

## ANOTHER DIMENSION OF THE HOMERIC FORMULA

W. INGALLS

FROM THE GROWING NUMBER of publications in the field, it would appear that the study of the Homeric formula is proceeding apace. But a major difficulty impedes our understanding of this complex phenomenon, for there is little agreement on the fundamental question of what a formula is. In many instances Parry's definition is either quoted or tacitly assumed.<sup>1</sup> In other cases scholars have pointed out shortcomings in Parry's formulation and its application and have attempted to redefine the concept.<sup>2</sup> Others still have sought out different qualities of formulaic language and have tried to add their findings to our conception of the formula.<sup>3</sup> But formulaic studies are still in their infancy. We simply do not know enough about the formula to frame a definition that will be satisfactory on all counts. The purpose of this paper is to make

<sup>1</sup>Parry's definition is quoted by A. B. Lord, *TAPA* 69 (1938) 440, *TAPA* 82 (1951) 71, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass. 1960) 30, and D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1959) 266, n. 10. It is tacitly assumed in the many papers of J. A. Notopoulos, especially "Homer, Hesiod and the Achæan Heritage of Oral Poetry," *Hesperia* 29 (1960) 178-197 and "The Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry," *AJP* 83 (1962) 337-368, and in W. McLeod, "Oral Bards at Delphi," *TAPA* 92 (1961) 317-325.

<sup>2</sup>The redefinition of J. Labarbe: "une locution figée, qui couvre exactement une portion de l'hexamètre et que l'usage appelle, au lieu d'une locution originale, chaque fois qu'il s'agit de rendre l'idée précise dont elle est le support, orné ou non" (*L'Homère de Platon* [Bibliothèque de la Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres de l'Université de Liège, Fascicule 117 (Liège 1949)] 17) is hardly more than a restatement of Parry's formulation. J. B. Hainsworth, *CQ* n.s. 14 (1964) 155-164 and *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford 1968) 33-35, A. Hoekstra, *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes: Studies in the development of Greek epic diction* (Verh. Amsterdam Letterkunde n.s. 71.1 [1965]) 8-18, and W. McLeod, *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 104-110, have all criticized Parry's definition.

<sup>3</sup>Lord's field-work led him to stress the role of analogy in the creation of formulae (*op. cit.* [above, n. 1] 35-45) even more than Parry had done in *L'Épithète traditionnelle dans Homère* (Paris 1928) 85-95; 218-238; *HSCP* 41 (1930) 145-146 = *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, ed. A. Parry (Oxford 1971) 68-75; 173-189; 322-323. J. A. Notopoulos, *AJP* 83 (1962) 356-357, n. 60, and W. McLeod, *TAPA* 92 (1961) 318-322, have extended the concept even further. In *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 104-105, n. 43 McLeod again argues in favour of analogical formulae. J. A. Russo has discovered that there is a distinct preference for the use of certain grammatical forms in certain positions in the Homeric hexameter (*Word Localization and the Formulaic Nature of the Homeric Hexameter* [Yale 1962]). He suggests that these "represent certain more general types of formulaic systems" (*TAPA* 94 [1963] 237). These views have not gone unchallenged. See J. B. Hainsworth, *art. cit.* (above, n. 2); W. Minton, *TAPA* 96 (1965) 241-253; and Albin Lesky, *AnzAlt* 18. 1/2 (January-April 1965) col. 13-14.

two suggestions which it is hoped will bring us nearer to an adequate definition.

As a first step, I would suggest that Parry's definition be abandoned as too narrowly based on formulae of one particular syntactical pattern, and inappropriate to other patterns. Parry defined the formula, in *L'Epithète traditionnelle*, as *une expression qui est régulièrement employée dans les mêmes conditions métriques, pour exprimer une certaine idée essentielle*. He followed this definition with the explanation:

L'essentiel de l'idée, c'est ce qu'en reste après qu'elle a été débarrassée de toute superfluité stylistique. Ainsi l'idée essentielle des mots ἦμος δ' ἡριγένεια φάνη ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως est *quand l'aube vint*; celle de βῆ δ' ἔμειν est *il alla*; celle de τὸν δ' αὖτε προσέειπε est *lui dit*; et . . . celle de πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς est *Ulysse*. On peut dire qu'une expression est employée régulièrement lorsque le poète s'en sert habituellement, et sans aucune crainte qu'on lui reproche de s'en être servi trop fréquemment. Si, par exemple, pour exprimer l'idée du prédicat d'une phrase qui veut dire essentiellement *un tel lui répondit*, par des mots remplissant le vers jusqu'à la césure féminine et se terminant par une voyelle brève, Homère se sert invariablement de τὸν δ' ἡμείβεται ἔπειτα, ces mots peuvent être considérés comme constituant une formule; . . .<sup>4</sup>

This discussion seems clear, but there is one important ambiguity. What are we to understand by the words *dans les mêmes conditions métriques*? One might assume that they mean "occupying one portion and one portion only of the verse" (such as the space between the bucolic diaeresis and the verse-end, the only place, for example, where the expression δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς occurs). On the other hand, one could argue that they mean "occupying one or more verse portions of the same metrical shape" (such as the space from the beginning of the second foot to the feminine caesura and between the bucolic diaeresis and the verse-end, the two locations where the expression ὥς τε νήπται is found).<sup>5</sup> But, if so, this clause of the definition seems superfluous; for obviously a word-group which is repeated verbatim will have "the same metrical shape" in each occurrence. We might infer, then, that Parry was using the words in the first sense.

But our inference would, it seems, be incorrect. For in his "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I. Homer and the Homeric Style" Parry again describes the formula; his definition, apart from now being expressed in English, remains unaltered. And so long as he is discussing the workings of a single type of formula, the noun-epithet combination, he does use the phrase "regularly employed under the same metrical conditions" with the meaning "used in one and only one portion of the verse." But when he turns to demonstrate how extensively

<sup>4</sup>*Op. cit.* (above, n. 3) 16-17; *collect. cit.* (above, n. 3) 13-14.

<sup>5</sup>Filling the second foot and third trochee in *Od.* 1.205; after the bucolic diaeresis in *Il.* 1.32, *Od.* 1.87, and *Od.* 5.31.

Homer used formulae, he abandons this restriction. For several times in his formular analyses of *Il.* 1.1–25 and *Od.* 1.1–25 Parry marks as formular word-groups which occupy two portions of the verse.<sup>6</sup> He even admits in his discussion of the analyses that formulae can occur in more than one place in the line. “Μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα is one of the rare cases of a formula of any length which is found in more than one place in the line” (*HSCP* 41 [1930] 129; *The Making of Homeric Verse* [Oxford 1971] 309–310).<sup>7</sup>

Parry’s definition appears to be a general statement derived largely from his observations of the noun-epithet combinations. Certainly the noun-epithet combinations are the only formulae (apart from clausal formulae such as Διὸς δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή in *Il.* 1.5 and whole verse formulae such as ἦμος δ’ ἠριγένεια φάνη ροδοδάκτυλος Ἥως) which normally fulfil the conditions of the definition. The word-group, πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, for example, fits the definition on all counts. It is an expression, and it is “régulièrement employée dans les mêmes conditions métriques.” The formula in question always occupies the space between the feminine caesura and the verse-end and is never found elsewhere. Finally, the formula πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς expresses the essential idea, “Odysseus,” when it has been “débarassée de toute superfluité stylistique.” The repeated phrase ἀλλγε’ ἔδωκεν, which Parry underlines as formular in his analysis of *Il.* 1.1–25, however, meets fewer of the definition’s requirements. It is, to be sure, an expression and the cause of no difficulty in that respect. Yet is it “employée régulièrement dans les mêmes conditions métriques?” In four of its five occurrences, it fills the verse between the bucolic diaeresis and the verse-end, as for example in *Il.* 2.375:

ἀλλὰ μοι αἰγίοχος Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἀλλγε’ ἔδωκεν.

But once, in *Il.* 1.96,

τοῦνεκ’ ἄρ’ ἀλλγε’ ἔδωκεν ἐκηβόλος ἦδ’ ἔτι δώσει,

it comes between the second foot and the feminine caesura. Can it, moreover, be “débarassée de toute superfluité stylistique?” The idea contained in this formula is no more and no less than what the words themselves say. The same is true of several other expressions, chiefly verbal, underlined as formular in Parry’s analyses. Parry’s definition, it would appear, is more or less adequate for only one part of the diction, the noun-epithet combinations, and in particular the formulae for the names of the principal gods and heroes; when it is applied to other parts of the diction its shortcomings become evident. This suggests that the definition is

<sup>6</sup>See the list in W. McLeod, *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 108, n. 44.

<sup>7</sup>For a different criticism of this expression see J. B. Hainsworth, *CQ* n.s. 14 (1964) 155 and *op. cit.* (above, n. 2) 34–35.

based primarily on the observation of noun-epithet combinations and should not, therefore, be applied to other parts of the diction.<sup>8</sup>

J. B. Hainsworth<sup>9</sup> has recently attempted a redefinition along Aristotelian lines. Noting that the essence of the term "formula" in any field is repetition, he proposes as the genus of the Homeric formula the "repeated word-group." He next considers the differentiae and suggests that the best-attested differentia of the formula word-group is the high degree of mutual expectancy which attends the use of components that if one occurs, another will too. He then passes to the various accidents which may befall the components of a formula but which do not destroy its identity. He mentions the following nine: (a) changes in metrics, including synizesis and lengthening *metri gratia*; (b) elision and correp-tion; (c) inflexion, including the usual cases of suppletion; (d) fluctuations in adjectival inflexion (or gender in nouns); (e) shifts in meaning; (f) alternative inflexions, including the observance or neglect of contraction or diectasis; (g) alternative forms of suffix; (h) presence or absence of prefixes, including the augment; (i) alternative forms of the stem. This definition goes a long way towards providing a formulation that is at once both rigorous and flexible. It significantly omits, however, any mention of the properties of the formula.

Suitable though Hainsworth's definition may be for his own purposes, it is doubtful that it will replace that of Parry as the "classic" formulation. M. Nagler had already raised serious doubts whether so precise a definition will ever be possible, and proposed a novel way of looking at the Homeric formula.<sup>10</sup> He draws attention to "phonemic correspondences" between adonean sections of the following verses:

χήτεϊ τοιοῦδ' υἱος· ὁ δ' ἄλλοδαπῶ ἐνὶ δῆμῳ	[Il. 19.324]
διογενὴς Ὀδυσσεὺς ἀλλογνώτῳ ἐνὶ δῆμῳ	[Od. 2.366]
φῶτα κατακτείνas ἄλλων ἐξέκετο δῆμον	[Il. 24.481]

and the two formulae *πίονι δῆμῳ* (9 times), *τίετο δῆμῳ* (6 times), and the phrase *ἔκετο δῆμον* (*Od.* 21.238), and raises the nice question whether a

<sup>8</sup>This inapplicability of Parry's definition reflects the fundamental weakness in Parry's work, viz., the attempt to apply conclusions drawn from the behaviour of the noun-epithet combinations to the rest of Homer's diction. This problem was foreseen by P. Chantraine in his review of *L'Épithète traditionnelle* (*RPh* n.s. 3 [1929] 299), who states, "Il ne faut pas oublier que M. Parry a choisi le cas le plus favorable à sa thèse. Dans son livre, les chapitres les moins démonstratifs sont ceux où il envisage, non plus noms propres, mais les noms communs. A plus forte raison serait-il malaisé d'enfermer les groupes verbaux dans des formules." The same illogicality in Parry's reasoning has been criticized by Hoekstra, *op. cit.* (above, n. 2) 10-12 and J. B. Hainsworth, *op. cit.* (above, n. 2) 33-34.

<sup>9</sup>*Op. cit.* (above, n. 2) 35 ff.

<sup>10</sup>"Towards a Generative View of the Oral Formula," *TAPA* 98 (1967) 269-311.

formula is in fact a word-group at all.<sup>11</sup> Adducing the analogies of description by families in contemporary analytic philosophy, of deep structures in structural grammar, and of the structuralist approach to myth, Nagler suggests that the formula is a pre-verbal *Gestalt* in the mind of the poet, a mental template underlying the production of an open-ended family of allomorphs, all related but in ways so complex as to be impossible to classify.

In a more recent publication Hainsworth speaks favourably of Nagler's suggestion. But he disagrees with the notion that a formula is a new creation at each incarnation because of the large number of unvarying formulae.<sup>12</sup> Readers of Hainsworth's book will recognize that this disagreement is based upon his view that "highly schematized formula-types are . . . the consequence of ossification of more flexible systems at points of frequent use."<sup>13</sup> Hainsworth appears to see the formulae coming into being in a matrix like Nagler's pre-verbal *Gestalt* and retaining a relatively high degree of flexibility. Through frequent need and frequent use, some formulae do eventually ossify and become schematized into the systems such as the noun-epithet combinations which Parry studied. Such a view of the development of formular diction seems likely. But its earlier stages are so elusive and the meaning of the pre-verbal *Gestalt* so obscure that the concept is hardly helpful to the student of the Homeric formula; for it is not until a formula has attained some degree of fixity that it can be identified and studied.

To identify formulae we must know more about them, and to gain this knowledge it is easier to work with formulae which, though mobile, have attained some degree of stability. Now Parry said, "Without the aid of writing, the poet can make his verses only if he has a formulaic diction which will give him his phrases all made, and made in such a way that, at the slightest bidding of the poet, they will link themselves in an unbroken pattern that will fill his verses and make his sentences" (*HSCP* 41 [1930] 138; *The Making of Homeric Verse* [Oxford 1971] 317). That is to say, the story is constructed using formulae as syntactical and metrical building blocks. But metricians have seen that—in a purely logical sense, without making any claims about the prehistory of the Homeric hexameter—each verse is constructed of four metrical building blocks. For the hexameter consists not only of a series of dactyls and spondees but also of four cola which are bounded by three regular

<sup>11</sup>276–278. He also thinks that the traditional, i.e., Alexandrian, sevenfold divisions of the parts of speech could not have been the functional ones in Homeric language. Anyone who has attempted to classify formulae according to their syntactic function would agree. This also becomes a crucial question in deciding what an analogical or structural formula ought to be.

<sup>12</sup>"Homer." *Greece and Rome. New Surveys in the Classics* 3 (Oxford 1969) 25.

<sup>13</sup>*Op. cit.* (above, n. 2) 113.

caesurae.<sup>14</sup> It would be reasonable to assume that these two metrical building blocks, the formula and the colon, should in some way be commensurate. And in fact this assumption can be substantiated.

We may begin by looking at two groups of formulae cited by Nagler. In order to show that phonemic correspondences between formulaic phrases are not limited to words, he lists the following verse-end phrases starting with *πίονι δῆμω* and displaying progressively greater variation in phonemic and metrical features:<sup>15</sup>

C<sub>2</sub>  
|| *πίονι δῆμω*

C<sub>2</sub>  
|| *τίετο δῆμω*

C<sub>2</sub>  
|| *ἔκετο δῆμον*

C<sub>2</sub>  
|| *παντί τε δῆμω*

C<sub>2</sub>  
|| *τῶδ' ἐνὶ δῆμω*

C<sub>2</sub>  
|| *φαῖν' ἐνὶ δῆμω*

C<sub>1</sub>  
|| *Τρώων ἐνὶ δῆμω*

θ  
|| *ἀλλοδάπῳ ἐνὶ δῆμω*

B<sub>1</sub>  
|| *ἀλλογνώτῳ ἐνὶ δῆμω*

B<sub>1</sub>  
|| *ἄλλων ἐξέκετο δῆμον*

<sup>14</sup>The four-colon theory was first put forward by H. Fränkel in "Der kallimachische und homerische Hexameter," *Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaft zu Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Klasse* (1926) 197-229. This paper was rewritten as "Der homerische und kallimachische Hexameter," and appeared in *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (Munich 1955, 1960<sup>2</sup>) 100-156; a brief description may also be found in Fränkel's *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*<sup>2</sup> (Munich 1962) 32-37. In my "The Structure of the Homeric Hexameter: A Review," *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 1-12, I deal with various criticisms of Fränkel's original colometry and the modifications to it suggested by H. Porter in *YCS* 12 (1951) 1-63. The structure is most easily seen in the following diagram:

$$- \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{A} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{B} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{C} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \left| \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array} \right| \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ \text{---} \end{array}$$

<sup>15</sup>*TAPA* 98 (1967) 277.

As the caesural marks added to Nagler's list indicate, despite their variation in phonemic and other metrical features, all these phrases, save one, share one common characteristic. They are bounded by licit caesurae. The one exception is really no exception at all. The verse in question (*Il.* 19.324) has already been quoted. Colometrically the phrase  $\delta\delta'$  should not be separated from  $\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\delta\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega$ . From a formulaic point of view, there is no reason not to take the three words together. If Nagler had written  $\delta\delta'\alpha\lambda\lambda\omicron\delta\acute{\alpha}\pi\omega$   $\epsilon\acute{\nu}\iota$   $\delta\acute{\eta}\mu\omega$  the problem would be solved.

Nagler next lists twenty whole lines "controlled by the word  $\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu$  in all its appearances in the Homeric corpus as a simple word or adjectival compound." He notes that "the series exhibits striking correspondences of various sorts among the examples," despite the fact that the word involved has "at least three different denotations" and that "the resemblances in the series as a whole cannot be accounted for by any of the objective criteria thus far put forward for formulaicness" (279). He further states that "many of our present metrical criteria are eluded at a stroke by the variety of word order, our syntactic and other criteria for the 'structural formula' by the variety of word-end and part of speech."

It will be seen at once that every verse in Nagler's list falls into four cola, divided in every case by licit caesurae.<sup>16</sup> Several of the phrases

<sup>16</sup>*TAPA* 98 (1967) 279–280. The caesural positions are given in accordance with the diagram in note 14. The abbreviation *versch.* stands for *verschoben* and indicates a caesura which has been "bridged" by what Fränkel calls a "heavy word or word-group" (*schweres Wort[bild]*). This is defined by P. Maas, *Greek Metre* (tr. H. Lloyd-Jones, Oxford 1962) 84–85, and the definition is quoted in *Phoenix* 24 (1970) 3, n. 10. The non-caesural positions are given in accordance with the system of E. O'Neill Jr., *YCS* 8 (1942) 113, which numbers the "half-feet" as follows:

$$\begin{array}{cccccccccccc} \frac{1}{1\frac{1}{2}} & \frac{2}{2} & \frac{3}{2} & \frac{4}{5\frac{1}{2}} & \frac{5}{5\frac{1}{2}} & \frac{6}{6\frac{1}{2}} & \frac{7}{7\frac{1}{2}} & \frac{8}{8} & \frac{9}{9\frac{1}{2}} & \frac{10}{10} & \frac{11}{11} & \frac{12}{12} \end{array}$$

Nagler's list is as follows:

$\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu$  = "veil"

$\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\alpha$   $\pi\alpha\rho\epsilon\iota\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$   $\sigma\chi\omicron\mu\acute{\omicron}\nu\eta$   $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\rho\acute{\alpha}$ $\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\alpha$	(4 times) (A2, B1, C1)
$\acute{\alpha}\lambda\epsilon\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\xi$ $\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\rho\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$   $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma$	[ <i>H. Cer.</i> 25] (A2, B1, C1)
$\tau\eta\sigma\iota\nu$ $\delta'$   $\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\acute{\iota}\theta\epsilon\nu$ $\eta\lambda\theta'$   $\acute{\epsilon}\kappa\acute{\alpha}\tau\eta$   $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma$	[ <i>H. Cer.</i> 438] (A3, B1, C1)
$\tau\eta\nu$ $\delta'$   $\acute{\omega}\delta\epsilon$ $\pi\rho\omicron\sigma\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\pi\epsilon$   $\acute{\rho}\epsilon\eta$   $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma$	[ <i>H. Cer.</i> 459] (A1, B1, C1)
$\tau\eta\nu$ $\delta\epsilon$   $\acute{\iota}\delta\epsilon$ $\pi\rho\omicron\mu\omicron\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha$   $\chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\varsigma$   $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\varsigma$	[ <i>Il.</i> 18.382] (A2, B2, C1)
$\acute{\alpha}\nu$ $\kappa\epsilon\phi\alpha\lambda\alpha\acute{\iota}\sigma\iota\nu$   $\acute{\epsilon}\chi\epsilon\tau\omicron$   $\theta\epsilon\alpha\acute{\iota}$   $\lambda\iota\pi\alpha\rho\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\iota$ [ <i>Cypria</i> 5.3] ( <i>versch.</i> A, B2, C1)]	
$\sigma\acute{\iota}\tau\omicron\nu$ $\delta\epsilon$ $\sigma\phi'$   $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\omicron\chi\omicron\iota$   $\kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\iota$   $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\mu\pi\omicron\nu$ [ <i>Od.</i> 4.623] (A4, B1, <i>versch.</i> C)	
$\sigma\phi\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\eta$   $\tau\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\gamma'$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$ $\pi\alpha\acute{\iota}\zeta\omicron\nu$ ,   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$   $\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\alpha$ $\beta\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\sigma\alpha\iota$ [ <i>Od.</i> 6.100] (A3, B2, C1)	
$\acute{\omega}\varsigma$ $\acute{\alpha}\rho\alpha$   $\phi\omega\nu\eta\sigma\alpha\sigma\alpha$   $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}$   $\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu$ $\acute{\epsilon}\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\nu$	[ <i>Od.</i> 5.351] (A3, B2, C1)
$\tau\eta$ $\delta\epsilon$ ,   $\tau\acute{\omicron}\delta\epsilon$ $\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron$   $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\nu\omicron\iota\omicron$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\sigma\sigma\alpha\iota$	[ <i>Od.</i> 5.346] (A2, B2, C1)
$\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\iota}\kappa\alpha$ $\delta\epsilon$   $\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\upsilon}\pi\omicron$   $\sigma\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\nu\omicron\iota\omicron$ $\tau\acute{\alpha}\nu\nu\sigma\sigma\epsilon\nu$	[ <i>Od.</i> 5.373] (A4, B2, C1)
$\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}$ $\tau\acute{\omicron}\tau\epsilon$ $\delta\eta$   $\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu$   $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron$ $\acute{\epsilon}\omicron$   $\lambda\upsilon\sigma\epsilon$ $\theta\epsilon\omicron\iota\omicron$	[ <i>Od.</i> 5.459] (A4, B2, C2)
$\acute{\alpha}\mu\beta\rho\omicron\sigma\iota\alpha\iota\varsigma$   $\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\alpha$   $\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}\zeta\epsilon\tau\omicron$   $\chi\epsilon\rho\sigma\acute{\iota}$ $\phi\acute{\iota}\lambda\eta\sigma\iota$	[ <i>H. Cer.</i> 41] (A4, B2, C2)
$\kappa\rho\eta\delta\acute{\epsilon}\mu\nu\omega$ $\delta'$   $\acute{\epsilon}\phi\upsilon\pi\epsilon\rho\theta\epsilon$   $\kappa\alpha\lambda\upsilon\psi\alpha\tau\omicron$   $\delta\acute{\iota}\alpha$ $\theta\epsilon\acute{\alpha}\omega\nu$	[ <i>Il.</i> 8.184] (A4, B2, C2)
$\kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\nu\omicron\nu$   $\theta'$ $\acute{\omicron}$ $\rho\acute{\alpha}$ $\omicron\iota$   $\delta\acute{\omega}\kappa\epsilon$   $\chi\rho\upsilon\sigma\acute{\epsilon}\eta$ $\acute{\alpha}\phi\rho\omicron\delta\acute{\iota}\tau\eta$	[ <i>Il.</i> 22.470] (A4, B1, C1)

listed are either verbatim formulae or formulae by analogy. In every case they occupy only cola of the verse and are bounded by only licit caesural locations. This, then, is one metrical criterion which has not been eluded at a stroke, and is, I would suggest, a criterion of the formula which has not as yet been adequately appreciated.

To further illustrate the intimate connection between the Homeric formula and the colometric structure of the hexameter, the formulae found by Parry in his analyses of *Il.* 1.1–25 and *Od.* 1.1–25 may be used:<sup>17</sup>

*Il.* 1. 1–25

1. . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
2. οὐλομένην, ἣ  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  ἄλγε' ἔθηκε
3. πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  Ἀϊδι προΐαψεν
5. . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή
6. ἐξ οὗ δ' ἣ  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  . . .
7. Ἀτρεΐδης τε  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς
8. . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  θεῶν ἔριδι  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι
9. . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_3 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  καὶ Διὸς υἱὸς  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  . . .
12. . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  ἦλθε  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  θοὰς ἐπὶ νῆας Ἀχαιῶν
13. λυσόμενός  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  φέρων τ' ἀπερείσι' ἄποινα
14. . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος
15. . . .  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  πάντας Ἀχαιοὺς

κρήδεμνον = "battlement, crenelation"

ῥοφ' οἶοι   Τροίης   ἱερὰ   κρήδεμνα λύωμεν	[ <i>Il.</i> 16.100] (A4, B1, C1)
οἶον ὅτε   Τροίης   λύομεν   λιπαρὰ κρήδεμνα	[ <i>Od.</i> 13.388] (A4, B1, C1)
ἄσομαι,   ἣ πάσης   Κύπρου   κρήδεμνα λέλογχεν	[ <i>H. Ven.</i> 6.2] (A3, B1, C1)
δήμου τε   προὔχουσιν,   ἰδὲ   κρήδεμνα πόλλος	[ <i>H. Cer.</i> 151] (A4, B2, C1)

κρήδεμνον = "stopper, seal"

ᾤϊξεν   ταμίη   καὶ ἀπὸ   κρήδεμνον ἔλυσε	[ <i>Od.</i> 3.392] (A4, B1, C1)
---	----------------------------------

<sup>17</sup>*HSCP* 41 (1930) 118–121 = *The Making of Homeric Verse* (Oxford 1971) 301–304.

For the purposes of this analysis, every word-group underlined by Parry with a solid line, i.e., "found elsewhere in the poems unchanged," has been quoted.



16. Ἀτρεΐδα δὲ μάλιστα  $\begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix} \dots \begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  κοσμήτορε λαῶν  
 18.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες  
 19.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  Πριάμοιο πόλιν  $\begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \\ || \end{smallmatrix} \dots \begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  οἴκαδ' ἰκέσθαι  
 21.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  Διὸς υἱὸν ἐκηβόλον Ἀπόλλωνα  
 22. Ἔνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες  $\begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix} \dots$   
 24.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_3 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  Ἀτρεΐδῃ Ἀγαμέμνονι  $\begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  ἦνδανε θυμῷ  
 25.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} B_1 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  κρατερὸν δ' ἐπὶ μῦθον ἔτελλε

## Od. 1.1–25

1.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα  $\begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  πολύτροπον δς  $\begin{smallmatrix} 9 \\ | \end{smallmatrix}$  μάλα πολλὰ  
 2.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον  $\begin{smallmatrix} 9\frac{1}{2} \\ | \end{smallmatrix} \dots$   
 4.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_3 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα δν κατὰ θυμόν  
 5.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  ἦν τε ψυχὴν  $\begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \\ || \end{smallmatrix} \dots$   
 6. ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὥς  $\begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ || \end{smallmatrix} \dots \begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  ἰέμενός περ  
 7.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_3 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο  
 8. νήπιοι οἳ  $\begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ || \end{smallmatrix} \dots \begin{smallmatrix} B_1 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  Ὑπερίονος Ἡελίοιο  
 9.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_3 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσιν  $\begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἡμαρ  
 10.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_1 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  θεά, θύγατερ Διός  $\begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix} \dots$   
 11. Ἔνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες  $\begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix} \dots \begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  φύγον αἰπὸν ὄλεθρον  
 12.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  ἥδὲ θάλασσαν  
 13. τὸν δ' οἶον  $\begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ || \end{smallmatrix} \dots \begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  ἥδὲ γυναικός  
 14.  $\dots \begin{smallmatrix} A_1 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  ἔρυκε Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων  
 15. ἐν σπέεσσι γλαφυροῖσι  $\begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ || \end{smallmatrix}$  λιλαιομένη πόσιν εἶναι

16. ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ \dots \end{smallmatrix} \right\| \begin{smallmatrix} 5 \\ \eta\lambda\theta\epsilon \end{smallmatrix} \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_1 \\ \text{περιπλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν} \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$
17.  $\dots \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_2 \\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\kappa\lambda\acute{\omega}\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\omicron \theta\epsilon\omicron\iota \end{smallmatrix} \right\| \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \\ \omicron\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\nu\delta\epsilon \nu\acute{\epsilon}\epsilon\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$
18.  $\dots \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ \pi\epsilon\phi\upsilon\gamma\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\omicron\varsigma \eta\epsilon\nu \end{smallmatrix} \right\| \begin{smallmatrix} 9\frac{1}{2} \\ \dots \end{smallmatrix}$
19.  $\dots \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ \theta\epsilon\omicron\iota \delta' \epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota\rho\omicron\nu \acute{\alpha}\pi\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$
20.  $\dots \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ \acute{\omicron} \delta' \acute{\alpha}\sigma\pi\epsilon\rho\chi\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma \mu\epsilon\nu\acute{\epsilon}\alpha\iota\nu\epsilon\nu \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$
21. ἀντιθέω 'Οδυσῆι  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ \dots \end{smallmatrix} \right\| \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \\ \gamma\alpha\iota\alpha\nu \iota\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\theta\alpha\iota \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$
22. 'Αλλ'  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_1 \\ \acute{\omicron} \mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu \underline{\text{ΑΙΘΙΟΠΑΣ}} \end{smallmatrix} \right\| \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_1 \\ \mu\epsilon\tau\epsilon\kappa\acute{\iota}\alpha\theta\epsilon \end{smallmatrix} \right\| \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \\ \tau\eta\lambda\acute{\omicron}\theta' \acute{\epsilon}\omicron\nu\tau\alpha\varsigma \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$

Most of the formulae found in the twenty-five verses from the *Iliad* fit neatly into the verse-cola and are bounded by the regular caesurae. Of the four exceptions, three (lines 2, 7, and 8) are examples of a regular caesura bridged by a "heavy word-group" (*schweres Wortbild*). The other exception raises an important question. Parry found only one repetition of the phrase  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon \theta\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota \nu\eta\alpha\varsigma \text{'Αχαιῶν}$ , in *Il.* 1.371:

$$\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_2 \\ \theta\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota \nu\eta\alpha\varsigma \text{'Αχαιῶν} \end{smallmatrix} \right\| \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_2 \\ \chi\alpha\lambda\kappa\omicron\chi\iota\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\omega\nu \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$$

where it comes at the beginning of the verse and neatly fits into the colometric structure, whereas the combination  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_2 \\ \theta\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota \nu\eta\alpha\varsigma \text{'Αχαιῶν} \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  is found eight more times (*Il.* 2.8, 17, 168; 6.52; 10.450, 514; 11.3, and 24.564). No one would doubt that the half-line  $\theta\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota \nu\eta\alpha\varsigma \text{'Αχαιῶν}$  is a formula. It is possible, however, to wonder whether  $\eta\lambda\theta\epsilon \theta\omicron\acute{\alpha}\varsigma \epsilon\pi\iota \nu\eta\alpha\varsigma \text{'Αχαιῶν}$  is formulaic or only a fortuitous repetition.

Turning to the verses from the *Odyssey*, a similar doubt may be raised about the combination  $\mu\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\nu, \delta\varsigma$  in 1.1. It recurs only in 10.330:

$$\eta \sigma\acute{\upsilon} \gamma' \text{'Οδυσσεύς ἐσσι μ\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma, \acute{\omicron}\nu \tau\acute{\epsilon} \mu\omicron\iota \alpha\iota\acute{\epsilon}\iota}$$

where it bridges a punctuation mark. Again it may legitimately be asked whether this is a chance combination or a formula.

Parry's underlining of *Od.* 1.2 without a full commentary is a little misleading. The combination  $\text{Τρ\acute{o}\iota\eta\varsigma \iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu \mu\omicron\lambda\iota\epsilon\theta\rho\omicron\nu}$  never recurs. The phrase  $\text{Τρ\acute{o}\iota\eta\varsigma \iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}}$  is found in *Il.* 16.100:

$$\delta\phi\rho' \omicron\iota\omicron\iota \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ \text{Τρ\acute{o}\iota\eta\varsigma \iota\epsilon\rho\acute{\alpha}} \end{smallmatrix} \right\| \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} C_1 \\ \kappa\rho\eta\delta\epsilon\mu\eta\nu\alpha \lambda\acute{\upsilon}\omega\mu\epsilon\nu. \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$$

A closely related expression  $\left\| \begin{smallmatrix} A_4 \\ \text{Κικ\acute{o}\nu\omega\nu} \end{smallmatrix} \right\| \left\| \begin{smallmatrix} B_1 \\ \iota\epsilon\rho\acute{o}\nu \mu\omicron\lambda\iota\epsilon\theta\rho\omicron\nu \acute{\epsilon}\lambda\acute{o}\nu\tau\epsilon\varsigma \end{smallmatrix} \right\|$  is found

in *Od.* 9.165. This case is complicated then both by the fact that the expression *Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον* never recurs verbatim and by the existence of a strikingly similar phrase. Is this a verbatim formula, a formula by analogy, or a fortuitous juxtaposition of phrases which happen to occur elsewhere in the Homeric corpus?

*Od.* 1.14 presents the same problem as *Il.* 1.12. The underlined combination *ἔρυκε Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων* recurs only once, in *Od.* 9.29, whereas <sup>B<sub>2</sub></sup> || *Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων* is repeated 9 times (*Od.* 5.78, 85, 116, 180, 202, 242, 246, 258, and 276) and <sup>C<sub>2</sub></sup> || *δῖα θεάων* is found 21 more times (*Il.* 5.381; 6.305; 14.184; 18.205; 19.6; 24.93; *Od.* 4.382, 398; 5.159, 192; 10.400, 445, 487, 503; 12.20, 115, 143, 155; 18.190, 197, and 20.55). Again it may be asked whether *ἔρυκε Καλυψώ, δῖα θεάων* is formulaic or only a chance repetition.

In *Od.* 1.16 Parry's analysis indicates that while *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ἔτος ἦλθε* never recurs verbatim, it is a conflation of the formula *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ* <sup>A<sub>4</sub></sup> || (repeated 106 times according to Parry) and the formulaic verse (*Od.* 2.107 = 19.152 = 24.142)

*ἀλλ' ὅτε* <sup>A<sub>3</sub></sup> || *τέτρατον ἦλθεν* <sup>B<sub>2</sub></sup> || *ἔτος* <sup>C<sub>1</sub></sup> || *καὶ ἐπήλυθον ὦραι.*

Whether the phrase in question came from a modification of these two formulae is unknown. What is clear is that the poet was working by analogy for the whole hemistich to the B<sub>2</sub> caesura.

The same appears to be true of *Od.* 1.18, where the poet probably created the phrase *πεφυγμένος ἦεν ἀέθλων* on the analogy of the system which included phrases such as *πεφυγμένον ἔμμεν δλεθρον* (*Od.* 9.455), *πεφυγμένον ἔμμεναι ἀνδρῶν* (*Il.* 6.488), and *πεφυγμένον ἔστ' Ἀφροδίτην* (*H. Ven.* 34).

In *Od.* 1.18 the parallel suggests that the poet was creating by analogy and in terms of the half line.

Analogy is also involved in *Od.* 1.22, where a different phrase has been inserted between two repeated words. Here the element inserted falls within the caesural boundaries; therefore this is not really an exception at all.

The majority of formulae found by Parry in his analysis of *Il.* 1.1–25 and *Od.* 1.1–25 occupy the verse cola without spilling over the regular caesura. The exceptions occur where a “heavy” word or word-group has bridged the A caesura, where formulae by analogy are involved and the poet is working in terms of a whole hemistich, or where the repetition is found but once and may be due to chance. The formulae from Parry's analysis, then, confirm the intimate connection between formulaic usage and the colometric structure of the hexameter. Just as the formulae are

the linguistic building blocks of the verse, so the cola are the metrical blocks. In other words the metrical shapes of the formulae tend to coincide with those of the cola with which the verse is composed.

Scholars have until now discussed the nature of the Homeric formula without reference to the metrical cola. Yet common sense suggests that there is an intimate connection between them; and the evidence confirms it. Thanks to the work of Parry, Lord, Nagler, and Hainsworth we are beginning to understand something of the genesis and development of the formula; but we are still far from an adequate definition. Parry's definition must be abandoned as a first step and, if the formula is ever to be given a fully satisfactory and comprehensive definition, its metrical dimension and more specifically its intimate connection with the colometric structure of the verse must be taken into account.

BISHOP'S UNIVERSITY, LENNOXVILLE, QUEBEC