

## TWO NOTES ON *ILIAD* 9<sup>1</sup>

IT has long been recognized that Circe's instructions to Odysseus at *Od.* 10. 516-40 were composed after their fulfilment at 11. 23-50.<sup>2</sup> Something similar in *Iliad* 9 seems to have been overlooked.

Agamemnon's offer to Achilles at 122-57 is reported by Odysseus at 264-99 in more or less the same words. The changes are substantial in only three places :

- |     |   |
|-----|---|
| 127 | ὄσσα μοι ἡνείκαντο ἀέθλια μώνυχες ἵπποι         |
| 269 | ὄσσ' Ἀγαμέμνονος ἵπποι ἀέθλια ποσσὶν ἄροντο     |
| 130 | ἐξελόμεν, αἱ κάλλει ἐνίκων φύλα γυναικῶν        |
| 272 | ἐξέλεθ', αἱ τότε κάλλει ἐνίκων φύλα γυναικῶν    |
| 134 | ἡ θέμις ἀνθρώπων πέλει, ἀνδρῶν ἡδὲ γυναικῶν     |
| 276 | ἡ θέμις ἐστίν, ἀναξ, ἡ τ' ἀνδρῶν ἡ τε γυναικῶν. |

Nothing can be made of 130/272, where *τότε* is dispensable but unobjectionable.<sup>3</sup> In each of the other pairs, however, it is clear which line was composed first. 134 could have been repeated without change at 276, and 127 needed no bigger change than *οἱ* for *μοι*;<sup>4</sup> furthermore, there are very few parallels in Homer for the rhythm of 134<sup>5</sup> and none for *ἡνείκαντο* in 127.<sup>6</sup>

No doubt the poet might have hit upon *ἡνείκαντο* and an ugly rhythm when he was composing Agamemnon's speech and then altered them both to something more conventional when he came to Odysseus' speech;<sup>7</sup> but it is more economical and less arbitrary to suppose that he started with Odysseus' speech and made only the necessary alterations of person.

Why was he able to start with Odysseus' speech? Either because someone else had already composed it or because he had already composed it himself. If someone else composed it, it belonged to a version of the story that did not

<sup>1</sup> Mr. J. Griffin, Dr. N. J. Richardson, and Dr. M. L. West very kindly offered comments on the two passages discussed here.

<sup>2</sup> Kirchhoff, *Die homerische Odyssee* (Berlin, 1879), 222-3; Blass, *Die Interpolationen in der Odyssee* (Halle, 1904), 119-20; Schwartz, *Die Odyssee* (Munich, 1924), 137; Page, *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford, 1955), 29-31.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. 559 and Fraenkel on *Ag.* 532.

<sup>4</sup> Dr. West points out that *οἱ* might have been ambiguous, since the person last mentioned was the hypothetical *ἀνὴρ* of 267; but there would surely have been no greater temptation to connect *οἱ* with this *ἀνὴρ* than to connect *οἱ* in 284 with Priam (278).

<sup>5</sup> *Il.* 5. 580, 11. 154; *Od.* 3. 34, 5. 234, 11. 260, 266. Leaf on 134 maintains that at *Il.* 11. 154 the elision makes a difference; but what matters is the pause in the middle of the line, which has nothing to do with elision. It is worth noticing that in three of the other five instances, as in 134, the second half of the line is occupied by an appositive phrase.

<sup>6</sup> The aorist active occurs, and so do other tenses of the middle, but not the aorist middle. See Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum* (Leipzig, 1885).

<sup>7</sup> Douglas Young, *Arion*, vi (1967), 312, notices that the change from 134 to 276 is not 'made necessary by the change of subject' (Hoekstra, *Homeric Variations of Formulaic Prototypes* [Amsterdam, 1965], 19) but proposes a fanciful explanation: Agamemnon, in offering to return Briseis, 'says he will swear that he had never mounted her bed or had intercourse with her "as is the fashion of mankind, of men and women" (9. 134). In repeating Agamemnon's offers to Achilles, Odysseus realizes this is a touchy topic, and alters Agamemnon's hexameter to run: "as is the fashion, my lord [*anax*], of men and women" (9. 276). Considering that Odysseus had earlier addressed Achilles as *pepon* (252), . . . that "my Lord" shows a tactful solicitude for correctness and deference, appropriate to Odysseus' wily character and to the dramatic juncture.'

embrace Agamemnon's speech. If he composed it himself, either the same is true or he composed it in writing.<sup>1</sup>

At the beginning of the book Agamemnon loses his nerve and urges the assembled Achaeans to leave for home.

ὡς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκὴν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ.  
 δὴν δ' ἄνεω ἦσαν τετιηότες νῆες Ἀχαιῶν 30  
 ὁψέ δὲ δὴ μετέειπε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης·  
 " Ἀτρεΐδῃ, σοὶ πρῶτα μαχήσομαι ἀφραδέοντι,  
 ἢ θέμις ἐστίν, ἄναξ, ἀγορή· σὺ δὲ μὴ τι χολωθῆς.  
 ἀλκὴν μὲν μοι πρῶτον ὀνειδίσας ἐν Δαναοῖσι,  
 φᾶς ἔμεν ἀπτόλεμον καὶ ἀνάλκιδα· ταῦτα δὲ πάντα 35  
 ἴσας Ἀργείων ἡμὲν νέοι ἡδὲ γέροντες.  
 σοὶ δὲ διάνδιχα δῶκε Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω·  
 σκῆπτρῳ μὲν τοι δῶκε τετιμῆσθαι περὶ πάντων,  
 ἀλκὴν δ' οὐ τοι δῶκεν, ὃ τε κράτος ἐστὶ μέγιστον.  
 δαιμόνι', οὕτω που μάλα ἔλπει νῆας Ἀχαιῶν 40  
 ἀπτολέμους τ' ἔμεναι καὶ ἀνάλκιδας, ὡς ἀγορεύεις;  
 εἰ δέ τοι αὐτῷ θυμὸς ἐπέσσεται ὥς τε νέεσθαι,  
 ἔρχο· πᾶρ τοι ὁδός, νῆες δέ τοι ἄγχι θαλάσσης  
 ἐστᾶσ', αἶ τοι ἔποντο Μυκὴνῃθεν μάλα πολλαί.  
 ἀλλ' ἄλλοι μενέουσι κάρη κομοῶντες Ἀχαιοὶ 45  
 εἰς ὃ κε περ Τροίην διαπέρσομεν. εἰ δέ καὶ αὐτοὶ  
 φευγόντων σὺν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν·  
 νῶϊ δ', ἐγὼ Σθένηςός τε, μαχήσομεθ' εἰς ὃ κε τέκμων  
 Ἰλίου εὐρωμεν· σὺν γὰρ θεῷ εἰλήλουθμεν."

The incident referred to in 34–6 took place in the ἐπιπώλησις (4. 365–421). On that occasion Diomedes contained himself, but now that the tables are turned he speaks his mind.<sup>2</sup>

This cross-reference, however, is an intrusion.<sup>3</sup> Lines 40–9 are a complete and devastating answer to Agamemnon's proposal, and they begin in the manner of other amicably reproachful speeches with δαιμόνι, which is almost invariably the first word of its speech.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> An oral poet could perhaps compose back to front if he rehearsed back to front, but would he rehearse back to front?

<sup>2</sup> The antithesis in 37–9 may be a retort to the antithesis in 4. 399–400.

<sup>3</sup> The term 'interpolation' is best reserved for additions to the canonical text, though the methods of the oral poet are in many respects those of an interpolator.

<sup>4</sup> Against 9 initial instances in the *Iliad*, 8 in the *Odyssey*, and 2 in the *Hymns*, are to be set only *Od.* 14. 443, where it is second word, and *Il.* 13. 448. Position seems to be ignored by Elisabeth Brunius-Nilsson, *ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΕ: An Inquiry into a Mode of Apostrophe in Old Greek Literature* (Uppsala, 1955); but her remarks on the passage under discussion lend support to the separation of 40–9 from 32–9: 'This speech, which begins

with the statement of certain facts, then becomes strangely tinged with emotion, when the vocative δαιμόνι is used' (p. 25).

The language of 32–9 is far from precise. *πρῶτα* in 32, whether it goes with *σοί* or with *μαχήσομαι*, serves no purpose: he does not quarrel with anyone else, and with Agamemnon he does nothing but quarrel. *ἀλκὴν μὲν μοι πρῶτον ὀνειδίσας* in 34 would most naturally mean 'the first thing you cast aspersions on was my valour', but *σοὶ δέ* in 37 changes the emphasis and shows that *πρῶτον* must mean something unparalleled in Homer outside subordinate clauses (e.g. *Il.* 5. 848, 15. 75). *ταῦτα δὲ πάντα* in 35 is presumably a compression of 'the full truth about my performance on the field' (*Od.* 11. 223, cited by Ameis-Hentze, is straightforward).

If Diomedes' speech once had a different form, it is impossible to ascribe the whole of the assembly to a diasceua<sup>1</sup>—though nothing but economy suggests that the earlier form should be identified with the present form less lines 32–9.

Analysis of the *Iliad* may seem to be outdated. 'The implications of those notorious inconsistencies and inconsequences have been reduced to a point where the student of Homer does not need to concern himself unduly with them.'<sup>2</sup> 'Die Annahme, die die Voraussetzung ... aller Homeranalyse ist, daß nämlich in den erhaltenen Epen größere, zusammenhängende Partien in ihrer ursprünglichen Form bewahrt und daher an sprachlichen und inhaltlichen Merkmalen erkennbar seien, steht im Widerspruch zur Auffassung der oral poetry-Forschung.'<sup>3</sup> Are there then no questions that can be asked any more about the composition of the *Iliad*? Admittedly, unity of authorship is incontestable in the sense that the present *Iliad* was composed by someone, and multiplicity of authorship is incontestable if its vocabulary was created by generations of poets;<sup>4</sup> but between these two extremes, neither of them very informative, there is ample room for a more ambitious question: how big were the pieces with which 'Homer'<sup>5</sup> worked?<sup>6</sup> Occasionally he worked with words (like *φοξός*), occasionally with phrases (like *ἀναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων*) occasionally with blocks of several lines (like *κηημῖδας μὲν πρῶτα* . . .); so far there is complete agreement among oral scholars. When anyone suggests, however, that he occasionally worked with whole stories, the calendar has immediately been turned back 50 years, as though the epic vocabulary did not owe its existence to traditional stories.

'Die Untersuchung von noch in unserer Zeit lebendigen Formen des

<sup>1</sup> Bergk, *Griechische Literaturgeschichte*, i (Berlin, 1872), 596. The passage of Nitzsch referred to by Ameis-Hentze in the *Anhang* concerns not *Il.* 9. 34–6 but *Od.* 9. 34–6.

<sup>2</sup> Hainsworth, *Homer (Greece & Rome, New Surveys in the Classics no. 3* [Oxford, 1969]), 29. The quotation illustrates the following comment of Heitsch, *Gnomon*, xlii (1970), 440: 'Erscheinungen, die früher zu analytischen Überlegungen veranlaßt und so unmittelbaren Einblick in die Entstehungsgeschichte unserer Epen gewährt haben, gelten jetzt als—letzten Endes belanglose—Eigenheiten der oral tradition, die ihrerseits in die Vorgeschichte unserer Epen gehört.'

<sup>3</sup> Förstel, *Glotta*, xlii (1970), 168. The article is an indiscriminating attack on Heitsch, *Epische Kunstsprache und homerische Chronologie* (Heidelberg, 1968).

<sup>4</sup> The orthodox arguments for this theory are examined by M. W. M. Pope, *Acta Classica*, vi (1963, pub. 1964), 1–21.

<sup>5</sup> 'Homer' is the author of the *Iliad* in its present form, which dates back no further than the sixth century. Unless Homer lived in the sixth century, therefore, he was not 'Homer', and people who claim to know

what he composed or how he composed it are deluding themselves.

No one has made this elementary but much neglected point with more vigour and clarity than Bethe, *Homer*, i (Leipzig, 1914), 50–6, ii (Leipzig, 1922), 294–302. 'Statt unserer Ilias und unserer Odyssee will man „Homer“ datieren. Aber was ist „Homer“? Ein schwankendes Idealgebilde klassischer Epik, das jedem seine Phantasie anders malt' (ii. 295–6). On the date of the present *Iliad*, see i. 50–6, ii. 303–28 (not all equally cogent).

<sup>6</sup> 'Mir scheint, gerade der, der die in der oral poetry wirkenden Kräfte des Erinnerns und Tradierens ernst nimmt, wird mit neuer Entschiedenheit fragen, „ob die Ilias sich aus aller kleinsten gleichberechtigten Zellen zusammensetzt, oder ob wir auf unauflösbare Teile stoßen, die bereits geformt sind, also Poesie darstellen“. Die damit bezeichnete Alternative dürfte die heute angemessene Form der homerischen Frage sein' (Heitsch, 27). The quotation is from Friedrich, *Verwundung und Tod in der Ilias* (Göttingen, 1956), 80. Cf. Pope, *op. cit.* 19: 'Did he build brick by brick, or in pre-fabricated sections?'

Heldensanges, vor allem bei den Südslawen, ... scheint ... zu zeigen, daß mündliche Heldendichtung stets Improvisation während des Vortrags ist, die zwar reichlich Gebrauch von vorgeprägten Formeln, Motiven und Themen macht, aber ältere Gedichte niemals unverändert übernimmt, sondern jeweils zu einer neuen Schöpfung umgestaltet. Das würde jede Analyse unmöglich machen.<sup>1</sup> That no story was ever taken over by 'Homer' in its original form is not demonstrable<sup>2</sup> and would not be important if it were. No one who believes, for instance, that Phoenix has been superimposed on an earlier embassy, or that references to the suitors have been superimposed on an earlier journey of Telemachus, is committed to the view that the earlier embassy or the earlier journey of Telemachus is preserved entirely unchanged.

Only one method of disentangling earlier stories from the present *Iliad* is excluded by the nature of the epic tradition: repeated phrases or passages need not be directly related. That was perceived long before Milman Parry.<sup>3</sup> It does not follow, however, that no occurrence of a traditional phrase is secondary, still less that no departure from a traditional phrase is secondary.<sup>4</sup> The conditions under which secondary uses are significant need careful examination, but such conditions certainly exist.<sup>5</sup>

In principle, then, analysis is not misconceived. In interest it could be thought to compare with formalism as literature compares with grammar.

Exeter College, Oxford

M. D. REEVE

<sup>1</sup> Förstel, 168.

<sup>2</sup> 'Homer' may have worked with written rather than oral stories, and even if he worked with oral stories, at least one scholar well versed in oral epic sees no objection to the idea that the whole *Iliad*, not just small parts of it, was transmitted orally for a time with little variation (Kirk, *CQ* liv [1960], 274-9, *Proc. Camb. Phil. Soc.* xcvi [1970], 51-6). On the relative importance in oral epic of improvisation and memorization see Hoekstra, op. cit. 18-20, and Young, op. cit.

<sup>3</sup> C. Rothe, pp. 154-68 of 'Die Bedeutung der Wiederholungen für die homerische Frage', in *Festschrift des königlichen französischen Gymnasiums* (Berlin, 1890), 123-68. Rothe's argument is summed up as follows by Cauer, *Grundfragen der Homerkritik* (Leipzig, 1895), 268, = <sup>2</sup>(1909), 487, = <sup>3</sup>(1921), 611: 'Rothe war der erste, der ... den richtigen Schluß zog: wo sich wörtliche oder fast wörtliche Übereinstimmung zwischen zwei Stellen findet, da braucht nicht eine der anderen nachgeahmt zu sein; sondern die Übereinstimmung kann dadurch entstanden sein, daß die Verfasser beider Stellen aus dem überkommenen Sprach-

und Gedankenschatze der epischen Poesie ein fertiges Stück sich zunutze machten, wobei es sehr wohl möglich war, daß dann und wann gerade dem jüngeren Sänger die Einfügung des angeeigneten Verses oder Satzes besser und täuschender glückte.'

The point is sometimes put inaccurately: 'the fact that formulae, or most of them, are common property means that no occurrence of a line or phrase is in any sense a quotation or a reminiscence of another occurrence' (Hainsworth, 30; for 'is' read 'need be').

<sup>4</sup> A use in epic is secondary if it is anomalous and a precedent in epic accounts for it. The word *ἐμμεμαώς* is an uncontroversial example: see Leumann, *Homerische Wörter* (Basel, 1950), 52.

<sup>5</sup> That is to say, conditions exist (e.g. at *Od.* 10. 516-40) under which the objector gives as much away by arguing 'the poet may have drawn on a similar passage and not this one' as by admitting at once 'he drew on this passage'. Förstel misses this point in his sweeping criticism (p. 166) of Heitsch's attempt at defining the conditions under which secondary uses are significant (p. 18).