶς*, which is preceded by the archaic remnants *παρέπλω* (said of the Argo!) *μ* 69, *ἀπέπλω ξ* 339, *προσεπίλνατο ν* 95 (and by *ἤλυθε, ν* 161). It was probably the intention to lend more colour and grandeur to his descriptions which made a late Ionic poet disregard *ἐννεσέμων ἐπὶ νηῶν, μελαινάων ἐπὶ νηῶν* (*κόλλης ἐπὶ νηὸς εἰσις?* *λ* 508) and create new, semi-Aeolic expressions out of old formulaic material (*ἐν νήεσσι* 22 ×). The formula *ἐπὶ πρύμνησι νέεσσι* may have been developed from *νηὶ παρὰ* (*δ' ἐνὶ*) *πρύμνη* (*K* 35 etc. 7 ×) and *νησὶν ἐπὶ πρύμνησιν* (*O* 248 etc., 4 ×).

In the foregoing chapters I have advanced a few suggestions regarding the question what elements of epic poetry were especially subject to innovation and in what parts the singers were inclined to be conservative. Now the recent forms of *νηῶς* present some curious facts. It is not surprising that in the *Odyssey*, which is generally regarded as the later of the two poems and in fact shows remarkable signs of drastic innovation,¹⁾ the forms *νεός* and *νέας* as compared with *νηός* and *νῆας* are more frequent than in the *Iliad*: *νεός:νηός*, *Il.* 3:22, *Od.* 16:74; *νέας:νῆας*, *Il.* 6: ± 170,

¹⁾ e.g. in the handling of the names of Phaeacians (above, p. 32 n. 4), suitors (below, p. 137 f.) and herdsmen (below, p. 138 f.).

Od. 10:25. However, contrary to what one would expect, the proportions for *νεῶν*: *νηῶν*, *νέεσσι*: *νήεσσι* (not to speak of *νέεσσι*: *νησι*) and *νέες*: *νήες* are quite different: *νεῶν*: *νηῶν*, *Il.* 40:68, *Od.* 2:13, *νέεσσι*: *νήεσσι*, *Il.* 8:26, *Od.* 1:10; *νέες*: *νήες* *Il.* 9:32, *Od.* 4:18.

What is the explanation of this unexpected difference? We are given a hint by the distribution of the form *νέες* in the *Iliad*, for 5 out of the 9 cases appear in the Catalogue and here the numbers of the ships are certainly not traditional but fictitious (*πεντήκοντα* B 509, *τριήκοντα* 516 = 680, *ἐνετήκοντα* 602.¹) It may well be, then, that the proportionally high frequency of expressions containing *νεῶν* and *νέεσσι* is to be accounted for in a similar way. Now in what situations do most of these expressions appear? In most cases 'ships' are not mentioned in the *Iliad* as being put to sea or beached, as vessels that cross the sea and carry cargoes and men, but as the most prominent feature of the Achaean encampment. Hence it does not seem a coincidence that *νεῶν*, *νέας* and *νέεσσι* are relatively often found combined with 'huts': *νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων*, 7 ×, *κατὰ (ποτι) κλισίας τε νέας τε*, 2 ×, *κλισίῃσι μνησθέντες ἡδὲ νέεσσι* O 409. Though the poet mostly keeps to a more ancient way of composition (*κλισίας καὶ νῆας εἶσας* A 306, *κλισίας καὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν* Θ 220, etc., 5 ×, *θαῶς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν* A 12, etc., 10 ×, etc.), it is clear that Homer — and perhaps his immediate predecessors as well — introduced new situations in the Battle near the Ships,² especially in A, M, N, O, Π, and, in this respect, referred more freely to the Achaean encampment.³ As the analysis of the phenomena discussed above appears to show, not all the relevant expressions were brand-new. Since, however, most of the incidental phrases containing *νεῶν*, *νέας*, etc. cannot possibly be reduced to older prototypes, this remodelling must have been fairly extensive. Besides, it is unlikely that all these new expressions replaced older formulae in which 'ships' were mentioned, cf., for example,

τόσσα, μεσηγὺ νεῶν ἡδὲ Ξάνθοιο ῥοάων Θ 556

and:

μεσσηγὺς Σιμόεντος ἰδὲ „ „ Z 4.

Some replacement there may have been, but it seems probable that in many cases the changes are due to elaboration (and modification: see

¹) Though Page argues that the Catalogue is a substantially Mycenaean composition, even he admits that the numbers of ships are unreliable (*H.H.I.* 151-153) and are partly given in late forms (*δγδώκοντα*, *ἐνετήκοντα*).

²) cf. also *ἐπὶ πρόμνησι νέεσσι*, N 333, E 51, O 722, T 135.

³) Whatever one may think of the Achaean wall, it is remarkable that the only instance of a sigmatic aorist of *ἄλλομαι* is found in the lines

<i>Πριαμίδῃ,</i>	}	<i>δς πρώτος ἐσήλατο τείχος Ἀχαιῶν</i>	<i>M</i> 438
<i>κεῖται ἀνήρ,</i>	}		<i>Π</i> 558

Of course this does not necessarily tell against the authenticity of the passages in which the wall is mentioned, but it provides independent confirmation for the view that in the Battle near the Ships innovation plays a considerable part.

the case of νέας ἀμφιελίσσας) of older material (cf. *Z* 4) rather than to simple replacement of ancient formulae by new creations. A few generations before Homer, one may be sure, the traditional subject of the Battle near the Ships¹⁾ was treated by the singers in a terser, more succinct and less varied way than was done in the *Iliad*.

¹⁾ cf. Webster, *M.H.* 60, 171 and *pass.*

VI

THE LIMITATIONS OF THE METHOD INNOVATION AND CONSERVATISM

The object of the preceding inquiry was to ascertain how certain linguistic innovations affected the development of epic style and, in particular, entailed changes in and decomposition of the formulaic diction. To this end an analysis was attempted of certain expressions or types of expressions, to determine the structure of their presumable prototypes and to identify the conditions under which the latter were altered. We started with what appears to be the most recent feature of Homer's language, quantitative metathesis. Next we examined the influence exerted by the loss of the digamma in East Ionic, a development which, in so far as the great majority of epic words is concerned, cannot have preceded the metathesis by a considerable time and may in fact have overlapped it to a certain extent. Accordingly, for all the innovations we have found in these respects, the *terminus post quem* has to be put only a few generations before the composition of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It is different, however, with the changes which appeared to be closely bound up with the increasing use of *v*-movable by the epic poets. If, with regard to certain of its uses our premises about its belonging to a certain dialect are not at fault, the changes observed in chapter IV may range from the time at which the epic was taken up by Ionian singers up to the date at which the Homeric poems were composed.

One may wonder why, after having examined the evolution made possible by the development of quantitative metathesis and the loss of digamma, I at once turned to the study of the influence exerted by the use of *v*-movable. Would not it have been more appropriate to look for indications of modification resulting from contraction, the loss of the dual, the introduction of *ῆσαν*, *ἔβησαν*, etc., the development of the *θ*-aorist of the passive and similar linguistic phenomena? The answer to this question is that, for various reasons, such an inquiry would be fraught with too many uncertainties to hold out a prospect of not too hypothetical results.

It is beyond all doubt that Homer has many cases of contraction which are due to modification of older prototypes. We already came across an instance of late contraction in

μαιμῶσιν, καὶ μοι μένος ὄρορε, νέρθε δὲ ποσσίν N 78,¹⁾

and many other cases could doubtless be detected by a systematic study. In *ἠβάω* too the long *a* seems to be original²⁾ and accordingly we find *εἶθ' ὡς ἠβῶοιμι, βῆθ' ἔμπεδος εἶθ' H 157, etc., 4 ×, cf. ξ 503,*

¹⁾ above, p. 000.

²⁾ see K. Meister, *o.c.* 87 ff.; on the chronology of epic contraction *ibid.* 195, cf. above, p. 31 n. 1.

but in what is likely to be an abbreviated form of $\epsilon\iota\theta'$ ὡς ἠβῶοιμι (< αἰθ' ὡς ἠβῶοιμι) we meet

ἠβῶμ', ὡς ὅτ' ἐπ' ὠκυρόω Κελάδοντι μάχοντο H 133.

In *N* 78 the contracted form is found in a runover word. A similar feature appears in *T* 104, where, after a line ending in a conspicuous archaism,¹⁾

σήμερον ἄνδρα φώωσδε μογοστόκος Εἰλειθυία

we read

ἐκφανεῖ, δε πάντεσσι περικτιόνεσσιν ἀνάξει.

In this verse the runover word seems to have replaced a proper name or an adjective, thus invading a line of the ancient type exemplified by

**Ἀλτα*, } δε Λελέγεσσι φιλοπτολέμοισι } **Φανάσσει* cf. *Φ* 86²⁾
 **Ἀλτης*, } } **Φάνασσε*

That, further, contraction may also be due to conjugation of an older prototype is clearly shown by a comparison of

ἔσσεται, αὐτίκα δ' ὕμμε κατακτενεῖ δξέι χαλκῶ Ψ 412

with

κατατάμεν	}	I 458 = δ 700
ἀποκτάμεν		E 675
κατέκταθεν		„ „ E 558
κατέκτανον		ν 271
ἀπέκτανον		ξ 271 = ρ 440 ³⁾

For the large majority of the relevant expressions, however, no ancient prototypes can be identified beyond reasonable doubt. This does not only apply to cases such as

ὡς δ' ἴκετ' Ὀγγυγίην νῆσον Νύμφην τε Καλυψώ ψ 333

in which both the form of the version itself⁴⁾ and the expression *Νύμφην τε Καλυψώ* point to 'free' innovation. Even in passages containing genealogies – in which the singers tended to be comparatively traditional – we often look in vain for the prototypes from which contracted forms of nouns and proper names are descended. This is not only true of forms with irreducible *-ou* but also – though in this case the subsequent contraction is not likely to have occurred a considerable time before Homer – of forms in *-ω* resulting from loss of intervocalic *ι*.⁵⁾ The line λ 287, for example,

τοῖσι δ' ἐπ' ἰφθίμην Πηρῶ τέκε, θαῦμα βροτοῖσι,

1) Whatever may be the explanation of *μογοστόκος*, it seems improbable that the word is simply to be regarded as an artificial creation (as Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 95 thinks), the more so as *Εἰλειθυία* is of Mycenaean origin. Frisk, who accepts *δικασ-πόλος*, rejects *μογο(ν)σ-τόκος*.

2) above, p. 34.

3) above, p. 51 ff. More examples in Witte, *Vokalkontraktion*, 215 ff.

4) above, p. 49 ff., 90 f., 112 f.

5) see the examples given by Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 55.

is part of the illustrious and age-old Neleid tradition. Is the contraction to be explained by assuming that it contains a formula in which *Πηρώ* was originally the subject?¹⁾ We might point to

ἦ δὲ Διώνυσον Σεμέλη τέκε, χάσμα βροτοῖσιν *Ξ* 325,

to the workings of association observed by Parry, and, perhaps, to τὸν (δν) ἠύκομος τέκε Λητώ (*A* 36, *T* 413, λ 318), etc. Yet such a line of argument is clearly far too hypothetical.

As we have seen above, there is some evidence to show that verbal forms were even more susceptible of alteration than noun-epithet formulae and related expressions. Now here we come upon the most formidable obstacle of all, for we have no means of making out which of the forms that might reflect older athematic ones (e.g. τίθει, προσήυδα) are actually descended from these. It is the riskier to speculate about this origin as several contracted forms which cannot have replaced athematic ones occur in a formulaic context: δρῶ, for example, is occasional (*Γ* 234) but ζῶει(-ν) καὶ δρῶ(-ᾶν) φάος *Ἡελίοιο* appears 8 times (δ 540 = κ 498, Ω 558, δ 833 ∼ ξ 44 = ν 207, Σ 61 = 442.²⁾)

As to the dual we do not find ourselves in a much better position. There is reliable evidence to show that Ionian singers must have used it at a time when it had fallen into disuse in their own dialect.³⁾ On the other hand we cannot be sure that their Aeolic or 'Achaean' predecessors used it consistently everywhere. In this respect the absence of a form such as πόδε—whereas πόδες and πόδας are frequent (21 × and 84 × respectively, e.g. in πόδας ὠκὺς *Ἀχιλλεύς*, 31 ×)—is significant. Since it cannot be due to a dislike on the part of the Ionian singers, it is not to be ascribed to mere replacement of older formulae by younger ones. We have to infer, therefore, that already at an early stage the plural was employed instead of the dual in several cases. How are we to make out, then, which of the very numerous expressions showing inconsistent

¹⁾ above, p. 69; cf. *Ἀλέξανδρον θεοειδέα*, etc. (Witte, o.c. 219), *Ἰππικὸς ἀρσίοπος*, *Αφρ.* 211.

²⁾ It might be argued that the phrase ζῶει καὶ δρῶ φάος *Ἡελίοιο* developed from ζῶειν καὶ δρῶν φ. *Ἡ.* and that this hypothetical prototype could be of Aeolic origin, as δρῶν (< *δρην) could come from δρημ(μ)ι (Sappho, L.P. 31) and since present infinitives in -ν of athematic verbs are found in Lesbian (*κέγναν*, etc., Buck o.c. 123). Yet the first part of the explanation is too speculative to provide a sound basis for further investigation.

χόλος δέ μιν ἄγριος ἦρει (*Δ* 23 = Θ 460, θ 304) may have replaced *χόλος δέ μιν ἄγριος *ἄγρη*, as was supposed by Fick, cf. also Wackernagel, *S.U.* 166 f. Yet we also find *ἡμερος αἰρεῖ* (*Γ* 446 = *Ξ* 328, *Λ* 89). Is this an Ionic modification of **ἡμερος ἄγρη*? Though the possibility cannot be denied, the absence of factual evidence precludes us from developing any methodical inquiry on these lines. (It remains to consider the possibility that δρῶ itself is an aeolism. Professor Kamerbeek points out to me that athematic verbs of e-stems have -ει in the 3rd pers. sing. of the present in Lesbian poetry, see Miss E.-M. Hamm, *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* 161. On *δοκεῖ εἶναι* see below, p. 142).

³⁾ above, p. 114.

use of the dual are ancient and which of them resulted from modification?

It is reasonable to assume, nevertheless, that the part played by ancient dual-formulae grew less important in the course of time, especially as regards verbal forms. In this respect it may be characteristic of the evolution that most of the archaisms in which the dual appears are not found incorporated in repeated expressions: *ξυμβλήτην* occurs only in φ 15, *καταπτήτην* is confined to Θ 136, *ἔικτον(-την)* appears only in:

<i>ἄνδρε δῶ, γενεῆ δὲ Διὸς μέγαλοιο ἔικτον</i>	δ	27
<i>πίμπλαντ', ὅσσε δὲ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετόωντι εἴκτην</i>	Α	104 = δ 662
<i>αἶε γὰρ δίφρου ἐπιβησομένοισιν εἴκτην</i>	Ψ	379
<i>στήτην ἐγγὺς ἰόντε, δέμας δ' ἄνδρῶσιν εἴκτην</i>	Φ	285,

of which only Φ 285 has a combination that may be part of a system, cf. *δέμας δ' ἤικτο γυναικι*, δ 796, etc., 4 × .¹⁾ Nor do the forms *ἀπειλήτην* (λ 313), *προσαυδήτην* (Α 136 ∼ Χ 90), *φοιτήτην* (Μ 266), which are probably to be explained as Ionicised Aeolic survivals,²⁾ show marked formulaic connections. Of this group only (*τεύχεα*) *συλήτην* could have survived as part of a system, however small that may have been,³⁾ and *τῶ δὲ συναντήτην* in π 333

τῶ δὲ συναντήτην, κῆρυξ καὶ δῖος ὑφορβος

may be compared with

	<i>τῶ δὲ λοεσσαμένῳ καὶ ἀλειψαμένῳ λίπ' ἐλαίῳ</i>	Κ	577	
cf.	{	<i>τῶ δε καλεσσαμένῳ ἀγορῆν ἐς πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς</i>	γ	137,
		<i>αἶ δὲ λοεσσάμεναι καὶ χρυσάμεναι λίπ' ἐλαίῳ</i>	ζ	96
		<i>καὶ ῥα καλεσσάμενος προσέφη χρυσέην Ἀφροδίτην</i>	Ε	427, cf. τ 15, φ 380,
		<i>ῥφα λοεσσάμενος τε τεταρπόμενός τε φίλον κῆρ</i>	α	310 χ 436,
	<i>,, ,, ,, ἰδὼν τ' εὖ κείμενα πάντα</i>	θ	437. ⁴⁾	

Yet all this is not only rather speculative but it does not get us very far either, since the expressions in question have no counterparts showing symptoms of modification.

The case of *βάτην* / *βήτην* (Π. 7/12, Od. 1/3) looks more promising at first sight. It may well be that *τῶ δὲ βάτην*, which corresponds with *βὰν δ' (ῥ') ἴμεναι*,⁵⁾ developed into *τῶ βήτην* (< **τῶ ῥα βάτην*??) at a time when the dual was still employed in East Ionic. It may further be supposed that this formula gave rise to

<i>βήτην εἰς Ὀδυσῆα δαίφρονα ποικιλομήτην</i>	χ	202
<i>,, ,, Ἐρεβος Σαρπηδόνοσ ἐσθλοὶ ἐταῖροι</i>	Π	327
<i>,, ,, ὡς ἐκέλευσ', ἐπὶ θῖν' ἀλόσ ἀτρυγέτοιο</i>	θ	49
<i>,, ,, ἀκροτάτη δὲ ποδῶν ὑπο σείετο ὕλη</i>	Ξ	285

¹⁾ On the other hand some cases may be due to archaising innovation, cf. Leumann, *H.W.* 181 on Α 104 = δ 662.

²⁾ Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 306, Ruijgh, *E.A.* 8.

³⁾ see above, p. 128.

⁴⁾ On -σσ- see Buck, *G.D.* 116 (Aeolic). Because of the spelling-convention we cannot make out if it was also Mycenaean.

⁵⁾ so that we may have to do with an ancient "system".

in a period when the use of the runover word had already become a current feature of epic diction.¹⁾ Yet the presence of *βάτην* is not an infallible criterion of the antiquity of the expression in which it occurs, for in *T* 47 we find

τὼ δὲ δῶν σκάζοντε βήτην, Ἄρρεος θεράποντε

in which *Ἄρρεος θεράποντε* is a product of archaisation, the traditional formula being *θεράποντες(-ας) Ἄρρηος*.²⁾ It is hardly probable in itself that an expression so special as *τὼ δὲ δῶν σκάζοντε βήτην* should have survived as a whole from the period in which the 'Ablaut' form *βήτην* was still used in living speech and the 'declension' of *θεράποντες Ἄρρηος* does little to enhance the probability of this supposition. Of course the phrase *τὼ δὲ δῶν σκάζοντε βήτην* may be a modification, resulting from separation of *τὼ δὲ βήτην*. If so, the explanation suggested above can be sustained, but this gives us little help since the other dual-expressions that contain archaisms are isolated survivals, of which no offspring can be found in Homer's diction.

The case of other recent and specifically Ionic phenomena is similar. The form *ἦσαν* may have replaced *ἦεν* and *ἦτην*. Yet, apart from the fact that we do not know from what formulae this—hypothetical—development started,³⁾ complete substitution of an equivalent form for an older one, does not afford us any means to trace the evolution. It leaves us exactly where we are. It is a different thing if we find equivalent combinations. We have already seen that in this case it is sometimes possible to make out how and why a younger idiom came to encroach upon an older one.⁴⁾ With regard to the ending *-ἦσαν* this phenomenon may be more widespread than I have been able to ascertain and a systematic inquiry into this matter might produce interesting results. So far I have only found a single instance which seems reasonably sure. Homer has

	<i>αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπησαν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτήτος</i>	<i>ε</i> 201,
cf.	<i>τάρπημεν</i> „ „ „	<i>Α</i> 780

along with the regular expression

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο *Α* 469 etc., 21 ×.

The latter phrase contains the (probably Aeolic)⁵⁾ archaism *ἔρος* and

¹⁾ or perhaps somewhat earlier, because of *Π* 327, *χ* 202.

²⁾ *B* 110, etc., 7 ×. It is to be noted that *Ἄρρεος* (*Δ* 441, *T* 47, *θ* 267), *Ἄρρη* (*B* 479), *Ἄρρη* (*θ* 276), *Ἄρρη* (*E* 757, *Φ* 431) and *Ἄρρη* (*v.l.* *Ἄρρη*, *E* 909) do not show any formulaic connections, but that *Ἄρρηος*, *Ἄρρη*, *Ἄρρηα* occur in formulae, some of which are apparently ancient: *μῶλον Ἄρρηος* (*B* 401, etc., 4 ×), *δζος (-ον) Ἄρρηος* (*B* 540, etc., 10 ×, cf. Risch, *Wortbildung* 188, Frisk, *s.v.* *δοζος*), (*θοῶ*) *ἀτάλαντος (-ον) Ἄρρη* (*B* 627, 11 ×), *Ἄρρηα ταλαύρινον πολεμιστήν* (cf. Trümper, *o.c.* 38, 134, Ruijgh, *E.A.* 80 f.), *E* 289 = *Y* 78 = *X* 267.

³⁾ Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 288, suggests *N* 789 and *Σ* 4.

⁴⁾ above, p. 127 n. 2; below, p. 146. In the *Odyssey* *τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε(ν)* increases (*Il.* 37, *Od.* 77) at the expense of *τὸν δ' ἡμείβετ' ἔπειτα* (*Il.* 38, *Od.* 24!.)

⁵⁾ Bechtel, *Gr. D.* I, 52, Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 211.

seems to have given way in ε 201 to an expression which can have been created only after the epic diction had entered Ionia.¹⁾

In this same period shifting of formulae may also have been furthered by the fact that forms in -ησαν became available. In the same way as *κουριδίης* (τ') *ἀλόχοιο* (ο 356) was probably turned into *κουριδίης ἀλόχου* (A 114) (after the pattern of *κουριδίην(-η) ἄλοχον(-ω)*) and *πατρὸς ἐοῖο* (usually at the verse-end: E 11, Ψ 360, T 399 ∼ Ψ 402; in ξ 177 in pos. 3½), *παιδὸς ἐοῖο* (E 266, Σ 71) could become *πατρὸς ἐοῦ*, *παιδὸς ἐοῦ* (A 396, M 403, δ 714; in pos. 3)²⁾ a possible prototype *οἱ δ' ἐλέλιχθεν (< ἐφέλιχθεν?)³⁾ may have taken the form οἱ δ' ἐλελίχθησαν when used in the initial hemistich (E 497 etc., 4 ×).⁴⁾ Yet this suggestion is a mere hypothesis and cannot provide a basis for further investigation.

A fortiori linguistic developments which were not confined to Ionic are unlikely to yield reliable results when used as criteria of modification of formulae. It may be true, as K. Meister argues, that the creation of the θ-aorist falls at least partly within the period of epic song,⁵⁾ but it is probably characteristic of the Homeric stage of the formulaic evolution that with some notable exceptions (e.g. *λύτο γόνυατα*, Φ 114, etc., 9 ×, cf. *λόντο δὲ γυνῖα*, H 16, O 435) the formulaic character of expressions based upon athematic aorists of the middle, which the θ-aorist is supposed to have replaced,⁶⁾ is far less strong than Meister's argument would lead us to expect. *ἀπέκτατο* is only found in O 437, P 472 (*ἀπέκτατο πιστὸς ἐταῖρος; ἐταῖρος ἀπέκτατο*), *κατέπηκτο* only in A 378 (*ἐν γαίῃ κατέπηκτο*); *μίκτο* appears only in *μίκτο δ' δμίλω* (λ 354, Π 813), whereas *ἐμίχθη* is found in *προμάχοισιν ἐμίχθη* (E 134, etc., 4 ×) and in *κονίησιν ἐμίχθη*, K 457, χ 329; *ἔσσυντο is lacking, but (*αὐτο*)*σχεδὸν ὀρμήθησαν* (-θήναι, -θήτην appears 4 × (N 496, etc.).

All this clearly shows that in the course of time the formulaic diction must have undergone most drastic changes. It is not only out of the question that, as Parry thought, the Ionian singers merely adapted an inherited repertory to their own dialect. It is also certain that many formulae were lost and partly replaced, that many others were elaborated and

1) K. Meister, *o.c.* 30 f., regards (with Wackernagel) the genitive *ποτήτος* as artificial.

Is it typical of the evolution that Homer has two pairs of equivalents for 'spear' (*μείλιον ἔγχος* ∼ *χάλκειον ἔγχος*, II. 6, Od. —, II. 18, Od. 5; *δόρυ μείλιον* ∼ *δόρυ χάλκειον*, II. 5, Od. —, II. 5, Od. 2) and that *μείλιον ἔγχος* and *δόρυ μείλιον* occur only in the *Iliad*? Does this point to metonymic employment progressing as the original meaning of *ἔγχος* and *δόρυ* got lost?

2) cf. Hainsworth, *o.c.* 62, Witte, *Glotta* IV, 8-28.

3) *ὧς ἐλέλιχθεν*, Z 109 at the verse-end (cf. *ἦ δ' ἐλελίχθη*, μ 416 = ξ 306). Cf. also *τεύχεα συλήσας* (-σαν, -την) and *τεύχεα συλήσωσι νεῶν ἐν ἀγῶνι πεσόντα*, above, p. 128.

4) οἱ δ' ἐλελίχθησαν καὶ ἐνάντιοι ἔσταν Ἀχαιῶν.

5) *o.c.* 116.

6) Chantraine, *G.H.* I, 401.

that from a date not much anterior to Homer up to the creation of our poems epic diction as a whole took on a much suppler form and a different colouring. This is clear, in a general way, from the grammatical facts noted by Chantraine and, in so far as definite formulae are concerned, from some of the phenomena pointed out by Webster.¹⁾ Our own inquiry corresponds with their views. The term 'formulaic' covers a conglomerate of phenomena, many of which are separated by a wide gap of time that can only rarely be bridged by our method. It covers *βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη* as well as *θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη*, it covers *νῆας ἕϊσας*—which, both in form and sense proves to be primitive—as well as the products of late modification *νέας ἀμφιέλισσας* and *νεὸς κvanoπώροιο*.²⁾ And, as the Homeric use of the latter formula and of many others proves, the frequency of a given formula is not necessarily proportional to its age. Nor is its belonging to a 'system' an infallible criterion and sometimes appearances are probably deceptive. In the second chapter we already found evidence for recent innovation and modification in the treatment of some names of Phaeacians³⁾ and of the poet's Ithacensian characters⁴⁾:

τοῖς δ' Ἀγέλεως μετέειπε(ν) ἔπος πάντεσσι πυφάσκων χ 131 = 247
 ,, ,, Ὀδυσσεὺς ,, σὺβώτew πειρητιζῶν ξ 459 = ο 304

Though the name of Agelaos is found 3 × in an older looking context (*Δαμαστορίδης Ἀγέλαος*) it is far from certain that, as a *suitor*, he is more or less traditional. The names of Ἀντίνοος, Ἀμφίνομος, Εὐρύμαχος, Κτήσιππος, some of which are rightly considered symbolic of the characters and behaviour of their bearers, have no claim to great antiquity in themselves. They were probably introduced into the saga at a time when, owing to the evolution of epic language, the singers were no longer apt to create names which, after the pattern of *ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων*, *βοῆν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος* etc., could figure in T₂ formulae. In the Odyssey the following types of lines are always used to describe the most prominent of these newcomers as speaking:

1.	τοῖσιν δ' Ἀντίνοος ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν	δ 773
	,, ,, Ἀμφίνομος ,, ,, ,,	π 394, σ 412, ν 244
cf.	,, ,, Ἀλκίνοος ,, ,, ,,	η 185, θ 25, ν 171
2.	,, ,, Εὐρύμαχος, Πολύβου παῖς ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν	π 345, σ 349, ν 359
3.	τόν δ' αὖτ' Ἀντίνοος	{ a. ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέειπεν σ 405 b. ἀπαμείβετο φώνησέν τε ρ 445
cf.	,, ,, ,, Ἀλκίνοος ,, ,, ,,	
	,, ,, ,, Εὐρύταλος ,, ,, ,,	θ 140, 400
	,, ,, ,, Ἀπόλλυκος ,, ,, ,,	τ 405
	,, ,, αὖ Λαέρτης ,, ,, ,,	ω 327

1) *Early and Late in Homeric diction*, especially 46-48.

2) above, p. 125 f.

3) above, p. 32 n. 4.

4) above, p. 39.

4. ὡς ἔφατ' } Ἀντίνοος	, τοῖσιν δ' ἐπιήνδανε μῦθος	σ 50, etc., 4 ×
cf. „ „ } Ἀμφίνομος		π 406, υ 247
	} Ἀλκίνοος	ν 16.

It seems significant that of these types, which undoubtedly constitute a 'system', 1 and 3 show a metrical lengthening of the syllable -ος, 1, 2 and 4 have τοῖσιν δ' with ν-movable making position ¹⁾ (3b has φώνησέν τε) and 2 has, moreover, irreducible -ον in a proper name. We cannot trace the development in detail but it is not rash to conclude that this kind of system was created by recent simplification and modification. ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπεν was probably borrowed from other types (δ σφι(ν) ἐν φρονέων ἀγορήσατο καὶ μετέειπε(ν), A 73, etc., 9 × ?); τὸν (τήν) δ' ἀδ Μηριόνης (Τηλέμαχος) πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ἦῶδα (N 254, α 388, etc., 42 ×) is certainly older than 3, τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἦρχε (μέγας Τελαμώνιος Αἴας, etc., E 420, etc., 18 ×) older than ἦρχ' ἀγορεύειν.²⁾

Parry says of the "epithète fixe" that it "ornait moins un seul vers, même un seul poème, que toute la poésie héroïque"³⁾ and that Homer's audience did not consider it either amusing or surprising that a swineherd should be called "divin"⁴⁾ and a cowherd an ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν. From a purely stylistic point of view this may be true, but it does not mean that former generations of readers were unduly puzzled by the use of these epithets, and that epic swineherds were traditionally called δῖοι because they belonged to the heroic age.⁵⁾ If we were to judge from the superficial formulaic impression, we might infer that σὺβώτης, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν (ο 389 etc., 5 ×), Φιλοίτιος, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν (ν 185, 254) and δῖος ὑφορβός (ο 301 etc., 13 ×) were highly traditional because of their fixity and since they belong, at least in part, to a 'system' (δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, etc., διοτρεφές, ὄρχαμε λαῶν) and to the traditional category of formulae serving after the trochaic and 'bucolic' caesuras. Yet Philoitios is 4 × called (ν 235 etc.) βοῶν ἐπιβονκόλος ἀνὴρ, so he may originally have been as anonymous as the cowherd appearing in γ 422. After the hephthemimeris Eumaios is always (15 ×) introduced by apostrophe:

τὸν } δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη, Εὐμαίε σὺβώτα	ξ 55, etc., 13 ×
τήν }	
τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὄχθήσας	ο 325
„ δ' ἐπικερτομέων	χ 194

¹⁾ above, p. 88-108.

²⁾ On ὡς ἔφατ' Ἀντίνοος (Ἀμφίνομος, Ἀλκίνοος), τοῖσιν δ' ἐπιήνδανε μῦθος ~ ὡς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ἐαδὸτα μῦθον εἶπε see above, p. 110, n. 1.

³⁾ E.T. 172.

⁴⁾ *ibid.* 191.

⁵⁾ *ibid.* 190: "parce qu'Eumée était un homme de l'âge héroïque". The rest of the sentence ("parce qu'il ne trouva que cette seule épithète —") shows that Parry was aware of a possible chronological difference between δῖος ὑφορβός and δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς, etc.

and with these lines we may compare τὸν (τὴν) δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος / δὲ μέγ' ὀχθήσας, etc. / προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (A 84, etc., 24 ×) — / προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς (A 511 etc., 22 ×), — / προσέφη κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ (E 689 etc., 10 ×), — / προσέφη ἑκάεργος Ἀπόλλων (E 439 etc., 4 ×) etc., etc. It appears, then, that in ξ 55, etc., an ancient type has been adapted in order to be used for the swineherd, in other words that this person is a newcomer in the saga and that the formulae *συβώτης, ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν* etc. are late adaptations of prototypes originally used for kings and noblemen: *(\cup) \cup — \cup \cup , *ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν*,¹⁾ *διοτρεφές, ὄρχαμε λαῶν, δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς*, etc.

In this connection it is worth noticing that apostrophe is also found in Δ 127, 146, Η 104, Ν 603, Ψ 600, (Menelaos) Ο 365, Υ 152, (Apollo), Ο 582 (Melanippos), Υ 2, (Achilles) and in Π 20, 584, 692–93, 744, 754, 787, 812, 843. Almost everywhere it serves to heighten the pathos of the scene (*τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ περιπαθές*, schol. Π 787) and therefore does not call for comment from a formulaic point of view. This is also true of Π 483 (*τὸν δ' ὀλιγοδρανέων προσέφη, Πατρόκλεες ἱππεῦ*), but in Π 20 and 744

τὸν δὲ βαρὺ στενάχων }
 ,, δ' ἐπικερτομέων } προσέφη, Πατρόκλεες ἱππεῦ

the circumstances hardly justify the emphatic character of the phrase. Now the initial hemistichs of the two lines have parallels in τὴν (τοῖς) δὲ βαρὺ στενάχων (A 364 = Σ 78, Δ 153) and in τὸν δ' ἐπικερτομέων (Ω 649), which are followed by *προσέφη (μετέφη) πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων)*. On the other hand it is a remarkable fact that Patroclus, though he has a noun-epithet formula in the genitive, has no formulaic combination in the nominative,²⁾ and in this respect he presents an even more striking case than Odysseus' swineherd. The phenomenon can probably be explained by assuming that a stage not much anterior to the composition of the *Iliad*, Menoitios' son was only a character of secondary importance, known not for what he did but for his friendship with Achilles and his death.³⁾ It could also be ascribed — but I consider this less probable — to replacement of an ancient formula⁴⁾ and, therefore, to the poet's desire to bring Patroclus out in full relief by apostrophe. In either case, however, the formulaic data support the supposition that Patroclus largely owns his prominence in the *Iliad* to Ionian singers⁵⁾ and/or to Homer himself.⁶⁾ It is interesting to note that the part he plays

¹⁾ There are no traces of this prototype in Homer, we only find (*Ἐρτακίδης ἦρχ'*) (*ἔθειλ'*) Ἀσιος, *ὄρχαμος ἀνδρῶν*, B 837, M 110, which may have been created by separation, cf. B 838 Ἀσιος Ἐρτακίδης, *ὄν* —, M 96 Ἀσιος Ἐρτακίδης.

²⁾ Twice he is given the general title *θεόφιν μῆστωρ ἀτάλαντος*, P 477, γ 110.

³⁾ It is probable that Patroclus is much older as a legendary figure, Page, *H.H.I.* 228.

⁴⁾ Mr. J. B. Hainsworth suggests *Πάτροκλος ἀμύμων.

⁵⁾ Page, *ibid.*

⁶⁾ Bowra, *T.D.* 12.

in the poem is closely related to the *Battle near the Ships*, which was also found to contain marked signs of formulaic innovation and elaboration.

All this does not mean, of course, that by a more thorough study of the Homeric phenomena and by refining the present method or by applying a different one it would be impossible to discover other lines of development leading up, finally, to earlier forms of epic diction. The remarks made above are only intended to bring out two things: first that the method followed so far is subject to many limitations and secondly that the evolution as a whole was far from being the simple, slow and mechanical process that was assumed by Parry. Though some parts of the diction must have undergone fewer changes than others, even what seems to be its most protected region – the passages containing genealogies and family-history – was penetrated by innovation. Alongside with such lines as

νῖος Ἄγασθένης, Ἀὐγηιάδαο ἄνακτος	B 624
*Ἀλκηστis, Πελλίαο θυγατρῶν εἶδος ἀρίστη	B 715
νῖος Σπερχειοῖο, διπυτέος ποταμοῖο	II 174
*Ἀλκιμέδων, νῖος Λαέρκεος Αἰμονίδαο	P 467
Ἐὐρύσθεύς, Σθενέλοιο πάϊς Περσηιάδαο	T 123

we find e.g.

αὐτοκασίγητος μεγαθύμον Πρωτεσιλάου	B 706
νῖόν ἑπερθύμον Δολοπίονος, ὅς ἑα Σκαμάνδρον	E 77.

Under these circumstances it may not be unprofitable to have a look at the other end of the chain and to see what can be gleaned for our purpose from the expressions which may with reasonable confidence be regarded as Mycenaean and Aeolic formulae.

Since Nilsson's *Homer and Mycenae* it has been argued by several leading scholars that the detailed descriptions of objects that are generally recognised as Mycenaean found their way into Homer because they were couched in fixed formulaic language. Now it is difficult indeed to imagine how any knowledge of objects which had disappeared centuries before and of happenings in which these objects play an essential part, could have been preserved during the Dark Age, except by means of the formulaic technique. Yet, unless the linguistic and prosodic notions upon which the present inquiry is based are grossly fallacious, this explanation, plausible though it be, is not confirmed by the actual wording of the passages in question, except, perhaps, in the most general sense. Even if we should accept a connection between *δινωτός* and Mycenaean *qe-qi-no-to*, *qe-qi-no-me-no*, the presence of *ποσι[ν]* (instead of *ποσι < *ποδ-σι*) in

δινωτῆν ἐλέφαντι καὶ ἀργύρῳ ἦν ποτε τέκτων	τ 56
πόησ' Ἰκμάλιος, καὶ ὑπὸ θρηῆνν ποσὶν ἦκε	57

prevents us from regarding this couplet as an Ionicised Mycenaean survival. In N 407 *δινωτός*, used to describe Idomeneus' shield, is followed

by *φορέεσκε*.¹⁾ It has already been noted that the episode about Periphetes tripping over the rim of his body-shield contains *πέσεν ὑπτιος* (Mycenaean evidence forbids us to assume <πέσε *σῦπτιος>). The same passage, besides, contains *στρεφθείς* and *βλαφθείς* and another *φορέεσκε*. Nor is the description of Meriones' helmet without recent forms: in *K* 262 *ῥινοῦ* and *πολέσιν* appear before a constant so that *-ου* is unresolvable and *ν* makes position. In the description of Nestor's bowl we find (in two adjoining lines) *αὐτοῦ* at the verse-end, *τέσσαρ' ἔσαν* and (reducible!?) *ἦσαν*, not to speak of *νεμέθοντο* and other 'suspect' forms. And, whereas everywhere else the accusatives *πόλεις* and *πόλιας* are used after the trochaic caesura so that they may reflect *πόλις*,²⁾ it is exactly Nestor's reference to the almost forgotten chariot-charges of the Bronze Age, that, along with *ἐπόρθεον* (*v.l.* *-ουν*, *-ενν*) has irreplaceable *πόλιας*:

ὧδε καὶ οἱ πρότεροι πόλιας καὶ τελεγε' ἐπόρθεον Δ 308.

In these cases the presence of recent elements might be supposed to have resulted from relatively superficial modifications, more or less comparable to those which entailed neglect of digamma and increasing use of *ν*-movable. However, with regard to some of Homer's most important subjects, development by way of gradual modification is out of the question. The well-known differences which scholars, from Helbig up to Finley and Kirk, have shown to exist between Mycenaean conditions and the heroic world as described or suggested in Homer, make it necessary to assume that in some of these matters the formulaic tradition was discontinued. Bronze-Age chariot-fighting, burial-customs and, above all, political and social structure must have had their formulae, if ever there was something like a Mycenaean formulaic diction.³⁾ In Homer these expressions are either completely forgotten or only incidentally and vaguely reflected in phrases showing a misunderstanding of their original meaning. In the cases of chariot-fighting and political organisation the gap is so wide that we have to content ourselves with noting the break in the tradition and leave it at that.⁴⁾ We cannot even evaluate the extent of the change that must have taken place. It is only burial-customs

1) On the vexed question whether *διωτός* is to be connected with *qe-qi-no-to* and *qe-qi-no-me-no* see e.g. Chantraine and Dessenne, REG LXX (1957), 302 ff.; on *Ἰκμάλιος* Ruijgh, E.A. 136.

2) whatever may be the interpretation of this phenomenon.

3) As to Mycenaean palace-administration one may have one's doubt whether it ever figured in epic poetry.

4) Kirk is certainly right in regarding Homer's "misconception about the use of chariots" as an indication for the extent to which Mycenaean battle descriptions survived in the Dark Age. Yet *ἦριπε δ' ἐξ ὀχέων* (< ἐκ Φοχέων?), E 47 etc., θ × (though (F?) ὄχος is not found on the tablets) may have been created for scenes of genuine chariot-fighting. It is still used for heroes *fighting* from chariots E 294, Θ 122, (313?) O 452.

which, probably because of human conservatism as regards terminology, seem to teach us something about the general character of the changes that took place in the formulaic diction. Arguing on the supposition that it is of Mycenaean origin we are forced to conclude that it must have lost an unknown but probably not insignificant number of phrases referring to inhumation and that these were replaced to a certain extent (e.g. by *πυρὸς λελάχωσι* (*λελάχητε*) *θανόντα*? *O* 350 = *X* 343) cf. *H* 80. On the other hand we find a few expressions which, though generally misunderstood, can be supposed to reflect Mycenaean burial-rites.¹⁾

The expression *ῥοδόεντι—ἐλαίῳ* (*Ψ* 186) has a parallel in the oil tablets from Pylos²⁾ and was possibly employed in connection with inhumation in ancient epic songs. In Homer, however, it is separated by *δὲ χρῆεν* with *ν*-movable obviating hiatus. The Mycenaean form of *ῥοδόεν*, moreover, is *wo-do-we* (*Forḫódōfen*), so the Homeric expression cannot have come direct from that dialect.³⁾ It is a different thing with *ἐνθα ἔ ταρχύσουσι* (*Π* 456 ~ 674) ~ *ἄφρα ἔ ταρχύσωσι* (*H* 85) and with *μέλιτος καὶ ἀλείφατος ἀμφιφορῆας* (*Ψ* 170). Though *ταρχύω*, as far as I know, has no Mycenaean connections, the formula in which it appears has no late characteristics and might be an extremely ancient survival.⁴⁾ The same is true of *μέλιτος—ἀμφιφορῆας*, the more so as here we find—in addition to *ἀλειφαρ*—a form which was already rivalled by a more recent one towards the end of Mycenaean times.⁵⁾ The expression could have figured in passages in which honey and oil were used either, as Mylonas thinks, to give comfort to the departed on his long journey to Hades or, as was already suggested by Helbig⁶⁾ and Cauer,⁷⁾ for embalming. The same substances are used in the lines *ω* 67–68, which describe the cremation of Achilles. Though their original purpose is clearly forgotten and in *Π* 456–57 the meaning of *ταρχύω* is misunderstood, the two expressions are probably Mycenaean formulae. If so, they certainly had formulaic relatives in Bronze Age poetry. In Homer, however, these have all vanished and there is no trace of any offspring.

Since the use of honey and oil—whichever of the two purposes they may have served—is generally recognised to go back to the period of

¹⁾ Of course the expressions may have entered the diction in the Dark Age, coming from a prose tradition (on this subject see Kirk, *S.H.* 108 f., 120 f.) which had preserved the memory of Mycenaean ritual. If *ῥοδόεντι—ἐλαίῳ, μέλιτος καὶ ἀλείφατος ἀμφιφορῆας* and *ἄφρα (ἐνθα) ἔ ταρχύσωσι (-σουσι)* really refer to embalming (but see below), it is less likely that they reflect Dark Age usage (see now Mylonas, *Burial Customs in C.H.* 486 ff.). At any rate *κτερεῖζω* seems to be of Mycenaean origin, see below.

²⁾ Bennett, *The Olive Oil Tablets of Pylos*, Minos, Suppl. 2 (1958), 17 ff.

³⁾ see, however, below, p. 145 n. 3 (on *θρόνος*).

⁴⁾ Leaf on *H* 85, Murray, *R.G.E.*⁴, 161–162, Nilsson, *G.G.R.* I², 375, n. 6.

⁵⁾ see Kirk, *S.H.* 115.

⁶⁾ *H.E.*² 56.

⁷⁾ *Grundfragen*², I 327; cf. also Murray, *ibid.*

inhumation¹⁾ and, consequently, to be a symptom of syncretism in its Ψ and ω context, it is no objection to Ruijgh's view of the Mycenaean origin of *κτερείζω* etc. that *ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερίσαιεν* is preceded in Ω 38 by *ἐν πυρὶ κήαιεν*. Now Ruijgh has also shown that *ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερίσαιεν* (-σειεν, γ 285) is an Ionic modification of Mycenaean *ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερείξαι* (-ξω).²⁾ But there is more. We also find

ἀλλ' ἴθι καὶ σὸν ἑταῖρον ἀέθλοισι κτερείζε Ψ 646
 ποσσῆμαρ μέμονας κτερείζέμεν Ἔκτορα δῖον; Ω 657.

Whereas the Ionic modifications (γ 285, Ω 38) show a recent form but have preserved the archaic meaning, in Ψ 646, Ω 657 the archaic form has acquired a personal object, that is to say a much wider sense, and has, besides, lost its formulaic character. The same, metonymic, sense is found in

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κε θάνω, κτεριοῦσί με δῖοι Ἀχαιοί Λ 455
 οὗ σε πρὶν κτεριῶ, πρὶν γ' Ἔκτορος ἐνθάδ' ἐνεῖκαι Σ 334
 ἐλκήσουσ' αἰκῶς, τὸν δὲ κτεριοῦσιν Ἀχαιοί X 336,

in which the recent forms may reflect *κτερίω*, as Chantraine and Ruijgh think, but in view of the extreme innovation apparent from meaning and context, may also be very late cases of contraction.

It has to be emphasised that among the terms of burial which have a reasonable claim to Mycenaean origin *ἐνθα ἔ ταρχύσουσι* \simeq *ὄφρα ἔ ταρχύσωσι* and *μέλιτος καὶ ἀλείφατος ἀμφιφορῆας* are isolated remnants, the sense of which was no longer understood. The expression for rose-oil, if it ever appeared in Mycenaean hexameter poetry (**Forḡdōfen* – \cup *ἔλαιFor?*), must have drastically changed later on and did not have any offspring either. Only *ἐπὶ κτέρεα κτερείξαι* (and possibly a few other expressions containing the same verb) was further developed, probably because the custom itself continued to be practised, even when cremation had already appeared. In the case of this expression, however, innovation throve to such an extent that even the sense of the verb changed considerably.

Whatever may be the origin of the cremation tradition which pervades the Homeric epics, it is clear that in the field of burial-customs the singers perforce had to adapt their diction to its requirements. Such a necessity, however, did not present itself in the treatment of several other subjects. Here we find discrepancies which are difficult to explain. Why, for example, did the singers keep to *δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον*³⁾ in order to denote a goblet, whereas they relegated *θόργος*-formulae to oblivion? Sometimes, of course, we may simply have to do with modernisation effected by substitution of a recent equivalent for an ancient form. Mycenaean *Fóρζω* for example,

¹⁾ Upon this Mylonas agrees with Helbig, Cauér and Murray. Similarly, syncretism seems visible in the use of *θάπτειν*, see e.g. Cauér, *ibid.*

²⁾ *E.A.* 83.

³⁾ above, p. 94 ff.

may have been replaced by equivalent forms of *Φέρδω* and *ρέζω*. Ionic *θεινε*, which is found in

δ δὲ φασγάνῳ ἀνχένα θείνας Y 481

and in *δ δ' ὑπ' οὐατος* ,, *θεινε* II 339, cf. a-no-wo-to K 875, Docs 330 f., may well be a modernised form of **gwen-se* or a late substitute for *ἐλασσε*, cf.

δ δ' αὐχένα μέσσον ἔλασσε K 455
αὐχένα μέσσον ἔλασσε (in pos. 5½) E 497.

Among the "linguistic clusters—found in speeches" Webster has noted the formulaic line *αὐταρ ἐγὼν ἐρέω ὧς μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ἄριστα* (I 103, etc.).¹⁾ Yet this phenomenon does not prove that in the very late period to which the contraction of *δοκέει* has to be assigned, there was still considerable formulaic creativity, in other words, that we should have to reconsider our view of the chronological relation between the end of oral composition and the creation of the Homeric poems. Still, it is doubtless typical of the development that 'Achaean' *δέατ'(ο)*²⁾ survived only in a single Homeric line, viz. in

πρόσθεν μὲν γὰρ δὴ μοι ἀεικέλιος δέατ' εἶναι ζ 242

and that another archaism of the same meaning, (*Φ*)*ινδάλλομαι* is found only four times in the whole of our epics (P 213, Ψ 460, γ 246, τ 224). Now (*Φ*)*εἶδεται* and (*Φ*)*εἶδετο* have different metrical values and were consequently confined to other formulae, so they cannot have supplanted *δέατο* and *Φινδάλλετο* (-ται) without upsetting whole formulaic types. This does not apply, however, to *δοκεῖ* as found in the following conditions:

<i>ἑσθλός μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι, ὀνήμενος· εἶθε οἱ αὐτῶ</i>	β	33			
<i>ᾧ πέπον, ὧς μὲν ἐμῶ θυμῶ</i>	ν	154			
<i>νῦν αὐτ' ἐξερέω</i>	}	<i>ὧς μοι</i>	<i>δοκεῖ εἶναι ἄριστα</i>		
<i>τοιγὰρ</i>				M	215
<i>αὐτὰρ</i>				ψ	130
			I 103 = N 735		

The formula (*μοι*) *δοκεῖ εἶναι* (*ἄριστα*) is likely to have developed from *(*Φοι*) *δέατ' ἔμμεν* (*ἄριστα*), from *(*Φοι*) *Φινδάλλετ' ἄριστα* (both used in narrative, see above p. 51 ff., and on *δέατο*, imperfect, Frisk s.v.), from *Φινδάλλεται ἦτορ* or something like it. Not only do we find *δέατ'(ο)* combined with *εἶναι* in ζ 242, but it is also remarkable that I 103 etc. have a parallel in

αὐτὰρ τοι ἐρέω ὧς μοι ἰνδάλλεται ἦτορ τ 224.

Such an explanation, however, is obviously out of the question in the case of *θρόνος*. If there was any continuity at all, the fact that Homer always has *θρόνος* (53 ×) and never *θόρονος* must have resulted from changes much more drastic than simple modernising substitution. The word is often found in expressions which are distinctly formulaic, e.g.

¹⁾ *Early and Late* 46.

²⁾ Ruijgh, *E.A.* 130.

in *κατὰ κλισμούς τε θρόνους τε* (α 145 etc., 8 ×), *ἐπὶ θρόνου ἀργυροήλου* (Σ 289 etc., 4 ×, with -ου at the verse-end, cf. *ιδέ* (I) *θρόνον ἀργυροήλου*, χ 341, *θῆκε θρόνον ἀργυροήλου*, θ 65), *ἐς θρόνον Ἴζε(ν)* (*εἶσε(ν)*, Ω 553, etc., 3 ×) and is followed by the archaisms *ἄλτο* and *ᾠρτο* in Α 645, Υ 62, Ω 515, χ 364 (*ἀπὸ θρόνου ᾠρτο*, etc.). None of these combinations can be transposed into expressions based on *θρόνος* without upsetting their metrical structures, so generally speaking we have to do with an element of the diction which was created in post-Mycenaean times. There is one case, however, which is reducible. It is *ἔζετο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνω*, Ο 150, where the unusual metrical lengthening seems to point to a prototype *ἔζετο* (i.e. **ἔσδετο*?) δ' **ἐν θρόνω*.¹⁾ If this explanation is correct, a few more expressions may also be supposed to reflect Mycenaean or 'mixed' prototypes: ρ 32 *κῶεα καστορνῦσα θρόνοις ἐνὶ δαιδαλέοισι* <*(*κῶΦαα*?) *καστορνῦ θρόνοις* (-σ'?) *ἐνὶ δαιδαλέοισι* (cf. *da-da-re-jo-de*, *Docs* 307) with development of a P₂ formula into a T₂ expression resulting from conjugation of a narrative T₁ formula; υ 150 *ἔν τε θρόνοις ἐδποιήτοισι* < **ἐν θρόνοις* (-σ'?) *ἐνποιήτοισι*?²⁾ Under the surface of the Homeric material, homogeneous though this looks, two types of expressions may be hidden, Mycenaean prototypes which were modernised and modified in the course of the evolution and combinations which were created in post-Mycenaean times.

However this may be, at the Homeric stage of its development, the structure of the formulaic diction appears to be determined by post-Mycenaean innovation. Even if the supposition advanced above is correct, the fact remains that *ἔζετο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνω* occurs only once, whereas Homer has the irreducible formula *κατ' ἄρ' (καθ-) ἔζετ' (-εῦ) ἐπὶ θρόνου* seven times (Α 536, etc.). Besides we should not forget that *ἔζετο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνω* may simply be a conflation of *ἔζετ' ἐπὶ θρόνου* and *ἔζετο δ' ἐν κλισμῶ*, (Ω 597, δ 136). It is significant that even in the case of a very simple expression such as "he (she) sat down on a seat", which must often have recurred in epic poetry, the traces of Homer continuing a Mycenaean tradition are either extremely scarce or non-existent.³⁾

In spite of our extremely scanty knowledge of the dialects that were spoken in Greece during the Late Helladic III and of their interrelations, and though we do not know what form or forms of Aeolic participated in the constitution of epic diction in and/or after that period, we may

¹⁾ *σεῖσατο δ' εἰνὶ θρόνω*, Θ 199. The reduction was, as I now see, already suggested by D. J. N. Lee, *Some vestigial Mycenaean words in the Iliad*, *BICS* 6 (1959), 7.

²⁾ The problem hinges on the question whether Mycenaean *o-i* is to be interpreted as *-oi'-i* or as *-ois*. If the latter explanation is correct (cf. Ruijgh, *Les datifs pluriels*, 99-105), we may have to do with instances of expressions consisting of a (South-) Mycenaean and a (proto-?) Aeolic prototype, see below, p. 145 ff.

³⁾ It is obvious that the preceding argument should be taken with the proviso that Ventris' transcription of *to-no* represents the only phonetic possibility (cf. *to-ro-no-wo-ko* 'makers of chairs', *Docs* 172?).

be sure, that the last-mentioned component was also affected by large-scale innovation. The pronouns *ἄμμες* and *ὑμμες* seldom appear in combinations which show a formulaic fixity and are sometimes found in the immediate neighbourhood of Ionic and very late forms, e.g. in *εἰδόσιν ὕμμ' ἐρέω πᾶσιν, φίλοι* (*Ψ* 787) and in *ἀτὰρ γνώσεσθε καὶ ὕμμες* (*Ω* 242). The few times that *ἰα* (*ιῶ*) occurs, it is always combined with different nouns: *ἰα γῆρος*, *Δ* 437, *ἰα πάτρη*, *Ν* 354, *ἰα ψυχῆ*, *Φ* 569, *ιῶ (κλον) ἦματι*, *Ζ* 422. The same is true of *πίσσορες* (-ας), which is even used (*Ο* 680) in a line that seems to suggest some familiarity with quadrigae. Though infinitives in -μεν and -μεναι are among the most essential characteristics of epic verse-making, they are only rarely found combined with datives of consonant-stems in -εσσι and other typically Aeolic forms: phrases such as *ἄνδρεςσι μετέμμεναι* (*Σ* 91) and (*φόνον*) *ἔμμεναι ἠρώεσσι* (*Π* 144 = *Τ* 391) are exceptional. *εὔαδε* is found only in *ἐπεὶ (ὦς γάρ) νύ τοι εὔαδε(ν)*, *Ξ* 340, *Ρ* 647, *Π* 28) and has twice *ν*-movable obviating hiatus (*Ξ* 340, *Ρ* 647). All this shows that on the one hand the Ionian singers used to "Aeolise" rather freely¹⁾ and that, on the other, they replaced Aeolic formulae or their constituents by later ones.²⁾ Modification must have been practised in various degrees, for some prototypes (e.g. **πολέεσσι δὲ θυμὸν ἀπέφρα*) can still be discovered, whereas others are irretrievably lost.

So far it has been taken for granted that both Mycenaean and Aeolic contributed to the formation of epic diction. At this point, however, it may be asked whether this preliminary assumption is not called in question by the phenomena observed up to now. Is it really conceivable that so many old prototypes, both Mycenaean and Aeolic, have fallen victims to modification and innovation? Does not the scarcity of the expressions

¹⁾ above, p. 73 n. 3 (*Παφλαγόνεσσι*), 114 f. (*βήμεναι*), 119 (*ὄμμ'*), 127 (*ποσὶν ταχέεσσι*).

²⁾ above, p. 100 n. 1. Though we do not know when and where *ἀμβροσίος* was formed from Aeolic *ἀμβροτος*, it is worth while to see how *ἀμβροσίη νύξ* behaves. In η 283-84 we find *ἐπὶ δ' ἀμβροσίη νύξ / ἦλυθ', ἐγὼ δ'* —. In view of the recent character of this type of runover word it appears that these lines show a modification of the employment found in

δόρπον θ' ὀπλισάμεσθ' ἐπὶ τ' ἦλυθεν ἀμβροσίη νύξ δ 429 = 574.

Since, further, (*ἐπὶ τ'*) *ἦλυθεν ἀμβροσίη νύξ* is based on *ν*-movable, it is interesting to note that Homer preserved an equivalent which is probably traditional and certainly Aeolic. It is found in

δοσασίη, τρέλλιστος ἐπήλυθε νύξ ἐρεβεννή Θ 488
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ δεκάτη μοι ,, ,, ,, I 474.

Even supposing that the two phrases *ἀμβροσίη νύξ* and *νύξ ἐρεβεννή* were complementary from the start in the same way as *ἀλγέα λυγρά* ∼ *κήδεα λυγρά*, *ἄνθρα ἕκαστον* ∼ *φῶτα ἕκαστον*, etc., there is reason to believe that *νύξ ἐρεβεννή* lost ground after the formulaic diction had entered the Ionic stage. The same, then, is likely to have happened to other formulae. Owing to this kind of replacement many combinations, Aeolic and other, may have disappeared altogether.

which can be identified beyond doubt as either Mycenaean or Aeolic suggest that at least one of the two dialects should be eliminated? The old controversy: Old Ionic against Aeolic, which seemed to have been decided in favour of the latter about the middle of this century, was then revived by Miss Lorimer¹⁾ and Strunk,²⁾ who tried to minimise the Aeolic contribution. After the decipherment of the Linear B tablets, this theory was adopted in a modified form by Webster, who defended it vigorously and impressively in his well-known book.³⁾ Since then, again, the opposite stand has been taken by Shipp, who denies Mycenaean participation.⁴⁾

In my opinion neither attempt has been successful. Some of the facts revealed by Ruijgh admit of no other explanation than the Mycenaean one. With regard to Aeolic we may point to such survivals as *ταχέεσσι πόδεσσι, ἐδεδύετο δαιτὸς εἰσης, Ἄρηα ταλαύρινον (πολεμιστήν?), ἱερευσέμεν αἶ κ' ἐλέηση(ς), νῶξ ἐρεβεννή, Καλυδῶνος ἐραννῆς, ἀργεννῆς (-σ'?) διισσι, ὅτι κε[ν] εἶπω (-ης, etc.), (τεὸν γένος) ὄπποθεν ἔσσι, ἀρχένα μέσσον (ἐλασσε) τῷ δὲ λοεσσαμένω, τῷ δὲ καλεσσαμένω, περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν, and probably to reconstructed phrases such as *πίσυρες καὶ εἴκοσι φῶτες, *πολέεσσι δὲ θυμὸν ἀπηύρα.*

There are, moreover, other aspects of the problem which have to be taken into account. Because of his conception of the nature of the formulaic repertory Parry had to postulate an extremely rigid fixity of transmission. Such a fixity, it has been pointed out, is hardly conceivable in itself and has in fact been shown by Webster and Hainsworth to be at variance with the general evidence. More specific arguments have been adduced in the chapters III-V of the present inquiry. If there is any truth in those discussions, we may be sure that the formulaic diction underwent drastic changes after it had been taken over by Ionian singers. In spite of the deficiencies of our method we were able to observe how certain ancient features were reduced (e.g. *ιδέ* by *τε καί*), even to the point of being almost dropped (*ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδόνον ἔειπε*), or intermingled with recent elements (*δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον > δέπας λάβεν ἀμφικύπελλον*).⁵⁾ When we take into account that a large proportion of the changes observed cannot have taken place more than one or two generations before Homer and that an unknown number of the remaining ones may have to be assigned to the same period, the scarcity of formulae which are undeniably

¹⁾ *H.M.* 459 ff.

²⁾ *Die sogenannten Aeolismen der homerischen Sprache*, Düsseldorf, 1957.

³⁾ *M.H.* 160 ff.

⁴⁾ *Essays, pass.*; cf. also Risch, *Die Entzifferung der Minoischen Linearschrift B*, *Anthropos* LIII (1958), 160.

⁵⁾ above, p. 62 f. (*ιδέ > τε καί*), p. 66 (*ἔπος δ' ὀλοφυδόνον ἔειπε > ὀλοφυρόμενος ἔπος ηῦδα*). These cases are extremely late (and *ὀλοφυδόνος*, moreover, cannot be shown to be Mycenaean) but they suggest how modification may have affected ancient formulae at earlier stages.

Mycenaean or Aeolic – some of them fundamental to the formulaic diction (e.g. *ἀντὰρ ἔπειτα, βὰν δ' ἴμεν*) – does not appear to tell against the supposition that both dialects provided the original substratum.

The answer to the question also depends on the view we take of the nature of this substratum. So far we have made a distinction between specifically Mycenaean and Aeolic formulae. But is it methodical to do so when studying the development of the formulaic diction by proceeding from the most recent data towards earlier stages of which any possible knowledge can only be gained by inference? Let us look somewhat more closely at the implication of either of the opposing theories.

First the supposition that the creation of epic diction was an exclusively Aeolic-Ionian affair. If it was, we have to assume that the elements which are now generally regarded as Mycenaean and/or Arcado-Cypriot survivals were present in Aeolic too when epic diction came into being. Still, if we are inclined to accept this supposition, we should be aware that the Aeolic we mean must have had a form quite different from the historical component of East Thessalian and of Lesbian. Fick had to admit such forms as *χερσί* and *πεφυζότες* into his original *Μῆνις* in order to have any nucleus left at all. Yet it is not only impossible to translate even the briefest passage of the Homeric poems into historical Aeolic: it is also doubtful whether singers could have managed with a diction exclusively based upon the form of this dialect that appears in the earliest inscriptions. Such a repertory would have had only plural datives ending in *-εσσι* and its participles of the perfect could only have had declined forms in *-οντος*, etc. It would have lacked *χερσί(ν)* (which, in Homer, is found more than a hundred times, often in ancient looking formulae such as *μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχων* (*O* 717 etc., 7 ×)), *ἀνδράσι(ν)* (± 67 ×, *ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσι(ν)*, *E* 488 etc., 7 ×, *ἀνδράσιν ἀλφιστήσι*, *a* 349), *νησί(ν)* (± 175 ×, *νησὶν ἐπι γλαφυρήσι(ν)*, *E* 327 etc., 12 ×), *εἰκότες* (*-τας*, *-τε*) (28 ×), *τετληότι(-τες)* (10 ×, *τετληότι θυμῶ*, *δ* 447, etc., 9 ×), *ἀρηρότος(-τι*, etc. 7 ×, e.g. *ζωστήρος(-ι) ἀρηρότος(-τι)* *Δ* 213, 134, cf. Myc. a-ra-ru-wo-a = *ἀραρφά*), and so on. Such a diction could not possibly have been the ancestor of our epics, so that we should have to fall back on putting down the origin of this Aeolic ancestor at a time when the innovations in question had not yet originated and this would necessarily lead us to postulate a form of Aeolic coming much nearer to Mycenaean.

There are as serious flaws in the Mycenaean-Ionian theory. It cannot be denied that emigrants from Pylos and from the Peloponnesus in general may have taken some epic songs with them. Nevertheless expressions of the type *βῆ (βὰν) δ' (δ') ἴμεν*, *ἱερευσέμεν αἶ κ'* (*ἐλεήση*), *ἐναιρέμεν ὄν κε (δόνηαι)*, *πιφανσκέμεν ὄν κ'* (*ἐδ εἰδῆς*), *ἀλαγκέμεν ὄπποτέ (κεν δῆ)*, **πολέεσσι δὲ θυμὸν ἀπέφρα*, are at the same time so fundamental to the diction and so often have ancient components that they cannot have been created by means of loan-words borrowed from the dialect of Lesbos and the Aeolic settlements of Asia Minor. They must ultimately go back to a

mainland substratum, the origin of which has to be localised in Central Greece and Thessaly.¹⁾ There are two additional arguments which lend support to this assumption. First, arguing on the supposition of a Mycenaean heroic poetry, I do not see why the Isthmus and Mt. Cithaeron should have proved insuperable barriers to travelling singers. Secondly, it is next to impossible to account for the presence in Homer, not only of references to many famous sagas centred around the sites of Thebes, Pleuron and Calydon, Orchomenos and Iolcos, but also of data which are found, to use Murray's term, "in the little backwaters" of epic narrative.²⁾ How could late Ionian singers have detailed knowledge of the obscure Iphiclos, living at the equally obscure Phylace, unless through a tradition which, by whatever route it reached them, must have originated in Northern Greece in pre-migration times? It is the same with other data found in those "little backwaters". Though the practice of giving Greek names to Trojans (Orestes, Adrastos, Orsilochos, to mention only the most famous names of Greek saga) far antedates the Ionic stage of heroic poetry, nothing precludes us from supposing that it was Homer or some of his Ionian predecessors who first used the name of *Ἵορμενος* for inconspicuous Trojans in *Θ* 274 and *Μ* 187. But did an Ionian create the expression *Ἀμύντορος Ἵορμενίδαο*³⁾ and was he the first to make both bearers of that name dwell in Central Greece, one in Hellas,⁴⁾ the other in Eleon,⁵⁾ a not unimportant fortress in Mycenaean times,⁶⁾ where, according to Homer he had 'a strong house'?⁷⁾

This way of putting the question was suggested to me some years ago by the parallels which appear to exist between the personal names iden-

¹⁾ cf. Page, *H.H.I.* 266, Kirk, *S.H.* 147 f. In fact Webster's reference to *περιπλομένων ἐναντιῶν* (which he rightly regards as a very early component of epic language) implies the same, for the formula cannot have been created within the (South-) Mycenaean-Ionian tradition.

²⁾ *R.G.E.*⁴ 220. See also Bowra, *Homer and his Forerunners* 15.

³⁾ *I* 448, *K* 266. I am unable to agree that the appearance of the patronymic in *-δης* has to be assigned to the transitional period following the migrations (Webster *o.c.* 156, 163). First it is doubtful whether the Mycenaean forms in *-i-jo* are really patronymics, cf. Mrs. N. van Brock, *Notes Mycéniennes*, *Rev. de Phil.* XXXIV (1960), 222-225. Secondly the absence of patronymics ending in *-da(s)* (but see *Docs* 94) proves nothing for other regions of Greece. Thirdly—and this is my main objection—there is not the slightest evidence that they were ever lacking in Aeolic and that at the very time when inter-cantonal communications were at their lowest ebb the vogue began to spread to the remotest parts of the Greek world. Webster himself mentions the Aleuadai and Scopadai. An ordinary citizen of a Thessalian town bears the name of *Παισιάδαο* on a sixth-century inscription, Miss Jeffery, *o.c.* 97.

⁴⁾ Phoinix' father.

⁵⁾ The original owner of Meriones' helmet.

⁶⁾ *R.E.* V (1905) *s.v.* Eleon (Philippson). The place was renowned for its prophets. It was the alleged home of the older Bakis (schol. *Ar. Pax* 1071), and another seer, who lived there about 600 B.C., is mentioned by Herodotus, V, 73.

⁷⁾ from which Autolykos stole the helmet, *πυκινὸν δόμον ἀντιτορήσας*, *K* 267.

tified on the tablets and some of the phenomena observed by the too much ignored Bethe.¹⁾ It has since found a counterpart in the discussion of place-names and their epithets by Page in his well-known chapter on the Catalogue of Ships. On account of our lack of linguistic knowledge the existence, in Mycenaean times, of a formulaic diction in which some archaic form of Aeolic was incorporated cannot be definitely proved by this line of argument. Still, whereas philologists are in the habit of looking for linguistic innovations in order to determine the character of a given dialect as opposed to others, from our point of view the fact that Mycenaean and Aeolic had many elements, archaisms and others, in common, is much more important. If Risch is right in regarding East-Thessalian as an archaic "Randdialekt",²⁾ I see no linguistic objection to the view that already before the twelfth century there developed an epic *κοινή* in which (South-) Mycenaean formulae were intermingled with expressions belonging to a dialect which, according to one's preference may be called "proto-

1) Bethe doubtless exaggerated, but if the interpretation of the proper names on the Lin. B. tablets is substantially correct, his theory (which was initiated by Dümmler and afterwards adopted by Cauer and Gilbert Murray) is vindicated on what I consider its most essential points. Why indeed should not the oral poets — their practice being as it is (see e.g. Bowra, *AJA* LIV (1950), 188, *H.P.* 522–536) — have introduced figures of tribal legend into the story of the Trojan War? Since they called two Trojans after a semi-historical personage of Central Greece (above, p. 149) and gave another the name of *Ἵορσίλοχος*, why should they not have added the name of Achilles' indigenous adversary *Ἀλέξανδρος* to that of a Trojan prince, which never developed into a formula. Only, this was not done by colonists of Asiatic Aeolis, as Bethe thought, but some centuries before by mainland singers.

Since there is no reason why stories about minor heroes should have been exempt from innovation, we cannot expect to find these men appearing in ancient formulaic nuclei. Nevertheless it may be worthwhile to have a look at the passages in which the heroes signalled by Bethe (*Die Sage vom Troischen Kriege* III, 81 ff.) and Murray (*R.G.E.*⁴ 223 f.) are mentioned (on their Thessalian and Boeotian origin I refer to the testimonies quoted): 1. Schedios, son of Iphitos. Hector kills him, *μεγαθύμου Ἰφίτου νιόν* (< **μεγαθύμου Φιφίτο*' *νιόν*, above, p. 24), *Ἰφωκίων ὄχ' ἄριστον* (*P* 306–07). The form of the latter hemistich of *P* 308 is due to modification of **πολλέσσ' ἀνδρῶσσι Φανάσων* (above, p. 55) which was combined with a relatively late *T*₁ formula (above, p. 117). 2. Leitos. According to Herodotus (VII 197) the Achaeans of Southern Thessaly called their prytaneum *λήιτον* (i.e. *λά(φ)ιτον*). Hector wounds his adversary, *P* 602, *νιόν Ἀλεκτρύνορος μεγαθύμου* (above, p. 24), *παῦσε δὲ χάρμης*. A-re-ku-tu-ru-wo-(-no) (PY An 654 etc., *Docs* 191, 278) is among the most firmly established interpretations of Mycenaean names of persons. On *χάρμη* see below, p. 151 n. 1. 3. Troilos (Bethe 85f.). With Amythaon he shares the epithet *Ἰπιοχάρμης* (below, *ibid.*). On To-ro-o (PY An 519) see *Docs* 150. 4. Dryops. A tribe of that name once lived between Phocis and Malis (Herodotus VIII 31, 43) in the immediate neighbourhood of the Spercheios. Achilles kills Dryops *Y* 455: *ὧς εἰπὼν Δρύοπ' οὔτα κατ' ἀχένα μέσσον ἄκοντι*. The ancient aorist *οὔτα* is followed by an expression which seems to have Aeolic relatives: *τὸν βάλε μέσσον ἄκοντι* (? *Y* 413; on *ἄκων* see Trümpy, *o.c.* 235), *ἀχένα μέσσον* (*E* 657), *ἀχένα μέσσον ἔλασσε* (*K* 455, *Ξ* 497, cf. above, p. 144), cf. (*διαπρὸ δέ*) *χαλκὸν ἔλασσε* (-σαν, -σαι) *N* 388, etc. 9 x.

²⁾ *Gliederung* 74.

and we have traced back the expressions in question to pre-Homeric prototypes. Yet it is only incidentally that this method enables us to identify expressions as elements of the pre-migration repertory. Neither when we have to do with cases of drastic innovation dating from the transition period nor with certain combinations of archaisms are our criteria of any avail.

INDEX OF PASSAGES

I HOMER

Iliad

	A	
1-25 - 11	91 - 124	35 - 37
3-4 - 12	110 - 135 n. 2	46 - 124, 128
12 - 129	117 - 36	50 - 116
19 - 56	129 - 152 n. 1	57 - 55
28 - 61 n. 4	131 - 36 + n. 2	89 - 114 n. 4
36 - 54, 133	165 - 125	139 - 54
72 - 64	181 - 125	169 - 89
73 - 138	182 - 56 n. 3	229 - 108 n. 2
84 - 139	208 - 127	234 - 133
104 - 134	233 - 56	240 - 124, 128
114 - 136	272 - 55	265 - 114 n. 4
119 - 56	275 - 40	283 - 128
141 - 60, 151	283 - 91 n. 2	335 - 109
250 - 112	359 - 112 n. 1	338 - 92 n. 7
268 - 152	373 - 55	339 - 103 n. 4
281 - 55, 152	382 - 102	351 - 55
284 - 108 n. 2	401 - 135 n. 2	362f. - 97f.
288 - 55, 57	414 - 65	444 - 124, 128
306 - 129	416 - 103 n. 5	446 - 133 n. 2
343 - 91	428 - 62 n. 3	Δ
354 - 33	433 - 36 n. 2	23 - 133 n. 2
364 - 139	451 - 53f.	47 - 37
396 - 73 n. 2, 136	452 - 54 n. 4	73 - 69 n. 4
416 - 122	475 - 32	96 - 36 n. 2
444 - 49 n. 2	479 - 135 n. 2	127 - 139
462 - 54	509 - 129	134 - 148
465 - 62 n. 3	516 - 129	142 - 37
469 - 135	518 - 24 n. 2	146 - 139
480 - 48 n. 1	540 - 135 n. 2	151 - 80
485 - 60	565 - 22	153 - 139
487 - 124	602 - 129	162 - 84
511 - 139	614 - 79 n. 5	203 - 180 n. 2
536 - 145	615 - 46f., 63, 118	213 - 148
537 - 61 n. 4	624 - 140	222 - 151 n. 1
547 - 106	626 - 47	259 - 54
566 - 61 n. 4	627 - 135 n. 2	287 - 50
584 - 94 n. 2	672 - 55	289 - 107
604 - 56 n. 3, 121	680 - 129	297 - 44, 93
	706 - 24 n. 3, 140	308 - 114
	715 - 140	325 - 90
	720 - 50	331 - 106
	743 - 152 n. 4	366 - 101
	837f. - 139 n. 1	388 - 73 n. 3
B		437 - 146
38 - 49		441 - 135 n. 2
43 - 103		459ff. - 97f.
45 - 93f.		
60-70 - 57	Γ	
70-71 - 57	18 - 114 n. 1	
	29 - 90 n. 2	

466 - 105 n. 1, 128	606 - 50	429 - 109 n. 5
467 - 30	608 - 151 n. 1, 152	455 - 151
470 - 56 n. 5, 57 + n. 4	618 - 128	492 - 110
495 - 114 n. 2	657 - 150 n. 1	
506 - 53 n. 5	661 - 102	<i>H</i>
	675 - 132, 151	1 - 32
<i>E</i>	683 - 66	16 - 136
1 - 33	689 - 139	52 - 112 n. 1
9 - 116 n. 3	691 - 105 n. 1, 108, 118	53 - 56
13 - 92	697 - 33 + n. 1	78 - 128
47 - 114 n. 4	732 - 68 n. 1	80 - 142
53 - 15	738 - 93	82 - 128
60 - 34	743 - 95 n. 3, 99	85 - 142
77 - 140	757 - 135 n. 2	88 - 61 n. 1
107 - 45 n. 1, 93	770 - 89	104 - 139
127 - 134	792 - 69 n. 2	108 - 59
134 - 136	794 - 93	133 - 132
137 - 68 n. 3	818 - 36	135 - 22
142 - 119 nn. 8, 9	838 - 53 n. 8	146 - 64
175 - 55	859 - 53 n. 9	157 - 131
187 - 78 n. 5	866 - 33	175 - 50
199 - 101 n. 2	871 - 108 n. 2	206f. - 114 n. 3
204 - 52, 64	878 - 50	211 - 108 n. 2
219 - 93	909 - 135 n. 2	218 - 151 n. 1, 152
225 - 33		220 - 65
226 - 62	<i>Z</i>	226 - 56 n. 4
274 - 58	4 - 129f.	229 - 128
277 - 24 n. 2	5 - 108 n. 2	277 - 13 n. 5, 49
289 - 135 n. 2	9ff. - 97f.	345 - 115
294 - 141 n. 4	13 - 34	371 - 51
302 - 53 n. 7	35 - 62	381 - 89
323 - 115	54 - 66	424 - 51
327 - 148	86 - 109 n. 5	432 - 89
338 - 65	88 - 115	
343 - 53 n. 6	94 - 120	<i>Θ</i>
353 - 57	109 - 136 n. 3	100 - 37 n. 7
362 - 34	165 - 79 n. 1	122 - 141 n. 4
420 - 138	179 - 73 n. 3	136 - 134
439 - 139	193 - 57	194 - 93
457 - 34	220 - 94 n. 2	199 - 113, 145 n. 1
470 - 69 n. 3	231 - 75 n. 3	216 - 58
481 - 30	235 - 33	220 - 129
488 - 148	253 - 52 n. 1	227 - 74
497 - 136	268 - 92 n. 7	274 - 149
523 - 80	275 - 120	313 - 141 n. 4
534 - 33 + n. 1	291 - 112	321 - 53 n. 7
535 - 34	297 - 115	356 - 55
546 - 55, 100 n. 1, 118	309 - 120	372 - 48 n. 1
550 - 128	317 - 115	432 - 62
555 - 119	395f. - 34	460 - 133 n. 2
556 - 62	397 - 55, 118	488 - 146 n. 2
558 - 132	406 - 59	490 - 85
563 - 69	422 - 146	544 - 51
586 - 98	424 - 67f.	

<i>P</i>	160 - 53 n. 6	62 - 145
5 - 54 n. 1	162 - 68 n. 3	77 - 34
9 - 38	220 - 36	78 - 135 n. 2
23 - 38	236 - 151	101 - 37, 116 n. 2
59 - 38	237 - 93	152 - 139
102 - 95 + n. 6	260 - 125	174 - 69
119 - 56, 66	266 - 118 n. 2	189 - 127 n. 2
136 - 99 n. 4	288 - 112	201 - 58
194 - 103 + n. 4	289 - 145	232 - 22
198 - 80	334 - 143	250 - 30
200 - 69 n. 6	349 - 89	285 - 53 n. 7
213 - 53 n. 6, 144	391 - 13 n. 5	290 - 151
222 - 51	406 - 37	326 - 12
236 - 118, 151	431 - 36 n. 2	337 - 112 n. 1
250 - 50	442 - 133	360 - 88
252 - 50	467 - 118	371f. - 34 n. 2
279 - 57	537 - 17 n. 2	380 - 56 n. 3
306ff. - 150 n. 1	545 - 48 n. 4	382 - 53 n. 7
308 - 55, 117, 150 n. 1,	552 - 90	383 - 118
151	570 - 122	413 - 150 n. 1
317 - 53 n. 5		455 - 150 n. 1
383 - 127	<i>T</i>	481 - 144
385ff. - 92	41 - 53 n. 7	495 - 120
447 - 139 n. 2	42 - 127	501 - 36
467 - 140	47 - 135 + n. 2	503 - 92 n. 7
472 - 136	77 - 36	
504 - 114ff.	84 - 51	\emptyset
529 - 102 n. 2	104 - 102 n. 4, 132	28 - 32 n. 7
586 - 79 n. 2	109 - 102 n. 4	41 - 44
597 - 32 n. 4	123 - 140	73 - 108 n. 2
602 - 150 n. 1, 151 n. 1	135 - 129	85f. - 33
612 - 124, 125 + n. 2	174 - 122 + n. 1	86 - 30, 33f., 132, 151
619 - 90 n. 1	189 - 32	98 - 56
633 - 90	191 - 104 n. 4	114 - 136
639 - 88 n. 3	219 - 91	121 - 108 n. 2
647 - 146	256 - 59	168 - 102 n. 2
671 - 107	269 - 151	179 - 151
680 - 118	316 - 98 n. 5	188 - 100 n. 1
698 - 12	332 - 15, 50	200 - 151
725 - 152	368 - 65	213 - 119 nn. 8, 9
727 - 35 n. 2	373 - 109	251 - 96
748 - 74 n. 1	391 - 145	285 - 134
759 - 151 n. 1	396 - 92	310 - 17 n. 2
	397f. - 113f.	322 - 37
<i>\Sigma</i>	399 - 136	350 - 63
4 - 135 n. 3	413 - 133	399 - 54f.
61 - 133		409 - 108 n. 2
71 - 136	<i>Y</i>	427 - 108 n. 2
78 - 139	2 - 139	431 - 135 n. 2
91 - 146	33 - 127	440 - 91
93 - 32 n. 7	35 - 34	448 - 67, 80
141 - 58	42 - 34 n. 4	524 - 100 n. 1
159 - 17 n. 2	55 - 58	564 - 127 n. 2

580 - 79 n. 1	152f. - 105ff.	852 - 126
602 - 106	166 - 68	861 - 98 n. 5
	170 - 142	878 - 126
	186 - 142	
	204 - 13 n. 5, 49	Ω
	219 - 94 n. 2	
	286 - 101	38 - 143
	296 - 39 n. 2	105 - 58
	307 - 79 n. 7	146-58 - 43
	312 - 77 n. 5, 91, 100f.	158 - 36
	319 - 101 n. 2	159 - 44
	360 - 136	175-87 - 43
	362 - 92	187 - 36, 44
	365 - 85	224 - 123
	379 - 134	242 - 146
	390 - 57	250 - 95
	402 - 136	257 - 151
	412 - 132	280 - 79 n. 4
	419 - 151 n. 1	281ff. - 117 + n. 3
	461 - 144	307 - 66
	529 - 96	321 - 122
	584 - 28	354 - 57
	597f. - 122	507 - 105
	600 - 122, 139	515 - 145
	612 - 12	553 - 145
	646 - 143	558 - 133
	656 - 94 n. 2	588 - 103 n. 2
	663 - 94 n. 3, 96	597 - 113, 145
	667 - 94 n. 3, 96	649 - 139
	670 - 116 n. 2	657 - 143, 152
	690 - 37	658 - 32
	692 - 33 n. 1	706 - 116 + n. 3
	699 - 94 n. 2	780 - 127
	787 - 15, 107, 119, 146	

 Ψ

8 - 101 n. 2
 29 - 109
 49 - 49
 55 - 50
 60 - 73 n. 3
 92 - 64
 102 - 66
 108 - 105
 143 - 69 n. 4
 151 - 106

Odyssey

	α	350 - 122	234 - 102 n. 4
		354 - 59	283 - 77 n. 5, 91, 100
	1-25 - 11	356 - 58	297 - 74 n. 3, 89 n. 2
	9 - 59	358 - 110	392 - 51
	71 - 82, 84, 107	366 - 80	395 - 103 n. 1
	77 - 104 n. 4	388 - 138	
	92 - 68		γ
	110 - 57		18 - 105
	124 - 37	β	40f. - 117
	145 - 145	33 - 144	48 - 48 n. 4
	154f. - 122	40 - 56 n. 4	63 - 94 n. 2
	168 - 59	47 - 102 n. 4	110 - 139 n. 2
	197 - 112	52ff. - 58	134 - 112 n. 1
	225 - 37	78 - 32	137 - 134
	310 - 134	91 - 30	151 - 113 n. 1
	325 - 121f.	148 - 35	162 - 125 n. 2
	349 - 148	165 - 102	181 - 33
		166 - 73 n. 3, 102, 121	

233 - 30, 59	662 - 134 + n. 1	107 - 36
245 - 106 n. 3	700 - 132, 151	185 - 137
246 - 144	707 - 37	197 - 122
278 - 36	712 - 89 n. 2	250 - 67 n. 4
285 - 143	714 - 136	283f. - 146 n. 2
299 - 124f.	773 - 137	298 - 137
352f. - 13 n. 2	780 - 60	305 - 79 n. 1
361 - 81	783 - 48 n. 1	326 - 51
374 - 59	796 - 134	
377 - 74	818 - 40f.	ϑ
382ff. - 120	831 - 89 n. 2	
399 - 68	833 - 133	15 - 69 n. 2
414 - 22	840 - 122	25 - 137
421f. - 104f.		34 - 60
422 - 138		49 - 134
459 - 54	ε	52 - 60, 121
462 - 62 n. 3	12 - 102 n. 4	54 - 48 n. 1
466 - 74	37 - 81	60 - 67
489 - 118 n. 1	61 - 56 n. 3	65 - 145
490 - 113 n. 1	78 - 61 n. 4	83 - 121
	126 - 62	89 - 94 n. 2
	132 - 67 n. 4	108 - 79 n. 4
	165 - 48 n. 7	111 - 32 n. 4
δ	201 - 135	113 - 15, 32 n. 4
8 - 101 n. 2	206 - 123	140 - 137
27 - 134	215 - 58	141 - 59
50 - 103 n. 3	234 - 57	259 - 50
113 - 105	248 - 86	266 - 122
135 - 45	288 - 123	267 - 134 n. 2
136 - 113, 145	308 - 112 n. 1	276 - 134 n. 2
137 - 50	320 - 59	302 - 13 n. 5, 49
163 - 56	321 - 64	304 - 89, 133 n. 2
173 - 90 n. 4	372 - 64	325 - 89
183 - 105	386 - 35 n. 3	367 - 121
189 - 108 n. 2	459 - 53 n. 4	397 - 59
198 - 37	486 - 35, 56	400 - 137
223 - 37		416 - 94
229 - 114 n. 4	ζ	437 - 134
253 - 106	26 - 103 n. 6	466 - 59
273 - 102	33f. - 105	481 - 79 n. 7
284 - 49	38 - 62, 103 n. 6	488 - 79 n. 7
320 - 68	69 - 109 n. 5	489 - 122
333-50 - 19	96 - 134	513 - 102
387 - 82	111 - 58	514 - 121
429 - 146 n. 2	116 - 119 n. 9	559f. - 91 n. 2
447 - 148	219 - 92	569 - 115
505 - 74 n. 3	223 - 81	
533 - 93	228 - 64	ι
540 - 133	242 - 144	46 - 68
562 - 112 n. 1	265 - 107	77 - 48 n. 1
574 - 146 n. 2		107 - 101
577 - 60, 113		127 - 50
608 - 36	η	155 - 152 n. 5
617 - 89 n. 2	34 - 90	186 - 86
635 - 47	81 - 103	

278 - 59	329 - 136	339 - 106
295 - 152 n. 3	331 - 122	347 - 84
303 - 152 n. 3	341 - 145	354 - 81
347 - 47	364 - 145	
350 - 58	402 - 92 n. 7	
352 - 110	409 - 49	ω
380 - 134	436 - 134	10 - 40
399 - 54	442 - 79 n. 7	22 - 112 n. 1
431ff. - 114	465 - 126 n. 1	26 - 95, 100 + n. 1
	478 - 88 n. 2	50 - 89
		60 - 56 n. 3
χ		67 - 142
8 - 106		118 - 112
20 - 90 n. 1	ψ	162 - 34f.
43 - 74 n. 2	47 - 122	188 - 91 n. 2
58f. - 122 + n. 1	48 - 92 n. 7	231 - 99 n. 4
85 - 90 n. 1	73 - 52 n. 1	322 - 52
86 - 94 n. 2	102 - 52	327 - 137
111 - 98 n. 5	130 - 144	332 - 111
122 - 94	170 - 52	339 - 50
131 - 9 n. 5, 39f., 137	183 - 59	343 - 122
145 - 98 n. 5	219 - 62	382 - 122
194 - 138	222 - 89 n. 2	417 - 50
202 - 134, 135 n. 1	231 - 105	431 - 47
212 - 39	265 - 109 n. 7	452 - 34
241 - 39	269 - 91 n. 2	466 - 104
247 - 9 n. 5, 39f., 137	271 - 91 n. 2	504 - 35, 56
280 - 90	315f. - 104, 122f.	538 - 74 n. 2
318f. - 54f.	333 - 132	

II HESIOD

Theogony

2 - 83 n. 2	275 - 67	700 - 84
15 - 27, 86 n. 3	329 - 85	735 - 85
60 - 26 n. 3	398 - 84ff.	769 - 85
63 - 83 n. 2	401 - 26 n. 3	777f. - 85
125 - 83	404 - 81 n. 6	844 - 84 n. 5
131 - 83	424 - 84	871 - 84
133 - 83	518 - 67	898 - 85
173 - 83 n. 2	570 - 84	908 - 81 n. 6
175 - 84	585 - 25 n. 3	1016 - 84
179f. - 84	602 - 84	

Erga

28 - 26	391 - 85	616 - 85
30 - 26	431 - 85	675 - 26
63 - 25 n. 3	531 - 85	683 - 26
198 - 85	564 - 26	739 - 81 n. 6
235f. - 85	592 - 27, 54	

III HYMNS

Apollo

4 - 36	148 - 84f.	447 - 53
15 - 54	163 - 77, 91	506 - 61
16 - 15	426 - 47	

Hermes

46 - 49 n. 1

Aphrodite

6 - 78f., 81f.	114f. - 79 + n. 3	199 - 79
15 - 79 + n. 7	126 - 78, 80	211 - 133 n. 1
25 - 78f.	128 - 79	212 - 78, 81
31 - 78, 81f.	140 - 78, 81, 85	225 - 78, 79 n. 4, 81, 111
54f. - 78f.	147 - 40f.	n. 1
55 - 111 n. 1	164 - 62	231 - 79 + n. 4
83f. - 78f.	169 - 62	232 - 58, 61, 62
85 - 61f.	171 - 58	274f. - 82 n. 2
102 - 78, 80, 85	181 - 78, 80f.	284 - 78, 81f., 85

IV OTHER AUTHORS

Anaxandrides, *Fr.* 65 K. - 99 n. 4

Apollonius Soph., *Lex.* (*ελλήπους*) - 67 n. 4

Aristophanes, schol. *Pax* 1071 - 149 n. 6

Callimachus, *Zeus* 14, 23, 82 - 12 n. 3

Artemis 22, 27, 122, 140 - 12 n. 3

Herodianus, *Rel.* 71, 11 L. - 120

Herodotus, V 73 - 149 n. 6

VII 3 - 79 n. 3

VII 197, VIII 31, 43 - 150 n. 1

Hesychius (*ἐχέσφιν*) 45 n. 3; (*δλοφους*) - 66 n. 1

Hippocrates, *Art.* (*περὶ ἄρθρων ἐμβολῆς*) 8 - 67 n. 4

Nonnus, I 335, 511 - 76 n. 7

Quintilianus, *Inst.* X, 1, 52 - 76 n. 2

Quintus Smyrnaeus, I 133, 539, II 295, V 296, VIII 108, IX 227 - 12 n. 3

Sappho, *Fr.* 21, 3 L.P. - 66 n. 1

Fr. 31 L.P. - 133 n. 2

Sophocles, *Ai.* 85 - 115

Theocritus, V 103 - 99 n. 2

Thucydides, III 102 - 151 n. 1

GENERAL INDEX

- Abbreviated version — 111, 117 n. 3
Abbreviation of formulae (prototypes) — 33 n. 2, 38f., 62ff., 132
Achaean — 72, 91, 109, 144; *see also* Mycenaean
Aeolic — 50, 91, 102, 103 n. 1, 119, 127 n. 2, 133, 135, 145 n. 2, 146ff., 150ff.
Aeschylus — 17, 69
Agelaos — 9, 39; *see also* Suitors
Ahrens, H. L. — 24, 57
Aias, son of Telamon — 95
Alcaeus — 44 n. 2, 50 n. 2
Alexandros - Paris — 150 n. 1
Allen, T. W. — 30 n. 1, 61 n. 3, 63, 77 n. 1, 78 + n. 5
Allen-Halliday-Sikes — 61 n. 3, 77f.
Arneis - Hentze - Cauer — 98 n. 4
Analogy — 17 n. 2, 59, 89, 106
Antithesis — 56ff.
Aorist (of Passive) — 136
ἄρα expressions — 13f., 116
Apollonius Rhodius — 14, 16, 17 n. 1, 20, 76f.
Apostrophe — 138f.
Arcadian — 50, 72 n. 5
Arcado - Cypriot — 148
Archaisation — 32 n. 4, 92, 97 n. 5, 115f., 126, 134 n. 1, 135
Archaisms (archaic elements, etc.) — 14, 42 n. 4, 50ff., 55, 63, 66, 73 n. 3, 74 n. 3, 80, 83, 89 n. 2, 90, 93, 95, 100 n. 1, 101, 105, 113 n. 1, 114, 117, 121, 123, 125f., 128 and VI *pass.*
Ares — 135 + n. 2
Attic - Ionic — 71f.
- Barnett, R. D. — 84 n. 2
Bartoněk, A. — 74 n. 3
Bassett, S. E. — 16 n. 4, 87 n. 1, 105, 109 nn. 1, 7, 101
Battle at the Wall (near the Ships) 101, 129f., 140
Bechtel, F. — 37, 72 n. 5, 99 n. 3, 113 n. 1, 116 n. 4, 117 n. 4, 135 n. 5
Bekker, I. — 5, 27 n. 5, 52
Bennett, E. L. — 142 n. 2
Bentley, R. — 49 n. 4, 53ff., 60 n. 1, 63
Bethe, E. — 9, 150 + n. 1
Boardman, J. — 98 n. 2
Body-shield — 16 n. 2, 74, 114, 141
Boeotian — 26
Boisacq, E. — 88 n. 4
Bowra, Sir C. M. — 7 n. 2, 16 n. 2, 18 + n. 2, 34, 52 n. 1, 139 n. 6, 149f.
Brock, N. v. — 149 n. 3
Buck, C. D. — 31 nn. 2, 5, 46 n. 1, 71, 133 n. 2, 134 n. 4, 151 n. 1, 152 n. 1
Burial-customs — 141f.
Buttmann, Ph. K. — 24
- Callimachus — 14, 20, 76 + n. 5, 77
Cauer, P. — 98 n. 4, 142f., 150 n. 1
Chadwick, J. — 8 n. 1, 99
Chantraine, P. — 8 n. 1 and *pass.*

- Chariots — 45, 93f.; chariot-fighting 141 + n. 4
 Christ, W. v. — 43 n. 1, 64
 Chronology — 7, 16 + n. 2, 25f., 31, 38, 42ff., 69ff., 74 n. 2, 76ff., 82, 91, 97ff., 109, 124, 127, 129, 131ff., 137ff., 144
 Colloquialisms — 37, 116 n. 2
 Composition — (oral) 10ff., 15–20, 25, 38, 68ff., 106, 117 n. 3, 124, 144; (collective) 19, 43f.
 Conjugation — 48 n. 1, 49ff., 62 n. 3, 74 n. 3, 81, 89ff., 102, 112, 118, 122 n. 1, 128, 131ff., 138f., 145
 Connective particles — 56, 62, 65f.
 Contamination — 36, 54, 103
 Contraction — 24, 31 n. 1, 32, 33 n. 1, 38, 91, 102, 112 n. 1, 113 n. 1, 122 + n. 1, 131ff., 143f.
 Crest-holder (of helmet) — 97f.
- Danielsson, O. A. — 34 n. 3
 Dative (sing., in *-σι* of *ι*-stems) — 115f.; (plur.) 71ff., 88; (in *-οισι(ν)*, *-ουν*) 93f.; (of *πολύς*) 100 + n. 1; (in *-εοσι*) 117ff., 146, 148
 Davison, J. A. — 9 n. 2, 10 n. 2, 29 n. 2
 Declension — 26, 28, 33f., 36ff., 47ff., 51, 69, 88, 93f., 112, 114f., 119, 125, 131 + n. 1, 151, 152
 Decomposition — 8, 27f., 41, 61, 75, 77, 83, 110, 131; *see also* Dissociation
 Delbrück, B. — 71 n. 2
 Denniston, J. D. — 14 n. 4, 56 n. 8, 118
 Dessenne, A. — 141 n. 1
 Devantier, F. — 26
 Dialogue — 52 + n. 4
 Digamma — (general) 21 n. 7, 22f., 26 n. 4, 29f., 42–47, 85 + n. 1, 124; (neglected) 13 n. 5, 24, 26 n. 4, 27, 29f., 35, 42–70, 71, 74f., 77, 89, 91, 94, 110 n. 1, 117 n. 1, 119, 131; (observed) 13 n. 5, 29f., 42–70, 74 n. 2, 84 n. 5, 110 n. 1, 112
 Dislocation — 27; *see also* Dislodgment, Dissociation
 Dislodgment — 27, 100; *see also* Dislocation, Dislodgment
 Dissociation (Disintegration) — 40, 90 + n. 4; *see also above*
 Divided formulae, — *see* Introduction and Separation
 Dor (L.) — Jannoray (J.) — van Effenterre (H. and M.) — 72 n. 5
 Doric — 72
 Dual — 91ff., 115, 131, 133ff.
 Dümmler, F. — 150 n. 1
- Ebeling, H. — 99 n. 4
 Elaboration — 43, 48ff., 52 n. 1, 109 n. 7, 110f., 126, 129, 136, 140
 Eleon — 149 n. 6
 Elis — 46 + nn. 1, 3, 63
 Elision — 65f.
 Enjambement — 34, 41, 50, 85ff., 101–110, 113 n. 1, 121ff.; *see also* Runover Word *ἐναγροφή* — 34, 111
 Equivalents — 13, 36 n. 1, 48 n. 7, 110 n. 1, 114 n. 4, 127 n. 2, 135f., 146 n. 2
 Essential idea — 11ff., 22, 65, 69
 Evolution (continuity of) — 8, 25ff., 46, 136–152
 Exposed positions — 56f., 59f.; *see also* Switch-point
 Extension (of formulae) — 61, 95; (paratactic, attributive) 107, 109 + n. 7; (of meaning) 113f.
- Feudal (dynastical) passages — 52, 73 n. 3, 149f.

- Fick, A. — 53, 103 n. 1, 133 n. 2, 148
 Finley, M. I. — 141
 Flexibility — 51, 66, 126
 Formula (definition of) — 11ff., 18
 Frequency — 11, 13, 94f., 128f., 136f.
 Frisk, H. — 14 n. 1 and *pass.*
- Gallet de Santerre, H. — 72 n. 5
 Genealogies — 52, 140
 'Geminatenaufösung' — 73, 110
 Genitive — (in *-εω, -έων*) *see* Metathesis; (in *-ου*) 93f.; (in *-οο*) 24; (in *-ου*) 31 n. 1, 132; (plur. of *πολύς*) 118
 Glides — 72f., 75 n. 3
 Gorgo — 121
 Gossaert, Geerten — 7
 Gow, A. S. F. — 99 n. 2
 Graphic expression — 66
 Gray, D. H. F. — 7f., 52, 73 n. 3, 97 n. 4
 Groningen, B. A. v. — 33 n. 1, 83 n. 1
 Güterbock, H. G. — 84 n. 1
 Guthrie, W. K. C. — 36 n. 1
- Hainsworth, J. B. — 8 n. 1, 14 n. 2, 15 n. 4, 16 n. 1, 23 n. 2, 25 n. 2, 31 n. 6, 35 n. 5
 41 n. 2, 49, 59 n. 1, 94, 120 n. 5, 136 n. 2, 139 n. 4, 147
 Hamm, E.-M. — 133 n. 2
 Hartel, W. v. — 43 n. 1
 Helbig, W. — 98 nn. 1, 3, 141ff.
 Helmet — 96ff., 113ff.; (boar's tusk) 16 n. 2, 144
 Herdsmen — 9, 138ff.
 Hermes — 38ff., 49
 Herodotus — 33 n. 1, 119
 Hesiod — 8, 18, 25 + n. 3, 26ff., 76, 83ff., 101, 108
 Hiatus — 41 n. 1, 52 n. 2, 72ff., 74, 96; *see also* *v-movable*
 Hippocrates — 119
 Hoekstra, A. — 26 n. 1, 28 n. 1, 45 n. 4, 67 n. 1, 84 n. 2, 85 n. 1, 151 n. 1
 Hoffmann, O. — 40 n. 1
 Horns (of helmet) — 97f.
 Humbert, J. — 77 n. 1
 Hybrids — 55 n. 1, 102 n. 4, 104, 127 n. 2
 Hymns (Homeric) — 8, 15, 18, 25ff.; (*Dem.*) 76f.; (*Ap.*) 61, 76f.; (*Hermes*) 76f.; (*Aphr.*) 40, 75ff., 86, 101, 107
- Identification (of pre-Homeric formulae) — 28ff., 33, 35f., 40, 46, 58, 88f., 94f.
 Ilios — 52, 64
 Improvisation — 18ff., 88
 Infinitive (in *-μεν, -μεναι*) — 27, 60, 82, 109 n. 7, 125, 144, 146
 Innovation — 27 and *pass.*
 Introduction (Insertion) (of new elements) — 34ff., 38ff., 54ff., 62f., 64f., 79 n. 7, 82, 94ff., 113 n. 1, 144ff., 117; *see also* Separation
 Inversion — 80; *see also* Transposition
 Ionic — 22, 26, 32f., 37, 44ff., 65f., 71, 74, 84, 88 n. 3, 89, 91, 95f., 100 n. 1, 103 n. 1, 108ff., 115, 119, 131, 133, 135, 143f., 146ff., 152
 Ionicisation — 26, 28, 32ff., 85, 100 n. 1, 133 n. 2, 134ff., 139f., 143f., 147, 152
 Irreducible forms — 16 n. 1, 32 n. 4, 37f., 44, 141

- Irregularities (prosodical) — 9, 21, 24, 27, 39, 91 n. 2, 111, 113 n. 1, 116ff., 125
 Isler, F. — 75f.
- Jeffery, L. H. — 31 nn. 2, 4, 5, 46 n. 1, 72 n. 4, 149 n. 3
 Juxtaposition — 58ff., 65ff., 79 n. 7
- Kakridis, J. Th. — 34 n. 2
 Kamerbeek, J. C. — 33 n. 1, 44 n. 2, 52 n. 4, 96 n. 4, 133 n. 2
 Kern, O. — 40 n. 1
 Kiechle, F. — 151 n. 1
 Kirk, G. S. — 7, 8 n. 1, 16 nn. 1, 2, 18 n. 1, 19 n. 1, 20 n. 1, 42 n. 4, 58, 63 n. 2,
 95 nn. 1, 2, 97, 105 n. 3, 109 n. 7, 141 + n. 4, 142 nn. 1, 5, 149 n. 1
 Kock, Th. — 99 n. 4
Kovή (epic) — 150ff.
 Krischen, F. — 99 + n. 6
 Kronos — 27f.
 Kuiper, F. B. J. — 71 n. 2
- Labarbe, J. — 19 n. 2
 Late formulaic development — 37f., 69, 137f.
 Latte, K. — 31 n. 3
 Leaf, W. — 37 n. 4, 121 n. 1, 142 n. 4
 Lee, D. J. N. — 145 n. 1
 Leeuwen J.f., J. v. — 24 n. 2, 30 n. 3, 33, 43 nn. 2, 3, 53 n. 2, 54 n. 5, 58, 92 + n. 5,
 119 n. 6
 Lejeune, M. — 40 n. 1, 44 n. 3, 46 n. 2, 145 n. 1
 Lesbian — 44 n. 2, 133 n. 1, 148, 152
 Leumann, M. — 9, 54 n. 3, 65, 72 n. 5, 73 n. 2, 98, 120 n. 4, 121 n. 4, 134 n. 1
 Liquids (doubling of) — 73f.
 Lolling, H. G. — 40 n. 1
 Lord, A. B. — 8 n. 2, 11 n. 2, 12 n. 2, 15, 18, 19 + n. 1
 Lorimer, H. L. — 7, 16 n. 2, 25 n. 3, 95 n. 1, 97, 99, 121 + n. 1, 147
- Mass-scenes — 93
 Meillet, A. — 10 n. 6, 11 n. 2, 17, 151f.
 Meister, K. — 7, 27 n. 5, 32f., 34 n. 5, 37, 40 n. 1, 43 n. 1, 56 n. 3, 102 n. 1, 106,
 114, 116 n. 3, 121 n. 5, 131 n. 2, 136 + n. 1
 Messages — 43, 57f.
 Metathesis (quantitative) — 30, 31–42, 44, 68ff., 71, 94f., 112, 124, 131
 Metonymy — 114f., 136 n. 1, 143
 Meyer, L. — 116f.
 Mobility — 35, 43, 89
 Modernisation — 26, 28, 32f., 54f., 85, 100 n. 1, 126, 143ff.
 Monroe, D. B. — 28
 Murray, G. — 142 nn. 4, 7, 143 n. 1, 149f.
 Mycenaean (dialect) (Linear B) — 8, 42 n. 4, 72, 105 n. 3, 132 n. 1, 134 n. 4; *see also*
 Achaeae; (formulae) 16, 140–152; (poetry) 52, 63 n. 1, 73 n. 1; (burial-customs,
 objects) 140–145
 Mylonas, G. E. — 142 n. 1, 143 n. 1
- Narrative — 34, 51, 81, 110f., 149
 Naxian — 31
 Neleids — 133, 151 n. 1
 Neologisms — 56 n. 3

- Nikandre-inscription — 31
 Nilsson, M. P. — 7, 9 n. 1, 36 n. 1, 118 n. 1, 121 n. 3, 140, 142 n. 4
 N-movable — 29, 55 n. 1, 62 n. 3, 71–112, 120ff., 127, 138, 141f., 146 n. 2
 'Nominativus pendens' — 34
 Nonnus — 76
 Nostos — 52, 67
 Notopoulos, J. A. — 15, 18f., 25, 78
 Noun-epithet formulae — 9ff., 13 n. 1, 50f., 52 n. 2, 88, 133; (dropped) 39, 95
- O'Neill Jr., E. G. — 12, 14, 20ff.
 Onomatopoeia — 74
 o-pa-wo-ta — 99; 114 n. 3
 Oppianus — 76
 Oral composition, *see* Composition
 Orsilochos-Ortilochos — 118
 Ox-formulae — 67f.
- Page, D. L. — 7, 8 n. 1, 16 n. 2, 46 n. 4, 64 nn. 1, 2, 95 nn. 2, 5, 129 n. 1, 130 nn. 3, 5, 149 n. 1, 150
 Palmer, L. R. — 24 n. 2, 71 n. 2, 95 n. 3, 96 n. 2, 99 n. 8, 122 n. 3
 Pamphylian — 72
 Parataxis — 56f., 107
 Parry, M. — 8 and *pass.*
 Particles (combinations of) — 14f., 37; (connective) 56, 62, 65f.
 Patroclus — 139
 Patronymics (in *-δης*) — 149 n. 3
 Patterns — (verse) 12; (metrical, syntactical) 12, 15, 34
 Perfect-forms in *-ᾶσι, -ᾷσι* — 90f., 105
 Permutation, *see* P₁, P₂, T₁, T₂ formulae
 P₁, P₂, formulae — 61–68, 93, 112 n. 1, 116–119, 126ff., 145
 Phaeacians — 32 n. 4, 110 n. 1, 137f.
 Philippon, A. — 149 n. 6
 Pisani, V. — 42 n. 5
 Polites — 95 n. 6
 Porter, H. N. — 21, 76 n. 5, 77 nn. 1, 2, 78
 Porzig, W. — 7
 Preferred positions, *see* O'Neill
 Proper names (given to Trojans) — 149, 150 n. 1
- qe-qi-no-me-no, qe-qi-no-to — 140
 Quintus Smyrnaeus — 17, 76
- Recitation — 18ff., 25
 Re-interpretation — 97ff.
 Repertory (formulaic) — 16, 25, 84 n. 2, 86, 92, 136, 147ff.
 Repetition — 70; (of passages) 19f., 23; (short-distance) 110f.; *see also* ἐκαστογράφῃ
 Replacement, *see* Substitution
 Risch, E. — 7, 45 n. 5, 46 n. 2, 102 n. 1, 135 n. 2, 147, 150
 Robert, C. — 99 n. 1
 Runover word — 86f., 101–110, 113 n. 1, 121ff., 131f., 135, 146 n. 2; *see also* En-jambement
 Ruijgh, C. J. — 7, 8 n. 1, 14 n. 3, 28, 38 n. 2, 42 n. 2, 50 n. 2, 63 n. 2, 64, 67 n. 4, 72 nn. 2, 3, 5, 74 n. 3, 95 nn. 2, 3, 109 + n. 6, 117 n. 2, 123 n. 1, 134 n. 2, 135 n. 2, 141 n. 1, 143ff., 151 n. 2

- Rzach, A. — 26, 84
- Sappho — 44 n. 2, 50 n. 2
- Scherer, A., *see* Thumb-Scherer
- Schmidt, M. — 45 n. 3
- Schulze, W. — 53, 66 n. 1, 99 n. 3
- Schwyzler, E. — 38 n. 2 and *pass.*
- Separation — 23 n. 1, 40f., 73 n. 3, 96, 113 n. 1, 115f., 118f., 119 n. 9; *see also*
Introduction (Insertion)
- Severyns, A. — 26ff., 30 n. 2, 42 n. 5, 47, 56 n. 1, 61f., 64
- Sheep-formula — 68 n. 2
- Shifting — 59, 68, 95, 113 n. 1, 120f., 136; *see also* Juxtaposition, Dislodgment,
Transposition
- Shipp, G. P. — 7, 8 n. 1, 32 n. 7, 33 n. 2, 36ff., 93 n. 1, 101, 124, 147
- Silver-studded sword — 16 n. 2
- Simile — 52 n. 4
- Simplification — 138
- Single combat — 92f.
- Single words, *see* O'Neill
- Smyth, H. W. — 46 n. 2
- Sommer, F. — 120
- Sophocles — 92
- Sotairos-inscription — 72
- Speech — (indirect) 111, 132; (speeches) 52 n. 1
- Stanford, W. B. — 90 n. 5, 104 n. 3
- Stein, H. — 33 n. 1
- Stifter, Th. — 120
- στίχοι ἀκέφαλοι* — 121f.
- στίχοι λαγαροί* — 120f.
- Strunk, K. — 147
- Stubbings, F. H. — 96 n. 5, 99 n. 4
- Styx — 85
- Subject formulae — 69, 133
- Substitution (Replacement) — 49, 53f., 80f., 91–94, 113, 127, 129, 133, 135f., 143ff.,
148ff., 152; *see also* Equivalents
- Substratum — (Mycenaean-Aeolic) 148ff., 152; *see also* Κοινή
- Suitors — 39, 110 n. 1, 137f.
- Suys-Reitsma, S. J. — 19 n. 3
- 'Sweet wine' formula — 48f.
- Switch-point — 44, 60, 83, 125; *see also* Exposed Positions
- Synizesis — 32–41, 105, 116, 118 + n. 2
- Systems (formulaic) — 9, 11, 13f., 17 + n. 1, 22, 34, 43, 54, 74, 80f., 101, 105f.,
108 n. 2, 134, 137f.
- Teiresias (prophecy of) — 91 n. 2
- T₁, T₂ formulae — 61–69, 116–119, 93f., 126f., 145, 150 n. 1
- Theocritus — 14
- Thessalian — 148ff., 152 n. 1
- Thrift(iness) — 13, 23, 90, 127; *see also* Equivalents
- Thumb-Scherer — 32 n. 4, 45 n. 2, 72 n. 8, 119 n. 7
- Tradition (unity of) — 25f.
- Traditional character of formula (criterion of) — 11
- Transmission — 29f., 49, 54f.
- Transposition — 59, 62, 68, 79ff., 86, 101, 111; *see also* Dislodgment, Juxtaposition,
Shifting

Trümper, H. — 38 n. 3, 95 n. 2, 96 nn. 2, 5, 97 nn. 2, 3, 99 n. 3, 113 n. 2, 114 n. 3,
135 n. 2

'Umdeutung', *see* Re-interpretation

Uranos (mutilation of) — 84

Ventris, M. — 99, 145 n. 3

Verbal forms — 49f., 89, 109, 133; (change of aspect in) 106; (change of voice in) 106

Virgil — 16, 17 n. 1, 92

Wace, A. J. B. — 16 n. 2

Wackernagel, J. — 37, 54 n. 3, 133 n. 2, 136 n. 1

Walcot, P. — 84 n. 1

Webster, T. B. L. — 7, 8 n. 1, 25 n. 3, 32 n. 5, 46 n. 3, 52 n. 4, 56 nn. 1, 4, 98 n. 2,
130 n. 4, 137, 144, 147, 149 nn. 1, 3

West Greek — 26, 72

Whallon, W. — 13 n. 4

Wilamowitz, U. v. — 9

Witte, K. — 10 n. 1, 28, 48 n. 7, 112f., 122 n. 1, 132 n. 3, 133 n. 1

ADDENDA ET CORRIGENDA

- p. 5, line 9: *For that read than*
- p. 12, note 3, line 1: *For σφεας read σφέας*
- p. 13, text, line 15: *After (23 ×) add comma*
- p. 19, note 1, line 2: *For expressions read passages*
- p. 20, text, line 3 from bottom: *For ἡγέμον' read ἡγεμόν'*
- p. 34, text, line 7 from bottom: *For ὄς read ὄς*
- p. 36, text, line 8 from bottom: *After M 424 add comma*
- p. 38, text, line 7: *After contraction delete comma*
 line 18: *After suggests add that*
 line 1 from bottom: *For "Ἴδεω θ' read "Ἴδεώ θ'*
- p. 39, text, lines 16 and 23: *For ὄψε read ὄπῃ*
 note 2, line 3: *For no ther read no other*
- p. 43, text, line 11 from bottom: *For δς read δς*
- p. 44, text, line 8 from bottom, etc.: *For ὄψ read *ὄψ*
- p. 54, text, line 8 from bottom: *For emission read omission*
- p. 57, text, line 2: *For δ' ἀρα¹) — read δ' ἀρα—¹)*
 line 6 from bottom: *For ὡς read ὡς*
- p. 58, text, line 5: *For θυγάτρα read θύγατρα*
- p. 60, text, line 11, etc.: *For ἡπειρόνδε and ἡπειροῖο read ἡπειρόνδε and ἡπειροῖο*
- p. 61, text, line 13 from bottom: *For εἶδος τε read εἶδος τε*
 note 4, line 3: *Before XLV add REG*
 line 4: *For ἡγούσην read ἡγούσην*
- p. 62, note 3, lines 2 and 3: *For ὀβελούσιν read ὀβελούσιν*
- p. 63, note 2, line 2 from bottom: *For Komawens read Ko-ma-we*
- p. 64, text, line 9: *For ὡς read ὡς*
 line 11: *For εἰληλούθει read εἰληλούθει*
 line 18 from bottom: *For on read to*
 line 7 from bottom: *After Ψ 92 (P₂) insert τό σφιν πόρε πότνια Κίρκη,
 κ 394 (line 1 from bottom)*
- p. 67, note 4, line 1: *For τοὺς read τοὺς*
- p. 68, text, line 12 from bottom: *For dialectical read dialectal*
 note 3, lines 5 and 8: *For ποιμήν and ποιμένες read ποιμήν, ποιμένες*
- p. 73, note 3, line 1: *For condition read conditions*
 line 7: *After p. 102). add The same applies to A 688, below, p. 108.*
- p. 74, text, line 6: *For espresion read expression*
- p. 75, note 3, line 3: *After 72 f add full stop*
- p. 78, text, line 2 from bottom: *Between 225 and 284 insert 275 ἀξουσί σοι
 (ἀξουσί τοι M)*
 note 4: *For 75 read 82 f.*
- p. 80, text, line 8: *For μητήρ read μήτηρ*
 note (7), line 6: *For μέν τ' read μέν τ'*
 line 7: *For 442 read 422*
- p. 83, note 2, line 3: *For reserves read reservations (id. p. 84, n. 4, line 1)*
- p. 93, text, line 8 from bottom: *For Σαρπηδόος read Σαρπηδόος*
- p. 100, text, line 5: *After metathesised add forms*
 note 1, line 8: *For spondees. read spondees,*
- p. 102, text, line 10: *After O 542 add see below, p. 132 (ἐκφανεῖ).*
- p. 104, text, line 7: *For ἐστι read ἐστὶ*
- p. 105, text, line 11: *After δὲ add full stop*
- p. 108, text, line 3: *After Ψ 153, etc. add ,cf. πολέσιν, A 688:
 δαίτρενον· πολέσιν γὰρ Ἐπειοὶ χρεῖος ὄφειλον.*

- p. 112, text, line 1 from bottom: *For* 60 f. *read* 60 f.)
- p. 114, note 3, line 2: *After* gemeint *add* quotation marks
- p. 115, text, line 11: *For* ἀμφι κίπελλον *read* ἀμφικίπελλον
- p. 116, text, line 13 from bottom: *After* departed *add* from
- p. 118, text, line 17: *For* always *read* but one (II 655)
- p. 119, text, line 13 from bottom: *For* Nauck's *read* Nauck's
note 8, line 1: *After* Φ 213 *add* (v.l. ἐκφθέγξατο)
- p. 120, text, line 3: *For* ἀδμητήν *read* ἀδμήτην
- p. 122, text, line 7 from bottom: *For* εἰμι *read* εἰμι
- p. 131, note 1: *For* 000 *read* 101 f.
- p. 132, text, line 10: *For* exemplified *read* exemplified
- p. 134, text, line 13: *For* γυναικι *read* γυναικι
- p. 136, note 4: *For* ἐναντιοι *read* ἐναντιοι
- p. 137, text, line 9: *After* which *delete* comma
line 6 from bottom:
For προσέειπεν *read* προσέειπε
For σ 405 *read* ρ 405
Add v.l. ἀπαμβετο φώνησέν τε (see *app. cr.*)
- p. 138, text, line 4 from bottom: *For* σβῶτα *read* σβῶτα
- p. 139, note 3, line 2: *For* 228 *read* 286
- p. 140, text, line 3 from bottom: *For* πόησ' *read* ποησ'
- p. 141, text, line 6: *For* constant *read* consonant
note 4, line 1 from bottom: *delete* O 452
- p. 144, text, line 5: *For* of gwen-se *read* (going back to Mycenaean *qen-, i.e. I.E.
*g^when-)
- p. 145, note 3, line 3: *After* 172 *delete* interrogation-mark
- p. 147, text, line 17: *After* σε) *add* comma
- p. 150, text, line 1 from bottom: *After* preference *add* comma
- p. 157, left hand column: *Between* 623 and 642 *insert* 632 — *add. et corr. ad* p. 132
centre column: *Between* 686 and 698 *insert* — *add. et corr. ad* pp. 73, 108
- p. 171, line 2 from bottom: *For* Juxtaponiit,s *read* Juxtaposition