

## LINGUISTIC AND FORMULAR INNOVATION IN THE MYTHOLOGICAL DIGRESSIONS IN THE *ILIAD*

WAYNE B. INGALLS

MILMAN PARRY'S STUDIES of Homer's style placed a heavy emphasis on the strength of the tradition, and appeared to minimize the poet's originality and creativity, to the distress of many scholars.<sup>1</sup> Although our understanding of the making of Homeric verse has developed since Parry's day, the issue of originality continues to be the focus of considerable interest.<sup>2</sup>

In a paper entitled "Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*," Malcolm Willcock examined innovation in several mythical paradeigms, that is, myths introduced for consolation or exhortation. He discovered evidence which suggests that Homer invented details, even central details, of these mythical paradeigms. Achilles, for example, in Book 24, encourages Priam to eat despite his sorrows by telling him the story of Niobe, who lost her twelve children but remembered to eat. Willcock suggests that the detail of Niobe's eating is an invention of the poet since it never occurs in any retelling of the myth except for Lucian when quoting Homer himself and is as apposite to its function in *Iliad* 24 as it is irrelevant to and inharmonious with the kernel of the Niobe story—"the mother . . . petrified by grief."<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Parry could well be accused of overstating the case, as the following quotation suggests: "Traces of originality remain, perhaps; but of an originality that does no more than rearrange the words and expressions of the tradition without important modifications. The poet's greatest originality in the handling of epithets would have been to use some noun-epithet formulae a little more or a little less frequently than other poets," *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère* (Paris 1928) 103-104, translated and reprinted by A. Parry in *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford 1971) 82-83. Typical of the reaction to Parry's views are the words of H. T. Wade-Gery: "The most important assault made on Homer's creativeness in recent years is the work of Milman Parry, who may be called the Darwin of Homeric studies. As Darwin seemed to have removed the finger of God from the creation of the world and of man, so Milman Parry has seemed to come to remove the creative poet from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*." *The Poet of the Iliad* (Cambridge 1952) 38-39. Much ink has been spilt on the topic over the last thirty years. See James P. Holoka, "Homeric Originality: A Survey," *CW* 66 (1972-73) 257-293 for a useful bibliography.

<sup>2</sup>Consider only three recent titles. M. Nagler, *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer* (Berkeley 1975), B. Fenik, *Homer: Tradition and Invention* (Leiden 1978), and J. Latacz, *Homer: Tradition und Neuerung* (Darmstadt 1979).

<sup>3</sup>CQ n.s. 14 (1964) 141-154 (the quotation is from 141). Willcock's work was based upon earlier studies including R. Öhler, *Mythologische Exempla in der älteren griechischen Dichtung* (Diss. Basel 1925), J. T. Kakrides, "Die Niobesage bei Homer," *RhM* 70 (1930) 113-122 and *Homeric Researches* (Lund 1948), D. Mulder, *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen*

Willcock's argument is based primarily on the narrative structure, since in his view the details of the myth are invented to further the narrative purpose. But there are two other types of evidence which lend support to Willcock's thesis, and the first of these is linguistic. The eight paradeigms which Willcock studied are full of relatively late linguistic features.

The most recent and comprehensive treatment of linguistic lateness in Homer is G. P. Shipp's *Studies in the Language of Homer*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge 1972) (hereafter cited as Shipp). In his first edition (Cambridge 1953, reprinted Amsterdam 1966), Shipp listed those forms designated recent by Paul Chantraine in the first volume (*Phonétique et morphologie*) of his *Grammaire homérique* (Paris 1942; 1953<sup>3</sup>) and examined their location in the *Iliad*. He discovered that many of the late features are found in the developed similes, while most of the remainder occur in digressions, descriptions, comments, and other passages which fall outside the narrative. In his second edition, Shipp extended his investigations to the *Odyssey* and added material from Chantraine's second volume, *Syntaxe* (Paris 1953), as well as other authorities. This additional material confirmed his earlier findings and showed that they apply equally to the *Odyssey*.<sup>4</sup>

---

(Berlin 1910), F. Wehrli, *RE Suppl* 5 (1931) 575 s.v. *Leto*, P. Von der Mühll, *Kritisches Hypomnema zur Ilias* (Basel 1952), C. Robert, *Die griechische Heldensage* (Berlin 1920), E. Howald, "Meleager und Achill," *RhM* 74 (1925) 1-12, E. Sachs, "Die Meleagererzählung in der Ilias," *Philologus* 98 (1933) 16-29, W. Schadewaldt, *Iliasstudien*<sup>3</sup> (Leipzig 1959), M. Noé, *Phoenix, Ilias und Homer* (Leipzig 1940), and W. Kraus, "Meleagros in der Ilias," *WS* 63 (1948) 8-21.

<sup>4</sup>In the first edition of his *Studies*, Shipp refrained from drawing explicit conclusions about the authenticity of similes, but he does speak of "the poets of the similes" (29), and his other comments reveal that he often regards "late" or "recent" to mean post-Homeric. On the isolated transitive use of the present in -σκ- in ἐπιβασκέμεν in *Iliad* 2.234, for example, he comments, "Zenodotus' athetesis of 231-4 is supported by the subjunctives 232 μίσγειαι, 233 κατίσχειαι also" (38). D. J. N. Lee, *The Similes of the Iliad and Odyssey Compared* (Melbourne 1964) was less circumspect; on the basis of Shipp's findings, Lee argues that many similes are interpolations, a view supported by Shipp in his second edition, 208-222. Such a view could not, of course, go unchallenged. C. J. Ruijgh, *L'élément achéen dans le langage épique* (Assen 1957) 22-25 and F. W. Householder and G. Nagy, "Greek," in T. Sebeok, ed., *Current Trends in Linguistics* 9 (The Hague 1972) 741-743, both argue that because late features are distributed throughout the corpus, the similes, even though they contain the majority of neologisms, cannot be an intrusive element. P. Chantraine, *RPh* 29 (1955) 73, objects that the similes cannot easily be excised from the text. G. S. Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* (Cambridge 1962) 201-203, maintains that the similes, late features and all, belong to the final monumental stage of composition, i.e., to Homer himself. This view accords best with both the linguistic evidence and the argument of artistic unity. See further William C. Scott, *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile* (Leiden 1974), Carroll Moulton, *Similes in the Homeric Poems* (Göttingen 1977), and my "Formular Density in the Similes of the *Iliad*," *TAPA* 109 (1979) 92-93.

An examination of the eight mythical paradeigms studied by Willcock with reference to Shipp's discussion reveals that they display an unusually high number of late forms. The 187 verses they fill contain 67 recent linguistic features. This total may be compared with the first 187 verses of *Iliad* 16, which contain 17 late forms.<sup>5</sup> An appendix lists these features with an explanation of why they are regarded as late and a reference to Shipp's discussion.<sup>6</sup>

That Nestor's reminiscences or the *exemplum* of Meleager are replete with late features will come as no surprise to anyone familiar with the history of Homeric scholarship. Most of these passages have been condemned as interpolations from antiquity for both linguistic and structural reasons. While the narrative structure suggests that the poet has invented details in the myths, the linguistic evidence indicates that the poet used less traditional language in his innovations.

The mention of less traditional language leads to the second type of evidence to support Willcock's thesis, the evidence of the formulas. If the poet used recent linguistic forms in his mythological inventions, how did he incorporate the late forms into the traditional formulaic patterns?<sup>7</sup> In other words, has the use of the recent forms required changes in the formulas in these passages?

In the first paradigm, Nestor's memories of helping the Lapiths (1.260–273), some indication of formulaic modification can be found. There is a cluster of unusual linguistic features precisely where the old warrior makes his point.

καὶ μαχόμεν κατ' ἔμ' αὐτὸν ἐγὼ κείνοισι δ' ἂν οὐ τις  
τῶν οἱ νῦν βροτοὶ εἰσιν ἐπιχθόνιοι μαχέοιτο  
καὶ μὲν μὲν βουλέων ξύνειεν πείθοντό τε μῦθω (271–273).

The phrase καὶ μαχόμεν οἱ ἐγὼ is found in 7.154. In 271, it appears that this combination has been separated and expanded by inserting the unusual and possibly contemporary expression κατ' ἔμ' αὐτόν.<sup>8</sup> In the next verse

<sup>5</sup>G. S. Kirk, "Studies in Some Technical Aspects of Homeric Style," *YCS* 20 (1966) 117–118 gives reasons why *Iliad* 16 is a good example of typical Homeric narrative.

<sup>6</sup>The brief descriptions of Shipp's reasons for designating the words in the appendix as "late" ought not to be taken as an indication that I simply accept all of his views. Householder and Nagy (above, note 4), 783–784, suggest, for example, that φορῆναι in 7.149 is a vestige of the Mycenaean (Arcado-Cyprian) phase of epic transmission. Obviously a thorough discussion of all of the 67 features in Willcock's paradeigms, however desirable, is beyond the scope of the present paper.

<sup>7</sup>A. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes: Studies in the development of Greek epic diction* (Verh. Amsterdam Letterkunde n.s. 71.1 [1965]) sought for and found evidence of modifications in formulas made possible by the introduction of recent linguistic features into the epic *Kunstsprache*.

<sup>8</sup>J. B. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford 1968), demonstrated that the modification of formulas was a normal process in Homeric composition. He examined formulaic mobility and the expansion, separation, and modification of formulas

(272), the formula *οἶοι νῦν βροτοί εἰς*’, which normally fills the verse to the masculine caesura in the third foot, has been extended to the feminine caesura in the same foot.<sup>9</sup> It is then followed by a regularly recurring structure *ἐπιχθόνιος/ν* + noun or verb into which is incorporated the unusual form *μαχέοιτο*.<sup>10</sup> Finally, it is possible to posit a prototype *\*καὶ μέν βουλᾶων* which has been modified after quantitative metathesis to *καὶ μέν μεν βουλέων*.<sup>11</sup>

In Agamemnon’s speech of exhortation to Diomedes (4.370–400), the late features are spread more evenly throughout the passage and there is less evidence of formulaic modification to incorporate them. Yet the use of the short stem declension of *Τυδεύς* in verse 372 appears to adapt existing formulaic patterns. Compare

<i>ἦ μὲν</i>	} <i>Τυδείδην/ς</i>	<i>δουρικλυτόν</i>	10.109
<i>τοὺς μὲν</i>		<i>δουρικλειτός</i>	11.333
<i>τὸν μὲν</i>		<i>δουρικλυτός</i>	23.681

with

*οὐ μὲν Τύδει γ’ ᾧδε* in 4.372.

Occasionally, indeed, metrical irregularities arise from the incorporation of recent linguistic features into the formulaic texture of the verse. The Consolation of Dione (5.382–404) provides good examples of this phenomenon. In 387, for example,

*χαλκῆψ δ’ ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας*

by resorting to synizesis, the poet is able to use the dative of *χάλλεον* in the initial position where the word normally falls in the formulaic verse

*χάλλεον. αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα σάκος μέγα τε στιβαρόν τε.*

Thus, the synizesis in the first foot may reflect the poet’s difficulty dealing with *χάλλεον*.

by declension, conjugation, etc. For the purpose of the present study, separation or expansion are only significant insofar as they allow the poet to employ recent linguistic features.

<sup>9</sup>This expression occurs four more times in the *Iliad*; three times in a repeated verse (5.304 = 12.449 = 20.287) and once separately (12.383). The longer form appears once in the *Odyssey* (8.222 ὄσσοι). While it may seem unlikely that the elided form is older or more traditional than the unelided form, the evidence seems to reveal a formula modified to allow the use of a late form.

<sup>10</sup>The citation of analogical formulas can be perilous. See further “The Analogical Formula in Homer,” *TAPA* 106 (1976) 211–226.

<sup>11</sup>Compare Hoekstra (above, n. 7) 34–35, 56–58. Not everyone agrees that *βουλέων* resulted from quantitative metathesis. K. Meister, *Die Homerische Kunstsprache* (Leipzig 1921, repr. Stuttgart 1966) 159, and F. Bechtel, *Die Vocalcontraction bei Homer* (Halle 1908) 113–115, both include *βουλέων* in a list of forms resulting from quantitative metathesis. So also P. Chantraine, *Grammaire* 69. Shipp<sup>2</sup>, however, regards the form as a contraction (174). In either case, it must be recent.

Shipp regards the form 'Ερμέα as a dactyl in 390 as a late feature (23). Again, it would appear that the poet employed 'Ερμῆς in the traditional position for the trisyllabic 'Ερμείας. Needing a dative, he produced the hiatus 'Ερμέα ἐξήγγειλεν . . .

In connection with the same passage Shipp remarks upon formulaic irregularities as evidence of late composition (248). He notes that the expression νῖος Διὸς αἰγινόχοιο in 5.396 is an untraditional combination, a mixture of Διὸς νῖος (7x *Iliad*; once *Odyssey*) and Διὸς αἰγινόχοιο (11x *Iliad*; 9x *Odyssey*). More might be said. The expression follows the pattern of κούρη/αι Διὸς αἰγινόχοιο (5x *Iliad*; 9x *Odyssey*) and is paralleled by θύγατερ Διὸς αἰγινόχοιο in 5.815. A clue to the poet's reason for creating this unusual expression may be found in the first half of the verse, εὐτέ μιν ωὔτος ἀνὴρ, where a unique crasis occurs, but following a clear formulaic precedent:

τοῖσι ἕκαστος	} ἀνὴρ	2.805
ἧ ῥ' οὐχ οὗτος		15.471
ὡς ἔπεισ' ἐσθλὸς		16.600
ὄφρα μὲν οὗτος		18.257

Having solved one metrical problem by using the unusual form ωὔτος in the first half of the verse, the poet had to create a new combination to fill out the verse with the meaning he intended.

Others have already noted evidence of formulaic modification in the Meleager episode. A. Hoekstra, for example, suggests that the recurrent πολλέων ἐκ πολίων may be derived from an earlier prototype \*πολλάων πολίων and that ἐξ ἀρέων μητρὸς κεχολωμένος of 9.566 may reflect an ancient \*ἀράων μητρὸς κεχολωμένος comparing ἐπέων κεχολωμένος in 11.703.<sup>12</sup> The expression 'Ιδεώ θ', ὅς in 9.588, moreover, although unique, according to Hoekstra shows "a syntactic type of enjambement which is likely to be traditional."<sup>13</sup>

Shipp observes that a striking feature of the Meleager story is a "tendency to vary formulaic combinations," and he adduces four examples (271): in 9.536 Διὸς κούρη μέγαλοιο which normally refers to Athena is applied to Artemis;<sup>14</sup> in 538 δῖον γένος ἰοχέαιρα occurs for Ἄρτεμις ἰοχέαιρα; in 560 Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων, which regularly fills the verse after the bucolic diaeresis, has been put in the genitive and moved to the beginning of the verse, a practice followed elsewhere only in the *Odyssey* and *Hymns*; in 564 ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων (10x *Iliad*) is expanded to ἐκάεργος ἀνὴρπασε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων.

The two final paradigms offer relatively little evidence of formulaic modification. In 18.399, the verse ending ἀψορρόου Ὠκεανοῖο which em-

<sup>12</sup>Hoekstra (above, n. 7) 36.

<sup>13</sup>Hoekstra 32-34.

<sup>14</sup>Cf. D. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley 1963) 328.

plays the extended form of ἀψόρρος seems a formula in its own right.<sup>15</sup> The form χρεώ on the other hand, although clearly formular in use—

ἦ τι	} μάλα χρεώ	9.197
τὸν δέ		11.409
τῷ με		18.406
οὗ τι		23.308

exists beside a parallel formula using χρή, νῦν σε μάλα χρή (*Iliad* 3x). Hoekstra suggests that a tendency developed to use χρεώ instead of χρή once χρή began to be felt as a verbal form, out of place without an infinitive following.<sup>16</sup> But whatever the explanation, the formula in question is evidently a late development.

What can we conclude from this discussion? In the eight mythical paradeigms in which Willcock found structural evidence that the poet invented details to suit his narrative purpose, we have found linguistic and formular evidence to support Willcock's thesis. First, the passages contain an inordinately large number of late linguistic features and, secondly, there is much evidence of the formular modification necessary to incorporate the new language into the traditional verse. The work of Willcock and others makes it clear that Homer was not a complete slave to his tradition.<sup>17</sup> I hope I have shown that, when innovating, he used newer language which he incorporated into the traditional patterns of utterance, the formulas.

#### MOUNT SAINT VINCENT UNIVERSITY, HALIFAX

<sup>15</sup>It recurs once in *Odyssey* 20.65. Compare βαθυρρού 'Ωκεανοῖο (*Iliad* 7.422 and 14.311; *Odyssey* 11.13 and 19.434), a likely formular variant.

<sup>16</sup>Hoekstra (above, n. 7, 37) also notes that it occurs at the verse end with synizesis and is therefore recent.

<sup>17</sup>See also J. H. Gaisser, "Adaptation of Traditional Material in the Glaucus-Diomedes Episode," *TAPA* 100 (1969) 165–176, B. K. Braswell, "Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*," *CQ* n.s. 21 (1971) 16–26, and M. M. Willcock, "*Ad Hoc* Invention in the *Iliad*," *HSCP* 81 (1977) 41–53.

#### APPENDIX

##### LATE FORMS IN THE PARADEIGMS STUDIED BY WILLCOCK

*Nestor's Reminiscences of Assisting the Lapiths* 1. 260–273

Καινέα	264	short stem declension of	
Θησέα	265	proper nouns in -εὺς	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 65
κατ' ἐμ' αὐτόν	271	κατά + acc. in specialized sense of "by myself"	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 133
μαχείοιτο	272	secondary to μαχήσσομαι	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 95–96
βουλέων	273	contraction of a genitive plural in -αων	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 174

*Binding of Zeus* 1. 396–406

Βριάρεων	403	Atticism	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 55
----------	-----	----------	-----------------------

*Exemplum of Tydeus* 4. 370–400

Τυδέϊ	372	short stem declension of proper names in –eus	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 65
ἐστρατόωνθ'	378	new formations in –άω	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 97
παράλεια	381	involving παρά "beyond," "against"	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 133–134
πρὸ ὁδοῦ	382	only here in Homer; elsewhere only in Attic	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 243
ἀγγελίην	384	noun based on adjectival form	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 129
Τυδῆ	384	short stem declension of proper names in –eus	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 65
Καδμείωνας	385	artificial extension of Καδμείοι at verse-end	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 243, 250
ξείνος	387	unusual hostile suggestion	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 243–244
Καδμείοισιν	388	Aeolic extension of –είος	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 250
ἀεθλεύειν	389	metrical variant for ἀέθλω	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 101–102
Καδμείοι	391	molossus ending in fourth foot	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 204
ἀναερχομένῳ	392	hiatus (reading mss, not Bentley ἀψ ἀναερχομένῳ)	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 244
τὸν υἱόν	399	"his son" as in later Greek"	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 244
ἀμείνω	400	contraction of comparative in –yos–	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 75
Ἄρειον	407	Attic form of Ἀρήϊον	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 244

*The Consolation of Dione* 5. 382–404

χαλκέω	387	with synizesis	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 189 with reference to Shipp <sup>1</sup> 135
Ἑρμέα	390	with synizesis and hiatus	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 17, 23
Ἦρη ὅτε	392	hiatus	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 248
ωὗτός	396	crasis only here	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 248
υἱὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο	396	untraditional combination	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 248

*Nestor's Killing of Ereuthalion* 7. 124–160

ἀκούσαι	129	with accusative and participle	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 144
θυμὸν	131	for ψυχὴν (cf. M. Leumann, <i>Homerische Wörter</i> [Basel 1950] 221)	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 259
ἡβῶμ'	133	contraction	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 159
κορυνήτην	138	"built on noun"	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 258
σιδηρεῖη κορύνη	141	iron weapon (cf. H. Lorimer, <i>Homer and the Monuments</i> [London 1950] 119)	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 259
φορῆναι	149	hybrid with Aeolic stem and Ionic ending	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 83–84
οὐδέ τις ἔτλη	151	"normally with an infinitive"	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 259
παρήορος	156	secondary sense (cf. Leumann. <i>ibid.</i> 228)	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 259
πολλὸς τις	156	"as often in Herodotos" (cf. Ameis-Hentze <i>Anhang</i> 47)	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 259

*The exemplum of Meleager* 9. 524–605

μέμνημαι	527	with accusative and dependent clause cf. LSJ	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 270
κουρήτες	529	"escaped Aeolic barytonesis of κούρητες"	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 270
θαλύσια	534	Doric festival name	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 244, 270
χλούνην	539	"isolated"	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 270
ἔθων	540	n-stem refashioned as –nt– stem	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 195
αὐτῆσιν ῥίξῃσι	542	idiomatic use of αὐτός	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 278
πολλέων	544	contraction	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 175

<i>θηρήτορας</i>	544	Doric?	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 270
<i>κακῶς ἦν + dative</i>	551	paralleled only in simile 324	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 270
<i>οἰδάνει</i>	544	secondary to Attic-Ionic <i>οἰδέω</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 86
<i>Εὐηνίνης</i>	557	Doric or Aetolian	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 270
<i>*Ἴδεω</i>	558	contraction of gentive in <i>-ᾶο</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 171–172
<i>τῶν τότε</i>	559	article combined with adverb	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 136–137
<i>ἐπώνυμον</i>	562	recurs only in <i>Odyssey</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 270
<i>ἀρέων</i>	566	contraction of genitive plural in <i>-ᾶων</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 147
<i>ἡεροφοῖτις</i>	571	secondary meaning of <i>ἀήρ</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 273, 271
<i>ἐξ Ἑρέβεςφιν</i>	572	<i>-φι</i> with preposition as genitive	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 70
<i>πρότατον</i>	577	later superlative in <i>-τατος</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 76
<i>ψίλην</i>	580	recurs only in <i>Odyssey</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 270
<i>ἄροσιν</i>	580	recurs only in <i>Odyssey</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 270
<i>τῶν</i>	592	defining relative	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 138
<i>ἀμαθύνει</i>	593	present in <i>-ύνω</i> not from <i>-υ-</i> adjective	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 94
<i>ἐτέλεσσαν</i>	598	with meaning “pay”	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 199
<i>ἐνταῦθα</i>	601	Attic spelling	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 13
<i>ἐπί</i>	602	with dative for purpose or genitive (so OCT)	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 133
<i>τιμῆς</i>	605	for <i>τιμῆεις</i> contraction after loss of digamma	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 19–20
<i>Hurling of Hephaestus from Olympus</i> 18. 394–405			
<i>Εὐρυνόμη</i>	399	epanalepsis	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 298
<i>ἄψορρος</i>	399	extension of <i>ἄψορρος</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 298
<i>χρεῶ</i>	406	reduced form of <i>χρειώ</i> to act as <i>χρή</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 31
<i>Niobe</i> 24. 602–617			
<i>ἡβώντες</i>	604	irregular metrical lengthening of denominative in <i>-α</i>	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 159
<i>Λητοῖ</i>	607	contraction	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 188
<i>ἰσάσκετο</i>	607	freely created iterative	Shipp <sup>2</sup> 89