

## HOMERIC WORDS AND SPEAKERS<sup>1</sup>

THE aim of this paper is to establish the existence of a significant difference, in a number of respects, between the style of the narrated portions of Homer and that of the speeches which are recorded in the two epics; and to offer some explanations for this fact. It will require the presentation of some statistics: I suspect that not all of the figures are absolutely accurate, but I feel confident that such inaccuracies as they may contain will not affect the validity of the inferences drawn from them. The mere fact of differences in vocabulary, while not without interest, is not extremely interesting or surprising. The hope of this paper is that patterns will appear, and that the 'reticence' or 'objectivity' of Homer, more often praised than investigated, will be illuminated by them; that particular passages in the poems will be shown to be stylistically interesting or unusual; and that some general considerations will emerge which suggest that the difficulties confronting the oral theory of Homer are rather more complex than is often supposed.

It is a striking feature of the Homeric poems, and one which particularly displeased Plato, that direct speech plays so large a role in them. The distinction between direct speech and narrative is not indeed an absolutely clear or simple one. The stories told by Odysseus in the *Odyssey*, for instance, are an obvious problem: are Books ix–xii to count as narrative or as speech? I have no doubt that they should count as speech. Odysseus' style of narration is not the same as that of the poet himself (to use a convenient shorthand for the manner of the narrative portions of the text). Aristotle pointed out that Homer allows his characters to say things for whose truth he himself does not vouch: to talk of monsters and marvels.<sup>2</sup> Jørgensen showed in 1905 that the persons in the poems speak of supernatural events in a different way from the poet.<sup>3</sup> The omniscient narrator tells us which god intervenes at each moment in human actions, while the characters, unable to see with the same clarity the divine workings, talk in terms of 'a god': θεός or δαίμων. It has been argued, for instance by Krarup in 1948,<sup>4</sup> that abstract nouns (another tricky term to define with exactness) are notably more frequent in the speeches of the characters than they are in the impersonal narration. Hermann Fränkel observes that the characters are much freer than the poet himself with explanations of events in terms of what we should call personifications: Ἄτη, Λιταί,<sup>5</sup> and so on. Norman Austin remarked that the deployment of name formulae may be very different in speech and narrative.<sup>6</sup> I hope to extend this sort of observation, and to indicate some underlying considerations, not so far discussed, which relate to the Homeric style in general, and which have important implications for the oral theory of composition. I shall conclude with some reflections on the language of Achilles and Agamemnon.

Although there has been a certain amount of work done, as we have seen, on the distinction between speech and narrative, I think it would not be unfair to say that most of the oralists have, in their published work, paid very little attention to it. The tension between the thing to be said, and the constraints of metre and language, is usually discussed in more general terms, the singer being imagined as confronted by an essentially monolithic task. In fact, however, the distinction I am discussing added very considerably to the complexity of the undertaking which faced him.

<sup>1</sup> Versions of this paper were given at a conference at the University of Pennsylvania in April 1984, and at a meeting of the Hellenic Society in London in November 1984. Many helpful comments were made on those occasions: I hope their makers will accept this general expression of thanks.

<sup>2</sup> Arist., *Fr.* 163 R=ΣΑ in *Iliad* xix 108. Cf. W. Suerbaum, 'Die Ich-Erzählungen des Odysseus', *Poetica* ii (1968) 150–177; B. Effe, "'Personale" Erzählweisen in der Erzählliteratur der Antike', *Poetica* vii (1975) 135–

157.

<sup>3</sup> O. Jørgensen, 'Das Auftreten der Götter in den Büchern 1–μ der Odyssee': *Hermes* xxxix (1904) 357–82.

<sup>4</sup> P. Krarup, 'Verwendung von Abstracta in der direkten Rede bei Homer', *C&M* x (1948) 1–17.

<sup>5</sup> H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1962) 68.

<sup>6</sup> Norman Austin, *Archery at the Dark of the Moon* (California 1975) 49.

First, a reminder of the proportions involved. Of the 15,690 lines of the *Iliad*, 7018 are in direct speech, or slightly less than half (45%). Of the 12,103 lines of the *Odyssey*, 8225 are in direct speech, or about two thirds (67%). As a proportion of both poems together the speeches amount to nearly 55%.<sup>7</sup> These proportions should be kept in mind when one assesses the significance of the figures which will be unpacked in this paper.

I begin with some facts about the use of abstract nouns. Krarup found a total of 529 instances of the use of abstract nouns in speech, as against 90 in narrative. Testing his figures, I find that he tended to help them along a little: for instance, the noun *μαχλοσύνη* 'lewdness' is excluded from his count of abstracts in narrative, on the inadequate ground that the Alexandrian scholars deleted the passage where it appears (*Il.* xxiv 30). But a ratio of 4 or 5 (rather than something near 6) to one is really present. Within the large and rather motley class of abstract nouns, which ranges from mere generalising expressions for unspecified plural concrete particulars (*πόσιος καὶ ἔδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο, ἡλικίη*) by way of the general names of definite physical activities (*ὄρχηστύς, ναυτιλίη, ἵπποσύνη, παλαιμοσύνη*) to true abstracts (*αἰδώς, εὐδικίαι, μειλιχίη*), it is observable that the more purely abstract they become, the greater is their preponderance in speech. Of the compounds of the family *ἀγανοφροσύνη—ἀεσιφροσύνη—ἀφροσύνη—δολοφροσύνη—ἐπιφροσύνη—εὐφροσύνη—δμοφροσύνη—σαοφροσύνη—φιλοφροσύνη—χαλιφροσύνη*, for instance, a set of 10 nouns, we find 19 instances in speech as against 2 in narrative. Such words as *εὐδικίαι, εὐεργεσίη, εὐηγεσίη, εὐκλείη, εὐνομίη, εὐπλοίη*, all are confined entirely to recorded speech. Krarup draws no inferences from such facts, which could be multiplied, beyond saying that 'an overwhelming majority of such words were created for the speeches in the poems'. Yet surely one point presents itself with immediate attractiveness, although it may at first sound like little more than the reformulation in other terms of the numerical ratios themselves. That is that the creators of the Homeric poems regarded these abstract and analytic types of expression as appropriate to the utterance of the characters in the epic: they were not equally appropriate to the recounting of events by the singer himself, as the mouthpiece of the goddess.

That way of putting the matter may not command immediate assent. An alternative explanation, it might be urged, and one which makes less in the way of assumptions, would be to suppose that the narrative scenes and passages—the journeys, meals, duels, battles—were in their general character and also in their verbal detail much more traditional, the speeches much more innovative. Consequently the tendency to abstraction and analysis in the speeches would simply be an instance of the general development of thought and language, visible in the speeches because their composition was later. There is some truth in this, although not as much (as we shall see) as might be thought; but I should still want to press the point that the Homeric singers can be seen to be well aware of the problem of stylisation and of different modes of conduct within the epics. Let me illustrate that by reference to a few pieces of Homeric stylisation of a very different kind.

Everybody knows that the world of the heroes, in which the action takes place, is explicitly declared to be 'different' from the world of the singers themselves. 'Such as men are nowadays', *οἷοι νῦν βροτοὶ εἶσι*, they are not at all the same as men were in those days, when kings were sprung directly from the loins of gods, and a man could lift with one hand the weight that now two stout fellows can barely hoist on to a waggon. Specifically, there were visible differences. Bronze, not iron, was the metal they used, and the singers, who cannot help letting slip a few hints that they themselves used iron (*αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφέλεκται ἄνδρα σίδηρος*, *Od.* xvi 294 = xix 13), are on the whole remarkably consistent in limiting their heroes to the older metal. They also describe a curious and unrealistic diet: nothing but roast beef for heroes, with no vegetables, apparently, and no fish except when one is starving (*ἔτειρε δὲ γαστέρα λιμός*, *Od.* iv 369 = xii 332). Such things are not as irrelevant as they may seem to the question of language, since they

<sup>7</sup> Figures: Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* i (Munich 1929) 92.

show that the singers (Homer) were highly self-conscious and eminently able to impose on their creation stylised ways, in accordance with a clear conception of the special conditions of heroic life. The consistent chastity of language in allusions to sexual matters, which won the applause of the pious poet William Cowper ('Homer is in point of chastity a most blameless author', he wrote to a clergyman friend),<sup>8</sup> is another example of this self-awareness. It therefore seems appropriate to expect that the later stages of the tradition will not simply have been introducing more contemporary linguistic modes into the speeches without reflection, but on the contrary allowing them into the speeches, and excluding them from such narrative as they composed themselves, in accordance with a feeling that they were more appropriate there.

It is a further argument, and a much more direct and convincing one, that the restriction of these words to speeches is not simply because they are abstract nouns. On the contrary, a more careful look at the evidence shows something more general and more interesting. The words ἀγανοφροσύνη and ἀφροσύνη, to take the first two of that group, belong not only to the class of abstract nouns but also to their own little families of Homeric words: in the first case ἀγανός and ἀγανόφρων, in the second ἀφραίνω, ἀφρονέω and ἄφρων. If we ask what the distribution between speech and narrative is of these groups, the totals are again strikingly one-sided. The words of the ἀγανός group cumulatively appear in speech 14 times, in narrative twice; those of the ἄφρων group appear in speech 21 times, in narrative once (*Il.* iv 104 τῷ δὲ φρένας ἄφρονι πείθειν). The marked preference for direct speech is thus not only a stylistic matter relating to highly abstract nouns, but appears to attach to the basic sense expressed by certain ideas, whether in adjectives, nouns, or verbs: of gentleness, of folly. It confirms this view that the word ἤπιος, another expression for gentleness, occurs in Homer 23 times in speech and only twice (*Il.* iv 218, *Od.* xv 557) in narration.

It will have become apparent that far-reaching consequences may be ascribed to such a preference, and it is right to produce some more evidence for the fact, before proceeding to a riot of inference. One of the words singled out as a true abstract was εὐδικία. That word is rare in Homer, coming in fact only twice. Its restriction to speeches might therefore seem a small thing: a reluctance on the part of the singer to put so very abstract a noun into the mouth of the goddess. Now, the cognate words in the epics (I disregard the *Hymns* throughout) are δικάζω, δίκαιος, δικασπóλος, δίκη; and the usage of those words divides into a total of 37 appearances in speech against 5 in narrative, a ratio of 5½ to one. Immediately the impulse is to enquire into the usage of the word θέμις and its relatives, ἀθεμίστιος / ἄθεμιστος and θεμιστεύω. θέμις (except in the few cases where the word is the name of the goddess Themis, a person who actually appears in the poem) comes 26 times in speech and 3 in narrative; θεμιστεύω and ἀθεμίστιος between them come 7 times in speech and once in narrative, giving a total of 33 to 4, just over 8 to one. Thus, for instance, the formula ἢ θέμις ἔστιν, which is versatile enough to appear in several different positions in the line, is never said in the narrative: the poet never commits himself to expressing, from his own mouth, the idea that something is correct, in line with timeless usage. The distinction to be made between the speeches and the poet's own words is then not only a stylistic one, at least in the narrow sense of avoiding in certain types of passage a certain grammatical type of word. What is avoided is the expression in the narrative of certain sorts of judgment: on the rightness and wrongness of action, on the sense or folly of decisions and moods. Such expression of judgment is both pervasive and important for Homer, but it is only rarely expressed in a direct way.

It will help in seeing what is being asserted here if a contrast is briefly made with the practice of Virgil. In the *Aeneid* the reader constantly finds verses which express, from the poet's own mouth, strong and direct emotion: such asides as *nefas!* (viii 688 *sequiturque—nefas—Aegyptia coniunx*), *visu miserabile* (ix 465), *heu vatum ignarae mentes!* (iv 65), *fortunati ambo!* (ix 446) allow Virgil to comment directly, in highly emotional terms. More widespread are passages which

<sup>8</sup> W. Cowper, Letter of 3 December 1785 to the Rev. J. Newton.

work an attitude into the narrative by a morally coloured epithet. Aeneas watches Dido's indignant ghost recede, *casu concussus iniquo*, says the poet (vi 475); Cacus steals the cattle of Hercules, *furiis Caci mens effera, ne quid inausum / aut intractatum scelerisve dolive fuisset* (viii 205): 'his mind maddened by the Furies, so as to leave nothing untouched or undared in the way of crime and trickery'. The Homeric use of words like δίκη and θέμις contrasts very sharply; as it does again with Virgilian lines like *saevit amor ferri et scelerata insania belli* (vii 461), or *eadem impia Fama furenti / detulit* (iv 298), *triste ministerium* (vi 223), *auri sacra fames* (iii 57), *insignis . . . Nisus amore pio pueri* (v 295), *certam quatit improbus hastam* (xi 767)—such expressions are everywhere in the *Aeneid*, forcing on the reader an explicit moral and emotional interpretation of events and characters.<sup>9</sup> The contrast helps to bring out the restraint of the Homeric manner.

No feature of Homeric style is more important than this. The narrator depicts events in a way which leaves the understanding of their moral significance to the audience—an audience whose presence is never acknowledged. That significance is brought out partly by the sequence of events themselves, and partly by such devices as the simile; but above all it emerges from direct speech, which in Homer is addressed, not by the poet to his own hearers, but by speakers to hearers within the poem. That is where the crucial moral terms appear.

I shall return to the question of emotion after a few more words on morality. It would be possible to make the objection to my treatment of θέμις and δίκη that these terms are not, after all, central to the thought of the poem, which is primarily envisaged, and meant to be judged, in other categories, of self-assertive heroism for example; so that the pattern of use of these moral terms is in reality less important than it may seem. I am anxious not to be unfair to this argument, which is an important one, and I make no great play, for instance, with the figures for the usage of words related to κακός. Like anyone who has actually tried to count and analyse the Homeric occurrences of a word like κακός, I cannot reach the heroic level of self-restraint which would be needed to refrain from setting out the results, in the most summary form; but I shall not dwell on them. For forms of κακός itself, a count produced the totals of 253 appearances in speech, 48 in narrative (5 to one); and for its unappetising family of κακίζομαι κακοεργίη κακομήχανος κακόξεινος κακορραφίαι κακότεχνος κακότης κακοφραδής κακώ, totals of 35 appearances in speech against 4 in narrative (9 to one). Those figures have a certain weight. As for the contrary word ἀγαθός, it emerges that in the *Iliad* it is used 47 times in narrative and 37 in speech, in the *Odyssey* 12 times in narrative and 12 times in speech. Those figures, however, are misleading: no fewer than 40 of the 46 narrative instances in the *Iliad*, and 6 of the 12 in the *Odyssey*, are repetitions of the single formula βόην ἀγαθός. If that phrase is excluded, the instances of ἀγαθός in speech outnumber those in narrative by 35 to 7 in the *Iliad*, and by 23 to 6 in the *Odyssey*.

Can this dichotomy be applied to what must be accepted as central ethical concerns of the Homeric epics, beyond the reach of objections to the singling out of δίκη or θέμις or κακόν as crucial terms? What follows represents an attempt to do it. Central to the *Iliad* is a high-handed act of Agamemnon and the struggle of Achilles against him and against the crescendo of appeals from the Achaeans that he should rescue them from destruction: his final relenting, his killing of Hector, his release of his enemy's corpse in a scene of shared humanity with Priam. After reflection the following key words—of course this list is not exclusive—seem to me to convey the essence of that moral story: ὕβρις and its congeners (the act of Agamemnon is called ὕβρις by Achilles, and Athena accepts the description—*Il.* i 203, 214); μῆνις (a term almost restricted to Achilles and the gods—this was no ordinary anger); ἀναιδείη and ἀναιδής (immediately applied to Agamemnon by Achilles, *Il.* i 149); ἀτάσθαλος (used of Achilles by Priam, *Il.* xxii 418); τιμή and its family—the crucial issue (cf. *Il.* i 352–6 and 505–10, eleven lines in which words of this group occur no less than 8 times); σέβας (used of Achilles' more human behaviour

<sup>9</sup> On 'Lyrisms' in Virgil, cf. R. Heinze, *Virgils epische Technik*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig 1914) 374; K. Latte in *Philol.* xc (1935) 154 = *Kleine Schriften* 584; F. Klingner, *Studien*

*zur griechischen und römischen Literatur* (Zurich and Stuttgart 1964) 166.

in the old days by Andromache, *Il.* vi 417, and urged on him as a motive for fighting by Iris, *Il.* xviii 178); *νηλής* and *ἔλεος*, the charge brought against Achilles by Ajax (*Il.* ix 628) and by Patroclus (*Il.* xvi 33), and the quality he seems to have lost in Book xxiv (line 44), but which at last he shows to Priam. The figures for the usage of all the words in these groups are: *ὑβρις* 26–3, *μῆνις* 19–12, *ἀναιδείη* 11–4, *ἀτάσθαλος* 30–1, *σέβας* 8–0, *τιμή* 111–15, *νηλής* (of persons) 8–0, *ἔλεος* 55–23. The total usage of the groups I calculate at 268–58, or nearly 5 to one. It is, I fear, not unlikely that some slips may have crept in, but the only thing I have done which does not reflect the facts in an absolutely straightforward way is to disregard, under the word *νηλής*, the formulaic repetitions of *νηλεῖ χαλκῶ* and *νηλεῖς ἦμαρ*. I have reckoned the instances where the word is applied to a person (or a heart, *νηλεῖ θυμῶ*).

It thus appears that the epics strongly favour the reservation of the crucial moral terms from the narrative to the speeches. In passing it may be observed that here again it is the sense rather than the grammatical category which is significant: not only *σέβας* but also its verb *σεβάζομαι* is limited to the speeches, *ἀτάσθαλος* is as restricted (though much commoner) as *ἀτασθαλίη*, and whereas we find three examples of the noun *ὑβρις* (out of 17) in narrative, the verb *ὑβρίζω* and the adjective *ὑβριστής* are restricted to speeches. The result thus rather laboriously reached is not perhaps extremely surprising. It is no secret that the poems contain a number of lively scenes of moral debate, and in a general way every reader is aware that the Homeric style is impersonal. The extent to which this is true, however, ought to pose a general question to the oralists, which I express rather boldly by saying that in important senses the Homeric epics have two vocabularies.

That provocative assertion needs to be given some flesh. Let me start with the fact that the word *σχέτλιος* is in both epics (it occurs 30 times) used 29 times in speeches, as an emotional remonstrance directed by one character to another, and only once in narrative, at *Od.* xxi 28. The usage of *δαιμόνιος*, (22 instances against none), is similar. It is thus exceedingly rare, that is to say, for anyone to be described by the poet as possessing either of these qualities. *δαιμόνιος* indeed hardly seems to have what might properly be called a meaning: its use conveys an attitude of shock or rebuke on the part of the speaker towards the person addressed. *σχέτλιος* however has a more definite sense, the nuance being of unreasonable persistence or disregard of a normal limitation. The narrative, which does not accept either of these epithets, is however happy with another apparently similar one, the word *νήπιος*. Like them it is often used as the first foot of a line, to comment unfavourably on an action or an attitude; and one character can say to another ‘*νήπιε*, the women of Troy are still defended by Hector’ (*Il.* xvi 833), or ‘*νήπιε*, don’t talk to me of ransom’ (*Il.* xxi 99). But this word, unlike *δαιμόνιος* and *σχέτλιος*, is also used by the poet himself, and quite frequently (14 times), to comment on deluded behaviour of his characters.

Two things are noticeable: first, that the poet always expresses this in the third and not in the second person: *νήπιος*, οὐδ’ ἄρ’ ἔμελλε . . . *νηπίη*, οὐδ’ ἐνόησεν . . . The emotional nuance is thus not as unrestrained as when the characters talk to each other with such epithets in the vocative (*νήπιε* 4 times: the usual usage of *δαιμόνιος*), or as it is when Virgil addresses his Nisus and Euryalus at *Aeneid* ix 446 as ‘*fortunati ambo! . . . vos . . .*’. The second point is that, unlike *δαιμόνιος* and *σχέτλιος*, the word *νήπιος* does possess a meaning which allows it to be used in narrative. *νήπια τέκνα*, young children, come in the epic, and the baby Astyanax is called in the narrative *νήπιος* (*Il.* vi 400). It is true that all the passages in which *νήπιος* is so used could be said to have an emotional colouring, but that is partly due to the nature of the world itself, rather perhaps than that of language. At any rate, the word is used in the epics as conveying a fact; and I think it is that which made it available for the poet to use in his own person, commenting on the delusions of his characters, in a way that the other two epithets, which had no unemotional uses at all, were not. Again, finally, it is worth repeating that a very nice distinction is observed. A character may address another in the vocative, *νήπιε*; for himself the narrator sticks to the nominative and the third person. The explanation for the distinction cannot be primarily metrical, as the other possibility did exist in the epic. It is a matter of stylistic and emotional level and tone.

A smaller group of words consists of those which are not only limited to direct speech but also wholly or mostly restricted to application to the speaker himself. Thus the phrases αἰνὰ τεκοῦσα and αἰνὰ παθοῦσα, which appear once each in the *Iliad*, are each time used by the speaker of herself:

ὦ μοι τέκνον ἔμόν, τί νύ σ' ἔτρεφον αἰνὰ τεκοῦσα; (i 414)

'Why did I bear you in sorrow and rear you?'

asks Thetis of Achilles, and

τέκνον, ἐγὼ δειλή· τί νυ βείομαι αἰνὰ παθοῦσα; (xxii 431)

'Why should I live in sorrow, now you are dead?'

says Hecuba to Hector. αἰνοπαθῆς behaves in the same way. Waking from a refreshing sleep, Penelope says

ἦ με μάλ' αἰνοπαθῆ μαλακὸν περὶ κῶμ' ἐκάλυψεν (Od. xviii 201)

'A gentle sleep covered me over in my cruel sorrow'.

More strikingly, the word αἰνόμορος, which comes three times, is always so used. In the disastrous battle of his men with the Cicones, says Odysseus, an evil destiny from Zeus came upon us,

ἡμῖν αἰνομόροισιν, ἴν' ἄλγεα πολλὰ πάθοιμεν (Od. ix 53)

'Upon us poor wretches, to make us endure many sorrows'.

The ghosts of the slain suitors tell Agamemnon, in the next world, of their destruction: Penelope set up the axes,

ἡμῖν αἰνομόροισιν ἀέθλια καὶ φόνου ἀρχήν (Od. xxiv 169)

'For us poor wretches a contest which was the beginning of our doom'.

Most eloquently of all, Andromache laments her fate. She was born to an evil destiny in the house of her father Eetion.

ὄ μ' ἔτρεφε τυτθὸν ἐοῦσαν,  
δύσμορος αἰνόμορον· ὡς μὴ ὄφελλε τεκέσθαι (Il. xxii 480)

'He brought me up when I was little—unhappy father and wretched daughter'.

The two Homeric instances of the word πανάποτμος are both spoken by Priam in the last book of the *Iliad*—ὦ μοι ἐγὼ πανάποτμος, to have had and lost so many fine sons (xxiv 255 and 493). The word παναώριος, 'doomed all too early',<sup>10</sup> makes its sole appearance in the same book, on the lips of Achilles:

ἄλλ' ἓνα παῖδα τέκεν παναώριον (xxiv 540)

'My father had one son, doomed to die all too early; and I do not even care for him in his old age'.

δυσάμμορος, 'doomed to misery', is used only in lamentation, and refers to the speaker in two of its three appearances. 'Our child is an orphan now,' says Andromache, 'the child whom we ill-fated pair brought to birth',

πάϊς δ' ἔτι νήπιος αὐτῶς,  
ὄν τέκομεν σύ τ' ἐγὼ τε δυσάμμοροι (xxii 484 and xxiv 726).

<sup>10</sup> Despite the ingenious argument of Maurice Pope, 'A Nonce-Word in the *Iliad*', CQ xxv (1983) 1-8.

The third instance is barely different, when Priam complains that he and Hecuba cannot satisfy their need for lamentation over Hector's body:

μήτηρ θ', ἣ μιν ἔτικτε δυσάμμορος, ἠδ' ἐγὼ αὐτός (xxii 428).

Some scholars have even wanted to take the epithet with what follows rather than what precedes; that is clearly wrong, but the distinction between the unhappiness of Hecuba and that of Priam is here of the slimmest. All these words have in common a conscious pathos, what might almost be called self-indulgence. In this they resemble the striking word which Thetis uses of herself, 'unhappy mother of the greatest of heroes':

ὦ μοι ἐγὼ δειλή, ὦ μοι δυσαριστοτόκεια (xviii 54).

Such words were evidently felt by the poet to be too different in ethos and colouring to appear in his own style, or even in ordinary speeches within the epics: their plangency suited the expression of self-pity.

Certain other words can be seen to have an inclination in the same direction: *δυσκλεής*, used only twice, and both times by Agamemnon of himself (*Il.* ii 115; ix 22), as he faces the agonising prospect of an inglorious and humiliated return to Greece. *δύσμορος* and *δύστηνος* are words which appear overwhelmingly in speech. The one exception is the 'sympathetic' line in which the poet says that 'poor Odysseus' was nearly drowned when his raft was wrecked:

ἔνθα κε δὴ δύστηνος ὑπὲρ μόρον ὤλετ' Ὀδυσσεύς (*Od.* v 436):

as sometimes happens in the *Odyssey*, the narrator has slipped from the dispassionate mode. But both words also come with some frequency in self-reference by the speakers.

Another point, not unrelated, can be made about the expressions *οὐκ ὀνομαστήν* and *δυσώνυμος*, 'not to be named' and 'of evil name'. The former appears in Homer three times, at *Od.* xix 260 and 570, and at *Od.* xxiii 19. It is always spoken by Penelope, in the phrase

Κακοῖλιον, οὐκ ὀνομαστήν,

'Evil Troy, not to be named'.

*δυσώνυμος* also comes three times: once it is applied to the Achaeans by Hecuba,

ἦ μάλα δὴ τείρουσι δυσώνυμοι υἴες Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* vi 255)

'The sons of Achaeans, evil to name, are wearing you out';

once by Penelope to the day of her forced re-marriage,

ἦδε δὴ ἠὼς εἰσι δυσώνυμος, ἦ μ' Ὀδυσῆος  
οἴκου ἀποσχήσει (*Od.* xix 571),

'This is the day of evil name which is to separate me from Odysseus' house';

and once in narrative, of death: Asius, the fool, was never to return alive to Troy,

πρόσθεν γάρ μιν μοῖρα δυσώνυμος ἀμφεκάλυπεν (*Il.* xii 116).

With the rather remarkable exception of this last instance, all utterances of these two phrases are made by women.<sup>11</sup>

<sup>11</sup> This fact surely reinforces, by the way, the conjecture of Martin at [Hom.] *hymn. Ven.* 253: Aphrodite complains of her sufferings because of her passion for Anchises,

ἐπεὶ μάλα πολλὸν ἀάσθη  
σχέτλιον οὐκ ὀνομαστόν, ἀπεπλάγχθη δὲ νόοιο,  
παῖδα δ' ὑπὸ ζώνῃ ἐθέμην βροτῶ εὐνηθεῖσα

'My infatuation was great, terrible, not to be named; and I am with child by a mortal man'.

The manuscripts read *ὀνότατον*; T. W. Allen prints Clark's *ὀνοταστόν*, which the commentary of Allen, Halliday and Sikes actually calls 'certain', but *ὀνομαστόν* has not only the right sense but also the right feminine ethos.

In the description of anger, a great Homeric subject, we find that words are used differently. *μῆνις* refers almost exclusively to the anger of gods and the wrath of Achilles, and that limitation is its dominant aspect: *μηνίω* is used as many times in narrative as in speech (3–3), *μῆνις* 10 times in speech and 6 in narrative. That is to say, there is no significant difference in the case of this word. *κοτέω* and *κότος* together occur 16 times in speech, 11 times in narrative: again, no significant difference. But we do find expressions which are only used in one or the other of the two modes. The common phrase *ὑπόδρα ἰδών* (26 times) is never used in the first person but always in the third; it is a striking fact that Odysseus, in the Wandering books of the *Odyssey*, not only never says \**τὸν δ' ἄρ' ὑπόδρα ἰδών προσέφη*, but that he never describes anybody else as looking in that way. The word *ὑπόδρα* is absent from those books, and it seems that it was felt to be appropriate only to the impersonal narrator. The same is true of the word *ὀχθέω* (*ὀχθήσας*, *ὠχθήσαν*), which is used 29 times in Homer, but always in narrative—and never in the Wanderings. (Such points as these, I remark parenthetically, are among the evidence which one might appeal to in support of the assertion that the *ἀπόλογοι* of Odysseus are to be classed as speech, not as narrative.) As 'looking *ὑπόδρα*' is confined to narrative, so is the statement that the eyes of an angry person 'flashed with fire' or 'burned' (*Il. i 104* etc.). Seven times is this idea used, and not in a formulaic phrase, except in as far as fire is always predicated of *ὄσσε*, never of *ὀφθαλμοί*; and it is never applied by one character to another. Only the narrator avails himself of it.

On the other hand, the phrase *χόλος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ* (4 times) is restricted to speech; and whereas the word *μένος* is neutral between speech and narrative (56–76), the word *χόλος* shows a clear preference for speech (47–13). The word *θυμαλγέα* is in the *Iliad* closely linked with the anger of Achilles: of its 4 appearances, two speak of his *χόλον θυμαλγέα*, one is his demand that Agamemnon should pay him back all his *θυμαλγέα λώβην*, and the fourth is used by Phoenix in his Meleager story to Achilles, when he tells him how the hero, angry like Achilles, withdrew from the fighting and stayed in bed with his wife Cleopatra, *χόλον θυμαλγέα πέσων*. The emotional epithet is particularly appropriate to speech rather than narrative. *χόλος* then, which is much commoner than *μῆνις* and appears constantly at the crucial points of the Achilles story, tends towards becoming too emotionally coloured a word for the direct speech mode, but has by no means reached that point exclusively. Anger, after all, was an ancient and regular epic theme. 'This is what we hear about the heroes of the past, *ὅτε κέν τιν' ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἴκοι*, whenever one of them was assailed by a violent *χόλος*', says Phoenix to Achilles (*Il. ix 525*). The length and the complexity of the treatment in the *Iliad* of the wrath of Achilles, which doubtless was original in giving the old theme of heroic anger a new and tragic turn, needed a new richness of psychological vocabulary to explain, or to make credible, the refusal of the hero in this poem to behave like other traditional heroes, accept the presents, and come back to battle. That at least would be my guess about the history. *χόλος*, more than *μένος* or *θυμός*, was developed to meet this need, never going as far as rarer words for mental states, such as *σέβας* or *ἀγή* (indignant astonishment), which were employed only in direct speech by the persons in the poems.

At the opposite extreme from heroic anger come the qualities of gentleness and restraint. The noun *αἰδώς* occurs 24 times in Homer, and only once (*Il. xv 657*) in narrative; the verb *αἰδέομαι* occurs 33 times in speech, 9 times in narrative. We have seen already that *ἀγανός* and the words etymologically connected with it are overwhelmingly commoner in speech than in narrative. The similar but rarer words *ἐνήης* and *ἐνηεῖη*, applied particularly to Patroclus, and the words *μείλιχος*, *μειλίχιος*, *μειλιχίη* and the word *ἥπιος* when they are used of persons, appear in speech 40 times but only 4 times in narrative, a ratio of 10 to one. *νηλής*, we saw, is used of persons 8 times in speech, never in narrative; the same sort of thing is true of another reverse of gentleness, the word *ἀπηνής* ('harsh', 'unyielding'). That epithet figures 11 times in speech, never in narration. In the case of anger it was suggested that the theme of the *Iliad* and the particular development of the anger of Achilles were at the back of the pattern of usage.



Gentleness has all the appearance of being an Homeric speciality. The quality for which Helen loved Hector, which all men loved and Briseis lamented in Patroclus, which Odysseus' mother mourned in her absent son until she died of grief (*Od.* xi 203)—that quality of gentleness can have found little room, as far as we can tell, amid the grim events and stern passions of the Thebais, any more than it does in the archaic epics of the Germans or the Norsemen. Words for anger, even if they might need some development for the superhuman wrath of Achilles, must have been present in the heroic tradition from the beginning. Words for its reverse were, I imagine, virtually non-existent. I should guess the nearest the epic before Homer came to them would be something like this:

ὥς τῷ γε κλαίοντε προσαυδήτην βασιλῆα  
 μείλιχίους ἐπέεσσιν· ἀμείλικτον δ' ὅπ' ἄκουσαν . . . (*Il.* xi 136–7)

'So did they in tears address the King with softening words, but unsoftened was the answer they heard.'

The creators of the Homeric epics had to develop a vocabulary for a quality which was important to them, and as the manner of the narration did not, for them, admit the use of words emotionally coloured in that way, they made great use of the speeches, in which the words are after all the responsibility of those who utter them. And it is important to observe that these very qualities are crucial to the plot, they are not merely decorative: the passionate anger and eventual relenting of Achilles, the gentleness of Patroclus which impels him to intervene and so to meet his death.

I turn now to some different aspects of language. First, an enquiry into negative epithets. Another of my calculations has been of adjectives beginning with α privative. They are numerous in the Homeric poems. They present insuperable difficulties to the enquirer who wants to add up exact totals, because in the case of some of these words the etymology is not agreed by scholars: for instance ἀπηγής or ἀσύφηλος. Some of these words were at least in later antiquity believed to be privative adjectives: ἀσύφηλος was derived from σοφός, for example. What the views of the singers were about the origin and meaning of some rare γλῶσσαι remains inscrutable. Other words are by some modern scholars derived from α privative originals, when perhaps the singers will have preferred a quite different theory: so Frisk conjectures for ἀτάσθαλος an ultimate original with an alpha negating the root of θάρσος, but the old etymology which connected the word with ἄτη probably seemed more perspicuous to the bards. These depressing considerations being stated by way of preliminary, so that the possibility of attaining a finally correct total here is not simply small but actually nil, I reckon that the speeches in the epics contain over 70 negative adjectives not represented in the narrative. They range alphabetically from ἄατος and ἀαγής to ἀφρήτωρ and ἄωρος.

I hope that this fact will be seen to have some significance. First, a considerable number of these epithets have an emotional or ethical value. When Priam is encouraged by the gods to venture into Achilles' power, they tell him: 'He is not without reflection, without consideration, a criminal': οὔτε γὰρ ἔστ' ἀφρων οὔτ' ἄσκοπος οὔτ' ἄλιτήμων (*Il.* 24.157 = 186). When the wise Nestor wants to utter a very severe condemnation of Agamemnon's reckless act, he says (putting his rebuke in a tactfully general form) ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιός ἔστιν ἐκεῖνος—'without kin, without law, without hearth' (like the monstrous Cyclops, in fact), 'is that man who is in love with hateful civil strife' (*Il.* ix 63). Such words do not recur in narrative, except that in the *Odyssey* the poet once swerves a little from his objectivity and calls a suitor ἀνήρ ἀθεμιστία εἰδώς (*Od.* xx 287). Such words as ἀεργός, ἀκήδης, ἀκλεής, ἀναίτιος, ἄπιστος, ἄποτμος, ἀπτόλεμος, ἀτρεκής, carry in different ways a charge of emotion and judgment.<sup>12</sup> Others, such as ἀγέραστος and ἄτιμος, are related to important aspects of the

<sup>12</sup> On the phrase ἀεικέα ἔργα see J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (Oxford 1980) 85 n. 9: it does not, as sometimes alleged, express a moral criticism of the action.

plot. Such value-charged words had their importance for the poets, but their tone was, I think, too subjective for their own utterance. Only from the lips of another could they fit in without disrupting the dispassionate ethos which, on the whole, was thought appropriate for the actual unfolding of events. Another point I guess at is this: some of these negative words, like abstract nouns, convey a certain nuance of abstraction and complexity in view of the world. Such words as ἀπειθής, ἄπρηκτος, ἀνάποινον, ἀτελεύτητος describe what is not present rather than what is. It seems to me likely that such a way of speaking may have struck the poets as more appropriate to human analysis and thinking than to the stream of honey-sweet utterance to be expected of the mouthpiece of the goddess. Different enquirers may put different totals in this column, but I think it will still emerge that this is a fact of the Homeric style. And as a fact it calls for an explanation.

That example of stylistic explanation may not have convinced the more sceptical. I follow it with a few which I think must be accepted. The introductory word ἦ, conventionally translated 'verily', receives in Ebeling's great *Lexicon Homericum* the comment *non est ipsius poetae sed eorum quos loquentes facit*—not used by the poet himself but by his speaking characters. That note, I observe in passing, is, as far as I can see, unique: this paper would have been a lot easier to prepare had the question presented itself to more composers of articles in that invaluable work of reference. It is a sad warning to successors that Denniston<sup>13</sup> quotes the comment only to produce an exception to it: the strange passage, deleted by Aristarchus, *Od.* xxii 31. Here the suitors, when Odysseus has shot Antinous, threaten him with death—for, says the poet, they supposed his act was accidental: ἐπεὶ ἦ φάσαν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα | ἄνδρα κατακτεῖναι. The passage is odd, for as Eustathius points out the Homeric manner was not to produce a chorus like this for a general verdict on events, but to allow one voice to speak for all—ὣδε δέ τις εἴπεσκεν. I, too, have another exception to add to Ebeling and Denniston. At *Od.* xxi 99 the *Odyssey* poet allows himself another aside. Antinous having remarked on the bow, Homer says:

ἦ τοι ὀιστοῦ γε πρῶτος γεύσασθαι ἔμελλεν  
ἐκ χειρῶν Ὀδυσῆος ἀμύμονος, ὃν τότε ἄτιμα . . .

'indeed, he was to be the first to taste an arrow from that bow at the hands of noble Odysseus, whom at that moment he was insulting'. The point is only worth making because this passage, too, is exceptional in another way. We observed that in the Homeric poems the verb ἄτιμα was used 15 times in the speech of the characters, and only once in narrative: this passage is in fact that one exception. The departure from the normal manner of Homer is thus independently clear in both the places where ἦ appears in the poet's own mouth.

Now, the word ἦ is one of the commonest in Homer, occurring some hundreds of times; yet the poet was in no doubt about the distinction between the style appropriate to it and that where it would have been out of place. By contrast, the particle μέν is just as much at home in narrative as in speech: a sample count of four Books, *Iliad* i and xv with *Odyssey* v and xvii, produced figures of 63 occurrences in narrative, 54 in speech. What is true of ἦ, however, is also true of another extremely common word, often associated with it: the adverb μάλα. ἦ μάλα comes 51 times, and never in narrative; μάλα οὐ 4 times, never in narrative; the very frequent usage of μάλα with adjectives, of which in speech there are dozens of instances before 20 different epithets, is in narrative almost wholly limited to the 3 phrases μάλα μέγας, μάλα πίονος and μάλα πολλά. The point is again in one way a trivial one, but in another highly suggestive. These little words ἦ and μάλα, constantly in use in speech, must have presented themselves almost automatically to the poet's mind; and yet the consciousness was retained that they were somehow less appropriate to the other parts of the poems—even though in general the style of speech and narrative appears even to thoughtful observers to be so very alike. I imagine the nuance which was felt was one of informality, of a sort of emphasis which would have slightly

<sup>13</sup> J. D. Denniston, *Greek Particles*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1954) 279.

blurred the uniform and dispassionate mode of presentation which the Muse's narrative called for. A neat illustration of the difference is provided by *Il.* xvi 742–50. Cebriones receives a deadly wound and falls from his high chariot: 'like a diver', says Homer, ὁ δ' ἀρνευτήρι ἔοικώς | κάππεσ' ἀπ' εὐεργέος δίφρου. But Patroclus, who slew him, does not leave the matter there. ὦ πόπποι, he cries, ἦ μάλ' ἔλαφρος ἀνὴρ, ὡς ῥεῖα κυβιστᾶ: 'Oh my, how nimble he is (ἦ μάλα), how lightly he tumbles . . .'. He goes on to develop the Homeric simile: Cebriones would make a fine living as a diver bringing up calamare. He concludes, ἦ ῥα, 'there really are some tumblers in Troy'. Not only the obvious ὦ πόπποι but also ἦ μάλα, ὡς κυβιστᾶ, ἦ ῥα, are all marks of the spoken style, which transforms the narrator's dispassionate observation ('like a diver') into an emotional and personal utterance. W. H. Friedrich says, 'Patroklos homerisiert', 'Patroclus speaks in Homer's style'.<sup>14</sup> That is true, we now see, only in a special sense.

The same sort of explanation may account for another stylistic variation: the use of the word οἶος. Apart from formal similes this word, common enough in speech, is rather rare in narrative. A hint of its emotional colouring emerges at once from the repeated formula of remonstrance after a shocking or surprising utterance: οἶον ἔειπες, 'what a thing to say!' A count of examples produced totals of 147 in speech, 16 (apart from similes) in narrative. Of those 16, 4 are repetitions of the formulaic phrase οἶοι νῦν βροτοί εἰσι, 'such as men are now', while another 4 relate to the characteristic differences between the existence of gods and men: the ichor which runs in their veins (*Il.* v 340), the food they eat (*Od.* v 197), the deathless unguent they use (*Od.* viii 365, xviii 193). One other is a rather feeble echo of this set, a passage which refers (*Il.* xx 480) to 'the sort of food that kings eat'. Those 9 instances are characterised by a certain stateliness, attained or affected, as are, more or less, most of the 7 remaining; for instance, in *Il.* xxiv 630 Priam marvelling at the beauty and stature of Achilles, ὄσσοις ἔην οἶός τε, 'how great and how fine he was'. What we do not find is anything like the informal note struck by οἶον ἔειπες, or the undisguised emotional colouring of the opening words of Zeus in the *Odyssey*—ὦ πόπποι, οἶον δὴ νῦ θεοὺς βροτοὶ αἰτιώωνται: 'How men find fault with us gods!' (*Od.* i 32). Locutions of this form can be, in their own way, very grand in style—there is no necessary taint of levity. Thus the reply of Thetis to her son at *Il.* xviii 95: shedding tears she said ὠκύμορος δὴ μοι τέκος ἔσσειαι, οἶ' ἀγορεύεις: 'your life will be short, from what you are saying'. Another example: the terrible reply of Achilles to the dying supplication of Hector. 'I wish my heart would urge me to chop you up and devour you raw, ὦμ' ἀπτοταμνόμενον κρέα ἔδμεναι, οἶα ἔοργας (xxii 347)—such things you have done'. As with ἦ and μάλα, such expressions, very common indeed in Homeric speech, must surely have been the sort of thing which came naturally into the head of the poet, only to be rejected from the narrative as inappropriate.

Two last examples of this kind. The word λίην comes 41 times in the poems; 40 times in speech, once in narrative. Athena can comment on Aegisthus' doom that it was only too well deserved—καὶ λίην κείνός γε ἔοικότι κεῖται ὀλέθρῳ (*Od.* i 46); Odysseus can compliment Demodocus by saying that his song is 'only too true' to the fate of the Achaeans at Troy, λίην γὰρ κατὰ κόσμον Ἀχαιῶν οἶτον αἰεῖδεις (*Od.* viii 489). That perhaps had too much of a tang of the colloquial for heroic narrative, dignified though utterances like these two can be. I do not want to succumb to the temptation of explaining away counter-examples, but it is worth observing that the one exception, *Od.* xiv 461, describes Odysseus' unspoken thoughts. He wonders if he can get Eumaeus to part with a cloak for him, ἐπεὶ ἔο κήδετο λίην—'since he was so much attached to him'.

We are in a way close to speech here, as we are when Penelope wonders whether her son has been murdered by the μνηστῆρσιν ὑπερφιάλοισι (*Od.* iv 790), or again whether to appear among the μνηστήρεσσιν ὑπέρβιον ὕβριον ἔχουσιν (*Od.* x 410, cf. also i 133f. and xx 12). Such passages, not very numerous—more numerous in the *Odyssey* than the *Iliad*—use emotional

<sup>14</sup> W. H. Friedrich, *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias* (Göttingen 1956) 118.

language in a way close to monologue. It is also notable that the second half of the *Odyssey* seems to be much the most fertile part of the poems in such passages, where the narrator slips in a detail of the more emotional style. Both the instances of ἦ (*Od.* xxi 99; xxii 31) come in explicitly moral asides by the poet, as does the sole use in narrative of the word ἀθεμίστιος, in a hostile sketch of the suitor Ctesippus, at *Od.* xx 287. So too does the single appearance in narrative (against 30 in speech) of the word σχέτλιος: at *Od.* xxi 28, in a discursive passage which connects the bow of Odysseus with the supreme archer Heracles. Iphitus, who entertained Heracles in his house, was killed by him—σχέτλιος, οὐδὲ θεῶν ὄπιν ἠδέσσατ' οὐδὲ τράπεζαν, 'a reckless act, disregarding the vengeance of the gods'. The thought of the theme of the *Odyssey*—violent abuse of hospitality—has led the poet into expressing a strong condemnation in his own voice. The word ἀτασθαλίαι is used only twice in narrative: once in the explicit moralising of the proem to the *Odyssey* (i 7), once in a sketch of another suitor, Leiodes (*Od.* xxi 146 ἀτασθαλίαι δέ οἱ οἴω | ἐχθραὶ ἔσαν). It is interesting to have it confirmed that in the second half of the *Odyssey* the heavy moral emphasis of the plot has coloured the language, too; the poet has repeatedly yielded to the temptation of open partiality. Another striking example is the poet's comment on the good swineherd Eumaeus, as he goes to bed:

συβώτης  
ἔσθλος ἐὼν ἐνίαυεν, ἀνάκτεσιν ἦπια εἰδώς (*Od.* xv 557).

'There he slept, the virtuous swineherd, devoted to his masters'.

That openly laudatory comment departs widely from the normal reticence of the epic narrator.

Oddly, the same feeling as with λίην did not attach to ἄλις, which is found 17 times in speech and 11 times in narrative, including such expressions as *Il.* xxii 473: while Andromache laments for Hector, ἀμφὶ δέ μιν γαλόω τε καὶ εἰνατέρες ἄλις ἔσταν, 'about her stood husband's sisters and brothers' wives in plenty'. The difference between the usage of λίην and ἄλις is so striking that it cannot be accidental: one is avoided in narrative, the other is not. It will be hard to think of any reason for this other than a perceived difference of stylistic level and nuance between them. The former, I suggest, is felt as emotional, the latter as factual. ἄλις recorded simply the presence of a considerable quantity, while λίην expressed a judgement on it. Two instances of the word in Herodotus bring out the point. Of the stories told by the Greeks of the Hellespont about the Thracian Salmoxis, the historian observes 'As for all this I neither disbelieve it nor feel very much belief in it', οὔτε ἀπιστέω οὔτε ὦν πιστεύω τι λίην (*iv* 96.2), a subjective and colloquial usage. But unlike Homer he is also prepared to use the word in a context of weighty moral judgment. The horrid fate of the cruel Pheretime shows that excessively savage punishments are hated by heaven, αἱ λίην ἰσχυραὶ τιμωρίαι πρὸς θεῶν ἐπίφθονοι γίγνονται (*iv* 205). That sentence, which concludes Book iv, is evidently meant to be in the high style. The last of this series is the word ἔμπης, 'none the less'. Thirty-six appearances, and only two of them in narrative; both in *Iliad* xiv (lines 1 and 174). Again the word is capable of appearing in speeches which are impressive, as when Ajax, preparing for his duel with Hector, tells the Achaeans to pray to Zeus, in silence, that the Trojans may not overhear them—ἦε καὶ ἀμφοδίην, ἐπεὶ οὐ τινα δείδιμεν ἔμπης (*Il.* vii 196) 'or even openly, since we fear no-one anyway'. That is well said and like Ajax, but it may be that the nuance of defiant emphasis was what made the word unsuitable for narrative, which aimed to achieve its effects in another way.

The best Hellenistic poets did not observe some of these distinctions, it may be remarked. Both ἦ and μάλα are freely used by Callimachus and Apollonius. I cite one example only, of an unobtrusive passage in Apollonius, the ethos of which is really un-Homeric. The poet says of the Lemnian women

ἀλλὰ γὰρ ἔμπης  
ἦ θαμὰ δὴ πάπτεινον ἐπὶ πλατὺν ὄμμασι πόντον  
(*Ap. Rhod.* i 630-1):

‘But all the same o very often did they gaze over the wide sea’.

ἐμπης, the emphatic word of contradiction, and the emotional ἦ introducing a narrated fact; even the word ‘often’ (θαμά comes in Homer eight times in speech, once in narrative: πολλάκι 15 times in speech, twice in narrative): all these tiny points help Apollonius’ description to be subjectively coloured, un-Homeric, on the way to the manner of Virgil. An example from Callimachus follows. A dozen times in Homer a character says ἄ δειλέ (δειλοί, δειλώ) to another character, in real or ironic sympathy with his suffering. Callimachus in his *Hymn to Artemis* 255 offers ironic commiseration to the barbarian king Lygdamis, who tried to sack the goddess’s city of Ephesus: ἄ δειλὸς βασιλέων, ὅσον ἤλιπεν, ‘Unhappy king, what a mistake he made!’ The expression of such an emotion in the narrator’s own voice suits the tone of a hymn, a tone of personal devotion, clearly different from the dispassionate Homeric manner. It is of course easy to find examples, in the lyric poets, of an emotional style of narration. Such passages of Bacchylides as 16.30 ἄ δύσμορος, ἄ τάλαιν’, οἶον ἐμήσατο, and 17.120 φεῦ· | οἴαισιν ἐν φροντίσι Κνώσιον | ἔσχασεν στραταγέταν, ἐπεὶ . . . are extreme in their ‘lyric’ style. Less obtrusive, but still distinct, are Pindaric passages like *Pythian* 9.22 (of Cyrene) ἦ πολλάν τε καὶ ἡσύχιον | βουσὶν εἰρήναν παρέχουσα πατρώαις, or *Olympian* 13.63 ὃς τᾶς ὀφιδώδεος υἱὸν ποτε Γοργόνος ἦ πόλλ’ ἄμφι κρουνοῖς | Πάγασον ζεῦξαι ποθέων ἔπαθεν . . .

These have been examples of kinds of locution, of phrasing, which perhaps seemed to the poet to have the wrong feel. I turn now to another set of words, avoided for a different reason. This is the set of χρή, χρῆμα, χρε(ι)ώ. The word χρῆμα is absent from the *Iliad* altogether; it comes 14 times in the *Odyssey*, 12 times in speech and twice in narrative. χρή, ‘one should’, appears 55 times in the two epics, but never in narrative. χρεῖω comes 24 times, two of them in narrative. The totals for the three words are thus 91 to 4, a very striking disproportion indeed. We have already seen that words like θέμις which express a direct moral judgment are avoided in the narrative style, and that might seem to explain the absence in that style of χρή, ‘ought’. But the marked asymmetry applies to the other words of this family, too, so that a further explanation is required. Can it be explained? The absence of χρῆμα from the *Iliad* gives a clue. The more elevated and the older of the two epics preferred not to admit this very common word, and the natural inference is that it was felt to be too prosaic or too ordinary. Even χρεῖω, a choicer form and more admissible, was felt to be more appropriate, like χρή, to the reported speech of men than to the impersonal utterance of the bard himself.

I conclude the general and longer part with a few typical instances of the sort of emotionally tinted expression which could be at home only in speech. There are obvious coinages like Δύσπαρις, Κακοῖλιος, Ἄϊρος, which exist to convey the emotional attitude of a particular speaker at a particular moment. There are words like οὔτιδανός, ‘worthless’, or οἶνοβαρής, ‘drunkard’, which are used in vehement utterances of contempt, and which form a different mode of hostile description from the factual one in which the poet gives us his own account of Thersites or Irus. The use of κύων, ‘dog’, with its relatives κυνῶπις and κυνῶπα and κυνάμνις, to convey scorn for a shameless man or woman or goddess, is another such example of a style of reprobation which is left for the angry exchanges of the characters: it would not sound right if the narrative were to refer to anyone in that voice. Vigorous metaphors—‘you would have put on a tunic of stone’ (*Il.* iii 57) meaning ‘you would have been stoned to death’; ‘I know how to wield to left and right my tanned ox’ (βῶν ἀζαλέην), and to ‘prance to grim Ares’, δηῖω μέλπεσθαι Ἄρηι (*Il.* vii 240); ‘Achilles has slain pity’ (*Il.* xxiv 44): such vivid expressions, memorable because they carry with them an attitude, whether contemptuous or ironic or angry, are a resource to the poet of a characteristically different sort from his own main style. Even verbs can have this aspect: when we hear that the coward, when serving in an ambush, μετοκλάζει (*Il.* xiii 281), shifts from one of his haunches to the other in the restlessness of fear, or when Athena assures Achilles that this time Hector’s doom is certain, and Apollo cannot save him however much he goes through, rolling to and fro at the feet of Father Zeus

(προπροκυλινδόμενος πατρός Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο, *Il.* xxii 221), the rare compound verbs, like ἐπισκύζομαι, to glower in resentment, never used in narrative, carry the vigorous bite of the speaker's scorn.

Similar observations can be made about other grammatical categories, for instance the superlative form of the adjective. It is no great surprise to find that clearly evaluative and emotional words like ἔχθιστος 'most hateful', and φίλτατος 'most dear', are commoner in the speech of the characters than in the narrative (respectively 3 to 1, the exception being the unusually explicit passage on Thersites which says of him 'He was most hateful to Achilles and to Odysseus', ἔχθιστος δ' Ἀχιλλῆι μάλιστ' ἦν ἡδ' Ὀδυσῆι, *Il.* ii 220, and 22 to 5, two of the five being repetitions in narrative of phrases which also occur in speech—*Il.* vi 9 = vi 272, and *Il.* xvii 441 = xvii 655). The same is true of words meaning 'most pitiful' or 'most shameful', οἰκτροτάτην, οἰκτιστον, ἐλέγχιστον; so too αἰνότατος, 'most terrible', occurs twelve times in speech and only once (*Il.* xiv 389) in narrative. It is more striking to discover that even apparently objective words like 'biggest', 'tallest', 'strongest', 'youngest', show the same tendency in a marked degree. The word νεώτατος occurs six times, and only once in narrative, of the young Trojan prince Polydorus, son of Priam:

τὸν δ' οὐ τι πατήρ εἶασκε μάχεσθαι,  
οὐνεκά οἱ μετὰ παισὶ νεώτατος ἔσκε γόνοιο,  
καὶ οἱ φίλτατος ἔσκε (*Il.* xx 408–10).

'His father would not let him fight, because he was the youngest of his children and the one he loved best'.

That passage, which also includes one of the rare appearances in the narrative mode of the superlative φίλτατος, is deliberately pathetic, introducing the poignant episode of Polydorus' killing. κάρτιστος appears 10 times in speech, only once (*Il.* xxi 253, in a simile) in narrative; μέγιστος comes 21 times in speech in the *Iliad* and only once in narrative, in the description of the garment offered by the women of Troy to Athena,

ὃς κάλλιστος ἔην ποικίλμασιν ἡδὲ μέγιστος (*vi* 294)

'it was the best embroidered and the biggest' (*cf.* vi 90 and vi 271, both in speech).

Characteristic uses of the superlative are such lines of Nestor as his description of the Lapiths:

κάρτιστοι μὲν ἔσαν καὶ καρτίστοις ἐμάχοντο (*Il.* i 267)

'Mightiest of men were they, and with the mightiest they fought',

or his comment on Ereuthalion:

τὸν δὲ μήκιστον καὶ κάρτιστον κτάνον ἄνδρα (*Il.* vii 155)

'He was the tallest and strongest man I ever slew'.

It seems that the superlative involves a claim, and so an emotional attitude, which the narrator prefers to avoid. The one apparently surprising objection I have found is the word ἄριστος, 'best'. That word comes, in the *Odyssey*, 59 times in speech and 16 in narrative, but in the *Iliad* the figures are respectively 52 and 79. That means that the asymmetry characteristic of other superlatives is not found with this common and important word. The explanation, I think, is that ἄριστος is very often not felt as a superlative, especially in battle scenes, where ἄριστος and ἄριστοι regularly mean 'leader' and 'fighters'. The verb ἀριστεύω and the noun ἀριστῆες confirm this, both from the formal point of view, in that the formation of a verb from a superlative is an unusual thing,<sup>15</sup> and also because these words normally mean no more than

<sup>15</sup> The history and relation of these words are not clear, *cf.* Frisk, *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, s.v.

'fight bravely' and 'warrior'. The *Odyssey*, which contains so much less in the way of battle-scenes, accordingly has very different figures.

My purpose in all this has been twofold. First, to illustrate the complexity and richness of Homeric language, and to indicate the keenness and the pervasiveness in the poems of subtle and perceptive distinctions. That point will lead to the final section, an account of the language of Achilles and Agamemnon. Secondly, to suggest that the language of Homer is a less uniform thing than some oralists have tended to suggest. Sometimes the sensibilities of the reader of some productions of that school are grated by the assumption that Homer had only one way of saying things, and that his task was done when he had made his verses scan: with a dutiful reference at the end to the 'dignity' or the 'elevation' of Homeric style. There have always been Latinists in the world who feel that they have produced a satisfying note on the name *Amphitryoniades* at *Aeneid* viii 103, when they observe that *Hercules* would not scan in the hexameter, and so Virgil found himself obliged to say *Amphitryoniades* instead.<sup>16</sup> That is surely to be regarded as an explanation, or even as a comment, on a very humble level, and we should all be anxious not to give the impression of saying just that about Homer. We may compare the notorious statement of Parry,<sup>17</sup> that 'in the choice of the generic epithet the poet was guided by considerations of versification, and in no way by sense'. More than half of the epics consists of speech, and that very large part of the poems has important distinctions of vocabulary, and of style, from the rest. The phenomena are not to be over-simplified.

After this double barrage of statistics and polemic we come in conclusion to the language of Achilles. Originally I had hopes of illuminating the vexed question whether Achilles can properly be said to 'abuse' the language of heroism: an idea launched in a brilliant paper by Adam Parry which has aroused much interest. It emerged in the course of writing this paper that the idea was not really a possible one. The objections were put in elegantly short compass by Michael Reeve<sup>18</sup> to Parry's notion of language being abused so as to express the contrary of its normal sense: those objections stand, and it would be idle to enlarge upon them. I shall instead conclude on a provocative note with a few more detailed points and one last generalisation. The latter first. It seems to me a priori perfectly possible that the Homeric poems give to different speakers characteristically different locutions. That is suggested as a possibility by the extent to which they distinguish speech itself from narration. It is confirmed by the evident fact of interest, within the poems, in different styles of speech. Antenor describes to Priam (*Il.* iii 209) the contrasting eloquence of Menelaus and Odysseus: the compressed but forceful utterance of Menelaus, the grand and voluble speech of Odysseus. That shows a theoretical interest, in the light of which it is not fanciful to see the speeches in *Iliad* ix of Odysseus, Phoenix and Ajax as deliberately contrasting in style. Nor is the utterance of Ajax, say, interchangeable with that of Nestor.

In 1978 an article by P. Friedrich and J.M. Redfield appeared, under the intriguing title 'Speech as a Personality Symbol—the Case of Achilles'.<sup>19</sup> The authors found nine distinctive features in Achilles' speech, which they compared with the speeches made by others in his presence. None of them related to the presence or absence of particular words in his vocabulary: they related to richness of detail (the sceptre, *Il.* i 234–9; his lock of hair, xxiii 144–51), cumulative imagery (ix 378–86, the gifts of Agamemnon), hypothetical images worked out in detail ('I shall sail tomorrow', ix 356; hypothetical rewards promised to Aeneas by Priam, xx 179 ff.), richness in similes, 'poetic directness' ('Let me die at once', xviii 98), 'explicit statement of the theme "the warrior is a wild beast"' (xxii 262 ff.) and of cannibalism (xxii 364), frequency of

<sup>16</sup> 'Virgil was metrically obliged to use some kind of periphrasis', Gransden on *Aeneid* viii 103.

<sup>17</sup> *The Making of Homeric Verse*: collected papers of Milman Parry (Oxford 1971) 149.

<sup>18</sup> M. D. Reeve, 'The language of Achilles', *CQ* xxiii (1973) 193–5.

<sup>19</sup> P. Friedrich and J. M. Redfield in *Language* liv (1978) 263–88. The strengthless objections of G. M. Messing, *ibid.* lvii (1981) 888–900, are rightly brushed aside by the authors, *ibid.* lvii (1981) 901–3. It was Joseph A. Russo who drew my attention to this article.

asyndeton and of extended vocatives, conveying strong emotion, frequency of 'emotive particles', ἦ and δῆ, with greater frequency of μοι than τοι, and rarer use of σὺ, suggesting that Achilles 'is keenly aware of others but careless of their feelings and dominant over them'. The article is an interesting one, of which it has seemed worth while to give an account because it appeared in a journal not constantly in the hands of the Homerist. It makes the point that disciples of Milman Parry have tended to concentrate too narrowly on the choice of epithets, and to pay too little attention to such features as 'the general shape of utterances, the use of rhetorical devices, and the choice of particles'.

Such a conclusion is important and timely, and much of the substance of the paper seems to me to be very suggestive, though some of it is rather more vaguely formulated than is ideally desirable, and some of the features which are not paralleled in the chosen control group of speeches are by no means unique to Achilles.<sup>20</sup> From a different angle it is, I think, possible to add some substance to the impression naturally formed in reading, and to some extent confirmed by Friedrich and Redfield.

The Appendix to this paper lists words which occur only in the speeches of Achilles, and (as a control) those which appear only in the speeches of Agamemnon. The vocabulary of Achilles is much richer and more interesting, as we should expect. Achilles is the most impressive user of language in the *Iliad*, while Agamemnon king of men at important moments in the plot makes speeches which are both demoralising and repetitive (*Iliad* ii 110 ff., ix 17 ff., xiv 74 ff.), while the reconciliation with Achilles leaves him inarticulate and floundering (xix 78 ff.), and in reply to the chivalrous gesture of Achilles in presenting him, at the funeral games, with a prize *hors concours*, he can say nothing at all (xxiii 890 ff.).<sup>21</sup> It comes as no surprise that the words which he alone uses include ἀποτίνω 'pay back', ἀγέραστος 'without a prize', ἀκτήμων and ἀλήιος, words for poverty, and δωτίμη 'a gift': for Agamemnon is very keen on possessions. He would have exacted a great ransom for Priam, had he known he was in Achilles' tent (xxiv 654, 687). The words πολυβοῦται and πολύρρηνες, expressive of wealth, come under the same heading, as does the wealthy word βαθύλειμον—all three applied to the cities he offers to Achilles as a recompense, in the vain attempt to make them sound attractive. He also expresses by his vocabulary his anxieties about his status: βασιλεύτερος is his word for himself, only used by another speaker once, when Achilles flings it back at him (ix 392). He alone uses δυσκλεής, on both occasions applying it hypothetically to himself—the historic humiliation which he fears. Its opposite, εὐκλείη, is similarly used by him alone. He hopes he will teach Achilles or anybody else not to try to rival him—ἴσον ἐμοὶ φάσθαι καὶ ὁμοιωθήμεναι ἄντην (i 187)—the second verb is used only by him in the *Iliad*. He alone speaks of a πρεσβήιον 'gift of honour', characteristically informing Teucer that the latter is doing well, as he should, and repaying his father for bringing him up, bastard though he is, in his own house: 'If Zeus and Athena allow me to sack Troy, I shall give a gift of honour to you first after myself' (viii 283 ff.).<sup>22</sup> He advises his brother not to bear himself proudly, μηδὲ μεγαλίζεο θυμῷ (x 69), but to address each officer courteously by name—'that is the harsh destiny which Zeus imposed on us at our birth'. Μεγαλίζεο is another unique word, from which Agamemnon's obsessive concern peeps out. More interesting, however, is Achilles.

<sup>20</sup> There are things to criticise. The statement that Achilles does not make limiting distinctions disregards xviii 105 ff. The uniqueness of his 'realising a hypothetical image', as at xx 179 ff., is illusory: see for instance Hector's account of Andromache's destiny after his death, or Andromache's of the fate of her orphan child, or Priam's of his own (vi 447 ff., xxii 487 ff., xxii 59 ff.); even in his presence we hear a hypothetical account of the consequences of the sack of the city of Meleager (ix 591 ff.). The theme 'the warrior is a wild beast', if it is rightly so called, is developed at least as clearly by Menelaus at xvii 19 ff. as by Achilles, who after all

begins ὡς οὐκ ἔστι λέουσι καὶ ἀνδράσιν ὄρκια πιστὰ (xxii 262), which presumably makes a rather different point. The problem with a lot of this is the choice of too narrow a control—the speeches of Achilles need to be compared, in some respects, with the other utterances in the poem as a whole. As for cannibalism, compare iv 34 ff. and xxiv 212.

<sup>21</sup> See D. Lohmann, *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (Berlin 1970) 76 n. 133.

<sup>22</sup> 'Quite characteristic of the arrogant style of the man,' observes P. Cauer, *Neue Jahrb.* (1900) 607.



It is surely striking that the particle of asseveration  $\mu\acute{\alpha}$  is used only three times in the *Iliad* (it comes once in the *Odyssey*), and on all three occasions it is Achilles who uses it. He reassures Calchas, swearing by Apollo— $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\ \gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho\ \text{'}\text{A}\rho\acute{\omicron}\lambda\lambda\omega\nu\alpha\ \Delta\iota\iota\ \phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\nu$ —that no king will threaten him, ‘not even if you speak of Agamemnon’ (i 86). He swears by Agamemnon’s inherited sceptre that all the Achaeans will regret their unjust treatment of him (i 234). He swears by Zeus— $\text{o}\acute{\upsilon}\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\ \text{Z}\eta\eta\prime$ ,  $\delta\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \tau\epsilon\ \theta\epsilon\omega\acute{\nu}\ \acute{\upsilon}\pi\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\varsigma$ —that while Patroclus lies unburied he will not wash the blood from his own body (xxiii 43). The unique intensity of his temperament and his speech is reflected in that usage. He alone in the *Iliad* talks of speaking ‘bluntly’, ‘straight out’,  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$  (ix 309). I remark here that as Telemachus in the *Odyssey* once swears in the vehement manner of Achilles (*Od.* xx 339), so he is given the only instance of the word  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\eta\lambda\epsilon\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$  in that poem (*Od.* i 373). I suspect that the *Odyssey* poet has actually tried to borrow for his Telemachus some traits from the supreme hero of the greater epic, a suspicion confirmed by the curious echo, in *Odyssey* Book ii, of the celebrated scene where Achilles flung down Agamemnon’s sceptre: Telemachus ends his speech to the men of Ithaca by throwing down the sceptre and bursting into tears.<sup>23</sup> The Achilles who speaks ‘straight out’ is also alone in the *Iliad* in expressing violent hatred for any man who does not say what he thinks—‘I hate that man like the gates of hell . . .’ ix 312: the phrase, like the sentiment, does not recur in the *Iliad*.

A count of the number of words used only by Achilles, and of those used only by Agamemnon, produced totals of 101, for Achilles and 58 for Agamemnon: they are listed in the Appendix. The two speak respectively 823 and 588 lines, that is to say the expected relationship between them is 71.4 per cent. More important than the mere total is the fact that the words which each has to himself are in various ways different. Achilles has such violent words as  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\iota\omicron\tau\omicron\mu\eta\sigma\omega$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\lambda\iota\chi\mu\eta\sigma\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\iota$  (of fishes licking the wounds of Lycaon),  $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\mu\eta\nu\acute{\iota}\sigma\alpha\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\kappa\epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\omega\varsigma$ ,  $\beta\omicron\upsilon\beta\rho\omega\sigma\tau\iota\varsigma$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\sigma\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\omega\nu\tau\alpha\iota$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon\beta\rho\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\nu$ ,  $\mu\eta\nu\eta\theta\omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\sigma\kappa\upsilon\delta\mu\alpha\acute{\iota}\nu\omega$ ,  $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\epsilon\rho\text{-}\sigma\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\eta\sigma\iota$ . He has for the objects of his hostility a battery of abuse unrivalled in the Homeric poems:  $\delta\eta\mu\omicron\beta\omicron\rho\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\kappa\acute{\upsilon}\nu\epsilon\omicron\varsigma$ ,  $\kappa\upsilon\nu\omega\pi\alpha$ ,  $\omicron\iota\nu\omicron\beta\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ ,  $\rho\acute{\iota}\gamma\epsilon\delta\alpha\nu\eta\varsigma$ ,  $\phi\iota\lambda\omicron\kappa\tau\epsilon\alpha\nu\omega\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon$ . He alone in the *Iliad* uses the words  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta$  (and  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota\delta\eta\varsigma$ , of a person) and  $\acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$ .<sup>24</sup> He alone uses the violent word  $\acute{\epsilon}\rho\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\omega$ , and he uses it twice. The words  $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\lambda\gamma\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  and  $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\rho\acute{\eta}\varsigma$  are only used of and about him—the griefs that pain his heart, the woman who pleased it but whom Agamemnon has taken away.<sup>25</sup> He alone uses ‘bloody’ in a metaphorical sense—the ‘bloody days’ of which he complains, the ‘bloody war’ which he refuses in Book ix but longs for in Book xix.<sup>26</sup> ‘You will tear your own heart’, he says to Agamemnon. He calls himself ‘a burden to the earth’; his friends call him  $\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$ , ‘one whose prowess is accursed’.<sup>27</sup> Such extreme and vehement language is without parallel, as is the word  $\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\omega\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$  ‘utterly doomed before my time’, which he uses of himself, and the word  $\delta\upsilon\sigma\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\kappa\epsilon\iota\alpha$ , ‘unhappy mother of the greatest of heroes’, which Thetis uses of herself because of him.<sup>28</sup>

It is remarkable that nobody other than Achilles uses the phrases ‘three and four times as much’ and ‘ten and twenty times as much’: it is natural to see in that the ebullition of his unique temperament, violent and uninterested in profit. ‘The Achaeans will repay you  $\tau\rho\iota\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\ \tau\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\pi\lambda\acute{\eta}\ \tau\epsilon$ ’, he says to Agamemnon, if you acquiesce in parting with Chryseis. The

<sup>23</sup> Compare *Od.* ii. 80 with *Il.* i 245 and  $\Sigma$  T ad loc: and my *Homer on Life and Death* (n. 12) 12. The comparison was already made in antiquity.

<sup>24</sup>  $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota\delta\epsilon\acute{\iota}\eta\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota\epsilon\iota\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon$ , i 149 and ix 372—not, it is worth observing, in an identical line;  $\acute{\omega}\ \mu\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\prime$   $\acute{\alpha}\nu\alpha\iota\delta\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$ , i 158.  $\acute{\upsilon}\beta\rho\iota\varsigma$ , i 203 and 214 (Athena accepts Achilles’ term).

<sup>25</sup>  $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\iota$   $\nu\eta\upsilon\sigma\iota$   $\chi\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu$   $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\lambda\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$   $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\epsilon\iota$ , iv 153;  $\pi\acute{\alpha}\upsilon\epsilon$ ,  $\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$   $\delta\acute{\epsilon}$   $\chi\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu$   $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\lambda\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ , ix 260;  $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$   $\gamma\prime$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$   $\pi\acute{\alpha}\sigma\alpha\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota$   $\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu\alpha\iota$   $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\lambda\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$   $\lambda\omega\beta\eta\nu$ , ix 387. At ix 505  $\tau\eta\eta\ \delta\prime$   $\gamma\epsilon$   $\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\epsilon\kappa\tau\omicron$   $\chi\omicron\lambda\omicron\nu$   $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\lambda\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$   $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\sigma\omega\nu$  is said of Meleager, when he is described as

behaving like Achilles. ix 336, of Agamemnon’s act:  $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\iota$   $\delta\prime$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\chi\omicron\nu$   $\theta\upsilon\mu\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\alpha$ . Achilles is begged to subdue his great  $\theta\upsilon\mu\omicron\varsigma$ , ix. 496.

<sup>26</sup>  $\acute{\eta}\mu\alpha\tau\alpha$   $\delta\prime$   $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\alpha$   $\delta\acute{\iota}\epsilon\pi\rho\eta\sigma\sigma\omicron\nu$   $\pi\omicron\lambda\epsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\zeta\omega\nu$ , ix 326;  $\omicron\upsilon$   $\gamma\acute{\alpha}\rho$   $\pi\rho\acute{\iota}\nu$   $\pi\omicron\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\mu\omicron\iota\omicron$   $\mu\epsilon\delta\acute{\eta}\sigma\omicron\mu\alpha\iota$   $\acute{\alpha}\iota\mu\alpha\tau\acute{\omicron}\nu\text{-}\tau\omicron\varsigma$ , ix 650; xix 313.

<sup>27</sup>  $\sigma\upsilon$   $\delta\prime$   $\acute{\epsilon}\nu\delta\omicron\theta\iota$   $\theta\upsilon\mu\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\mu\acute{\upsilon}\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ , i 243: only here is this rare verb used in a non-literal sense.  $\acute{\alpha}\chi\theta\omicron\varsigma$   $\acute{\alpha}\rho\omicron\upsilon\rho\eta\varsigma$ , xviii 104.  $\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\alpha\rho\acute{\epsilon}\tau\eta\varsigma$ , xvi 31.

<sup>28</sup>  $\pi\alpha\nu\alpha\omega\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ , xxiv 540;  $\acute{\omega}\ \mu\omicron\iota$   $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omega$   $\delta\epsilon\iota\lambda\acute{\eta}$ ,  $\acute{\omega}\ \mu\omicron\iota$   $\delta\upsilon\sigma\alpha\rho\iota\sigma\tau\omicron\tau\omicron\kappa\epsilon\iota\alpha$ , xviii 54. She also says that she is  $\acute{\alpha}\iota\nu\acute{\alpha}$   $\tau\epsilon\kappa\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$ , i 414: also unique.

generosity of that offer is brought out curiously by the comparison with what Athena says to Achilles: dissuading him from striking Agamemnon dead, the goddess assures him, more cautiously, that 'three times the recompense' will one day come to him, if he is patient. The Achilles to whom it came naturally to talk in less exact and more resounding terms is the Achilles who will be above the level of haggling with Agamemnon or with Priam at the end of the poem. He goes even further. Even if the offer of compensation from the King were ten and twenty times as great, he still would not touch it: even if the Trojans were prepared to ransom Hector's corpse ten and twenty times over, he still would not let it go. No other Homeric speaker needs to use such words, because no other says such things.<sup>29</sup>

Along with the violent language goes a vein of the opposite, as his character combines violence and exorbitance with the gentleness which spared Trojan captives and respected the armour of Eetion.<sup>30</sup> Achilles excels all other characters in the *Iliad* in the number of similes which he utters in his speeches.<sup>31</sup> They are not only more numerous but also more extended than is normal. Of the five which are developed beyond a single line, two refer to his passionate anger, but three to helpless young creatures. Anger, χόλος, is sweeter than honey as it swells in the breast, he says in a moment of reflection; in his rage he tells Hector that there can be no more talk of agreements or conventions between them than between men and lions, or between sheep and wolves. The other side of his character is seen when he compares himself, harassed by the river, to a helpless boy, minding the flocks, who is cut off and drowned in a mountain torrent; the weeping Patroclus to a little girl in tears, plucking at her mother's skirt and hoping to be picked up; and his own role in the Achaean army to the hard-worked and hungry mother bird, who brings morsels to her unfledged young 'while she herself fares ill'.<sup>32</sup> Those images have in common a tenderness, an eye for the helpless and the vulnerable, which cannot be paralleled in the speech of anybody else in Homer. A touch in Achilles' language which perhaps is analogous is his effective use of the phrase ὀλίγον τε φίλον τε at i 167: the apparently simple but moving phrase ('small, but my own') is proverbial, according to Kirk *ad loc.* It comes once more in Homer, at *Od.* vi 208. It is surprising that it should be so rare. As an extreme instance of the range of utterance in the poems one might take the long speeches of Nestor: in that equable stream of flowing eloquence the idiosyncratic and intense similes of Achilles would be as out of place as the vehement instances of asyndeton.<sup>33</sup>

A last feature of Achilles' speech, no less important, is his tendency to invoke distant places and resounding names,<sup>34</sup> lines which, in extreme contrast with the staccato which characterises some of his utterances, open out into a spacious rhythm which goes with a vision of places far removed from the battle-ground of Troy or the crowded assembly of the Achaeans. 'The Trojans have not done me any harm: they have never ravaged my crops':

οὐδέ ποτ' ἐν Φθίῃ ἐριβώλακι βωτιανείρῃ  
καρπὸν ἐδηλήσαντ', ἐπεὶ ἤ μάλα πολλὰ μεταξὺ  
οὐρεά τε σκιόεντα θάλασσά τε ἠχήμεσα·  
ἀλλὰ σοι, ὦ μέγ' ἀναιδές, ἄμ' ἐσπόμεθ', ὄφρα σὺ χαιρήσῃς,  
τιμὴν ἀρνύμενοι Μενελάω σοί τε, κυνῶπα . . . (i 155–9).

<sup>29</sup> τριπλῆ τετραπλῆ τε, i 128; καὶ ποτέ τοι τρις τόσσα παρέσσειται ἀγλαὰ δῶρα, i 213. Cf. xix 146–8, xxiv 578, 654 ff., 686–8. δεκάκις τε καὶ εἰκοσάκις, ix 379; xxii 349. The *Odyssey* emulates this, at *Od.* xxii 60 ff: Εὐρύμαχ', οὐδ' εἴ μοι πατρώια πάντ' ἀποδοῖτε . . . Eustathius remarks on that passage (1919. 22): οὐ πολλὴν ὑπερβολὴν ἔχει, 'the hyperbole is not great'; he compares the utterances of Achilles and concludes that Homer tones down the exaggeration 'in accordance with the quality of the characters', τῇ τῶν προσώπων ποιότητι συμμετρίαζει καὶ τὸ ὑπερβάλλον τῆς δόσεως.

<sup>30</sup> xxi 100 ff., cf. xxiv 156–8; vi 417.

<sup>31</sup> Similes in speeches, cf. C. Moulton, *Similes in the Homeric Poems* (Göttingen 1977) 100.

<sup>32</sup> xviii 110, xxii 262, xxi 282, xvi 7, ix 323. The speeches in Book ix are well discussed by Lohmann (n. 21) 240.

<sup>33</sup> This term, as Friedrich and Redfield find, is not easy to define satisfactorily. An extreme instance, ix 364–77, with Σ T on 374, ἐμφαντικώτεροι γίνονται οἱ λόγοι θάσσον διακοπτόμενοι· ἐν γοῦν δ' στίχοις ἡ' εἰσὶν αὐτοτελεῖς στιγμαί, and R. von Scheliha, *Patroklos* (Basel 1943) 174.

<sup>34</sup> See *Homer on Life and Death* (n. 2) 75 f.

The passage is highly characteristic of Achilles. The speech opened with the word ὦ μοι, ἀναιδείην ἐπιειμένε—an expression, as we have seen, unique to this speaker, both in the abstract noun and also in the sense. Then there is the sudden turn from violent personalities to the wide inhuman vista of distant places: Phthia is dwelt upon with two long compound adjectives (to achieve this effect Achilles adds to the formulaic ἐριβόλακι an epithet which occurs only here in the two epics), bringing out its fertility, then the beautiful verse which expresses the great distance and empty spaces of land and sea which now separate Achilles from his fertile home land, again ending with a word unique in the *Iliad*. After that timeless moment, in which the movement of the poem stands still, the hero plunges back into his violent and insulting style—line 158, in extreme contrast with the unbroken pace of 157, falls into four abrupt cola, and we hear words as unique to Achilles as βωτιανείρη and ἠχήεσσα but of a very different kind—ἀναιδές, κυνῶπα—and an unparalleled construction too. The adverbial μέγα with a simple adjective, rare in itself (three instances in the *Iliad*, three in the *Odyssey*), is unique in Homer with a vocative: the nuance perhaps was colloquial.

The rhythm of i 157 resembles that of another unforgettable line of Achilles. Over the body of Iphition the son of Otryntes he cries ‘You are down, most violent of men . . . Here is your death, though you were born by the Gygaean Lake, by the Hyllus rich in fish and the Hermus with its whirlpools’,

κεῖσαι, Ὀτρυντιάδη, πάντων ἐκπαγλότατ’ ἀνδρῶν  
 ἐνθάδε τοι θάνατος, γενεὴ δέ τοι ἔστ’ ἐπὶ λίμνη  
 Γυγαίῃ, ὅθι τοι τέμενος πατρῴϊόν ἐστιν,  
 Ὕλλῳ ἐπ’ ἰχθυόεντι καὶ Ἑρμῷ δινήεντι (xx 389–92).

The hero achieves a note of dispassionate pathos like that which the poet himself often strikes in the recording of the death of a warrior,<sup>35</sup> but the last of these four lines, with its massive epithets symmetrically spaced as the mind contemplates these serene and distant waters, is characteristic of the speaker Achilles. Something similar happens in the next book. Achilles has killed Asteropaeus, who boasted of being the son of a river-god. Over his corpse he claims to be the superior of any river’s son, sprung as he is from Zeus:

τῷ κρείσσων μὲν Ζεὺς ποταμῶν ἀλιμυρῆντων  
 κρείσσων αὖτε Διὸς γενεὴ ποταμοῖο τέτυκται.  
 καὶ γὰρ σοὶ ποταμός γε πάρα μέγας, εἰ δύναταί τι  
 χραισμεῖν· ἄλλ’ οὐκ ἔστι Διὶ Κρονίωνι μάχεσθαι,  
 τῷ οὐδὲ κρείων Ἀχελῷος ἰσοφαρίζει,  
 οὐδὲ βαθυρρεῖται μέγα σθένος Ὠκεανοῖο,  
 ἐξ οὗ περ πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα θάλασσα  
 καὶ πᾶσαι κρῆναι καὶ φρεῖατα μακρὰ νάουσιν (xxi 190–7).

Of the two massive epithets, ἀλιμυρῆντων recurs once in the *Odyssey*, while βαθυρρεῖται is unique in both epics: they have a family resemblance to βωτιανείρη and ἠχήεσσα, individual and imposing words for the great features of the natural world. The passage begins as a jeer, uttered in triumph, εὐχόμενος, like that over the body of Iphition, or indeed like the attack on the shameless Agamemnon: Asteropaeus’ boasted descent from a river was no use to him in the event, any more than the river Scamander, beside which he was slain, could aid him. But the thought of the rivers is developed: the mighty Achelous, the vast and deep flowing stream of Ocean (a timeless and motionless line), all the natural waters of the world. The rare words, the distant perspective, the moment of rest in a context of violence: these are characteristic of the utterance of Achilles.

The episode which precedes the killing of Asteropaeus is that of Lycaon. He too is slain by Achilles, who throws his body into the river, and speaks in triumph:

<sup>35</sup> On Homer’s ‘obituaries’ see *ibid.*, 103 ff.

καί οἱ ἐπευχόμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευεν·  
 ἔνταυθοῖ νῦν κείσο, μετ' ἰχθύσιν, οἳ σ' ὠτειλήν  
 αἷμ' ἀπολιχμήσονται ἀκηδέες· οὐδέ σε μήτηρ  
 ἐνθεμένη λεχέεσσι γοήσεται, ἀλλὰ Σκάμανδρος  
 οἷσει δινήεις εἴσω ἄλός εὐρέα κόλπον . . .' (xxi 121–5).

'Lie there among the fishes: they will lick the blood from your wound, uncaring. Your mother shall not lay you out and lament you, but the swirling Scamander shall carry you into the broad bosom of the sea.' Again we find the same transition: from the cruel taunt of the victor, in this case particularly savage, to the broad rhythm and dispassionate perspective of the movement of the waters. It is remarkable, too, that Achilles develops the idea of the lost wealth of Troy at greater length and with more moving fullness of detail, just in this manner, even than Hector. In Book xviii Hector says 'Once men called Priam's city rich in gold and rich in bronze, but now many fine treasures are lost to us, and many possessions have been sold and gone to Phrygia and fair Maeonia, since great Zeus was angry with us' (xviii 288–92). Achilles says to Priam 'You too, old king, we hear were prosperous once: of all that are enclosed between Lesbos out to sea and Phrygia inland and the boundless Hellespont, of all they say that you were most blessed in wealth and in sons':

καί σε, γέρον, τὸ πρὶν μὲν ἀκούομεν ὄλβιον εἶναι·  
 ὅσσον Λέσβος ἄνω, Μάκαρος ἔδος, ἐντὸς ἔργει,  
 καὶ Φρυγίη καθύπερθε, καὶ Ἑλλήσποντος ἀπείρων,  
 τῶν σε, γέρον, πλούτῳ τε καὶ υἰάσι φασὶ κέκασθαι (xxiv 543–6).

The boundless Hellespont is a typically Achillean detail, which colours the whole with that recurrent contrast between the sufferings of men and the serenity of the great waters.

He it is who invokes Zeus as god of Dodona, dwelling afar, served by strange priests:

Ζεῦ ἄνα, Δωδωναίε, Πελασγικέ, τηλόθι ναίων,  
 Δωδώνης μεδέων δυσχειμέρου· ἀμφὶ δὲ Σελλοὶ  
 σοὶ ναίουσ' ὑποφῆται ἀνιπτόποδες χαμαιεῦναι (xvi 234–6).

Τηλόθι is a word particularly attracted to Achilles—of its seven appearances in the *Iliad* three are in his mouth, the others being his bitter statements that Patroclus died far from home, in need of his absent friend, and that Peleus has only one son, doomed to die all too soon, who is not taking care of the old man but sitting at Troy, far from home, bringing grief on Priam and his sons. A fourth occurrence is the sorrowing of Thetis for her son, who was soon to die at Troy, far from home.<sup>36</sup> Apart from that word, the invocation of Zeus of Dodona is full of long and unusual epithets—ἀνιπτόποδες and χαμαιεῦναι never recur in Homer, while δυσχειμέρου is used only once elsewhere, again of Dodona (ii 750)—and dwells lingeringly on the special features of a remote and exotic place, the shrine of Achilles' distant home. His spear comes from the high slopes of Mount Pelion; his appearance on the edge of the battlefield, glorified by Athena, is like a distant fire seen over the sea, τηλόθεν ἐκ νήσου.<sup>37</sup>

Achilles is often to be found alone on the sea-shore. There he calls on his mother to attend to his grievance:

αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς  
 δακρύσας ἐτάρων ἄφαρ ἔζετο νόσφι λιασθεῖς,  
 θῖν' ἔφ' ἄλός πολιῆς, ὀρόων ἐπ' ἀπείρονα πόντον (i 349–51).

There he lies weeping for Patroclus,

ἐν καθαρῷ, ὅθι κύματ' ἐπ' ἠϊόνος κλύζεσκον (xxiii 61).

<sup>36</sup> xvi 243, xviii 99, xxiv 541, xxiv 86.

<sup>37</sup> xvi 144, xviii 208. Cf. xix 324 ὁ δ' ἄλλοδαπῶ ἐνι

δήμῳ | εἵνεκα ῥιγεδανηῆς Ἑλένης Τρωσὶν πολε-  
 μίζω.

There he wanders alone, sleepless, thinking of his dead friend,

τοτὲ δ' ὀρθὸς ἀναστὰς  
δινεύεσκ' ἀλύων παρὰ θῆν' ἄλός (xxiv 11–12).<sup>38</sup>

That is appropriate to the son of a sea-goddess, who feels himself alone among men. It also suits that solitariness that his perspective on human life is the deepest and the truest, as we learn from his speech to Priam in Book xxiv. The ability to rise beyond the immediate confines of the action and to the contemplation of distant places—ancient Orchomenus and Egyptian Thebes, hundred-gated, and rocky Pytho with its treasures, and the river Spercheius which he will never see again, and Phthia with its deep soil (when does Agamemnon or Menelaus speak of the soil of his homeland?) and Sipylus, where Niobe is turned to stone, and the island of Scyros, where his son may be dead for all he knows—once, indeed, he thought that Patroclus would take the boy to Phthia, when Achilles was dead, and show him all his possessions.<sup>39</sup>

That it is Achilles whose speech is really different is of course not an accident. The *Iliad* needed to have an exceptional hero at its centre, for the plot to work: a hero not merely quick to take offence, which is not an exceptional quality, but on the one hand so passionate in his heroism that he will not accept, as the price of his co-operation, the sort of restitution which other heroes accept as normal;<sup>40</sup> and on the other hand capable of a humanity which prevents him from being a monster or a villain, a figure with whom the audience could not sympathise. The moral complexity of the plot, which is truly tragic, demanded a complex Achilles. It is therefore no surprise that the Achilles of the *Iliad* actually is exceptional, and that his speech reflects that. The aim of this part of this paper has been to confirm that it really is so, and to show part of the way in which it is achieved.

JASPER GRIFFIN

*Balliol College, Oxford*

<sup>38</sup> Cf. also xix 40, and W. Elliger, *Landschaft in griechischer Dichtung* (Berlin 1975) 67.

<sup>39</sup> ix 381 ff., ix 405, xxiii 142 ff., i 155, xxiv 615, xix

326 ff.

<sup>40</sup> Clear especially from ix 515 ff., ix 628 ff., ix 645 ff.

## APPENDIX

(a) Words which occur in the speeches of Achilles but not elsewhere in the *Iliad*. Words which do not occur in the *Odyssey* are underlined.

This list is of limited significance. Chance must play a role, not quantifiable, in such matters; and at least as significant as unique words are special usages of words, such as Achilles' metaphorical use of αἰματόεις and his unparalleled usage of ἀμύσσω. So also are phrases like his vivid ἄχθος ἀρούρης. But such things involve too much subjective judgment for 'pure' statistics.

<u>ἀεργός</u>	<u>δείλη</u>	<u>ἤχηεσσα</u>	<u>παλίλλογα</u>
<u>αἰκῶς</u>	<u>δεκάκις</u>	[ <u>θυμαλγέα</u> ] <sup>1</sup>	<u>παλιμπλαγγθέντας</u>
<u>ἄκμηνος</u>	<u>δημοβόρος</u>	<u>θυμαρέα</u>	<u>παναώριος</u>
<u>ἄκοντιστύς</u>	<u>δικασπόλοι</u>	<u>καρός</u>	<u>παριαύων</u>
<u>ἄλιμυρηνέντων</u>	<u>δουρικτητή</u>	<u>καταλειβομένοιο</u>	<u>περίσχεο</u>
<u>ἄμμείξας</u>	<u>ἐγγέινομαι</u>	<u>καταλήθομαι</u>	<u>πίθος</u>
<u>ἀμφιδεδίνηται</u>	<u>εἰκοσάκις</u>	<u>κτεάτισσα</u>	<u>πολυδάκρυτος</u>
<u>ἀναθηλήσει</u>	<u>εἰκοσινήριτα</u>	<u>κτητοί</u>	<u>προσσημαρ</u>
<u>ἀπηλεγέως</u>	<u>ἐκατόγχειρον</u>	<u>κύνεος</u>	<u>ποτινίσσεται</u>
<u>ἀποδειροτομήσω</u>	<u>ἐκατόμπυλοι</u>	<u>κυνῶπα</u>	<u>ῥιγεδανῆς</u>
<u>ἀπολιχμήσονται</u>	<u>ἐκπαυλότατε</u>	<u>λειστή</u>	<u>σκυδαίνω</u>
<u>ἀπομηνίσαντος</u>	<u>ἐλετή</u>	<u>ληιάς</u>	<u>συνημοσύνας</u>
<u>ἀπονάσσωσι</u>	<u>ἐνδίνων</u>	<u>ληιστή</u>	<u>συφορβός</u>
<u>ἀποπλείω</u>	<u>ἐνορχα</u>	<u>λωβητός</u>	<u>τηλεκλυτός</u>
<u>ἀπτῆσι</u>	<u>ἐνταυθοῖ</u>	<u>μά</u>	<u>τομή</u>
<u>ἄρεκτον</u>	<u>ἐξοιχνεῦσι</u>	<u>μάστακα</u>	<u>τρύζηται</u>
<u>ἀσκελέως</u>	<u>ἐπαγαλλόμενος</u>	<u>μεθορμηθεῖς</u>	<u>ὑπάλυξις</u>
<u>ἀύπνους</u>	<u>ἐπαίτιος</u>	<u>μεταπαυσωλή</u>	<u>ὑπεροπλή</u>
<u>ἄφήτορος</u>	<u>ἐπεκλώσαντο</u>	<u>μετατροπαλίζεο</u>	<u>ὑποφήται</u>
<u>βαθυρρείταιο</u>	<u>ἐπισκύζωνται</u>	<u>μετοχλίσσειε</u>	<u>φιλοκτεανώτατε</u>
<u>βούβρωστις</u>	<u>ἐσδύομαι</u>	<u>μηνιθμός</u>	<u>φλοῖός</u>
<u>βρῶσις</u>	<u>εὐπλοῖην</u>	<u>οἶνοβαρές</u>	<u>φρείατα</u>
<u>βρωτύς</u>	<u>ἐφυβρίζων</u>	<u>ὀλετήρα</u>	<u>χαλκότυπος</u>
<u>βωτιανείρη</u>	<u>ἐχέφρων</u>	<u>ὀμόφρονα</u>	
<u>δασμός</u>	<u>ζωρότερον</u>	<u>ὄνειρόπολος</u>	
<u>δεῖ</u>	<u>ἦμα</u>	<u>ὀπίζομαι</u>	

(b) Words which occur in the speeches of Agamemnon but not elsewhere in the *Iliad*

<u>ἄβροτάξομεν</u>	<u>δεκάς</u>	<u>κεναυχέες</u>	<u>πηγούς</u>
<u>ἄβρότη</u>	<u>δήνεα</u>	<u>κουροτέροισι</u>	<u>πολυβοῦται</u>
<u>ἄγέραστος</u>	<u>δολοφροσύνη</u>	<u>κρήγυον</u>	<u>πολυδίψιον</u>
<u>ἄδάμαστος</u>	<u>δραίνω</u>	<u>λιπαροπλοκάμοιο</u>	<u>πολύρρηνες</u>
<u>ἄκράαντον</u>	<u>δυσκλέα</u>	<u>μεγαλίζεο</u>	<u>πρεσβήιον</u>
<u>ἄκτημων</u>	<u>ἐνδείξομαι</u>	<u>μείλια</u>	<u>προστήσας</u>
<u>ἄλαλύκτημαι</u>	<u>ἐξέμεν</u>	<u>μεταμώνια</u>	<u>πτωσκάζω</u>
<u>ἄλήιος</u>	<u>ἐπιστεφέας</u>	<u>μεταφρασόμεσθα</u>	<u>ῥωγαλέον</u>
<u>ἄπροτίμαστος</u>	<u>ἐπίτηδες</u>	<u>οἶνοχόοιο</u>	<u>σπάρτα</u>
<u>ἄριμθηήμεναι</u>	<u>εὐκλείης</u>	<u>ὀμοιωθήμεναι</u>	<u>συμφράδμονες</u>
<u>ἄφροσύνης</u>	<u>εὐπρυμνοί</u>	<u>οὔθαρ</u>	<u>τίνυσθαι</u>
<u>βαθύλειμον</u>	<u>ἐφέστιοι</u>	<u>παραίσια</u>	<u>φειδώ</u>
<u>βαθύσχοινον</u>	<u>ἠλιτόμηνον</u>	<u>πάτησαν</u>	<u>ψευστήσεις</u>
[ <u>βασιλεύτερος</u> ] <sup>2</sup>	<u>θαλίη</u>	<u>παισωλή</u>	
<u>δαιτρόν</u>	<u>θύρετρα</u>	<u>περιώσιον</u>	

<sup>1</sup> Cf. p. 52

<sup>2</sup> Cf. p. 51