

## FORMULAIC AND NONFORMULAIC ELEMENTS IN HOMER

MARGALIT FINKELBERG

ACCORDING to the hypothesis originally put forward by Milman Parry, all Homeric expressions were assumed to be formulae or modifications of formulaic patterns, organized in so-called "formulaic systems"; these systems, of which the Homeric epics presumably represented only a part, were thought to provide for the expression of a given idea in any grammatical form and under any metrical conditions.<sup>1</sup> As the study of Homer's formulaic composition proceeded from the proper to the common nouns, however, it became clear that the gaps in the formulaic systems were too numerous to be ascribed simply to the chances of representation,<sup>2</sup> and that there was in fact insufficient evidence for asserting the thoroughly formulaic character of Homeric diction. Thus, according to the figures adduced by J. B. Hainsworth, the proportion of unique expressions among noun-epithet combinations that do not contain proper names ranges from one-third to one-half—a proportion that, as Hainsworth says, is "disturbingly high in a diction commonly supposed to be entirely formulaic."<sup>3</sup> If one further considers that a single word occupying a fixed position in the hexameter cannot be counted as a formula,<sup>4</sup> one must agree with A. Hoekstra that "it is practically out of the question that Homer's diction is wholly formulaic and traditional."<sup>5</sup>

1. As J. B. Hainsworth pointed out, the term "formulaic system" (or "formula-system," or "the system of formulae," Parry's "système de formules"), though ubiquitous in Homeric scholarship, is often used loosely and variably; see *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford, 1968), p. 8, n. 1. For an adequate account of Parry's intended meaning, see S. L. Schein, *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's "Iliad"* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1984), p. 6.

2. See esp. M. W. M. Pope, "The Parry-Lord Theory of Homeric Composition," *A Class* 6 (1963): 12-13 (repr. in *Homer: Tradition und Neuerung*, ed. J. Latacz [Darmstadt, 1979], pp. 338-67); Hainsworth, *Flexibility*, pp. 72-73; A. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes* (Amsterdam, 1965), pp. 15-16.

3. "The Homeric Formula and the Problem of Its Transmission," *BICS* 9 (1962): 66 (repr. in *Tradition und Neuerung*, pp. 368-86); for the figures, see id., "Structure and Content in Epic Formulae: The Question of the Unique Expression," *CQ* 14 (1964): 155-64.

4. See E. G. O'Neill, "The Localization of Metrical Word-Types in the Greek Hexameter," *YCS* 8 (1942): 105-78; as O'Neill has shown, words of the same metrical shape tend to occupy fixed metrical positions in any hexametric poetry; hence, treating any such single word as a formula would make the distinction between formulaic and nonformulaic poetry obsolete. Cf. also the excellent discussion by Hoekstra in *Homeric Modifications*, pp. 14, 20-25.

5. *Homeric Modifications*, p. 24; cf. Hainsworth, *Flexibility*, p. 13.

The problem, however, is that neither this statement nor Parry's original thesis can be verified, for the simple reason that we have no means of identifying a nonformulaic expression. As distinct from the formulae, which are easily recognized because of their repetition, a unique expression, taken as it stands, does not reveal whether it is an underrepresented formula or a nonformulaic expression. As a result, scholars more often than not find that "it is impossible even to guess whether [a given expression] . . . is the sole survival of a traditional phrase or a new creation."<sup>6</sup> I believe that this uncertainty is mainly attributable to our practice of limiting our investigations to the noun-epithet combinations, and that it can be overcome if we subject a verbal rather than a nominal idea to formulaic analysis.

It need hardly be said that verbal expressions are far from being just another part of Homeric diction. For all the importance of the noun-epithet combinations, we must remember that it was Homer's main task not merely to name Agamemnon or the tower-like body-shield but to recount a story, and that verbs are the essential means by which stories are recounted. The verbs provide the contexts that determine how a given name is used, whereas nominal expressions, including noun-epithet combinations, by their very nature cannot stand by themselves: a noun-epithet combination for "sea" can participate in conveying such different ideas as "to sail across the sea" and "to come to the seashore," but this does not affect the corresponding formulaic system. Hence, whereas the study of noun-epithet combinations can only establish formulaic systems on purely morphological grounds, tracing a given verbal idea would allow us to isolate a unit of content that reflects Homer's real needs in treating a given subject. By analyzing such a unit we should be able to approach the issue of underrepresentation more concretely than in the case of the noun-epithet combinations. If a given unique expression conveys an idea different from those usually expressed by the traditional formulae, or if it differs from these formulae in other respects, there would be reason to regard the expression as nonformulaic rather than as an underrepresented formula. Noun-epithet combinations do not lend themselves to this sort of analysis: because these expressions are detached from their original contexts, we cannot say whether they participate in the expression of unusual or singular ideas. Only by analyzing a verbal idea can we isolate a group of expressions that exhausts everything Homer said on a given subject, and at the same time keep before our eyes the contexts in which these expressions occur.

There is, however, an additional problem. In the study of Homer's formulaic composition the verbal formulae still constitute a virtually unexplored field. Notwithstanding the obvious morphological differences

6. D. Gray, commenting on *Il.* 1. 157 *θάλασσά τε ἤχηεσσα*, in "Homeric Epithets for Things," *CQ* 41 (1947): 57 (repr. in *The Language and Background of Homer*, ed. G. S. Kirk [Cambridge, 1964], pp. 55-67); see also Hainsworth, "Structure and Content," p. 164, B. Alexanderson, "Homeric Formulae for Ships," *Eranos* 68 (1970): 39.

between the noun and the verb,<sup>7</sup> it is usually taken for granted that conclusions reached on the basis of the noun-epithet combinations are universally applicable to other parts of Homeric diction, including the verb. This can hardly be called a correct procedure, especially since the applicability of Parry's method to Homer's verbal expressions was contested as early as 1929, in P. Chantraine's review of *L'épithète traditionnelle*.<sup>8</sup> Chantraine's legitimate doubts have not been answered by the Parryists, so that the question still remains open. Accordingly, the main question of this paper—whether by examining a large unit of content defined by a given verbal idea we can better understand the relations between the formulaic and the nonformulaic in Homer—cannot be answered until we have resolved another question: are the principles of Homer's formulaic composition as applicable to verbal expressions as they are to noun-epithet combinations?

Because they are evenly distributed in the Homeric poems, the expressions for emotions constitute a suitable test-group: not being tied to any particular context, they can be found in both "early" and "late" parts of the epics, in both martial and domestic episodes, in the main narrative, the digressions, the speeches, and the similes. I have chosen to test the expressions for joy because they proved to be the most clearly delimited group among the descriptions of emotions in Homer: the descriptions of joy rely on only three verbs—*γηθέω*, *γάλλωμαι*, and *χαίρω*—and involve no substitute systems whose analysis would require that the scope of the investigation be enlarged.<sup>9</sup> I have observed the following limitations: since participles are not conjugated and thus, for the purpose of formulaic analysis, resemble nouns more than they do verbs, I have not taken them into account (but see n. 24); since the verb *χαίρω*, when used in an expression of greeting, does not function as an expression of joy, I have excluded such uses from the analysis. Within these limitations I have assembled a group of exactly one hundred expressions to serve as the subject of the following analysis; I will also adduce the relevant material from other epic poetry whenever it is available.

I have provisionally distributed the expressions into the categories "formulaic" and "isolated" according to the following principles. I count as formulaic any expression that occurs at least twice in Homer or any unique expression that presents a modification of a recognizable formulaic pattern. Conversely, I count as isolated any unique expression that cannot be shown to follow an attested formulaic pattern; the fact that a single word in a given expression occupies a fixed position in the hexameter is not sufficient ground for regarding the expression as

7. See esp. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications*, pp. 50–51.

8. *RPh* 3 (1929): 299; a similar doubt about formulae involving common nouns has been removed, mainly by the studies of J. B. Hainsworth.

9. Thus, for example, the feeling of sorrow is regularly expressed by the combinations *ἄχος εἶλε* or *ἄχος γένετο*, so that an analysis of Homer's expressions for this emotion would have to consider all the formulaic systems in which the two forms *εἶλε* and *γένετο* occur, whether or not these systems involve the expression of sorrow itself.

formulaic (see n. 4). There is, in addition, a third category, the so-called "unqualified" expressions, that is, expressions that do not unequivocally belong to either of the other two categories. I realize that these three categories, while allowing one to avoid forced decisions for ambiguous phrases, result in a somewhat loose classification of the material, but this is not meant to be a rigorously statistical study: my main intention is to suggest the general proportions of the formulaic and the nonformulaic in the group of expressions under discussion and, if possible, to define the relations between these two categories.

For a convenient presentation of the material, I have divided the expressions into groups according to the main word-breaks in the hexameter and, whenever possible, according to the main "stems" of related expressions. The general context of an expression is specified as follows: d. sp. = direct speech, sim. = simile, rem. = reminiscence;<sup>10</sup> expressions not labeled in one of these ways belong to the main narrative. If an expression has been characterized by G. P. Shipp as late or abnormal, I simply note this fact without further commentary.<sup>11</sup>

## I. FORMULAIC EXPRESSIONS

This group comprises all the expressions for joy that can be shown to have been produced by means of the formulaic technique—that is, both the formulae proper and their modifications—as well as the unique expressions that can be shown to be related to an attested formulaic pattern.

### A. EXPRESSIONS INTRODUCED IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE VERSE

#### *Formulaic patterns*

- |     |            |         |          |            |                          |
|-----|------------|---------|----------|------------|--------------------------|
| (1) | <i>Il.</i> | 6. 212  | ὦς φάτο, | γήθησεν δὲ | βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης     |
| (2) | <i>Il.</i> | 17. 567 | " "      | " "        | θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη      |
| (3) | <i>Od.</i> | 7. 329  | " "      | " "        | πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς   |
| (4) | <i>Od.</i> | 8. 199  | " "      | " "        | " "                      |
| (5) | <i>Od.</i> | 13. 250 | " "      | " "        | " "                      |
| (6) | <i>Od.</i> | 18. 281 | " "      | " "        | " "                      |
| (7) | <i>Od.</i> | 8. 385  | " "      | " "        | δ' ἱερὸν μένος Ἀλκινόοιο |

Modifications:

- (8) *Od.* 2. 35 ὦς φάτο, χαῖρε δὲ φήμη Ὀδυσσεύος φίλος υἱός<sup>12</sup>  
 (9) *Il.* 1. 255 ἢ κεν γηθῆσαι Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες (d. sp.; Shipp, p. 118)<sup>13</sup>

10. Though formally part of direct speech, the reminiscences are distinguished both by the higher density of their formulaic elements and by their common use of the imperfect tense, not the present that is usually employed in direct speech. These two features seem to justify regarding the reminiscences as a separate part of the epic narrative, not identical with direct speech.

11. All references are to the second edition of Shipp's *Studies in the Language of Homer* (Cambridge, 1972). It is worth mentioning that Shipp left *Iliad* 10, 23, and 24 without commentary.

12. A metrical equivalent of the usual γήθησεν δέ, the expression χαῖρε δὲ φήμη deviates from the sequence imperfect-aorist (φάτο . . . γήθησεν) regularly used in expressions of this type; see P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*, vol. 2 (Paris, 1963), p. 193. The expression is probably a hybrid of the pattern γήθησεν δέ and the pattern found in nos. 27 and 28, where the imperfect χαῖρε(v) and the dative κλεθρόνι (synonymous with φήμη) also occur.

13. As Shipp suggested, the shorter form γηθῆσαι was preferred to the more usual γηθήσειε(v) in order to combine the verb with the formula Πρίαμος Πριάμοιό τε παῖδες; note also that this form

This pattern, the most widespread Homeric formula for the expression of joy, is itself a variant of a very prolific stem of the type ὦς φάτο, μείδῃσεν δὲ . . . , or ὦς φάτο, ῥίγησεν δὲ . . .<sup>14</sup> It is always introduced after the first-foot caesura, following the expression ὦς φάτο; the pattern is also attested in other epic poetry (see *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 370 and *Hes. Th.* 173). The modifications include replacement of the usual γηθέω by χαίρω (no. 8) and adaptation of the formula to a modal proposition (no. 9).

(10) *Il.* 24. 424 ὦς φάτο, γήθησεν δ' ὁ γέρων, καὶ ἀμείβετο μύθῳ

Modification:

(11) *Il.* 14. 270 ὦς φάτο, χήρατο δ' Ὑπνος, ἀμειβόμενος δὲ προσηύδα (Shipp, pp. 110, 285)

This is the abridged variant of the preceding pattern, allowing the poet to express the sequence hearing–rejoicing–reacting within a single verse. As in number 8, the modification consists in the replacement of γηθέω with χαίρω, entailing the abnormal form χήρατο.

(12) *Il.* 3. 111 ὦς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἐχάρησαν Ἀχαιοὶ τε Τρῳέες τε

(13) *Il.* 19. 74 " " " " " εὐκνήμιδες Ἀχαιοὶ

Modification:

(14) *Od.* 23. 32 ὦς ἔφαθ', ἡ δ' ἐχάρη καὶ ἀπὸ λέκτροιο θοροῦσα

This is a fairly uncommon postconsonantal variant of the preceding stem, employing the verb χαίρω after the second-foot caesura; it is not attested in other epic poetry. As in numbers 10 and 11, the modification presents an abridgement of an originally hexameter-long pattern.

(15) *Il.* 4. 255 τοὺς δὲ ἰδὼν γήθησεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων

(16) *Il.* 8. 278 τὸν δὲ " " " " "

(17) *Od.* 5. 486 τὴν μὲν ἰδὼν γήθησε πολύτλας Δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς

(18) *Od.* 24. 504 " " " " " "

Modification:

(19) *Il.* 1. 330 - - οὐδ' ἄρα τῷ γε ἰδὼν γήθησεν Ἀχιλλεύς

This is another ramified stem, the original form of which is certainly represented by the variant τοὺς δέ (or τὸν δέ, etc.) rather than by the variant τὴν μὲν (etc.);<sup>15</sup> the pattern is also attested with the verb ῥιγέω (*Il.* 5. 596, 11. 345, 12. 331). The modification adapts the original formula to a negative proposition, introducing it after the first foot, which leads to the displacement of the combination ἰδὼν γήθησε(ν) two feet forward.

(20) *Od.* 22. 207 τὴν δ' Ὀδυσσεύς γήθησεν ἰδὼν καὶ μῦθον ἔειπε

Modifications:

(21) *Od.* 13. 226 τὴν δ' Ὀδυσσεύς γήθησεν ἰδὼν καὶ ἐναντίος ἦλθε

(22) *Il.* 10. 190 τοὺς δ' ὁ γέρων " " θάρσυνέ τε μύθῳ

allows the optative to be used in place of γήθησεν (nos. 1–7), thus preserving the structure of this most common Homeric expression for joy.

14. This pattern was discussed by Parry in *Lépitète traditionnelle*; see *The Making of Homeric Verse*, ed. A. Parry (Oxford, 1971), pp. 11–12.

15. The latter became possible only after the disappearance of the digamma; see Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications*, p. 35.

- (23) *Il.* 4. 283 καὶ τοὺς μὲν γήθησεν ἰδὼν κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων  
 (24) *Il.* 4. 311 καὶ τὸν μὲν " " " "

This is the abridged variant of the preceding pattern, accompanied by a change in the original order (γήθησεν ἰδὼν, instead of ἰδὼν γήθησε(ν) as in nos. 15–19) without a simultaneous change in the position of γήθησε(ν). I suggest that like number 10 this abridgement was originally intended to make the formula fit the sequence seeing–rejoicing–reacting within the single verse; only number 20 expresses this general sense, and this is why I regard both number 22, which is a particular application of the same idea, and number 21, which adapts the pattern to another context, as modifications. As for numbers 23 and 24, both expressions adapt the formula to the same specific context (Agamemnon inspects his army, rejoicing anew on seeing a contingent that is prepared for battle; cf. no. 15, where his first reaction is registered) and cannot be taken to represent a generally applicable formulaic pattern.

- (25) *Od.* 13. 353 γήθησέν τ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς  
 (26) *Od.* 21. 414 " " " " " " "

The phrase ῥίγησεν δ' ἄρ' ἔπειτα ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων at *Iliad* 4. 148 shows that numbers 25 and 26, which at first sight look like a fixed expression, in fact represent a more general formulaic pattern. It differs from the preceding patterns in that it does not introduce the feeling of joy as one's response to hearing or seeing something. It is not attested in other epic poetry.

#### *Fixed expressions*

- (27) *Od.* 18. 117 ὥς ἄρ' ἔφαν, χαῖρεν δὲ κληδόνι δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς  
 (28) *Od.* 20. 120 " " ἔφη, " " " " "

Note the employment of the imperfect, which is rather unusual in this context (cf. n. 12 above).

#### *Modifications of other patterns*

- (29) *Il.* 13. 494 ὥς Αἰνεία θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι γεγήθει (sim.)

The related pattern is obviously ὄφρ' εἴπω τά με θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι κελεύει (4 times in *Il.*, 5 in *Od.*), or something to this effect.

- (30) *Il.* 16. 530 Γλαῦκος δ' ἔγνω ἥσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ γήθησέν τε

This is an obvious modification of the pattern αὐτὰρ ὁ (or: Ἐκτωρ) δ' ἔγνω ἥσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ φώνησέν τε (3 times in *Il.*).<sup>16</sup>

16. Actually, in this context one would rather expect the formula χαῖρε δὲ θυμῷ (nos. 46–51 below). Note that γήθησέν τε violates the usual sequence aorist–imperfect (the closest parallel is *Il.* 14. 154–56 ἔγνω . . . χαῖρε δὲ θυμῷ: see no. 46; on the sequence aorist–imperfect, see Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique*, 2:193).

- (31) *Od.* 23. 266 οὐ μὲν τοι θυμὸς κεχαρήσεται (d. sp.; Shipp, pp. 116, 358)  
 (32) *Il.* 15. 98 πᾶσιν ὁμῶς θυμὸν κεχαρήσεμεν (d. sp.; Shipp, pp. 116, 287)

No clear prototype can be identified for the combination θυμὸς (-ὄν) κεχαρήσεται (-μεν); however, the expression's presence in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* strongly suggests that such a prototype did exist. At the same time, if we take the expression to be an original formula, it would be not only our sole example of a verbal formula in the future tense but also the only case of a linguistically late formula (see Shipp, p. 116). Because of this, I suggest that the original expression was θυμῷ κεχαρισμένε, formed by analogy with the formula κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ (5 times in *Il.*, 1 in *Od.*), which gave rise to a similar modification in another part of the verse as well (see no. 54 below).

#### B. EXPRESSIONS INTRODUCED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE VERSE

##### *Formulaic patterns*

- (33) *Il.* 11. 683 γεγήθει δὲ φρένα Νηλεΐς (rem.)  
 Modifications:  
 (34) *Il.* 8. 559 γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα ποιμήν (sim.)  
 (35) *Od.* 6. 106 γέγηθε δέ τε φρένα Λητώ (sim.)  
 (36) *Il.* 6. 481 χαρείη δὲ φρένα μήτηρ (d. sp.)  
 (37) *Il.* 13. 493 γάνυται δ' ἄρα τε φρένα ποιμήν (sim.)  
 (38) *Il.* 20. 405 γάνυται δέ τε τοῖς ἐνοσίχθων (sim.)

That number 33, though it occurs only once, should be taken as the prototype of the entire stem follows not only from its greater syntactic simplicity (with δέ, as distinct from the nonfunctional δέ τε in nos. 34 and 35), but also from the fact that this is exactly the form that is found in other epic poetry (see *Hymn. Hom. Cer.* 232 γεγήθει δὲ φρένα μήτηρ and *Hymn. Hom. Ven.* 216 γεγήθει δὲ φρένας ἔνδον). Though all the modifications are similar in adapting the prototype to a different tense or mood (nos. 34, 35, 37, 38 to the present, and no. 36 to the optative),<sup>17</sup> the two last examples are peculiar in starting the expression at the penthemimeral caesura.<sup>18</sup>

- (39) *Od.* 24. 513 ἐχάρη καὶ μῦθον ἔειπε  
 Modification:  
 (40) *Il.* 3. 76 χάρη μέγα μῦθον ἀκούσας

I suggest that this pattern was originally intended to express the sequence hearing–rejoicing–reacting within a single verse;<sup>19</sup> in this regard it resembles the patterns dealt with above in numbers 10 and 20. But the

17. Cf. also *Od.* 6. 147 χολώσαιο φρένα κούρη. I take γέγηθα to have the force of a present (“I am glad”; cf. LSJ, s.v. γηθῶ); consequently, the pluperfect γεγήθειν must have the force of an imperfect.

18. Nos. 37 and 38 possibly present an independent, postpenthemimeral variant of the pattern discussed; however, since they (like the modifications) are in the present tense rather than the imperfect, I find it preferable to group them with the modifications.

19. The full contexts of nos. 39 and 40 are ὡς φάτο, Λαέρτης δ' ἐχάρη κτλ., and ὡς ἔφαθ', Ἐκτωρ δ' αὐτε χάρη κτλ., respectively.

fixed position of (ἐ)χάρη after one of the central caesurae (not paralleled in the γήθησεν of the two former patterns; see also nos. 88 and 89 below) suggests an independent variant specially tailored to the middle of the verse.

(41) *Od.* 4. 344 κεχάροντο δὲ πάντες Ἀχαιοί (rem.)

(42) *Od.* 17. 135 " " " " (rem.)

That the expression presents a formulaic pattern rather than a fixed phrase is demonstrated by κεχάρητο δὲ Κύκνος ἀμύμων at *Aspis* 65.

### *Modifications of other patterns*

(43) *Od.* 7. 269 γήθησε δέ μοι φίλον ἦτορ (rem.)

Though unique, this expression is obviously related to Homeric phrases such as *Iliad* 5. 670 μαίμησε δέ οἱ φίλον ἦτορ, *Iliad* 21. 389 ἐγέλασσε δέ οἱ φίλον ἦτορ, and the like.

## C. EXPRESSIONS INTRODUCED IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE VERSE

### *Formulaic patterns*

(44) *Od.* 14. 51 χαῖρε δ' Ὀδυσσεύς

(45) *Od.* 14. 526 " " "

The phrase χαῖρε δὲ Λητώ at *Hymnus Homericus ad Apollinem* 125 suggests that this is a formulaic pattern (viz., \*χαῖρε δ' Ἀχιλλεύς, and the like) rather than a fixed expression.

### *Fixed expressions*

(46) *Il.* 14. 156 χαῖρε δὲ θυμῷ

(47) *Il.* 21. 423 " " "

(48) *Il.* 22. 224 " " "

(49) *Od.* 8. 483 " " "

(50) *Od.* 14. 113 " " "

(51) *Od.* 24. 545 " " "

(52) *Il.* 5. 514 τοῖ δὲ χάρησαν

(53) *Il.* 7. 307 " " "

### *Modifications of other patterns*

(54) *Il.* 1. 256 κεχαροῖατο θυμῷ (d. sp.; Shipp, p. 226)

Number 54 is an obvious modification of the formula ἐμῷ κεχαρισμένε θυμῷ (5 times in *Il.*, 1 in *Od.*; cf. also *Od.* 6. 32 κεχάριστο δὲ θυμῷ). Another similar modification is *Hymnus Homericus ad Cererem* 458 κεχάρηντο δὲ θυμῷ.



D. EXPRESSIONS IN ENJAMBMENT

*Formulaic patterns*

(55) *Od.* 4. 259–60 αὐτὰρ ἐμὸν κῆρ / χαῖρ' (rem.)

(56) *Od.* 20. 89–90 " " " / " (rem.)

Modification:

(57) *Il.* 14. 139–40 ὁλοὸν κῆρ / γηθεῖ ἐνὶ στήθεσσι (d. sp.; Shipp, p. 285)

There are plenty of associated expressions (e.g., *Od.* 12. 192–93 αὐτὰρ ἐμὸν κῆρ / ἤθελ', *Od.* 7. 82–83 = 23. 85–86 πολλὰ δέ οἱ κῆρ / ὄρμαιν'). For number 57, see especially *Odyssey* 16. 274–75 σὸν δὲ φίλον κῆρ / τετλάτω ἐν στήθεσσι; for a similar scanning, see *Iliad* 6. 523–24 τὸ δ' ἐμὸν κῆρ / ἄχνυται.

*Fixed expressions*

(58) *Il.* 24. 321–22 οἱ δὲ ἰδόντες / γήθησαν, καὶ πᾶσιν ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θυμὸς ἰάνθη

(59) *Od.* 15. 164–65 " " " / " " " " " " " "

The formula (without καὶ πᾶσιν κτλ.) is also attested in *Hymnus Homericus* 33. 16–17.

*Modifications of other patterns*

(60) *Il.* 13. 414–16 ἔφημι / . . . / γηθήσειν κατὰ θυμόν (d. sp.)

The phrase of which our expression is a part, extending as it does over three lines and involving two "necessary" enjambments, can hardly be counted as formulaic; but the expression itself is obviously connected with the formulaic pattern represented in phrases such as *Odyssey* 1. 323 θάμβησεν κατὰ θυμόν and *Iliad* 21. 127 = *Odyssey* 2. 156 ὄρμηναν (-εν) δ' ἀνὰ θυμόν.

Of the sixty expressions in this group, thirty-seven (62%) are formulae proper, and twenty-three (38%) are modifications of attested formulaic patterns. They are distributed among different contexts as follows: the majority (42) are found in the main narrative, while the rest are distributed more or less evenly among reminiscences (6), direct speech (7), and similes (5); all the occurrences in direct speech and the similes are modifications of formulaic patterns (see table 1). The temporal and modal distribution is as follows: the majority are in the aorist indicative (33) and the imperfect (15), while the rest are in the present indicative (5), the optative (3), and the future (3); the present, the optative, and the future occur only in the modifications of formulaic patterns (see table 2). All the personal forms are in the third person singular or plural (see table 3).<sup>20</sup> The six expressions marked by Shipp as late or abnormal constitute ten percent of the total; all are modifications of formulaic

20. This covers all the expressions except the future infinitives in nos. 32 and 60.

patterns (see table 3). Clearly, then, most of the formulaic expressions—the formulae proper (excluding the modifications)—form a coherent group: they occur only in the main narrative or the reminiscences, they are formulated in the third person singular or plural of the aorist or imperfect, and they are free from late or abnormal linguistic features.

## II. ISOLATED EXPRESSIONS

This group comprises the expressions for joy that are not only unique but also isolated, in that they are not related to an attested formulaic pattern.

### A. EXPRESSIONS INTRODUCED IN THE FIRST HALF OF THE VERSE

- (61) *Od.* 14. 377 ἦδ' οἱ χαίρουσιν (d. sp.)
- (62) *Il.* 3. 23 ὥς τε λέων ἐχάρη (sim.)
- (63) *Od.* 3. 52 χαῖρε δ' Ἀθηναίη
- (64) *Od.* 24. 313 χαῖρε δὲ κείνος ἰών (rem.)
- (65) *Il.* 3. 27 ὥς ἐχάρη Μενέλαος (sim.; Shipp, p. 237)
- (66) *Il.* 10. 277 χαῖρε δὲ τῷ ὄρνιθ' Ὀδυσσεύς
- (67) *Il.* 18. 259 χαίρεσκον γὰρ ἔγωγε (rem.)
- (68) *Od.* 22. 411 ἐν θυμῷ, γρη῏, χαῖρε (d. sp.)
- (69) *Il.* 11. 73 - - Ἔρις δ' ἄρα χαῖρε<sup>21</sup>
- (70) *Od.* 2. 249 οὐ κέν οἱ κεχάρητο γυνή (d. sp.)
- (71) *Il.* 19. 185 χαίρω σεῦ, Λαερτιάδη, τὸν μῦθον ἀκούσας (d. sp.)

As distinct from the formulaic expressions, the isolated expressions that start at the beginning of the verse only rarely reach its end, usually stopping at the penthemimeral, the trochaic, or the hephthemimeral caesura. Note that numbers 62 and 65 are two “horns” of the same simile.

### B. EXPRESSIONS INTRODUCED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE VERSE

- (72) *Il.* 9. 77 τίς ἄν τάδε γηθήσειε; (d. sp.)
- (73) *Il.* 21. 347 χαίρει δέ μιν ὅς τις ἐθείρη (sim.)
- (74) *Od.* 22. 306 χαίρουσι δέ τ' ἄνδρες ἄγρη (sim.)

Note that number 72 begins after the trochaic caesura, numbers 73 and 74 after the penthemimeral caesura.

### C. EXPRESSIONS INTRODUCED IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE VERSE

- (75) *Od.* 10. 419 ὥς ἐχάρημεν (d. sp.)
- (76) *Od.* 24. 514 ἡ μάλα χαίρω (d. sp.; Shipp, p. 363)

21. Though linguistically normal in itself, the expression is part of a highly problematic passage; see Shipp, *Studies*<sup>2</sup>, p. 274. Note that the position of χαῖρε is unique in Homer, being paralleled only in *Hymn. Hom. Ap.* 90 Δῆλος μὲν μάλα χαῖρε. Cf. the imperative χαῖρε in no. 68 above.

- (77) *Il.* 7. 191 χαίρω δὲ καὶ αὐτός (d. sp.)<sup>22</sup>  
 (78) *Il.* 23. 647 χαίρει δέ μοι ἦτορ (d. sp.)

Number 75 begins after the bucolic diaeresis, numbers 76–78 after the hephthemimeral caesura.

#### D. EXPRESSIONS IN ENJAMBMENT

- (79) *Od.* 23. 266–67 οὐδὲ καὶ αὐτὸς / χαίρω (d. sp.; Shipp, pp. 116, 358)  
 (80) *Il.* 20. 362–63 οὐδέ τιν' οἶω / Τρώων χαϊρήσειν (d. sp.; Shipp, p. 116)  
 (81) *Od.* 12. 379–80 ἦσιν ἐγὼ γε / χαίρεσκον (d. sp.)  
 (82) *Il.* 13. 343–44 μάλα κεν θρασυκάρδιος εἴη / ὅς τότε γηθήσειεν  
 (83) *Il.* 8. 377–78 ἦ νῶϊ Πριάμοιο πάϊς κορυθαίολος Ἔκτωρ / γηθήσει κτλ.  
 (d. sp.; Shipp, p. 262)  
 (84) *Il.* 24. 490–91 ἀλλ' ἦτοι κεῖνός γε . . . / χαίρει τ' ἐν θυμῷ (d. sp.)  
 (85) *Il.* 24. 705–6 εἴ ποτε καὶ ζῶοντι . . . / χαίρετ' (d. sp.)  
 (86) *Il.* 14. 503–4 οὐδὲ γὰρ ἦ Προμάχοιο δάμαρ . . . / ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ ἐλθόντι  
 γανύσσεται (d. sp.)  
 (87) *Od.* 8. 77–78 ἄναξ δ' ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων / χαῖρε νόω (rem.)

As distinct from the formulaic expressions in enjambment, which invariably begin after the bucolic diaeresis, the isolated expressions can begin after the bucolic diaeresis, after one of the central caesurae, or at the very beginning of the verse.

Of the twenty-seven expressions on the list, the majority (16) are found in direct speech, while the rest are evenly distributed among the main narrative (4), the similes (4), and the reminiscences (3) (see table 1). The temporal and modal distribution is as follows: nine expressions are in the present indicative and eight in the imperfect; the rest are evenly distributed among the aorist and future indicative and the optative (3 each); one expression is in the imperative (see table 2). Alongside the usual third person singular or plural, we find five examples of the first person, one of the second person, and one example of the imperative;<sup>23</sup> this means that twenty-two percent of the personal forms are not in the third person, in which the formulaic expressions invariably occur (see table 3). Four expressions (15%) contain late or abnormal forms (see table 3).

### III. UNQUALIFIED EXPRESSIONS

In this group I include expressions that, though repeated twice or paralleled in other epic diction, cannot with sufficient reason be associated with an attested formulaic pattern, or that, though in themselves unique, cannot with sufficient reason be categorized as totally isolated. I would suggest that the expressions in this group are underrepresented

22. Note that the speech of Ajax, to which the expression belongs, abounds in Attic elements; see Shipp, *Studies*<sup>2</sup>, p. 259.

23. All are personal forms except the future infinitive in no. 80.

formulae, formulae in the stage of formation, isolated expressions whose repetition is due to chance, and the like. (None of these expressions is introduced in the first half of the verse.)

#### B. EXPRESSIONS INTRODUCED IN THE MIDDLE OF THE VERSE

- (88) *Il.* 5. 682 χάρη δ' ἄρα οἱ προσιόντι

Though this phrase is unique I have not classified it as an isolated expression because of the possible parallel in *Hymnus Homericus ad Mercurium* 506 χάρη δ' ἄρα μητιέτα Ζεύς.

- (89) *Il.* 13. 609 χάρη καὶ ἐέλλπετο νίκην

We cannot exclude the possibility that this expression is an underrepresented formula, following the pattern found in number 39 above.

- (90) *Il.* 16. 600 μέγα δὲ Τρῶες κεχάροντο

This unique phrase is probably associated with the metrically equivalent formula represented in numbers 41 and 42 above.

- (91) *Od.* 20. 104 γήθησε δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς

This expression should probably be referred to the same category as *Hymnus Homericus ad Apollinem* 118 μείδησε δὲ γαῖ' ὑπένερθεν.

- (92) *Il.* 7. 127 μέγ' ἐγήθειεν ᾗ ἐνὶ οἴκῳ (rem.)

- (93) *Il.* 7. 214 μὲν ἐγήθειον εἰσορόωντες

It is not certain that μέγ' (μὲν) ἐγήθειεν (-ον) can stand as an independent formulaic pattern, especially since the close proximity of the two expressions in *Iliad* 7 somewhat diminishes the possibility that this is a genuine formula.

#### C. EXPRESSIONS INTRODUCED IN THE SECOND HALF OF THE VERSE

- (94) *Il.* 7. 189 γήθησε δὲ θυμῷ

This unique expression has a parallel in μείδησε δὲ θυμῷ at *Odyssey* 20. 301.

- (95) *Od.* 3. 438 κεχάροιτο ἰδοῦσα

It is not certain whether number 95 is a modification of number 54 or an isolated expression.

- (96) *Od.* 9. 356 ᾗ κε σὺ χαίρης (d. sp.; Shipp, p. 332)

- (97) *Il.* 1. 158 ὄφρα σὺ χαίρης (d. sp.)

Since this is an obvious case of a repetition that could well be due to chance, I have not classified numbers 96 and 97 as either formulaic or isolated.

D. EXPRESSIONS IN ENJAMBMENT

- (98) *Od.* 19. 462-63 - - - τῷ μὲν ῥα πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ  
χαῖρον νοστήσαντι (rem.)  
(99) *Od.* 12. 42-43 - - - τῷ δ' οὐ τι γυνὴ καὶ νήπια τέκνα  
οἴκαδε νοστήσαντι παρίσταται οὐδὲ γάνυνται (d. sp.)

The structure of number 98 is obviously similar to that of number 99: both expressions begin after the second-foot caesura; the phrases πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ and γυνὴ καὶ νήπια τέκνα are interchangeable; and νοστήσαντι occupies the same position in the verse. Yet the structure is still too loose to allow one unhesitatingly to place the expression among the formulae, and there are cases in which the same idea is expressed quite differently (see, e.g., nos. 70 and 86). Is this perhaps a formulaic pattern in the making?

- (100) *Od.* 12. 87-88 οὐδέ κέ τίς μιν / γηθήσειεν ἰδὼν (rem.)

I cannot classify this unique expression as isolated because of its possible association with formulaic structures of the type γήθησεν ἰδὼν and because of the possible parallel in *Hymnus Homericus ad Venerem* 279 γηθήσεις ὀρόων.

Of these thirteen expressions, seven belong to the main narrative, three to direct speech, and three to reminiscences; the similes are not represented (see table 1). The temporal and modal distribution is as follows: five expressions are in the aorist indicative, three in the imperfect; the subjunctive and the optative account for two expressions each; and the present indicative accounts for one expression (see table 2). Two expressions in this group are in the second person, and one is categorized by Shipp as late or abnormal (see table 3).

In this paper, I undertook two tasks. The first was to examine whether the principles of formulaic composition are as applicable to Homer's verbal expressions as they are to the noun-epithet combinations. In the light of the material treated above, we can see that this question should be answered positively: of the one hundred expressions examined, sixty percent proved to be formulae or modifications of attested formulaic patterns, while the rest (40%) could be categorized as isolated or remained unqualified. This proportion is similar to Hainsworth's figures for unique expressions among noun-epithet combinations that do not contain proper names (from one-third to one-half).<sup>24</sup> To the extent, then, that these one hundred expressions are a representative sample, we can say that from the standpoint of formulaic composition Homer's verbal expressions behave in the same way as the rest of Homeric

24. See at n. 3 above. The nonsubstantivized participles expressing joy form a group of 21 expressions, of which 16 are formulaic, 2 are isolated, and 3 are unqualified. If these were also taken into account, the proportions of the formulae, the isolated, and the unqualified expressions would be 63%, 24%, and 13%, respectively.

diction.<sup>25</sup> There is, then, no ground for questioning the applicability of Parry's theory to Homer's verbal expressions.

The main purpose of this study was to define the relations between the formulaic and the nonformulaic in Homeric diction. Here, instead of attempting to establish the so-called "formulaic systems" on a priori morphological grounds, I isolated a unit of content that exhausts everything Homer actually said on this specific subject. The results obtained from examining the structure of this unit and the behavior of its components are as follows.

The distribution of Homer's expressions for joy among various epic contexts is represented in table 1. Note that whereas a large majority of the formulaic expressions (70%) occur in the main narrative and only eleven-and-a-half percent in direct speech (in the case of the formulae proper the figures are 86.5% and zero, respectively), fifty-nine percent of the isolated expressions occur in direct speech and only fifteen percent in the main narrative.

The distribution of the expressions for joy among various tenses and moods is represented in table 2. Note that whereas fifty-six-and-a-half percent of the formulaic expressions occur in the aorist and only eight-and-a-half percent in the present (the figures for the formulae proper are 65% and zero, respectively), thirty-three-and-a-half percent of the isolated expressions occur in the present and only eleven percent in the aorist.

We can see, then, that the formulaic and the isolated expressions behave as mirror-images of one another: whereas the formulaic expressions occur most frequently in the main narrative (as opposed to direct speech) and the aorist (as opposed to the present), the isolated expressions occur most frequently in direct speech and the present tense (note that both the reminiscences and the imperfect tense that frequently occurs in them are neutral in respect of this division). This functional specialization of the formulaic and the isolated expressions is further demonstrated by the distribution of the expressions for joy among the personal forms of the verb, as represented in table 3: whereas the formulaic expressions—both the formulae proper and their modifications—occur only in the third person singular and plural, twenty-seven percent of the isolated expressions occur in the first or second person of the verb.

Of course, all this is not coincidental. The main group of formulaic expressions is clearly specialized so as to express the joy that springs from hearing or seeing something cheerful, which is of course the most common situation in the epic narrative: these are the expressions cast in the aorist. Note that the formulae in the aorist expressing joy as an

25. To check my results, I also examined Homer's expressions for seafaring, including all the occurrences of *πλέω* (*ἀποπλέω*, *περιπλέω*, etc.), the relevant uses of *ἐλαύνω* and *(δια)τρέχω*, and such rare verbs as *ναυτίλλομαι* and *ποντοπορεύω*. There were 55 expressions (including the participles), of which 28 (51%) were formulaic, 17 (31%) were isolated, and 10 (18%) were unqualified—proportions similar to those exhibited by the expressions for joy.

TABLE 1  
CONTEXTUAL DISTRIBUTION

	NARRATIVE	REMINISCENCES	SIMILES	DIRECT SPEECH
Formulaic				
Total	70%	10%	8.5%	11.5%
Formulae	86.5%	13.5%	—	—
Modifications	43.5%	4.5%	21.5%	30.5%
Isolated	15%	11%	15%	59%
Unqualified	54%	23%	—	23%

TABLE 2  
TEMPORAL AND MODAL DISTRIBUTION

	INDICATIVE				OPTATIVE	SUBJUNCTIVE	IMPERATIVE
	Aorist	Imperfect	Present	Future			
Formulaic							
Total	56.5%	25%	8.5%	5%	5%	—	—
Formulae	65%	35%	—	—	—	—	—
Modifications	43.5%	8.5%	22%	13%	13%	—	—
Isolated	11%	30%	33.5%	11%	11%	—	3.5%
Unqualified	38.5%	23%	7.5%	—	15.5%	15.5%	—

TABLE 3  
PRESENCE OF PERSONAL FORMS AND LATE OR ABNORMAL FEATURES

	PERSONAL FORMS		LATE OR ABNORMAL FEATURES
	3d singular or plural	Other	
Formulaic			
Total	100%	—	10%
Formulae	100%	—	—
Modifications	100%	—	26%
Isolated	73%	27%	15%
Unqualified	85%	15%	7.5%

immediate reaction occur in every portion of the verse: at the beginning of the line (nos. 25 and 26), after the first-foot caesura (nos. 1-7, 10, 12, 13), after the second-foot caesura (nos. 15-18, 20, 27, 28), after each of the central caesurae (nos. 39, 41, 42), and after the bucolic diaeresis (nos. 52, 53, 58, 59). All these formulae are in the third person singular or plural. Another, more restricted group of formulaic expressions is specialized to express joy as a feeling accompanying the main action; these

expressions are cast in the imperfect and occur after the two main word-breaks in the second half of the verse, the trochaic caesura (no. 33) and the bucolic diaeresis (nos. 44–51). Like the formulae in the aorist, all the formulae in the imperfect are in the third person. These exhaust Homer's formulaic system for the expression of joy.

One would reasonably expect that the task of expressing joy in senses other than those conveyed by the formulae proper would be performed by modifications of the formulaic patterns. And indeed, in the group of formulaic expressions only the modifications are encountered in the similes and direct speech (see table 1), only the modifications occur in the present, the future, or the optative (see table 2), and only the modifications contain forms characterized by Shipp as late or abnormal (see table 3). If, however, we compare the modifications with the isolated expressions, we find that the modifications on the whole still behave in the same way as the formulae proper: forty-three-and-a-half percent of them occur in the main narrative (as opposed to fifteen percent of the isolated expressions) and are cast in the aorist (as opposed to eleven percent of the isolated expressions); they occur only in the third person; and they are found in direct speech and the present tense far less often than the isolated expressions. These findings are in line with Parry's view that the modifications were intended to adapt the traditional formulae "to the expression of ideas more or less like those of the original formulae":<sup>26</sup> when the idea of joy must be expressed in senses differing from the formulae proper, the job is generally entrusted to the isolated expressions.

Thus, the so-called "isolated" expressions differ from the formulaic expressions in several respects: they cannot be shown to have been modeled on formulaic patterns; and they tend to occur in direct speech (rather than the main narrative),<sup>27</sup> in the present tense (rather than the aorist), in forms of the verb other than the third person,<sup>28</sup> and, above all, in unusual narrative situations.<sup>29</sup> All these differences justify the con-

26. *Making of Homeric Verse*, p. 196; Parry's system, however, did not provide the traditional poet with the ability to express ideas different from those expressed by the formulae proper. Note that both the isolated expressions and the modifications of formulaic patterns have high proportions of late and abnormal usages (see table 3), probably because both types must have been formed to express joy in senses different from those conveyed by the formulae proper, with the isolated expressions used where the difference was greater, the modifications, where it was less.

27. Cf. J. Griffin, "Homeric Words and Speakers," *JHS* 106 (1986): 36–57; Griffin concludes that Homeric speeches have "important distinctions of vocabulary, and of style, from the rest" (p. 50).

28. According to Hoekstra (*Homeric Modifications*, p. 51), before the digamma was dropped "the share of the 3 p. sing. of imperf. and aor. is likely to have been proportionally even more prominent . . . than it was in Homer's time." This likelihood, together with the relatively high proportion of late and abnormal usages in the isolated expressions, seems to indicate that these expressions belong to the "late" layers of the Homeric epics. On the whole, however, I doubt that the evidence adduced in this paper can be taken to suggest that the contexts in which these expressions occur (i.e., direct speech and similes) were much less prominent in epic poetry before Homer; see n. 35 below.

29. Since the formulae proper can express joy only as an immediate emotional response or as a feeling accompanying the main action, invariably in the 3d person, every other expression of joy is necessarily "unusual": note, for example, the complete lack of uniformity among Homer's expressions for such a simple idea as "I am glad" (nos. 71, 76, and 77; cf. no. 79).



clusion that the isolated expressions cannot be considered underrepresented formulae.<sup>30</sup>

Let us return now to the so-called "unqualified" expressions. The way in which these expressions are distributed among the epic contexts and among the tenses and moods, sharply differing as it does from the clear functional specialization of the formulaic and the isolated expressions, confirms our earlier assumption that this is not a coherent group: it must embrace both formulae proper and nonformulaic expressions. We are now in a position to refer at least some of the unqualified expressions to one or the other of these clearly defined categories. Thus, not only do numbers 91 and 94 occur in the main narrative and in the aorist (the two main indicators of a formulaic expression), but number 91 also supplies the missing third person singular expression for the penthemimeral caesura (the third person plural was represented in nos. 41 and 42), while number 94 supplies an aorist expression for the position after the hephthemimeral caesura, an expression that was missing in the formulaic system for joy. It is likely, then, that these two expressions are underrepresented formulae. The same seems to be true of numbers 92 and 93, which supply the missing imperfect expression for the position after the penthemimeral caesura. By contrast, numbers 96 and 97 should be identified as nonformulaic because they occur in the second person, a form that is found neither in the formulae proper nor in their modifications. It is still unclear, however, whether numbers 89, 90, 95, and 100 should be treated as modifications or as nonformulaic expressions, and the status of numbers 88, 98, and 99 also remains uncertain. As a result, the formulaic and nonformulaic expressions account for sixty-four percent and twenty-nine percent of the total, respectively; the proportion of unqualified expressions amounts to only seven percent.

Thus, by comparing a given expression with the well-established formulaic patterns for a given idea, we can determine with a considerable degree of certainty whether the expression is formulaic or nonformulaic. Though this conclusion is based on only one specific group of expressions, it can reasonably be extended to any such group in Homer. To illustrate this, let us consider the case of *θάλασσά τε ἤχήμεσα* (*Il.* 1. 157).<sup>31</sup> Though this unique expression does not by itself reveal whether it is nonformulaic or an underrepresented formula, we can decide the matter if we enlarge the context of our discussion. D. Gray has shown

30. Note that these differences are not universal characteristics found equally in every group of verbal expressions. Thus, most of the formulaic expressions for seafaring (64%) occur in reminiscences, a fact that explains the high frequency of both the imperfect tense (50% of the formulaic expressions; cf. n. 10 above) and the 1st-person forms of the verb (cf., e.g., such expressions as *πλέομεν νόκτας τε καὶ ἡμᾶρ* at *Od.* 10. 28, 80, 15. 476, *πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ* at *Od.* 9. 62, 105, 565, 10. 77, 133, or *πλέομεν Τροίηθεν ἰόντες* at *Od.* 3. 276). Such expressions mostly occur in Odysseus' and others' accounts of their travels, which must have been embedded in the epic tradition of *νόστοι* (I wish to thank the Editor for having drawn my attention to this point). Only by analyzing a given unit of content thoroughly and in context can we define the relation between its formulaic and nonformulaic elements.

31. Cf. above, at n. 6.

that the group of formulaic expressions for sea lacks a formula in the nominative: all the nominative expressions for sea are unique.<sup>32</sup> The reason for this becomes clear if we reflect that the idea "sea" usually appears in contexts such as "to sail across the sea," "to come to the seashore," and the like, none of which requires the nominative case. Moreover, the idea "the sea divides," which is the original context of θάλασσά τε ἡχήμεσσα,<sup>33</sup> is hardly an idea that the epic poets would need to express as frequently as, say, "to sail across the sea." Hence, since the phrase is not related to an attested formulaic pattern, is found in the case that is not represented in the formulaic system for sea, and expresses an unusual idea, we can infer that θάλασσά τε ἡχήμεσσα is not a formula.

Now, if twenty-nine percent of Homer's expressions for joy cannot be considered formulaic, we have a proportion that—to use Hainsworth's words again—is "disturbingly high in a diction commonly supposed to be entirely formulaic."<sup>34</sup> Given the regularity with which these nonformulaic expressions fall into the same morphological, semantic, and narrative categories, we must ask what function they perform in the epic diction as a whole. We saw that the distribution of the formulaic and the nonformulaic expressions is anything but fortuitous. Instead of evenly covering all possible situations requiring an expression of joy, the formulaic system for this idea only provides expressions that occur in the third person of the aorist indicative or imperfect and express joy as an immediate emotional response or as a feeling accompanying the main action. All other situations in which joy might be expressed constitute one huge "gap." As we saw, though this gap can occasionally be filled with modifications of formulaic patterns, it is most commonly filled with nonformulaic expressions: this is their primary function.<sup>35</sup>

But if the nonformulaic expressions filled the gaps in the formulaic systems, this must mean that the nonformulaic elements in the traditional diction were complementary to the formulaic elements. This relationship, I believe, is to be explained by the same principle of economy

32. "Homeric Epithets," p. 56.

33. Achilles is explaining to Agamemnon that he has no feud with the Trojans: *Il.* 1. 156–57 ἐπεὶ ἡ μάλα πολλὰ μεταξὺ / οὐρεά τε σκιάοντα θάλασσά τε ἡχήμεσσα. As Griffin has shown, the expression is part of a highly individual passage; see his analysis of *Il.* 1. 155–59 in "Words and Speakers," pp. 53–54.

34. See above, n. 3.

35. Though it is reasonable to assume that the nonformulaic expressions belong to the "late" layer of the Homeric epics, we cannot conclude that epic diction before Homer consisted mostly of traditional formulae (see n. 28). If the nonformulaic expressions were indeed coined to fill the gaps left by the traditional formulae, this can only mean that, unlike the formulae, which were preserved in the stock of traditional expressions, the nonformulaic expressions were ephemeral creations that varied from one poet to another. Thus, even if epic poets before Homer also composed long speeches and extended similes abounding in nonformulaic expressions, the latter were not likely to survive, simply because they had not been fixed in writing. Cf. the observation of Hoekstra (in whose opinion the narrative element was more prominent in the pre-Homeric tradition than it is in Homer) that formulaic introductions to Homer's speeches indicate that "even at very early stages dialogue existed alongside narrative" (*Homeric Modifications*, p. 52, n. 1). That this may also be true of similes is shown by the formulaic pattern represented in nos. 33–38, which seems cast specifically to fit the subject matter of similes.

on which Parry founded his theory of formulaic composition. Just as the traditional poet found it "thrifty" to have formulae for all recurring ideas and standard narrative situations, so he found it equally thrifty not to overload his formulaic apparatus with expressions for just any idea and situation: as Pope aptly remarked, "it is easy to see how an equipment of formulae complete enough to meet the demands of every emergency might exceed the creative capacity of any individual singer."<sup>36</sup> Moreover, there is reason to suggest that this thriftiness did not operate only at the level of the unique idea. Though each phrase in our list of nonformulaic expressions is unique, the same cannot be said of the ideas that they express. For example, though the idea "no one would be glad on seeing this" is repeated three times—in Nestor's speech in *Iliad* 9 (no. 72), in the poet's comment on the bloodshed in *Iliad* 13 (no. 82), and in Circe's description of Scylla in *Odyssey* 12 (no. 100)—the optative γηθήσειε(v) is found in a different metrical position each time (after the hephthemimeral caesura, after the 1st-foot caesura, and at the beginning of the line, respectively): clearly, there was not even a tendency to make a formula out of this idea. The reason seems obvious: this idea was not so common that it would be useful to coin a formula for it; where the poet wished to express something to this effect, he found it more convenient to create an appropriate expression ad hoc. To claim that the poet was not free to choose this alternative is to deny that he had the elementary skill required to compose a nonformulaic hexameter line.<sup>37</sup>

*The Hebrew University of Jerusalem*

36. "The Parry-Lord Theory," p. 9; cf. also Hainsworth, *Flexibility*, p. 114.

37. I would like to thank the anonymous referees of *CP* and the Editor for their helpful comments.