THE CONTINUATION OF THE *ODYSSEY*:
SOME FORMULAIC EVIDENCE

N. POSTLETHWAITE

IN A recent paper I suggested some criteria for identifying signs of oral composition in such shorter pieces of Greek hexameter poetry as the *Homeric Hymns*.[1] The basic premise in that paper was that the true sign of orality lay not in the repetition of "Homeric" formulae in a particular hexameter composition, but rather in the use of certain types of formular modification in accordance with set phrase and verse patterns.[2] I further suggested that in the frequency of these modifications it might well be possible to recognize individual features of style in oral composition. The material which I examined was the common noun + epithet word groups in the four long *Homeric Hymns* to Demeter, Apollo, Hermes, and Aphrodite, and one passage each of comparable length from the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.[3] The aim of this paper is to apply the same methods of formulaic analysis to the so-called "continuation" of the *Odyssey*, that is, 23. 297–24. end. Working from the premise of modification as a feature of oral style, I shall argue that the evidence from this section of the *Odyssey* demonstrates, within the limitations set by the choice of material, quite radical stylistic differences between this section and those of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* which were used as a control in the earlier paper.

My view of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* has long been that of the oralist unitarian: that is, that one or at most two singers produced the two epics substantially as we have them. Thus it was never my aim in undertaking this investigation to adopt a separatist standpoint; I wished merely to put forward some additional evidence which might help those who were undecided about the place of this episode in the *Odyssey* to make their choice. The argument about the episode is sufficiently well documented to render any review here of its history plethoric;[4] suffice to say that, after all the discussion, it is probably viewed with greater suspicion by more people than any other passage in the two epics.

My methods of analysis were set out fully in the paper cited above, and I limit myself here to a brief summary. The main difference from the usual method is that instead of treating all the diction of a very limited portion of a poem—sometimes no more than 25 lines—I examine just one element

---

1. "Formula and Formulaic: Some Evidence from the *Homeric Hymns*," *Phoenix* 33 (1979): 1–18.
2. By "phrase pattern" I denote a metrical pattern which governs the lexical reorganization of a word group, while a "verse pattern" regulates the localization of word groups within the hexameter.
3. *Il.* 1. 176–611 and *Od.* 2. 1–434.
4. See D. Wender's recent monograph, *The Last Scenes of the "Odyssey"* (Leyden, 1978), for bibliography and discussion.

of the diction of the whole of that poem. The advantage of this method is that the full thematic breadth is covered, and the very real danger is avoided of dealing with a stereotyped passage in which a high formulaic content is very likely to be found. The obvious disadvantage is the danger of abstracting to the whole of the diction characteristics which are found only in that one element under consideration. In this analysis I shall be dealing with the common noun + epithet word groups (CN–E) in the continuation and, for comparative purposes, I shall use the data which emerged from my analysis of the four long *Homeric Hymns* and the two samples of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. The material will be presented under the same four headings as in my earlier paper, namely, the quantity of formulaic diction among the CN–E, the mobility of CN–E, the separation of CN–E, the expansion of CN–E.[5] The first section constitutes an attempt to establish the oral nature of the continuation, the other three an attempt to identify within it those features of oral style mentioned above.

THE QUANTITY OF FORMULAIC DICTION AMONG THE CN–E

It is probably true to say that in most oral studies undue importance has been attached to the identification of formulae, to the exclusion of other equally valid tests, for example, the incidence of enjambment. The formula-test retains its importance nonetheless, as does the statistical criterion proposed by A. B. Lord that up to 60 percent formula or formulaic with up to 25 percent straight formula clearly marks a literary work, and that upward of those figures indicates an oral composition.[6] A formula is to be defined as a repeated word group, while a formulaic CN–E is one which is not repeated but which may have been created by analogy to a known formula of the same metrical shape. The picture of the formular texture of the CN–E which emerged from my previous investigation was very clear: in the sample of the *Iliad* 59 of the total 73 CN–E with elements juxtaposed were demonstrably formulae, in the sample of the *Odyssey* 77 of the total 94; in percentages these figures are respectively 80.8 percent and 81.9 percent. The close resemblance of these two figures suggests that, in the case of CN–E diction, a figure of around 80 percent straight formula is the norm in Homer. The traditional nature of this element of the diction is thus clearly established and, according to Lord's criterion, orality is proved. The equivalent figures for the *Hymns* are *Demeter* 60.4 percent, *Apollo* 71.2 percent, *Hermes* 53.4 percent, and *Aphrodite* 64.4 percent; although by Lord's criterion orality is again established, the figures for the *Hymns* are consistently and markedly lower than those for Homer. I attempted to explain this difference, and also the considerable differences among the *Hymns* themselves, by what I termed the "personal tradition," that is, that each composer had his own personal store of favored formulae which he used habitually when the occasion arose: what was a formula for the

5. For a full description of these terms, see J. B. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford, 1968), and my earlier paper.
6. "Homer as Oral Poet," *HSCP* 72 (1968): 24.

composer of *Demeter*, for example, may not have been so for the composer of the *Iliad*, and vice versa. According to this explanation, the reason for the relative infrequency of formulae in the *Hymns* is simply their brevity: a formula is recognizable only by its repetition, and in the space of a poem of, say, five hundred lines there is very limited scope for repetition.

As I argued in my earlier paper, this kind of formula-test has a limited validity. The comparatively low incidence of "Homeric" formulae in the *Hymns* and the consequently high incidence of "original" CN-E certainly suggests, at least to me, that here we have a criterion for identifying individual style in composers. The corollary, however, is not necessarily true: a high incidence of "Homeric" formulae in a poem does not prove Homeric authorship, since this ignores the possibility of deliberate imitation; we are all able, with the aid of the concordances, to compose quite passable "Homeric" hexameters, or rather hexameters with a high content of Homeric formulae. According to my count, there are 155 Homeric formulae among the 189 CN-E with elements juxtaposed in the continuation. This gives a percentage figure of 82.0, which is right in line with the figures for the two samples of Homer, particularly that of the *Odyssey*, given above. By the limited criterion of formular density, the continuation has as much right to stand in the main body of the *Odyssey* as does 2. 1-434; however, I would stress that this test does nothing to disprove the contention that it was the creation of an (oral) imitator extremely well versed in Homeric diction.

Thus the evidence of the formula count does not suggest separate authorship, and one other negative point may be made: if for a moment the idea of the "personal tradition" may be accepted, then we may say that if the continuation was by a different hand we might well expect to find CN-E formulae which are unique to this part of the poem, that is, CN-E which are repeated here but nowhere else in the *Odyssey*. But in fact, apart from the well-known example of ψολόεντα κεραυνόν at 24. 539 which is repeated in the dative at 23. 330,[7] I can find only one other such formula, that is, περικαλλέ' ἄεθλα (24. 85 = 24. 91). Again the evidence may hardly be said to argue for separate authorship.

THE MOBILITY OF CN-E

In this section I turn to the first of three types of formula modification, or mutation, which I suggested earlier are a more reliable test of orality in shorter works than the straightforward formula count. In this section, as in the two following, I shall treat the continuation as a separate short poem and attempt to identify differences or similarities between this poem and the main body of the *Odyssey*, as represented by 2. 1-434, and the passage of the *Iliad* and the *Hymns*. I shall again be dealing with common noun + epithet word groups with their two elements juxtaposed. My method is to establish the "primary position" of each CN-E, that is, the position which it normally occupies in the Homeric corpus, and then to

---

7. See D. L. Page, *The Homeric "Odyssey"* (Oxford, 1955), p. 102.

isolate those CN–E which have moved away from their assumed primary position; in identifying the primary position the sole criterion will be frequency of occurrence. I shall also attempt to discover any modifications which may have forced the composer to move the formula, or indeed which may have been forced upon the composer by the very act of moving it. The aim is to discover the frequency of this type of mutation and I shall express this, not in percentages, but in terms of "scatter," that is, the number of lines per occurrence; in this way the difficulties presented by the differing lengths of the samples analyzed will be avoided.

The figures for occurrence of mobility given in my previous paper were as follows (in each case the first figure is the total number of occurrences and the figure in parentheses is the scatter): *Demeter* 14 (35.4), *Apollo* 29 (18.8), *Hermes* 28 (20.7), *Aphrodite* 27 (10.8), *Iliad* 13 (33.4), *Odyssey* 17 (25.5). There is no obvious pattern to account for the wide variations—to judge from the scatter figures—among the different works, no correlation between them and the age of the works. In the absence of any such pattern, I suggested as a fairly obvious explanation that this mutation constituted a feature of oral style and varied in degree of density according to the tastes of the individual composers. If this explanation is correct, then there is established a separatist criterion by which we may mark off a passage of the two epics as being by a different author, in the same way that the *Homeric Hymns* could be marked off from Homer.

In gathering the evidence from the continuation I have followed the same practice as in my earlier investigation and included only those examples in which the statistical evidence is unequivocal. Thus, for example, I have excluded μέγα τόξον (24. 172); in the Homeric corpus it appears twice in position fifth–sixth feet including the occurrence under consideration here, twice at second–third, and twice at fourth–fifth; in view of the evenness of distribution it is impossible to decide which is the primary position and which are examples of mobility, and it seems safer to exclude it, and any other such cases, from consideration.

I count 17 examples of mobile CN–E in the continuation, giving a scatter figure of 36.7; thus mobility is less common in the continuation than in any of the passages analyzed and considerably less common than in *Odyssey* 2. 1–434. All the examples from the continuation are given in table 1; of the two positions the first is the primary position of the expression, the second the position to which it has moved.

The majority of these examples are straightforward, and only four require a few words of explanation, in that they have undergone some form of modification during the process of mobility. In the case of ἀντιθέους θ' ἑτάρους at 24. 300 the composer has been forced to move the formula as a result of declining it: the primary expression is evidently ἀντιθέοις ἑτάροισιν reaching from the beginning of the fourth foot to the verse end; the loss of the final syllable after declension into the accusative rules out this position and the composer moves it to the space between the verse beginning and the caesura of the third foot. Λεύκ' ὀστέ' is a rather curious case; at first

sight it appears to be an example from a quite common series in which there is elision of the final syllable after movement: there is certainly a primary expression λεύκ' ὀστέα at position third foot caesura–diaeresis (*Odyssey* twice against *Odyssey* once at fourth foot caesura–fifth foot end) from which the expression may be seen to have moved, with elision, to fourth foot caesura–fifth foot first short. There is, however, a more likely looking primary expression in ὀστέα λευκά in the final two feet of the verse (*Iliad* twice against *Iliad* once at first–second). My own inclination is to accept this as the primary expression, with all examples of λεύκ' ὀστέ(α) as modifications, by inversion and elision, of it. The two remaining examples involving modification are simple cases of inversion: at 24. 518 the primary expression γλαυκώπιδι κούρῃ in position fourth foot caesura–verse end has been inverted and moved to second foot caesura–diaeresis; and at 24. 289 the primary παῖδ' ἐμὸν occupying the first dactyl of the verse has been inverted to fit neatly between the weak caesura of the third foot and the diaeresis.

Thus common noun + epithet word groups are relatively less mobile in the continuation, and of the 17 examples in total only 9 are paralleled elsewhere in the two epics, namely, ἀγλαὰ δῶρα, τάδε ἔργα, μέγα ἔργον, μέγαν ἱστὸν, νῆα θοὴν, ὅρκια πιστά, λεύκ' ὀστέ', φίλος υἱὸς, χρόα καλὸν. In explanation of these two facts I offer the tentative suggestion that we have here a stylistic difference resulting from separate authorship, but I would not deny that the evidence is far from conclusive. Of one thing, however, we may be certain: by the criteria applied to the main body of the *Odyssey* this section is also the product of oral composition.

TABLE 1

		Primary Position	New Position
	CN-E		
24. 260	οὗτος ἀνὴρ	2–3	1–2
24. 304	κλυτὰ δώματα	3–4	4–5
24. 314	ἀγλαὰ δῶρα	5–6	4–5
24. 240	κερτομίοις ἐπέεσσιν	1–3	2–4
24. 455	τάδε ἔργα	5–6	4–5
24. 458	μέγα ἔργον	2–3	1–2
24. 300	ἀντιθέους θ' ἑτάρους	4–6	1–3
24. 129	μέγαν ἱστὸν	5–6	2–3
24. 518	κούρῃ γλαυκώπιδι	4–6	2–4
23. 330	νῆα θοὴν	3–4	2–3
24. 483	ὅρκια πιστὰ	4–5	1–2
24. 72	λεύκ' ὀστέ'	3–4	4–5
24. 289	ἐμὸν παῖδ'	1	3–4
24. 56	οὗ παιδὸς	2–3	2–3[8]
24. 151	φίλος υἱὸς	5–6	2–3
23. 342	γλυκὺς ὕπνος	4–5	5–6
24. 44	χρόα καλὸν	2–3	5–6

8. Even after movement this formula remains in the second–third feet position. The primary position reaches from the middle of the second foot to the third foot caesura; at 24. 56 the CN-E is moved back to the beginning of the second foot.

THE SEPARATION OF CN–E

Again in this section I shall employ the methods described in my earlier paper. My aim is to discover the frequency of this type of CN–E mutation in the continuation and also to identify the phrase patterns involved, again with a view to comparison with the other samples analyzed. I do not limit myself to the separation of demonstrable formulae, but include all common noun + epithet groups which contain an intrusion of some kind. I reproduce below the table of figures from my previous paper, but with the addition of the comparable evidence from the continuation. In this table column (1) comprises ordinary separation by one or more words, (2) is separation by a preposition, (3) is separation by a connective, and (4) is separation over the verse end.

TABLE 2

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	Total	Scatter
Demeter.................	46	18	7	10	81	6.1
Apollo..................	33	17	12	13	75	7.3
Hermes.................	57	17	9	20	103	5.6
Aphrodite...............	24	13	13	11	61	4.8
Iliad 1. 176–611..........	18	6	2	8	34	12.8
Odyssey 2. 1–434..........	14	10	1	10	35	12.4
Continuation.............	46	20	13	23	102	6.1

The implications of this table become clearer when the various columns are themselves expressed in terms of scatter:

TABLE 3

	(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)
Demeter..........	10.8	27.5	70.7	49.5
Apollo...........	16.5	32.1	45.5	42.0
Hermes...........	10.2	34.1	64.4	29.0
Aphrodite.........	12.2	22.5	22.5	26.6
Iliad 1. 176–611...	24.1	72.3	217.0	54.2
Odyssey 2. 1–434..	31.0	43.4	434.0	43.4
Continuation......	13.6	31.2	48.0	27.1

The scatter figures for the two control passages of Homer are, at 12.8 and 12.4, sufficiently alike to suggest that a figure in the neighborhood of these represents the normal frequency of separation of CN–E in the two epics. The scatter figures for the Hymns are very far removed from this norm and cause me at least to entertain the possibility that relative frequency of separation constitutes a stylistic hallmark of the oral composer. An alternative possibility is that the greater incidence of CN–E separation— and of mobility too—in the Hymns represents less firm control of the diction on the part of their composers. Whichever explanation is accepted, one thing seems abundantly clear: the scatter figure for the continuation places it right in line with the Hymns, particularly Demeter, and quite apart

from the two samples of Homer; separation of CN–E is in fact twice as common in the continuation as in the other passage of the *Odyssey*. Furthermore, as may be seen from Table 3, in each of the different types of separation the consistency is maintained and the affinities of the continuation evidently lie with the *Hymns*. It is impossible to find a single category of separation where the mutation is as common, or anywhere near it, in either of the samples of Homer as in the continuation.

Now I am not of course about to suggest that *Demeter* and the continuation were the products of one and the same composer; nor do I even believe that these figures can be taken as a criterion of age, whereby we might be able to locate the continuation at a later date. However, I would state with some confidence that, judging from these figures, either the continuation was the product of a different singer from the rest of the *Odyssey* or else it was the product of the same singer but in a very different—much more elaborate—style. The differences in the scatter column in the table above are sufficiently dramatic for me at least to be forced to adopt a separatist stance toward the continuation.

Thus far the argument has been based exclusively upon the frequency of occurrence of separation, since I am employing this as a criterion of oral style. I believe, however, that in the case of shorter works the true proof of orality lies in the phrase and verse patterns which facilitated this type of mutation, since herein lies the least imitable element of Homeric, that is, oral, diction. The patterns are the least imitable element because, even with the concordances to hand, they are barely recognizable; yet the composers of the *Iliad*, the *Odyssey*, and the *Hymns* knew them, or at least they used them, even if unwittingly, whenever they wished to separate a CN–E. In the analogy of modern Yugoslav singers and their training, it was this type of pattern to which Lord referred: "Although it may seem that the more important part of the singer's training is the learning of formulae from other singers, I believe that the really significant element in the process is rather the setting up of various patterns that make adjustment of phrase and creation of phrases by analogy possible. This will be the whole basis of his art."[9]

The patterns are many and varied and largely based upon the two extremities of the verse and the caesurae. As in my previous paper, I shall limit myself here to an incomplete statement of them but sufficient, I hope, to show a complete affinity with the rest of Homer and the *Hymns*. All the patterns described below find parallels elsewhere in the Homeric corpus.

Ordinary separation based on the verse end. (_) $\cup\cup$_/$\cup\cup$_ $\cup\cup$ / _$\cup\cup$_$\cup$ second foot–verse end: 24. 216 πατρὸς πειρήσομαι ἡμετέροιο, 24. 531 πτολέμου Ἰθακήσιοι ἀργαλέοιο, 24. 81 Ἀργείων ἱερὸς στρατὸς αἰχμητάων. ($\cup$)$\cup$ _/ $\cup\cup$_ $\cup$/ $\cup$_$\cup$ third foot–verse end: 23. 350 πολέων κεκορήμεθ' ἀέθλων, 24. 517 πάντων πολὺ φίλταθ' ἑταίρων, 24. 315 νεφέλη ἐκάλυψε μέλαινα,

9. *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass., 1960), p. 37.

24. 178 ταχέας δ' ἐκχεύατ' ὀϊστοὺς, 24. 277 τόσους δ' ἐπὶ τοῖσι χιτῶνας;[10] cf.
∪— / ∪ ∪—∪ ∪ /— — in which the intrusion is extended at the expense
of the first short of the second element: 24. 149 κακός ποθεν ἤγαγε δαίμων,
24. 401 θεοὶ δέ σε ἤγαγον αὐτοί, 24. 310 ἐμῆς ἀπελήλυθε πάτρης. ∪ ∪/— ∪ ∪/
— ∪ fourth foot-verse end: 24. 268 ἐμὸν ἵκετο δῶμα, 24. 199 κακὰ μήσατο
ἔργα, 24. 444 τάδε μήσατο ἔργα.[11]

   Ordinary separation based on the verse beginning. — —/— ∪ ∪ —/— — ∪ ∪
verse beginning-fourth foot: 24. 326 λώβην τινύμενος θυμαλγέα, 24. 340 ὄγχνας
μοι δῶκας τρισκαίδεκα, 24. 274 χρυσοῦ μέν οἱ δῶκ' εὐεργέος. — ∪ ∪/— ∪ ∪ —
(∪)/(∪) ∪ — verse beginning-fourth foot caesura: 23. 342 δεύτατον τοῦτ'
ἄρα εἶπεν ἔπος, 24. 331 οὐλὴν μὲν πρῶτον τήνδε, 24. 192 ὄλβιε Λαέρταο πάϊ; cf.
— ∪ ∪—/∪∪— ∪/ ∪—: 24. 444 ἀθανάτων ἀέκητι θεῶν, 24. 200 κουρίδιον
κτείνασα πόσιν.

   As stated at the outset this description of the patterns involved in CN–E
separation must of necessity be limited to certain of the more common
types; yet even this brief examination is sufficient to show that the con-
tinuation differs in no way from the rest of the corpus.

   As in my study of the *Hymns* I also offer here evidence for patterning in
separation by a preposition; once again examples of these patterns may be
found in the rest of Homer.

   Separation by a preposition based on the verse end. —/ ∪ ∪/— — bucolic
diaeresis-verse end: 23. 345 ὃν κατὰ θυμὸν, 24. 511 τῷδ' ἐπὶ θυμῷ, 24. 365 ᾧ
ἐνὶ οἴκῳ.[12] ∪— — —/ ∪ ∪/— — third foot caesura-verse end: 24. 408 εὐξέστου
ἐπὶ δίφρου, 24. 117 εὐσσέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν; cf. ∪—∪ ∪—/ ∪/ ∪—: 24. 226
εὐκτιμένη ἐν ἀλωῇ, 24. 336 εὐκτιμένην κατ' ἀλωήν. This covers all but two
examples from the continuation of separation at the verse end by a prepo-
sition, but these two are themselves members of patterns which are com-
pletely regular in Homer: — —/ ∪ ∪/— — fourth foot caesura-verse end:
24. 50 κοίλας ἐπὶ νῆας; ∪ ∪—/ ∪ ∪/—∪ ∪— — third foot caesura-verse
end: 24. 523 κόρυθος διὰ χαλκοπαρήου.

   Separation by a preposition based on the verse beginning. — ∪/ ∪/— ∪∪ —
(∪) verse beginning-third foot caesura: 24. 94 πάντας ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους, 24.
301 νηὸς ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίης, 24. 73 οἴνῳ ἐν ἀκρήτῳ, 24. 317 πόντον ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντα.[13]
Again the one remaining example from the continuation subscribes to a
completely regular pattern: — —/—/ ∪ ∪— verse beginning-third foot
caesura: 23. 349 εὐνῆς ἐκ μαλακῆς.

   Separation by a preposition based on third foot caesura. ∪—/ ∪∪ /—∪
third foot caesura-fifth foot: 23. 32 κακὰς ὑπὸ κῆρας, 24. 419 θοῆς ἐπὶ νηυσί,
23. 315 φίλην ἐς πατρίδ'.

   In the case of separation over the verse end, I argued in my previous
paper that the evidence from the *Hymns* and the two samples of Homer
suggested that the model for such separations was the localization of the

---

10. Cf. 24. 227 ῥυπόωντα δὲ ἔστο χιτῶνα.
11. Cf. 24. 184 στόνος ὄρνυτ' ἀεικής.
12. Cf. 24. 509 πᾶσαν ἐπ' αἶαν.
13. Cf. 24. 82 ἀκτῇ ἔπι προὐχούσῃ.

two elements in their respective verses.[14] The first element was very often placed at the end of the first verse—in fact over half the examples from the *Hymns* were thus placed; the second element was almost always placed at the beginning of the second verse—in 46 of the total 54 examples in the *Hymns*. Where such localization did not take place, it could be demonstrated either that the word was occupying its own primary position, or else that it had been dislodged from initial or terminal position by some other word which was itself primary there. An identical model may be constructed for verse-end separation in the continuation: there are 23 examples in total,[15] of which 10 comprise a first element shaped ($\smile$)__$\smile$ at the verse end—slightly less pro rata than in the *Hymns*, but not significantly so; of these same 23, 18 have a second element at the verse beginning shaped __ $\smile$ (5), __ $\smile\smile$ (8), and __ $\smile\smile$ __ (5)—figures which are directly comparable to those above for the *Hymns*. The rules of localization appear to be the same in all the passages examined: as in the case of the other types of separation, the technique in the continuation is apparently the same, but it is employed with much greater frequency. Column (4) in Tables 2 and 3 reveals no clear pattern in the incidence of verse-end separation: it is a common feature in both *Aphrodite* and *Hermes*, but relatively uncommon in *Apollo* and *Demeter*; again I would suggest that this is best explained in terms of stylistic differences. Once more there is a very obvious contrast between the scatter figure for the continuation, at 27.1, and the control sample of the *Odyssey*, at 43.4, and once more I find it difficult not to adopt a separatist position in the light of such evidence.

THE EXPANSION OF CN–E

The expansion of CN–E by the addition of one or more epithets involves no internal reorganization of the word group such as was seen in the case of separation. Consequently no metrical patterns of the type identified in the previous section may be observed in this type of mutation, other than the regular patterns of localization such as apply to all other metrical word-types (see n. 14). In my earlier paper the very existence of the mutation in the *Hymns* as well as in Homer was again taken as evidence of their orality; however, the frequency of this type of mutation was low, compared to the other mutation categories, and it was with rather less conviction that it was argued that expansion could be demonstrated to be a feature of Homeric oral style. The figures for the *Hymns* and the control samples of Homer, with the scatter figures in parentheses, are: *Demeter* 5 (99.0), *Apollo* 8 (68.2), *Hermes* 11 (52.7), *Aphrodite* 4 (73.2), *Iliad* 2 (217.0), *Odyssey* 6 (72.3). Expansion then is, broadly speaking, more common in the *Hymns* than in the passages of Homer, and furthermore only one

---

14. See E. G. O'Neill, "The Localization of Metrical Word-Types in the Greek Hexameter," *YCS* 8 (1942): 103–78; H. N. Porter, "The Early Greek Hexameter," *YCS* 12 (1951): 1–63.

15. In Book 23 verse-end separation is found at lines 319–20, 331–32, 342–43, and in Book 24 at lines 2–3, 37–38, 45–46, 48–49, 65–66, 78–79, 87–88, 129–30, 147–48, 197–98, 205–6, 227–28, 228–29, 249–50, 252–53, 278–79, 289–90, 311–12, 341–42, 397–98.

example in the *Hymns* is a verbatim repetition of a Homeric formula: the presence of expansion therefore is not to be explained in terms of imitation of Homeric diction.

In the continuation I find 19 cases of CN–E expansion,[16] giving a scatter figure of 32.8, which indicates that this type of mutation is more common in the continuation than in any of the other passages analyzed and more than twice as common as in the control sample of the *Odyssey*. As was suggested above, when the figures for frequency of occurrence are so meager there is a very real danger of exaggerating their importance. However, if the figures are to be taken to mean anything, my own view is that expansion as a feature of oral style is as good an explanation as any. In that case its comparative frequency in the continuation, while in no way conclusive evidence in itself, certainly appears to support the general picture presented by the other figures, particularly those for separation, that the continuation should be held separate from the remainder of the *Odyssey*.

The conclusion which I wish to draw from the evidence presented depends upon the acceptance of two propositions. First, that all the passages which I have analyzed are oral compositions: that the Parry–Lord proof of the orality of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is still valid and that compositions which employ the same phrase and verse patterns as the two epics are themselves thereby revealed as oral creations. Second, that the modification, or mutation, of word groups is a feature of oral style: that the considerable variations in frequency of occurrence of mutations among the various compositions are to be explained in terms of their composers' artistic tastes, in the same way that it may be shown that composers had their own individual stock of favored formulaic diction. The acceptance of these two propositions provides a reliable separatist tool.

In the analysis of the continuation it is clear that there are significant differences between it and the two other samples of Homer under all the subheadings except one, namely, the amount of formulaic diction among the CN–E. In this section alone the figures for the continuation and for *Odyssey* 2. 1–434 were almost identical; on the other hand mobility was less common, expansion more common, in the continuation than in any of the other passages, and separation was twice as common in the continuation as in the passages of Homer. If my two propositions are accepted, only one explanation seems possible: just as it may be shown that the *Hymns* were produced by different singers, so the continuation was obviously not a product of the same composer as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. This may explain the differences with regard to mobility, separation, and expansion. But how to explain the similarities in the quantity of formulaic diction? The answer, I believe, must be imitation. As I argued earlier, it is almost beyond the bounds of possibility that an imitator could even identify the phrase and verse patterns employed in mutation, unless he had been

16. In Book 23 expansion is found at lines 340, 351, 353, and in Book 24 at lines 68, 80, 118, 128, 132, 211, 266, 267, 275, 276, 277, 282, 283, 289, 329, 505.

trained to use precisely those rhythms, that is, unless he was himself a singer. However, the imitation of Homer's formulae is open to all—to the modern scholar as much as the ancient singer. I believe that the evidence presented here indicates, beyond reasonable doubt, that the continuation of the *Odyssey* was composed by a singer who consciously imitated Homer's own formulae.

University of Leicester