HOMER'S SENSE OF TEXT

HOMERIC 'TEXT', CYCLIC 'TEXT'

IN this article[1] I am concerned to form a view of the interaction of Homer's *Iliad* with other texts prior to his. This is an issue whose legitimacy, particularly in English-language scholarship, has been rather obscured by scholarly discourse in terms of oral poetics, an issue I shall discuss presently. Yet, unless they are completely new fictions, the Cyclic epics do show us some of the material with which Homer was bound to be interacting, and it has been the achievement of the Neoanalysts to detail that interaction. In the following I do not claim to add greatly to the repertoire of neoanalytic data, but I do hope to build on it some sense of Homer's achievement in this area and to make clear our entitlement to respond to Homer's intertextuality.

By the word 'text' I refer to a *fixed* poem. There is some telling, e.g. of the *Aithiopis*, which is sufficiently fixed for Homer to allude to it specifically, to inform his work by it, and for his audience to recognise this interaction. A narrative may indeed become such a text thanks to writing, but only because writing *fixes* it, not because there is something special about writing. It is perfectly possible to have a fixed (memorised) text in an oral tradition, and Nagy, noting

E. Bethe, 'Homer und die Heldensage: die Sage vom troischen Kriege', *NJ* vii (1901) 657-76.

E. Bethe, *Homer: Dichtung und Sage*, vol. i 'Ilias' (Leipzig-Berlin 1914); vol. ii 'Odyssee, Kyklos, Zeitbestimmung' (1922); vol. iii 'Die Sage vom Troischen Kriege' (1927).

M.E. Clark, 'Neoanalysis: a biblographical review', *CW* lxxix (1986) 379-94.

M. Davies, *The Epic Cycle* (Bristol 1989).

G.F. Else, *Homer and the Homeric problem* [*Lectures in memory of Louise Taft Semple*] (Cincinnati 1965).

H. Erbse, 'Nestor und Antilochos bei Homer und Arktinos', *Hermes* cxxi (1993) 385-403.

J.M. Foley, *Immanent art: from structure to meaning in traditional oral epic* (Bloomington-Indianapolis 1991).

J. Griffin, 'The Epic Cycle and the uniqueness of homer', *JHS* xcvii (1977) 39-53.

J. Griffin, *Homer on life and death* (Oxford 1980).

A. Heubeck, *Die Homerische Frage* [*Erträge der Forschung* xxvii] (Darmstadt 1974).

A. Heubeck, 'Homeric studies today: results and prospects', in Fenik 1978: 1-17.

R. Janko, *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. iv 'books 13-16' (Cambridge 1992).

M.S. Jensen, *The Homeric Question and the oral-formulaic theory* (Copenhagen 1980).

J.T. Kakridis, *Homeric researches* (Lund 1949).

G.S. Kirk, *The songs of Homer* (Cambridge 1962).

G.S. Kirk, *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. i 'books 1-4' (Cambridge 1985).

W. Kullmann, *Die Quellen der Ilias (troischer Sagenkreis)* [*Hermes* Einzelschrift xiv] (Wiesbaden 1960).

W. Kullmann, 'Zur Methode der Neoanalyse in der Homerforschung', *WS* xv (1981) 5-42.

A.B. Lord, *The Singer of tales* (Cambridge, Mass. 1960).

A.B. Lord, 'Homer as oral poet', *HSCP* lxxii (1967) 1-46.

A.B. Lord, *Epic singers and oral tradition* (Ithaca 1991) [ch.2, pp. 38-47 reprints 'Homer's originality: oral dictated texts', *TAPA* lxxxiv (1953) 124-33].

R. Merkelbach, 'Die pisistratische Redaktion der homerischen Gedichte', *RhM* xcv (1952) 23-47.

G. Nagy, *Greek mythology and poetics* (Ithaca 1990) 23.

J.A. Notopoulos, 'Studies in early Greek oral poetry', *HSCP* lxviii (1964) 1-77.

H. Pestalozzi, *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias* (Erlenbach 1945).

N.J. Richardson, *The Iliad: a commentary*, vol. vi 'books 21-24' (Cambridge 1993).

W. Schadewaldt, *Von Homers Welt und Werk*[2] (Stuttgart 1951).

R. von Scheliha, *Patroklos: Gedanken über Homers Dichtung und Gestalten* (Basel 1943).

G. Schoeck, *Ilias und Aithiopis: Kyklische Motive in homerische Brechung* (Zürich 1961).

O. Taplin, *Homeric soundings* (Oxford 1992).

D. Young, 'Never blotted a line? formula and premeditation in Homer and Hesiod', *Arion* vi (1967) 279-324.

the archaic accentuation preserved by rhapsodes, has argued that Homer's own text is a case in point, preserved fixed in an oral tradition.[2] Between the two extremes of total fixity and utter fluidity lie various levels of semi-fixity. Amongst these, and sufficient for most of my argument, lies a firm and standard sense of how the story goes (Proklos' summaries of the Cyclic epics may serve as a model for this), which I shall later refer to with Kullmann's term, *Faktenkanon*. But I think it is also worth envisaging a stronger case, where Homer interacts with specific implementations of the standard story (those, indeed, which standardise stories), if only to see that the problem with demonstrating that he referred to specific texts is not that the critical method is illegitimate but that the evidence runs out, i.e. earlier epic and Cyclic epic are not known *verbatim* to us, a few fragments apart.

A fixed text is more visibly owned and authored, and whoever borrows it owes an acknowledgement. Thus, the supposed author, Homer himself, if he is not a projection from the textuality of later ages, testifies to the fixed character of *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The *Iliad* was a 'text' already for Homer. Construction of an architecturally accomplished poem on that scale (or delivery over a practical minimum of three days) implies some impressive—probably life-long—degree of premeditation and planning, a sense of text, and suggests something which in principle is capable of being repeated. Such a construction does not necessitate the use of writing (Taplin 36), though it is interesting that the age of the first authors is also an age during which writing is coming into more general circulation.[3] The difficulty with Homer's use of writing is more at the practical level: 15,693 lines of *Iliad* and 12,110 lines of *Odyssey*, and who paid for all that parchment or papyrus?[4] A 'Peisistratean recension' might indeed explain the funding, as indeed it would explain much else.[5]

The author of the *Kypria* already regarded the *Iliad* as a text. Any reading of the *Kypria* will show it preparing events in readiness for (specifically) the *Iliad* to refer back to them, for instance the sale of Lykaon to Lemnos and the kitting out of Achilles with Briseis and Agamemnon with Chryseis.[6] The *Kypria* very obviously does refer to the *Iliad* and was designed to lead up to it. It has rightly been described by Davies as 'a hold-all for the complete story of the Trojan War up to the events of the *Iliad*'.[7] Therefore, in the form in which it is reported to us by Proklos, it is later than Homer, in dialogue with Homer, and presupposes Homer as text. To reach this form of Homeric supplement from any earlier form would require more than mere adaptation: it would require severe re-editing and re-composition, by the author of the *Kypria*, let us say Stasinos, himself. The *Kypria* is clearly embedded in textual thinking.

The *Aithiopis*, however, unlike the *Kypria*, can be read as an independent work not necessarily presupposing the *Iliad*,[8] though one was clearly influenced by the other. It cannot

---

[2] Fixed preservation in other traditions, e.g. R. Finnegan, *Literacy and orality: studies in the technology of communication* (Oxford 1988) 95; *ead., Oral poetry: its nature, significance and social context*[2] (Bloomington 1992) 73-8. Nagy 40-3. Yet the assumption that fixity and writing are the same thing remains prevalent, e.g. A. Ford, *Homer: the poetry of the past* (Ithaca 1992) 132.

[3] A. Lesky, 'Homeros', *RE* Suppl. xi (1968) 687-846, at p. 706 views the architecture in particular as ruling out 'oral improvisation'—though 'improvisation' is not quite the right term.

[4] Kirk 1962: 99. Economics, Jensen 94. Other objections to writing: Kirk 1985: 13.

[5] It would have to be invented if it did not exist, *cf.* Merkelbach 40.

[6] Observed by Bethe 1922: 202, who concludes (241) 'Ein selbständiges Werk hatten sie niemals sein sollen.' For the question, 'why was Chryseis at Thebe?', obligingly answered by the *Kypria*, see Taplin 85 & n. 4.

[7] Davies 4. The opening of the poem appears to have been stylistically late—Davies 3, referring to J. Wackernagel, *Sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Homer* (Göttingen 1916) 1-159.

[8] Notopoulos 34 f.; Bethe 1922: 243: 'Die Aithiopis, d.h. Memnons Aristie und Tod, liegt in einheitlicher Überlieferung vor. Sie bildet ein geschlossenen Ring, ein selbständiger Gedicht.' Insufficient allowance for differences between Cyclic epics in Davies 4 f. Dating of the *Aithiopis*: 775 or 760 according to Eusebios *Chron.*

wholly be excluded that Arktinos was an 8th-century poet and antedates Homer, a view which Notopoulos was prepared to entertain. The *Aithiopis* would then be one of those predecessors of Homer in the (by now?) relatively fixed tradition which inspired him and led to his work. Though it is conventional to stress the brevity of the Cyclic Epics, they are only brief in comparison with Homer, who could readily be conceived as carrying forward a tendency to greater length which the newly fixed tradition was now displaying; this would dispose of some of the romantic oddity of the sudden appearance of the 'monumental poet'. Some Cyclic epics remain very long works compared with a standard recitation length, on Notopoulos's reckoning, of around one book (a 'lay'). The *Aithiopis*, though not rising to the eleven books of the (perhaps later) *Kypria*, was of substantial length at five books, suggesting that it was as fixedly designed as Homer's works were. Its plot at least was of elegant and compelling structure, it sought 'une grandeur et une émotion' (Severyns)[9] and, if *Odyssey* 24.48-49 is anything to go by, it must have contained one of the most thrilling moments in Cyclic epic as an uncanny scream rising over the sea heralds the arrival of Thetis and the Muses to lament the body of Achilles.

'Cyclic epic' is a term of convenience: these were works composed by different poets at different times and stand in different relationships to Homer. The *Aithiopis* is at one extreme, the *Telegony* of Eugammon of Kyrene (*fl.* 567 BC according to Eusebios)[10] at the other. Eugammon looks to be the most innovative and the least typical—it does not seem appropriate, on the basis of his *Telegony*, to read Homer's Circe in the light of her son Telegonos and Telemachos' later marriage to her.[11] But most Cyclic epics were as traditional as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,[12] indeed probably more so (see below on the 'Uncanonical *Iliad*'), and their access to tradition should not be funnelled exclusively through Homer. Rather, Homer may draw on the material that they are using. If they too were transmitted orally, some of them from early dates, they too must surely have received their definitive written form and definitive statement of their future careers as cyclic supplements to Homer at the 'Peisistratean recension'.

I think it is an attractive conceptual model that Homer was exploiting a tradition which had developed recognised, quite fixed, 'texts' and that his works were not the first 'texts'. Thus however much his manner may be derived from an oral tradition, he is so far towards being a literary text that non-oral literary analytical techniques should not be disqualified. In distinguishing between oral and non-oral criticism, the analysis of Foley provides a useful focus.[13] For him, in the oral-traditional mode of composition the power of the poem depends on its resonance with the established elements and strategies of tradition—the meaning of any part of the poem is 'inherent' in the (typical) scene, motif, or expression. In the 'modern'[14] literary mode of composition, meaning is newly and distinctively 'conferred' on the text. Foley also speaks here of the relative balance between these two extremes in any given work, an important point if one is not to exaggerate the orality of Homer. Clearly, the economy of the

---

(ed. R. Helm *GCS* xlvii, Berlin 1956); born *c.* 744 and a 'pupil of Homer' according to Artemon of Klazomenai (4th century BC?) *FGrH* 443F2.

[9] A. Severyns, *Le Cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque* (Liége-Paris 1928) 322.

[10] The date of Eugammon may indeed, as often thought (e.g. Davies 6), simply be based on a decent interval after the foundation of Cyrene (c. 630), but, if so, that is a perfectly reasonable ground for the dating, not a refutation of it. It is fair to assume that Eugammon belongs to the last generation of poets before the Peisistratean recension.

[11] It is, however, somewhat disturbing that a *Telegony* is also ascribed to Kinaithon of Sparta, which would take the story much further back. For supposed influence of the *Telegony* on our *Odyssey*, see Davies 87 f.

[12] See Notopoulos, esp. 18-45.

[13] Foley 8.

[14] One feels the influence of Romanticism in this formulation and it becomes clear that Homer and Vergil are indeed not poles apart. Vergil is rather an oral poet in his closeness to tradition, his focus on recitation, and his tendency to sound patterns.

Homeric formula implies a significant leaning towards the oral-traditionalist pole when discussing, e.g., πόδας ὠκὺς 'Αχιλλεύς in 1.58. But my contention in this article is that Homer had a sufficient sense of text to allow us to move towards the literary pole when discussing his use of other 'authors'. Specifically, the following description by Lord of Bosnian performers does not apply to him:[15]

> We have learned that a tradition is made up not of discrete songs but of songs, or preferably, stories about a limited number of heroes, tales that overlap and intertwine, in such a way that in the experience of both the singer and his traditional audience any one traditional song can evoke subconsciously a large group of other songs, or stories, in the tradition.

Homer, we will find, did more than evoke subconsciously, through the tradition, a corpus of stories. He evoked particular stories at particular points for particular effect and could well have had particular tellings, 'texts', in mind.

On this model, then, he emulated, and advanced on, earlier masters—and perhaps advanced on his own work through incremental variation of an original, much shorter, quarrel poem. The expansion involved the composition of new episodes, which were assigned a place in his growing 'supertext', but his implied total text was probably never performed in its entirety (see below).[16] Goold in particular has argued forcefully for Homer's works being formed by continual additions and has made clear that the additions were made to a very fixed text, which Goold interprets as therefore written.[17] Furthermore, Goold has observed that the additions so respect book divisions and the book divisions in any case make such sense that, like Notopoulos, he thinks they must be Homer's own. There would indeed be a certain literate virtuosity, a degree of *epideixis*, in ultimately creating a poem that consists of one recitation for every letter of the alphabet (if, as could be the case, that is the number of letters his alphabet had), though this may be too small a unit of recitation.[18] There is however an alarming corollary if Goold is wrong on one essential point: have we recovered not the 'Nature of Homeric Composition', but the method of the Peisistratean recension as it gathered songs supposedly by 'Homer', conceived of as hitherto 'scattered'? There is no evidence that we have Homer's *Iliad* other than the perceived unity of the poems (is that enough?)—which only Merkelbach (42) has denied, if not with such devastating consequences in mind.

But even if we do not go to that extreme, there remains something strange about Homer's textuality. It is hard to be convinced by any of the suggested occasions for the oral performance of Homer's lengthy works (unless a festival performance is conceived of as a Bayreuth[19] with, unusually for the Greek world, no competitors performing their own monster-epics). Nor,

---

[15] Lord, unpublished, cited by Foley 11.

[16] Similarly, Young 306.

[17] See G.P. Goold, 'The nature of Homeric composition', *ICS* ii (1977) 1-34, esp. pp. 9, 10-12, 26-30 for the points cited here.

[18] I am realigning Notopoulos's argument (11 f.). The consensus is, however, firmly against the book-division being Homer's own, and gently in favour of its being Alexandrian (Taplin 285; Richardson 20 f.). The ultimate reason is less the apparent absence of book divisions from papyri (in fact there are some signs of recognition of book divisions, S. West, *The Ptolemaic Papyri of Homer* [Köln-Opladen 1967] 22 f.) than the absence of any awareness of book divisions in any author before the fourth century BC (West 18). But West is now inclined to push the book division back to the Peisistratean recension; and Jensen (87) is 'inclined to interpret the arrangement of each poem into twenty-four songs as resulting from the process of dictation'—making the scribe responsible for the assignation of one letter of the 'Ionic alphabet' to each book (at the Peisistratean recension, on Jensen's view). Larger units: an anonymous referee of this article comments: 'The *Odyssey* falls so neatly into six nearly equal parts (each of four present-day books, except that the third part ends at 13.92), that I find irresistible the inference that it was composed specifically with a view to performance in six instalments.'

[19] The comparison of an anonymous referee.

evidently, can it have been designed *in toto* for a readership.[20] It is apparently unperform-able.[21] Unless we should simply accept the endurance of singer (with assistants?) and of audience on some occasion not yet accurately envisaged (there are, worryingly, no close parallels), there may be a fault in our conception of this problem. I therefore ask a radical question, returning us almost to the views of Bentley:[22] *do we have any reason to suppose the Iliad was ever in fact performed complete before the Peisistratean Panathenaia?* If not, it is up to us to conceive of a way in which an *Iliad* only told in isolated episodes might nonetheless have an identity. The *Iliad* would on this supposition be the environment, the sense of total story, the 'supertext', within which Homer and his successors sang episodes to audiences. Yet this 'supertext' was sufficiently designed, developed and fixed for it to be theoretically possible to put together the episodes and create the monumental whole that no-one in fact had heard before: possibly this was the grandiose scheme of Peisistratos. The 'supertext' itself was a remarkable invention. Just as other poets operated, for instance within an environment of a 'Trojan War' saga, ultimately collected together as what we know as 'the Cyclic epics', so Homer created a tauter environment—of Achilles' withdrawal from, and return to, battle—to which he transferred by allusion much of the Trojan War material. He designed and constructed his rhapsodies within that context, and these rhapsodies were finally collected together as 'the *Iliad*'. He expanded his work, as it were, by oral word-processing, but the hard copy of the whole document was only printed in 6th-century Athens. This is not so very different from the known features of certain oral traditions, where only selected episodes from the 'whole story' are ever performed, where 'Mr Rureke ... repeatedly asserted that never before had he performed the whole story within a continuous span of days'.[23]

FAKTENKANON, INTERTEXT

Homer does not, of course, refer to other historical poets. But he does refer to other poems, or subjects for poems. How defined are these poems? And how defined is his own?

I have argued elsewhere that Greek Mythology is an intertext formed from all tellings of myth that 'readers' (or listeners) have ever encountered.[24] Thus for any particular myth there is a sense of how the story goes, which need not be dependent on a single telling. Any new telling of a myth positions itself in relation to the intertext and gains its sense and ambience from that relationship. This model is applicable equally to oral and literary traditions. Indeed, there is an important intertextual element to heroic-epic tradition, which for instance leads Hatto to speak of its oral and post-oral form as consisting of the 'totality of its texts' or perform-ances.[25] For each myth/subject, regardless of whether there is reference to a specific hypotext

---

[20] Nagy 38.

[21] This is particularly well shown by Kirk 1962: 280 f., who finds himself driven by an entirely reasonable argument to the desperate solution of a genius-Homer defying normal performance conditions. Kirk 1985: 12 talks of its having 'been performed in a special way at which we can only guess', rejecting as unlikely that it 'was never intended to be heard as a whole'. The suggestion of assistants (or sons/apprentices) comes from an anonymous referee and would somewhat recall the recitals of Vergil. Ford (n. 2) 133 also arrives at this position, speaking of 'a still largely illiterate age in which they would have been rarely read and nearly impossible to perform in toto'.

[22] H. Lloyd-Jones, 'Remarks on the Homeric question', in: *Greek epic, lyric and tragedy: the academic papers of Sir Hugh Lloyd-Jones* (Oxford 1990) ch.1 [reprinting H. Lloyd-Jones, V. Pearl, and B. Worden (eds.), *History and imagination: essays in honours of H.R. Trevor-Roper* (London 1981) 15-29], at p. 3.

[23] Foley 12 on the Pabuji epic in Rajasthan and on the Mwindo tradition, citing this particular passage from D. Biebuyck, *The Mwindo epic from the Banyanga* (Berkeley 1969) 14.

[24] K. Dowden, *The uses of Greek mythology* (London 1992) 7-9.

[25] A.T. Hatto, 'Towards an anatomy of heroic/epic poetry', in: J.B. Hainsworth (ed.), *Traditions of heroic and epic poetry*, vol. ii 'Characteristics and techniques' (London 1989) 145-306, at pp. 147 f.

(this or that poet's telling), there is an intertext which, except in some peculiarly disputed or little-known myth, will amount to what Kullmann called a *Faktenkanon*, a standard event-list.[26] On the larger scale, it is obviously unthinkable that Homer's tradition was so fluid that he had no sense at all of how the story of Troy went and what incidents were generally included. Lord too, consistently with his stress in the *Singer of Tales* on 'the stable skeleton of narrative', has stated that there is a 'more or less stable core' in response to Smith's observation, in the case of the performers of the Rajasthani epic of the warrior-prince Pabuji, of 'substantial agreement amongst them as to what kinds of story-element are "necessary".'[27] Without such a sense of how the story goes, it would be impossible for Avdo Medjedović to have claimed a repertoire of 58 (therefore identifiable) epics, or for Lord to envisage that Homer 'sang these two songs often'.[28] Homer's Phemios, after all, knew various songs from which the audience might wish to choose (*cf.* Jensen 116-8). This is an important point to grasp about limitations on fluidity. Jensen (49), for instance, regards Lord's views as confirmed by a West-Central African tradition where 'two performers are never exactly alike, yet the singers are engaged in various definite songs and by no means improvising freely'.

The *Faktenkanon* is the bottom line of Homeric intertextuality. It is because of its existence that Homer is able to allude—in a way, notably, that Bosnian bards do not[29]—to other epic subjects:

- *Iliad:* the two expeditions against Thebes (4.365-410), the hunting of the Kalydonian Boar (9), Herakles (e.g. 14.266 with 15.25, 14.324, 15.640), Perseus (14.320), Semele and Dionysos (14.323-5), Pylian epics (e.g. 11.670-761), and Oedipus (23.679).

- *Odyssey:* Nostoi and the vengeance of Athene (as told by Phemios, 1.326-7), the Argonaut myth (12.69-72), Oedipus (11.271), Herakles (8.224, 11.267) and his murder of Iphitos (21.22-30).

There is no way of telling from these references whether Homer refers here to common stories or particular poems. The number of these references, however, does show his concern to place his own work in a context of other epics and to give it a sense of reaching out to the rest of the legendary world. Slatkin rightly speaks of Homer establishing 'bearings for the poem as it unfolds and linking it continually to other traditions and paradigms and to a wide mythological terrain'.[30]

HOMERIC SILENCE

Homer's manipulation of the *Faktenkanon* can also be discerned in negative. As part of his self-definition, he has a policy of exclusion.[31]

Homeric silence about a tradition does not necessarily mean that it was unknown to him.

---

[26] Kullmann 1960: 12 f.

[27] J.D. Smith, 'How to sing a tale: Epic performance in the Pabuji tradition', in: J.B. Hainsworth (ed.), *Traditions of heroic and epic poetry*, vol. 2 'Characteristics and techniques' (London 1989) 29-41, at p. 36; Lord 1987: 67; Lord 1960: 99. *Cf.* Milman Parry, *The making of Homeric verse: the collected papers of Milman Parry*, ed. A. Parry (Oxford 1971) 446 on '*stable* or *essential*' themes.

[28] Finnegan 1992 (n. 2) 174. Lord 1960: 151.

[29] Lord 1960: 159, Young 305.

[30] L.M. Slatkin, *The power of Thetis: allusion and interpretation in the* Iliad (Berkeley 1991) 108.

[31] *Cf.* also Slatkin (n. 30) 15 on the 'exclusion of such traditional mythological material, or its displacement into more or less oblique references'.

One instance is the sacrifice of Iphigeneia.[32] Because it is not overtly referred to in the *Iliad*, the scholiast comments, 'Homer does not know the sacrifice of Iphigeneia'. Yet Agamemnon's words to Calchas, accusing him of a habit of evil prophecy (1.106-8), gain point if they react with a knowledge of that tradition shared by Homer and his audience. Homer also does not know: the education of Achilles by the Centaur Cheiron, and his invulnerability but for his heel; the theft of the Palladion; Kassandra the prophetess; and, but for 24.29 (damned by Aristarchos), the Judgment of Paris. To create his *verismo* he is prepared to blank out parts of traditions. Bellerophon may (in a narration of ancestry) kill the Chimaira, but winged horses are proscribed.[33] Prophets like Calchas and Helenos may exist and may be said to be able to foresee the future; but they must not do any actual foreseeing—that would disrupt the human tone and they must make do with advising.[34] Homer's Kassandra is no prophetess—she is simply the most beautiful of Priam's daughters, ready to be married off at 13.365 (or to be raped by Aias?) and first to perceive the return of Priam with Hektor at 24.699 (almost prophetic?). As Griffin has shown, Homer deliberately cultivates a very special tone that distances him from the more tolerant (or less discriminating) cyclic epics: he is most reluctant to allow elements that are 'fantastic, miraculous, romantic ... sensational, ignoble'.[35] So, absent details are not necessarily post-Homeric inventions—even if, indeed especially if, they display garish taste, because Homer establishes his idiosyncratic good taste precisely by excluding details that fail his test. The sacrifice of Iphigeneia was either too gross or, if we think of the replacement of her by a deer at the moment of sacrifice, too miraculous—hence Homer's 'sedulous silence' (Davies 46).

This is not a quaint characteristic of Homer, but a deliberate choice. If he meant his work to be so perceived, it could only be so perceived in contrast to the prevailing character of a tradition, which therefore included these motifs and *to which, by refusing reference, he made reference*. This is once again indicative of his method, to create the literary effect of his own poem by manipulation of the audience's experience of other poems.

THE UNCANONICAL *ILIAD*

How much of the *Iliad* itself belongs to the *Faktenkanon*? Which canonical or generally recognised events of the Trojan War is it its business to relate?

The *Iliad* has a narrow time span, measured in days, and rather a lack of incident compared with the Cyclic epics (just as Aristotle observed in the cases of epics of Herakles and Theseus). It concerns neither the beginning nor the conclusion of the war. Instead it focusses on a moment in the war when there was a quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, Achilles withdrew from the action, and as a result Patroklos and Hektor were slain. Neither Patroklos nor Hektor seem to be figures particularly well embedded in the epic tradition,[36] and however much Homer tries to persuade us that Achilles' death follows upon that of Hektor, it is not strictly true that Hektor's death makes it come any sooner (except that a few hours have been divertingly filled

---

[32] Homeric ignorance: K. Dowden, *Death and the maiden* (London 1989) 11 f.

[33] J.H. Gaisser, 'Adaptation of traditional material in the Glaucus-Diomedes episode', *TAPA* c (1969) 165-76, at p. 170.

[34] No foreseeing: Griffin 1977: 48, Kullmann 1960: 221-4.

[35] Griffin 1977: 40 f. The qualitative distinction is an important point in Schadewaldt's work too, see Heubeck 1974: 43.

[36] Patroklos invented by Homer: Scheliha 236-51, 391; Schadewaldt 178-81; raised from obscurity by Homer: Kullmann 1960: 44 f., 193 f.; Janko 313. Hektor: J.W. Scott, *The Unity of Homer* (Berkeley 1921) ch.vii esp. 226; Scheliha 221 f.; Kullmann 1960: 182-8; Janko 312. According to Bethe 1901: 674, H. Usener tried to reconstruct an *Iliad* with Paris replacing Hektor.

for Achilles). Hektor, as used by Homer, is a figure who inventively encapsulates 'the new realm in which man is son and husband and father and citizen as well as fighter' (Else 39) in contrast to the brutal heroic world that is one aspect of Achilles. In fact the originality of Homer's plot is precisely that it stands aside from the *Faktenkanon*, but continually echoes it whilst evaluating men and war. It depends on the *Faktenkanon* for its context and resonance, but is largely untraditional in its ostensible choice of subject.

This has the most curious corollary for the *Iliad* as battle epic: it is very difficult for anyone to die in the *Iliad* unless they have been specially, non-traditionally, invented for it. This is because, if they have an existence independent of the *Iliad*, then the *Iliad*, as a non-traditional work, does not embrace previously significant moments in their life, such as their loss of it. A striking case is that of Achilles, to whom in a psychological sense everything happens in the *Iliad*, but to whom in cold fact nothing happens—except the loss of an (invented or severely overhauled) friend and the defeat of a (similarly untraditional) enemy. He himself, as we have seen, despite Homer's nudgings is no closer to death than he was earlier. In the case of other heroes, Kullmann showed[37] that so far as one can tell, of the Greek heroes found in the *Catalogue of Ships*,

1. the thirty-six who do not die in the *Iliad* figure somewhere else also in the story of Troy; depending on one's prejudices, it is quite possible to view all of them as belonging to pre-Homeric poetry;

2. this is also true of five of the ten who die (Askalaphos, Schedios, Amphimachos, Elephenor—who all figure in posthomeric events—and Tlepolemos who does not);

3. the other five (Arkesilaos, Prothoenor, Klonios, Diores & Medon) are inventions who exist to be killed.[38]

Obviously Achilles has a story, his personal *Faktenkanon*, including for instance the wounding of Telephos, the slaying of Troilos (whence his epithet, πόδας ὠκύς, 'swift-footed'),[39] and the death by arrow to the heel. Other heroes too will have had their stories, but one reading of these researches of Kullmann is that conceivably as many as thirty-six heroes are preserved from death in the *Iliad* precisely because they are part of, belong to, another story, a story of their own perhaps unknown to us—these are not just miscellaneous heroic names used at will.

Thus when Homer uses a hero, in principle we should be aware of the rest of his text, or some central, perhaps different, way of telling his story. When Telamonian Aias performs so majestically in the great fight for the body of Patroklos (17, e.g. 274-318, 626-55), we should compare his role in recovering the body of Achilles (which leads to the contest over the armour). In his instruction (715-21) to Meriones and Menelaos to remove the body of Patroklos while he and his namesake fight rearguard, we see the displacement of the motif in which he personally removes the body of Achilles as Odysseus fights rearguard. And when he wrestles

---

[37] Kullmann 1960: 122 f. Kullmann challenged, e.g. by Heubeck 1974: 45; for such criticism and its validity, see Clark 382.

[38] On the Trojan side, surely Pandaros is of this type: he is a Paris-avatar, who exists to break the truce and be killed (on Pandaros as Paris, now see Taplin 104 f.); Euphorbos is a similar figure, who in killing Patroklos foreshadows Paris killing Achilles (16.812), *cf.* Janko 410, 414 and Clark 385, referring to H. Mühlestein, 'Euphorbos und der Tod Patroklos', *SMEA* xv (1972) 79-90. For this avatar technique, *cf.* Phoinix who is a Nestor-avatar who can be left at Achilles' tent (Phoinix as Nestor, *cf.* Erbse 387).

[39] Just as πολύτλας points forward to the return of Odysseus from Troy, Nagy 23.

with Odysseus (23.708-37), we should look ahead to that other contest between them.[40] When Aias son of Oileus behaves badly in the games (23.473-98), we should perceive the character failing that will lead him to sacrilege; and the intervention of Athene later in the book and his complaint against her (23.782) look forward to the storm in which she will have him destroyed.[41] This twenty-third book conducts its own, final, review of the Greek heroes and their society, thereby balancing the parades that introduced them in the *Catalogue*, the *Teichoskopia*, and the *Epipolesis*,[42] but also reaching out to other stories in which the heroes figure.

It is less clear to me how other heroes with a pre-existing identity have been incorporated in Homer's narrative. If it is true, as Bethe alleged, that the conflict of Tlepolemos (of Rhodes)—appearing at Troy here only, to be slaughtered—and Sarpedon (of Lykia) looks like a local combat re-set in Troy, then what continuity does it carry with it, in what does 'diese Sage' consist?[43] I think it might, just conceivably, be a celebrated case where the slayer was himself slain: Sarpedon retires very wounded from this combat, πατὴρ δ' ἔτι λοιγὸν ἄμυνεν ('but his father still warded destruction from him', *Iliad* 5.662) so that he might provide the poet with a distinguished victim for his invented, or much revamped, Patroklos and undergo a special (Memnonic) death, as we shall see. The poet certainly, when one examines the dialogue (5.640-54), is labouring overtime to assert the relevance of the contest to its (now?) Trojan setting. Hektor too poses difficulties: if his tomb at Thebes is to be taken seriously, then the firmest supporting argument is his propensity for killing Boiotians and the like in the *Iliad*, as Bethe once observed. Yet I still do not understand the mechanics of this phenomenon in the *Iliad*. Is it traditional for Hektor to kill Teuthras, Orestes, Trechos and Helenos (5.705-10) of Boiotia and not A, B, C of Pylos, without there being any further thematic or textual implications, just a link of name with name? Does it just 'feel right'?

So, the *Iliad*, being less than canonical, cannot legitimately include the direct telling of events from the *Faktenkanon* of the Trojan War and the lives of the Greek heroes. How else, then, can it respond to known events?

ILIAD, MIRROR OF THE WHOLE WAR

The *Iliad* tells within itself and is meant to tell within itself, by allusion, by reflection and by replay, the whole story of the Trojan expedition up to the fall of Troy and beyond.[44] It does not just accidentally and inevitably reflect other events, by virtue of its being situated in that war, or by virtue of Homer's head being full of oral stuff. There is a clear and deliberate intention to reach out, embrace, and mould his poem on, major events in the war and to *evoke* those specific events. I can scarcely imagine any perception more fundamental to the understanding of the *Iliad* than this—and it is one which is shared by scholars of quite different persuasions who have been less concerned with oral issues.[45]

---

[40] Kullmann 1981: 23-5, now accepted by Richardson 202, 246.

[41] Proklos' summary of Hagias of Troizen, *Nostoi*; Eur. *Tro.* 65 ff., 70, 90.

[42] *Cf.* Richardson 78.

[43] *Iliad* 5.627-98: Bethe 1901: 668 f.; C. Robert, *Studien zur Ilias* (Berlin 1901) 402; P. Cauer *Grundfragen der Homerkritik*³ (Leipzig 1923) 242; Bethe 1927: 65. 'Bethe's fundamental elements, the duels, are very meagre and somewhat uninteresting myths', M.P. Nilsson, *Homer and Mycenae* (London 1933) 48.

[44] For a list of possible allusions to *Antihomerica* and *Posthomerica* see Kullmann 1960: 6-11.

[45] E.g. Kullmann 1960: 365 f. ('In der ganzen Ilias kann man die Beobachtung machen, dass dies Epos in seinem Aufbau den ganzen Krieg zu repräsentieren scheint' plus detailed table); Griffin 1980: 1 ('The wrath of Achilles and its consequences are made to represent the whole story').

The *Catalogue of Troops*, with its emphasis on ships and its rather slighter Trojan pendant, evokes the mustering of the Greek fleet at Aulis and is overtly linked to that scene by Odysseus' recall of the prophecy of the sparrows and snake. The *Teichoskopia* belongs with the first sighting of the Greek leaders, perhaps even on the occasion of the Duel between Menelaos and Paris, which must surely be the opening event. The *Epipolesis* presumably follows the failed duel, but in any case has the atmosphere of an initial event. Achilles' withdrawal from the fighting is associated in the first book with Thetis and her fears for him, which caused her elsewhere in the mythology to hide him on Skyros. He had to be retrieved from there by an Embassy, which is replayed in the ninth book and strongly associated there with the inverse movement, namely his prospective return home. The *Doloneia*, an apparently ill-motivated night-expedition against Troy, eliminates Rhesus, who in order to leave room for Hektor has to be scaled down from the man who would have saved Troy, had he tasted its water.[46] But it also surely mirrors the expedition of Odysseus and Diomedes to steal the Palladion. Attention had already been drawn to the Palladion in the sixth book, with particular irony when the Trojan Women call on Athena to demolish Diomedes (6.307), but with a second irony, that she should do so at the Skaian Gate, where of course Achilles will in fact be killed by the Paris to whom Hektor is currently heading. And of course, to linger a little in Book 6, the starting point for the meditation on Astyanax is the fate which the audience knows will befall him on the capture of Troy.

The later part of the book is especially, and more than merely typologically,[47] affected by intertextuality with what we know as the *Aithiopis* of Arktinos, focused in particular on Achilles' defeat of Memnon and his own death (Pestalozzi 7).[48] The observation of this relationship has been the major achievement of the neoanalytic school of criticism, as Janko (312-3) has recently recognised. There can be no doubt that the events of the two poems, the *Aithiopis* and the *Iliad*, mirror each other; the only question is the direction—which in the light of the non-canonical nature of the Homeric plot seems to me to flow from *Aithiopis* to *Iliad*. There is room for difference of view on this issue, but the view I suggest is that, although it can be argued that this similarity or that similarity makes better sense in the context of the *Aithiopis* than in that of the *Iliad*, it is more important to perceive that the aggregation of references forward to the sequence of events leading to Achilles' death gives us a fine, resonant *Iliad* and an allowable and consistent method on Homer's part: his poem looks forward just as it looks backward.

Achilles' death was an event before the *Iliad* and his death was doubtless regularly lamented by Thetis, as depicted in *Odyssey* 24 (from Arktinos?). It is not in itself hard to realise that the death of Patroklos, who had gone into battle masquerading as Achilles, knowingly foreshadows the death of Achilles himself. Other connections include: the role of Apollo in both (*cf.* 22.359); the role of Aias in the fight over the body (a theme which, as Else has observed, is here in Book 17 'fully expanded');[49] the reception of Achilles' mourning as a pointer to his death by the Thetis who must eventually mourn him (18.35), and who accidentally will mourn Patroklos (23.14); the deathlike posture of Achilles, lying μέγας μεγαλωστί ('huge, hugely',

---

[46] B.C. Fenik, *Iliad X and the Rhesus: the myth* [*Collection Latomus* 73] (Bruxelles 1964).

[47] Notopoulos 34 f.

[48] Pestalozzi was in effect the first to adumbrate the full picture of the influence of the *Aithiopis* on the *Iliad*, though the way was pointed by Kakridis 1949: 93-5 (1944 in Greek). This picture has subsequently been developed, notably by Schadewaldt (155-202, 'Einblick in die Erfindung der Ilias: Ilias und Memnonis'), Kullmann 1960 (from his Habilitationsschrift of 1957) and Schoeck. In my opinion, the most thoroughgoing and dependable of these texts is Kullmann's. For a full account of neoanalysm, see Clark.

[49] Else 39.

18.26, on which more below). All this, and maybe the funeral games too, point unmistakeably forward.

A particular part in all this is played by Nestor's son Antilochos. In the *Aithiopis* he is Achilles' closest friend, as (derivatively) at *Odyssey* 24.79—μετὰ Πάτροκλόν γε θανόντα ('after, that is, the death of Patroklos'), is patched in to maintain consistency with the *Iliad*.[50] But he is killed by the new arrival Memnon as he saves his father Nestor, trapped because Paris has shot down one of his horses. This *Nestor in Danger* scene appears in Pindar (*Pythian* 6.28, presumably on the basis of Arktinos) and is anticipated at *Iliad* 8.80-129, where this time Diomedes plays the part of Antilochos, much more than just a typical scene (X rescues Y in a chariot).[51] This time Diomedes rescues Nestor; next time Antilochos will—and it will cost his life. Diomedes and Nestor are very close in *Iliad* 8-9; and Nestor himself says that Diomedes could be his own youngest son (9.57). At the very least, this depiction of Diomedes as Antilochos enhances the warmth with which we, like Nestor, view his character. If we had the full text of the *Aithiopis* perhaps there would be more: is there something lurking behind the either cowardly or deaf figure of Odysseus running away as only Diomedes is left to save Nestor (8.92 ff.)? Does this, as Kullmann suggested, represent (and superimpose) an agonising moment as Antilochos appeals, is ignored and realises he must die for his father?[52]

Memnon is a hero with a divine mother like Achilles (Eos) and armour made by Hephaistos (Vergil, *Aeneid* 8.383-4). The major duel between them perhaps reached its climax through appeals of their respective mothers to Zeus, and Memnon's death was settled through the weighing of the sons' souls, the Ψυχοστασία (the title of Aeschylus' play on the subject)—which Homer presses into service (though he weighs dooms not souls) for rhetorical, amplificatory effect in that other climax, at *Iliad* 22.208-13.[53] Memnon is, however, at his mother's request granted immortality and to judge by art his body is taken off by Sleep and Death (transferred to Sarpedon in Patroklos' mock-Achillean *aristeia*, 16.666-83).[54] Slatkin has observed the relationship of this mother and child story to the Eos and, e.g., Tithonos story and to Sanskrit mythology of the cognate dawn-figure, *Uṣás*-.[55] If this Indo-Europeanising approach represents the origins of the tradition, then the fact that Dawn is Memnon's mother (and that Thetis is merely, as Slatkin observes, associated with events at dawn) would seem to indicate a direction of flow from the less innovative, Arktinos, to the more innovative, Homer. Achilles' revenge is complete but now he assaults the city of Troy itself, the fatal point at which Paris and Apollo kill him (like Homer's Patroklos, warned by Apollo and killed by a Paris-substitute, Euphorbos, and Apollo).[56]

---

[50] 24.77 and 24.79 look artificial.

[51] Connection of the scenes: Bethe 1914: 109-12, Pestalozzi 10, Schoeck 20-2. Accepted and, revealingly, muddled by Davies 4—it is hard to hold the scenes apart. Typical or meaningfully borrowed?—fair, if cautious, discussion in B.C. Fenik, *Typical battle scenes in the Iliad: studies in the narrative techniques of Homeric battle description*, [*Hermes* Einzelschrift xxi] (Wiesbaden 1968) 231-40. For a different view, that Arktinos is here developing Homer, see Erbse.

[52] Kullmann 1960: 32. The replay in the *Iliad* is taken rather lightly by Kullmann 1981: 25, who sees it as the Aithiopis minus the tragedy. In contrast, Erbse 394-7, though I disagree with his ultimate conclusion, shows that the episode has a proper function in the Homeric text.

[53] Pestalozzi 11 f., Schadewaldt 164, Schoeck 29 f.

[54] Schadewaldt 165 f.; M.E. Clark & W.D.E. Coulson, 'Memnon and Sarpedon', *Museum Helveticum* xxxv (1978) 65-73. There is the problem of why Death should remove someone granted immortality (Davies 57), but perhaps it is no more a problem than why a dead Sarpedon should be anointed with ambrosia, given immortal clothing and transported if permanently, and Homerically, dead (in implicit contrast not only to Memnon, but also to Achilles on Leuke).

[55] Slatkin (n. 30) 28-33. On *Uṣás*-, see also J. Puhvel, *Comparative Mythology* (Baltimore 1987) 60.

[56] 16.651-5. Clark-Coulson (n. 54) 66 f. Euphorbos as Paris-avatar, above n. 38.

Patroklos' death anticipates the death of Antilochos, as Hektor's triumph and defeat anticipate those of Memnon, already signalled in the death of Sarpedon. The consequence of the Memnon-story is the death of Achilles himself, itself also immanent in the death of Patroklos. The Wagnerian *Leitmotifs* of the story of Achilles' death have become very dense and overshadow this whole area of the text, from 16 to 23—perhaps he is already dead, even Lord of the Dead,[57] in 24, given the *katabasis*-quality of Priam's journey. Memnon, naturally, does not appear in the *Iliad*, but Antilochos does and some of his movements seem to prepare for the *Aithiopis*:[58] he is proposed out of thin air by Aias (wondering, perhaps meaningfully, if he is still alive, 18.653) to carry the news of Patroklos' death to Achilles (Bethe 1914: 100); and both in his protectiveness to Achilles when he makes the report (18.32-4) and in the Funeral Games (23.540 ff., 785 ff.), the growing cordiality between the two is apparent. Even Achilles' final and fatal attack on Troy is prefigured in his passing thought of trying out the Trojans (22.378-84; Schadewaldt 168-9).

The end of Troy, symbolised by the death of Hektor (Schoeck 117), is within sight at the end of the *Iliad*, visible in the pathetic Priam and Hekabe of 22 and 24. Perhaps too it was not Vergil's Priam that was the first to have in mind a contrast between Achilles and Neoptolemos in their treatment of Priam—they do after all talk of fathers and sons and death and it is no casual irony that it is the son of Achilles who will finish Priam, conversely entering *his* home and with converse behaviour. The ransoming of his dead son by Priam also reflects (and may be the model for) the failed attempt by Chryses to ransom his daughter at the outset of the poem—a scene which itself reflects an earlier one.[59] Having rejected the ransom, Agamemnon finds himself in dispute with Achilles over a woman that he has taken with some injustice from him. This could be a typical scene, but here it serves to recall the cause of the Trojan War, the dispute between Paris and Menelaos over Helen, with Agamemnon this time cast as Paris, belonging with other replays in Books 1-4 of the beginning of the war.[60] And moving one step back to Chryseis, it will be seen that Kalchas intervenes decisively to ensure that Agamemnon loses a daughter (not in this case his own) because of the wrath of Apollo (not this time Artemis), an allusion surely underlined by Agamemnon's complaint that Kalchas has never spoken a useful word for him—referring then to the sacrifice of Iphigeneia (see above).

Willcock, who went further than other English scholars in the 1970s to pay attention to this relationship between Homer and the *Aithiopis* material, observed 'interaction between parts of the poet's own repertoire' and 'thematic association, in the way that his "Muse" directed him' and reckoned that these facts 'show us something of the method of the oral poet'.[61] That, I think, was to stay too close to the oral-'inherent' pole. This was Homer's conscious use of other texts (inasmuch as artistic creation is a conscious process), a use which any student of Vergil would recognise, but for misplaced guilt at the illegitimacy of our sense of text.[62]

---

[57] A long shot, this, but see H. Hommel, 'Der Gott Achilleus', *SB Heidelberg* Abh. i (1980).

[58] M.M. Willcock, 'The final scenes of *Iliad* XVII', in: J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. de Jong & J. Kalff, *Homer: beyond oral poetry: recent trends in Homeric interpretation* (Amsterdam 1987) 191 ('as if to prepare for what will happen after the end of the *Iliad*'); Kullmann 316 ('bereiten offenbar bewusst den Aithiopisstoff vor').

[59] D. Lohmann, *Die Kompositio der Reden in der Ilias* (Berlin 1970) 169-73; Richardson 5 f., 17.

[60] Briseis and Helen functionally compared already by Bethe 1901: 667.

[61] M.M. Willcock, *A companion to the Iliad* (Chicago 1976) 287. Even Kullmann, in a concessive mood, allows the concept 'zumindest assoziativ von ihr beeinflusst', 1981: 20.

[62] Thus I think Page's sarcasm recoils on itself, when he derides the neoanalysts for treating Homer's use of his predecessors like Vergil's use of Homer and contrasts them with 'those of us who have long understood the process of growth of the traditional oral epic' (D.L. Page, 'Homer and the Neoanalytiker', *CR* xiii [1963] 21-4).

QUOTATION (OF OTHERS, OF SELF)

The question of fixed texts would be definitively solved if we could identify non-formular verbatim quotations. But even if Homer was able to allude to texts in this way, our loss of all earlier texts would seem to exclude knowledge of his having done so. All the same, there may be two dimly visible instances:

1. As Patroklos is mourned, we read μετὰ δέ σφι Θέτις γόου ἵμερον ὦρσε ('and amidst them Thetis aroused the desire for lament', *Iliad* 23.14), but as Kakridis pointed out, she has not arrived and is not there—these lines have been taken 'bodily from an epic description of Achilles' funeral'. It is hard to justify the lines and they give the impression of a poet on auto-pilot who has let the evoked text take over.

2. At *Iliad* 18.26 we see an Achilles, overcome by grief at the death of Patroklos, ἐν κονίῃσι μέγας μεγαλωστὶ τανυσθείς ('stretched out huge, hugely in the dust'). It takes no great imagination to see this as an iconic anticipation of his own death, but the words μέγας μεγαλωστὶ ('huge hugely') are unusually powerful and in fact recur to describe the fallen Achilles at *Odyssey* 24.39-40: ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίης | κεῖσο μέγας μεγαλωστὶ λελασμένος ἱπποσυνάων ('in the swirl of dust you lay huge, hugely, forgetful of your horsemanship').[63]

In addition, on the larger scale, the *Catalogue of Ships* and the *Catalogue of Women* in Odyssey 11 point towards pre-existing verbatim texts.[64]

Beyond quotation, there is the question of how far repetitions in the text of the *Iliad* are meant to remind us of their earlier occurrences.[65] A fairly negative answer to this question would be expected from an oralising perspective, but the text does seem to invite a different view, such as that of Heubeck that Homer's formulaic diction has developed (through writing, he thinks) into a poetic vehicle allowing reminiscence and foreshadowing (1974:149). Yet, on any view, oral poetry cannot be completely disposable ('hear it, forget it'). Indeed Taplin has argued that the rapt attention of oral audiences promotes cross-reference and his recent book depends on its validity, whilst retaining a non-written Homer. One example, if perhaps rather a debatable one, is at 5.278: here Pandaros speaks of the πικρὸς ὀϊστός ('bitter arrow') he has fired against Diomedes, reminding us (according to Else 34-5) of the equally 'bitter arrow' which he scandalously fired against Menelaos 700 lines earlier (4.118).[66] A stronger example, however, is the incident where Hektor admits that Troy will perish at 6.447-9, thereby confirming for the audience the judgment of Agamemnon, given earlier in the same three lines

[63] *Cf.* Schadewaldt 168; Kullmann 1960: 38 f. There is of course a problem here with whether 'forgetful of your horsemanship' is appropriate, something which it is in the one other use at *Iliad* 16.776 of Kebriones; but equally one may query whether 'huge hugely', a rare 'formula', is justly deployed on such a minor and expendable figure and it is this that is the issue, not the tagging on of the second half-line. On the other hand, Kebriones' death is sited somewhere near the Skaian Gate (16.712) in an area of text where Apollo is very active, and may confront Patroklos-Achilles with a vision of the death and fight for the body (16.765-80) awaiting Achilles in person.

[64] References: Kakridis 84, Gaisser (n. 33) 176. Catalogue of Ships: Kullmann 1960: 157-68, 1981: 23, 38 ('offenbar der Katalog zum grössten Teil wörtlich von anderswoher übernommen wurde').

[65] On verbatim repetitions scarcely attributable to formulaic composition, see Young 311 f.

[66] πικρὸς ὀϊστός, or the accusative, are very Iliadic. The phrase occurs 10 times and the word πικρός occurs only another three times with different substantives. (In the *Odyssey* it occurs only seven times, once of an ὀϊστός; in Apollonius only four times, of which only one occurrence is associated with ὀϊστῶν ; in Quintus only once, of πόλεμον.) The first six references in the *Iliad* are at 4.19, 134, 217, 5.99, 110, 278. The first three references are to the wounding of Menelaos; the second three to the wounding of Diomedes. The two scenes are linked in our minds, but perhaps more by the rarity of arrows than by the word πικρός.

(at 4.163-5), that the fall of Troy will be the reward for Pandaros' Trojan treachery (Else 36).[67] Indeed, Agamemnon's comfort of Menelaos in the sure knowledge of punishment of Trojan treachery mirrors the basis of the whole expedition in the first place, (cf. Else 35-6).

CONCLUSION

Throughout this article I have taken the Neoanalytic view that where Homer's material reflects Cyclic material, except in obvious deviant inventions, notably of Eugammon, Homer knows that material and constructs his text with reference to it. But if one were not prepared to accept this direction of flow and were to suppose instead that Cyclic material, such as the story of Antilochos, was based on Homer, it is not clear that the reading of Homer which I propose would necessarily fall. Doubtless if we were in the original audience of Homer, at the longest festival in history, events surrounding Antilochos would have no significance but the obvious. But if we had been in the audience of a post-Homeric Arktinos, or even if in modern times we think about Arktinos' material (perhaps after reading Kullmann), it is inevitable that Homer's Antilochos, for example, has found a place in a larger intertext and gained in depth and resonance thereby. One achievement, then, of the Cyclic poets would be to have created a greater Homer in which the death of Patroklos and the closing development of Antilochos' character is given a larger, doom-laden forward reference. This would be a marvellous and paradoxical result, but it is not the most economical solution. The economical solution remains that Homer is responsible for the greatness of his own work precisely because he had harnessed the power of reference to other texts.

I have raised the question whether oral poetry ever, or Homer's tradition in particular (if he must be treated as an 'oral poet' within some meaning of that term), excludes the evocation of specific scenes in other 'poems'. There is clearly a model which excludes specific evocations—in Foley's terminology in such a case the poem would operate through the 'inherent' meanings of oral-traditional poetry rather than meanings 'conferred' on it by the literary artist.[68] It is, however, questionable whether this extreme oral poetry has actually existed. It would seem psychologically unlikely that *specific* associations can be prevented and that the use of literary techniques can ever be fully excluded, any more than that, on the other hand, life and art can wholly cease to be formulaic. There is no need, then, to adopt the consistent but pernicious view of Jensen (30) that excludes the search for what is new and special in Homer, a view which is, after all, as unacceptable to Lord as to Kakridis' vision of Homer 'who stands alone in his greatness'.[69] But equally this does not have to lead us to the other extreme, where

> "oral" is only an empty label and "traditional" is devoid of sense. Together they form merely a façade behind which scholarship can continue to apply the poetics of written literature.
>
> Lord 1967: 46

It would, however, be less worrying to abandon oral criticism of Homer than to adopt it exclusively. If we did adopt an all-oral Homer, we have too little left of alleged Greek oral poetry to have any feel for the effects which Homer creates and to estimate his merit. The texts would be simply inaccessible, because they depend for their inherent meaning on a tradition

---

[67] A different link between these scenes is found by Taplin 107, unaware, I think, of Else's argument.

[68] Foley 8.

[69] J.T. Kakridis, *Homer revisited* (Lund 1971) 23.

which is lost.[70] The meaning of Homer depends on what we are able to perceive.

So my conclusion is that Homer, his contemporaries and his immediate predecessors—recognised experts in something more than a trade—were knowingly producing fairly fixed products. In the rhapsodies constituting his *Iliad* Homer makes conspicuous use either of Arktinos' *Aithiopis* itself or of a predecessor with practically the same contents. The density of reference to that particular poem's *Faktenkanon* seems to guarantee that the connection is of special importance. So far from this demeaning Homer or rendering him in some way derivative, defective and ill-motivated (one cause of resistance to the neoanalytic method which looked as though it was picking holes in Homer), in fact it shows Homer's understanding of the power of textual interaction; it enriches and deepens the *Iliad*, showing something of what makes it so very special. From the *Iliad*—the framework, if I am right, that encompasses so many of his (episodic) performances—Homer looks out to the world of heroic poetry, and in particular to its sense of tragedy, and somehow calls upon us to evaluate the worth of heroic life and our own. Homer's use of such material and his wonderful control over ambience, evocation and undertone make that coherent sense of this work and of its author which a critical vocabulary reduced to identifying exceptional formulae and deviations from typical scenes never could.

KEN DOWDEN

University of Birmingham

---

[70] Foley 247 addresses this problem by deriving 'extratextual meanings' from the text itself, but it is plain—*cf.* 247 n. 6—that, even if effective, this method can only lead to a poor-quality understanding of the text. The real problem is the legitimation, and disqualification, of critical language: Foley's excellent chapter on *Iliad* 24 acquires legitimacy through conforming to his oral-'inherent' discourse, but it does not say anything which is specially surprising or categorically different, i.e. which reveals an unperceived Homer.