TRANSACTIONS

OF THE

AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

1949

I.—Parataxis in Homer: A New Approach to Homeric Literary Criticism

JAMES A. NOTOPOULOS

TRINITY COLLEGE

καὶ γέρα τῷ ὀξύτατα καθορῶντι τὰ παριόντα, καὶ μνημονεύοντι μάλιστα ὅσα τε πρότερα αὐτῶν καὶ ὕστερα, Republic 516c

The first paragraph constitutes a summary of this paper.*

This paper poses the question, do the same principles of literary criticism apply to both written and oral literature? The answer is no. Plato and Aristotle have fathered the concept of organic unity which ultimately arose in pre-Socratic philosophy and Hippocratic medicine. In view of the oral nature of the Homeric poetry is this criterion valid? A survey of the literature up to the middle of the fifth century reveals various degrees of unity involved, but indicates that the predominant type is a paratactic and inorganic flexible unity as observed in the Homeric poems. Parataxis of style and of structure began with oral poetry and influenced the structure of post-Homeric literature, even if it was a written literature. If this is the case Homeric scholarship must realize that the time has come to lay the foundations of a literary criticism, non-Aristotelian in character and emanating mainly from the physiognomy of oral literature which differs in style and form from written literature. This paper is a *prolegomenon* to the formulation of such a non-Aristotelian *Poetics*, with an attempt to understand the grounds for parataxis in oral literature, the misunderstanding of which has led to Procrustean criticism of Homer in the past.

* Dedicated to the memory of Corporal Francis C. Kowalczyk, *Ὁμηρίδου:*

. . . ἀπέφθιτο Ἰλιόθι προ
ἐσθλὸς ἐών.

Although the oral nature of the Homeric poems has been clearly established by the late Milman Parry[1] the implications of this new approach to Homer have not been fully realized with respect to the principles of artistic and literary criticism to be used in appreciating and evaluating the Homeric poems. Hitherto the literary criticism, as van Groningen has shown,[2] has been based on the conception of literature as an organic unity which is admirably expressed in Michelangelo's definition of art as "the purgation of the superfluous." This criterion of literary criticism is strongly fixed in the mind of Western Europe because of such outstanding works of organic art as the Parthenon and *Oedipus Rex*, and because of Plato's and Aristotle's expression of its principles. But before the unfortunate consequences of this literary *idée fixe* on Homer are discussed it is well to consider the origin and development of the organic unity school of literary criticism.

Van Groningen points out[3] that although this doctrine of literary criticism is first mentioned in Plato's *Phaedrus* 264c, it received its initial impulse among the Sophists, as is shown in Alcidamas' *περὶ σοφιστῶν* 27–8 and Gorgias' *Ἑλένης ἐγκώμιον* 3. A study of the evidence, however, shows that the conception of organic unity is much older than the fifth century. Professor J. L. Myres has shown that the early Attic Geometric vases show "the first step toward the conception of an organic whole composed of mutually dependent parts."[4] The geometric style contains within it the first manifestation of the later Greek genius for the organic relation of the "Many and One." The subordination of the secondary to the principal, and the progressive symmetry of the parts show that it was the Geometric potter who first stated in the language of plastic form and decoration the conception of organic unity in a work of art. The organic art of a Geometric vase in Athens is in sharp contrast to the inorganic art exhibited in Eastern vases,[5] which embody the Homeric inorganic conception of art.

The second manifestation of the concept of organic unity is also found in Athens and finds expression in Solon's conception of

[1] See the collected bibliography in A. B. Lord, "Homer, Parry, and Huso," *AJA* 52 (1948) 43–44.

[2] B. A. van Groningen, *Paratactische Compositie in de Oudste Grieksche Literatuur* (Amsterdam, 1937); "Éléments inorganiques dans la composition de l'*Iliade* et de l'*Odyssée*," *Revue des Études Homériques* 5 (1935) 3–24.

[3] van Groningen, *Paratactische Compositie* 1–3; "Éléments inorganiques" 5 note 1.

[4] J. L. Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?* (Berkeley, 1930) 499.

[5] *Ibid.*, 488.

the state. The word συναρμόσασθαι in fr. 33A[6] is the key to Solon's organic conception of the body-politics. In his conception of Justice and the rule of law as the foundation of the social cosmos[7] Solon may be said to be the first to have given expression in politics of the concept of cosmos which was being developed by the Ionian philosophers of the sixth century. For it is to philosophy that we must go to find the full expression of the notion of cosmos which regulates through harmony the relation of the parts to the whole. The concept of organic unity arises from the philosophical attempts of Ionian science to see reality in its alltogetherness. The problem of the one and the many, which is Plato's fundamental problem and accounts for the transference of the problem from philosophy to literary criticism in the *Phaedrus*, was faced by the pre-Socratic philosophers in such a way that they sought for an organic unity underlying the diversity of change. Though it is not necessary here to trace their specific methods of relating the parts to the whole,[8] several illustrations may be given. A fragment of Pherecydes expresses the problem in religious terms. "Zeus," he says, "when about to create changed into Eros, because by combining the Cosmos out of opposites he brought it into harmony and love, and sowed likeness in all, and unity extending through all things."[9] Heracleitos is not only the father of Plato's flux but also the Parmenidean ally of unity. "It is wise," he says, "to listen not to me but to the Word and to confess that all things are one."[10] This finds varied elaboration: "Joints, whole and not whole, connected-separate, consonant-dissonant, and from all things one and from one all things,"[11] and, "the fairest man is flesh composed of parts scattered at random, so is the cosmos."[12] Such fragments are illustrative of the soundness in seeking in pre-Socratic philosophy the impulse and origin of the organic unity which is to dominate physics, medicine, logic, philosophy, and literary criticism, all of

[6] J. M. Edmonds, *Elegy and Iambus* (The Loeb Classical Library) 1.146.

[7] Cf. W. Jaeger, *Solons Eunomie* (*SPAW* 1926); *Paideia* (Oxford, 1939) 140.

[8] Walther Kranz, "Kosmos als philosophischer Begriff frühgriechischer Zeit," *Philologus* 93 (1939) 430–448.

[9] Frag. 3 (Diels, *Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*).

[10] Frag. 50 (Diels).

[11] Frag. 59 (Bywater).

[12] Frag. 124 (Diels), as interpreted with the reading of the MS: σάρξ by McDermott, *AJPh* 62 (1941) 492–494. The writer wishes to add in support of the reading of the MS that Heracleitos may have in mind the dismemberment of Orpheus in the phrase σάρξ εἰκῆ κεχυμένων.

which evolve out of the reason's attempt to organize discreteness into an organic unity. Anaxagoras' νοῦν . . . κοσμεῖν τὰ πράγματα διὰ πάντων ἰόντα[13] is in essence the philosophical foundation of the literary doctrine of organic unity.

In the Hippocratean treatise περὶ διαίτης there is the phrase τὰ ἐν σώματι ἀπομίμησις τοῦ ὅλου and in Aristotle we find a variation of this as ὥσπερ ἐν τῷ ὅλῳ, καὶ ἐν τῷ σώματι.[14] If to this is added Democritus' ἄνθρωπος μικρὸς κόσμος[15] we find it not surprising that the notion of organic unity should also appear in Greek medicine which is grounded in Ionian philosophy. In the Hippocratean treatise περὶ ἀρχαίης ἰητρικῆς it is stated that the physician must have a knowledge of the ὅλον, a statement which influenced *Phaedrus* 270C.[16] Furthermore, the observation of living organisms must have furnished Hippocratic medicine ample evidence for the development of the concept of organic unity. The comparison of a work of art to a ζῷον in *Phaedrus* 264C shows strong Hippocratean influence, a fact which is corroborated by the mention of Hippocrates in the argument of the *Phaedrus*. Socrates refers to the Hippocratic method as a parallel to his own principle τὸ ἓν πολλά, τὰ πολλὰ ἕν.[17] Thus the association of Plato's first statement of the concept of organic literary unity with Hippocrates' similar conception in medicine shows that the origin of Plato's doctrine is to be found in Hippocratic medicine as well as pre-Socratic philosophy which influenced both.

It is evident that the concept of the organic unity of a work of art is also the result of the application to literature of Plato's own philosophical analysis of the one and the many. The centrality of this conception in Plato has many facets, one of which is its application in the field of literary criticism. Plato's aversion to ἰσονομία in the *Republic* is reflected in his dislike of the ἰσονομία of each and every line of the Midas epigram which he quotes in the *Phaedrus* to illustrate the inorganic conception of literature. Such an ἰσονομία, which he calls χύδην (*Phaedrus* 264B), "helter skelter," was abhorrent to Plato's philosophical instincts and his tradition and accounts for his dislike of Lysias' speech and of the Midas epigram. His application of this philosophical thesis to Lysias' speech and to the

[13] Plato, *Cratylus* 413C.

[14] *Problemata* 908A.31.

[15] Frag. 34 (Diels).

[16] Περὶ ἀρχαίης ἰητρικῆς 20.

[17] Cf. *Phaedrus of Plato*, ed. W. H. Thompson (London, 1868) 124; for the comparison of the organic unity to a ζῷον see *Tim.* 32D-33A; cf. *Protagoras* 329D–E.

Midas epigram must also be related to his views on art in the *Republic*.[18] Ἡδονή *per se* has no standards and any work of art which is not organized on the basis of selective and subordinating principles imposed by reason is not art but uncontrolled ἰσονομία. The pleasure of art unless controlled by reason is meaningless ἰσονομία and the enjoyment of such art resembles that of the women and children who are attracted by any and every gaudy color,[19] by the uncoordinated paratactic pleasure of the moment.

Plato himself points out in *Phaedrus* 268D the application of his statement of the concept of organic unity to tragedy. It remained, however, for Aristotle to develop this conception fully in the *Poetics* 1459A.18–21. In discussing the relation of poetry to drama Aristotle states that both have several points in common. "The construction of its stories," he says, "should clearly be like that in a drama; they should be based on a single action, one that is a complete whole in itself, with a beginning, middle, and end, so as to enable the work to produce its own proper pleasure with all the organic unity of a living creature." This organic unity, which Aristotle posits both for drama and poetry, established a canon of criticism whereby the proper measure of quantity makes for quality, a doctrine which has much in common with the *Ethics*. This passage also marks the stage in literary criticism when the rules for the criticism of drama also apply to epic poetry, the beginning, as we shall see later, of a confusion which has had unfortunate consequences for the proper appreciation of Homer.

In applying this conception to epic poetry Aristotle praises Homer for selecting one action, one section out of the whole; Aristotle accounts for a digression, like the Catalogue of the Ships, as a conscious effort "to relieve the uniformity of his narrative."[20] In the case of other epic poets, he continues, although they treat of one action it has a multiplicity of parts, sufficient to supply, unlike the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, materials for more than one tragedy. Although Aristotle attributes to the Homeric poems an organic unity, in accordance with his statement in 1459A.18–21, and accounts for the inorganic elements in it as relief, he definitely puts epic poetry in the same category as drama. As we shall see, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have a unity; but unlike that of the drama

[18] *Rep.* 603A 10–603B 1.

[19] Cf. *Rep.* 557C, 559D, 561E; *Laws* 719C.

[20] *Poet.* 1459A.37.

it is inorganic and, moreover, the digressions far from being, like Homer's similes, for purposes of relief, are actually the substance of the narrative, strung paratactically like beads on a string.

The effect of Aristotle's association of epic poetry with the organic unity of a drama has been a completely false *post hoc, ergo propter hoc* literary criticism of Homer. The organic conception of literary criticism, backed by the great prestige of Plato, Aristotle, and Horace's *Ars Poetica*,[21] laid the foundations of a type of literary criticism which has persisted until the present day. Similarities have been all the more impressed on us by such statements of Aeschylus as that his plays were slices from the Homeric banquet.

Lest it be misunderstood that both Plato[22] and Aristotle were not aware of the existence of a paratactic type of literature, it needs to be pointed out that both were aware of its existence but that the principles of literary criticism which they set forth applied essentially to literature of the fifth and fourth centuries which had evolved from a paratactic to a hypotactic type, from a style which Aristotle calls λέξις εἰρομένη, to such a masterpiece of organic unity as the *Oedipus Rex*. It must be realized that the projection into the criticism of pre-fifth century literature of principles of criticism applicable to a later period has resulted in the misunderstanding of the physiognomy of oral epic poetry and the subsequent literature whose form oral poetry influenced. The fault lies not primarily with Aristotle's *Poetics*, although the close association of the drama with the epic was a major factor in the confusion, but with post-Aristotelian tradition which did not clearly recognize that the principles of the *Poetics* did not apply to a large body of literature which Aristotle refers to in the *Rhetoric* 3.9 as λέξις εἰρομένη, the style of parataxis. This style, he says, "is the ancient one; for example, 'This is the exposition of the investigation of Herodotus of Thurii.' It was formerly used by all, but now used only by a few. By a continuous style I mean that which has no end in itself and only stops when the sense is complete. It is unpleasant, because it is endless."[23] These pregnant remarks of Aristotle show that he is

[21] *Ars Poet.* 1–37.

[22] For Plato's awareness of a paratactic type of literature compare his appraisal of the ἰσονομία of the Midas epigram, the speech of Lysias in the *Phaedrus*. His view of the poets in *Laws* 719c and in the *Republic* shows that their inability to control inspired disorder through the order of reason makes them unfit to dwell in the πόλις, which is the organic structure of reason expressed in the social relations of man.

[23] *Rhet.* 3.9. For the best treatment of this notion see H. Fränkel, "Eine Stileigenheit der frühgriechischen Literatur," *NGG* (1924) 63–103, 105–127.

conscious of a type of literature, of which Herodotus is a late survival. It is the task of modern scholarship to write a *Poetics* for this body of literature which Aristotle and Plato, both concerned with a new type of literature which supplanted the λέξις εἰρομένη, did not write.

Before proceeding with the first step in the formulation of the principles which must underlie the λέξις εἰρομένη it is necessary to survey rapidly the parataxis in style, structure, content, and thought which characterizes pre-Socratic literature. In his studies van Groningen has shown that the literature before the middle of the fifth century is largely inorganic in character. The reader will profit greatly from his analysis. The following examples supplement and widen the horizon of parataxis in the various fields of Greek expression.

Parataxis in Homer extends beyond the style and characterizes the structure and thought of the poems. Like Odysseus Homer himself may be called πολύτροπος. The episodic, inorganic, and paratactical nature of the Homeric poems has been noticed and commented on as early as Aristotle who calls the *Iliad* πολύμυθον (*Poetics* 1456A.12), one with a plurality of stories in it. In another statement, difficult to reconcile with the previous one, he emphasizes the unity of the story of the *Iliad* (1459A.30 ff.). These two statements add up to the truth that the *Iliad* has a unity but that its unity is inorganic. Aristotle looks upon the episodes as giving an element of variety to the epic (1459A.37). He also remarks that some epics have a unity but it is not of the right kind because the action consists of the plurality of the parts (πολυμερῆ), each easily detached from the rest of the work (1459B.1). Though Aristotle has a higher estimate of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* because they supply materials for only one or two tragedies in contrast to the other epics, each of which supplies material for several tragedies,[24] he still calls the *Iliad* a πολύμυθον σύστημα (1456A.12, 1462B.8) which may be Aristotle's term for inorganic unity. He is conscious that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are made up of several actions (ἐκ πλειόνων πράξεων) and of many parts (ἔχει πολλὰ τοιαῦτα μέρη). Aristotle's characterization of the other epics as μία πρᾶξις πολυμερής (1459B.1) and the Homeric epic as πολύμυθον σύστημα shows that the concep-

[24] Cf. S. E. Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer* (Berkeley, 1938) 233–237 for a sketch of the *Iliad* in the form of a drama.

tion of the Homeric epic as an inorganic unity is not modern.[25] Where Aristotle is responsible for the ensuing literary criticism of treating the epic as an organic unity is his statement that the unity of the Homeric epic is such as to be capable of being dramatized in one simple tragedy, and that the epic resembles tragedy, though to a lesser degree, in conforming to the same rules of completeness and unity that he set forth in chapters 7 and 8 of the *Poetics*.

Homer, unlike Horace's *semper ad eventum festinat*, always has time. The *μῆνις* of Achilles tacks, as it were, through such digressions as the dream of Agamemnon, the Catalogue, the *aristeia* of Diomedes, the Doloneia, until it reaches its fulfilment in the nineteenth book. In the *Odyssey* such digressions as the entire Telemachy, the episode of Theoklymenos (15.223 ff.), the boar hunt (19.399 ff.), and the second Nekyia (24.1 ff.) go far in substantiating the Homeric style as *λέξις εἰρομένη*. This parataxis is not a unique feature of the structure only. We find parataxis in other aspects besides episodes. We find parataxis in the epic style,[26] in the similes,[27] where the poet digresses beyond the original point of comparison and finds delight in the similes *per se* which reveal Homer's own world and nature; and in thought, such as the Glaucus and Diomedes episode (*Il.* 6.232–236) where, as Perry shows, the poet looks upon the exchange first from the traditional *ξενία* and then from the economic point of view, completely unconcerned with the incongruity of the modern point of view.[28] We also find parataxis in the shield of Achilles and in the religion of Homer, where, as Calhoun has shown,[29] Homer presents his gods paratactically, first, as gods collectively who are imbued with the moral

[25] Cf. Eustathius on *Il.* 3.230: *οὕτως εὐμηχάνως Ὅμηρος τὰς ἔξω τε τοῦ νῦν καιροῦ ἱστορίας ἐπεισοδιάζει τῇ ποιήσει καὶ ταῖς μεθόδοις αὐτὴν καταποικίλλει τῶν ἀφηγήσεων*, and Schol. *Od.* 1.284: *τῆς Ὀδυσσείας οὐκ ἐχούσης ἐξ αὐτῆς ποικιλίαν ἱκανὴν τὸν Τηλέμαχον ἐξελθεῖν εἰς Σπάρτην καὶ Πύλον ποιεῖ, ὅπως ἂν τῶν Ἰλιακῶν ἐν παρεκβάσεσι πολλὰ λεχθείη . . . ὁ ποιητὴς ποικιλίας λόγων καὶ ἐξαλλαγῆς ἰδεῶν, ἵνα μὴ μονότροπος ᾖ τῆς ποιήσεως ὁ τρόπος.*

[26] Cf. *The Odyssey of Homer*, ed. W. B. Stanford (London, 1948) 1.lxxxix; B. E. Perry, "The Early Greek Capacity for Viewing Things Separately," *TAPhA* 68 (1937) 410–412.

[27] Cf. Eustathius on *Il.* 2.87: *οὐ γὰρ ἡ παραβολὴ ὅλη τῷ πράγματι ὅλῳ προσαρμόζειν ἐνταῦθα δύναται*; H. Fränkel, *Die Homerischen Gleichnisse* (Göttingen, 1921); Bassett, *op. cit.* (above, note 24) 164–172.

[28] Cf. Perry, *loc. cit.* (above, note 26) 404–405; cf. also Richard Heinze's pertinent remarks on the paratactic technique in Homer as contrasted with Virgil in *Die Augusteische Kultur* (Leipzig and Berlin, 1930) 149 ff.

[29] G. Calhoun, "Homer's Gods: Prolegomena," *TAPhA* 68 (1937) 11–25.

attributes of divinity and secondly, as *dramatis personae*, imbued with human frailties as exhibited in the Aphrodite and Ares interlude. A survey of the Homeric poems shows parataxis rather than organic unity to be the dominant feature. The inorganic parts even if preceded by a prologue are, as van Groningen shows,[30] united by such devices as recurring lines, transitions, echoes, and foreshadowing.

The paratactic type of composition is, as will be shown later, the result of oral composition and certain conditions which accompany oral composition. At this point there remains to be shown that the paratactic type of composition is not unique to Homer. A survey of the oral literatures in Chadwick's *The Growth of Literature* shows that oral literatures both past and those surviving are characterized by λέξις εἰρομένη, episodic parataxis.[31] When set in the context of oral literature the Homeric parataxis is too common and observable a feature in oral literatures to serve as the basis for the divisionist, scissors and paste school of critics. As van Groningen aptly states, "La philologie doit en tirer cette leçon définitive, que jamais ces irrégularités, ces contradictions et ces fautes, que jamais donc des éléments de nature non organique dans la composition des deux épopées ne pourront servir à prouver une pluralité d'auteurs. La conclusion, si elle est exacte, ne manque pas d' importance."[32]

Mnemosyne was invoked by poets long after it had ceased to be in written literature the reality that it was in oral literature.[33] Even so does the inorganic and paratactic type of literature persist long after oral literature gave way to written literature. The history of the Greek literature shows a paratactic type of literature lingering as late as Herodotus when it gives way to the new ideal of organic literature. This post-Homeric parataxis reveals two things: (1) it serves to re-enforce the conclusion already obvious that the Homeric oral literature is the *fons et origo* of later paratactic literature, in style as in content; (2) it shows the long *fortleben* of this type of literature when the factors which produced it ceased to operate.

[30] van Groningen, "Éléments inorganiques," *REH* 5 (1935) 19–24.

[31] H. M. Chadwick and N. K. Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature* (Cambridge, 1932–1940) 1.502 ff.; 2.134 ff., 413 ff., 593 ff., 746 ff.; 3.161 ff.

[32] van Groningen, *loc. cit.* (above, note 30) 18.

[33] J. A. Notopoulos, "Mnemosyne in Oral Literature," *TAPhA* 69 (1938) 465 ff.

A survey of the post-Homeric literature shows that although there are instances of organic literature the paratactical type of composition accounts for the form of considerable literature. An analysis of Hesiod's *Works and Days* shows an even more intensive form of πολύμυθον σύστημα than Aristotle would find in Homer. It shows that the unity is moral rather than structural. The lack of unity and proportion would be fatal to the unity of authorship if the poem were abstracted from the context of inorganic literature[34] and the manifestations of the paratactic mind in other media.

In his analysis of Alcman's *Partheneion* van Groningen illustrates how largely paratactic this poem is, how its unity is achieved through a transitional phrase. Two parts, he says, are found here threaded "sans qu'une idée générale les domine: example frappant de ce qu' on peut appeler composition paratactique."[35] Xenophanes, furthermore, actually begins a poem with a transitional line revealing how used to parataxis was the audience. An analysis of the first elegy of Solon shows that it is a paratactic poem, with the poet, in the course of his thoughts, flying from one topic to another, a perfect example of how the paratactic *fortleben* of the Homeric oral epic had conditioned the audience to a paratactic type of literature. Likewise, Semonides' poem on women reveals the same paratactic technique. It is only a mind which is conditioned by parataxis in language, thought, and structure that can best cope with a Pindaric ode or an Aeschylean chorus with their abrupt transitions, their flexible, lightning-like paratactic imagery which leaps paratactically like Homer's similes.[36] It is only a paratactically trained mind which can appreciate the poems of Empedocles and Parmenides. The position of Δόξα in Parmenides' poem can only be accounted for by the paratactic tradition of poetry which now comes over into philosophy. It explains better than any reason the polarity in the thought of Parmenides' poem.

When it comes to the drama we have a long way to go before we can reach the organic unity which Aristotle claims for the drama. The linear development of the *Prometheus Bound* is a striking example of the *fortleben* of parataxis in Aeschylus, and the

[34] Cf. Myres, *op. cit.* (above, note 4) 510 for a comparison of the poem with the contemporary loose-jointed art.

[35] van Groningen, *loc. cit.* (above, note 30) 10–11; "The Enigma of Alcman's Partheneion," *Mnemosyne* 3 (1935–6) 241 ff.; cf. T. B. L. Webster, *Greek Art and Literature 530–400 B.C.* (Oxford, 1939) 10–11.

[36] Cf. Webster, *op. cit.* 38, 70–71, 89.

Persae is called less a play than a tiny trilogy.[37] Even as late as Euripides we find a paratactic mind necessary to appreciate a certain scene in the *Bacchae*. Gilbert Murray, in a review of Verrall's *The Riddle of the Bacchae*, says, "The Greek habit was to let each scene stand very much by itself, producing its own effect uninterrupted by references to other parts of the play. An incident or a character which has done its work is simply allowed to drop."[38] Even the very traditional structure of the drama demands a paratactic tradition for its effectiveness. It is only the paratactic mind which can jump undisturbedly from an episode to a choral passage or a parabasis which often has little or no connection with the organic unity of the play. A systematic study of parataxis in the Greek drama would show that Aristotle has excluded from his unity considerable inorganic material which is found in the drama.

Finally, we come to Herodotus who came to Athens and, in the very midst of a literature which was rapidly being molded by the concept of organic unity, brings in his work an Ionian parataxis. Though a contemporary of Socrates, Herodotus is far from putting into practice the type of organic composition advocated by the Sophists and the *Phaedrus*. Herodotus is a child of the epic tradition[39] and he follows closely in prose the paratactical inorganic unity which is found in the Homeric epics. When Herodotus says, προσθήκας γὰρ δή μοι ὁ λόγος ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἐδίζητο (4.30), he states in self-conscious terms the paratactic inorganic unity which governs the method of his composition and reveals the longevity of the flexible inorganic parataxis that emanated from the Homeric poems.

We end this story of parataxis with Herodotus even though one could go on to show that Plato's dialogues, ironically even the *Phaedrus* itself, are full of parataxis and digressions made necessary by the very nature of the spoken word which the dialogues try to imitate. That parataxis is first of all a state of mind rather than a form of literature is evident when we come to Greek art which reveals a story paralleling that of literature. That we have a similar story in Greek art strengthens the reasons for positing for the understanding of Greek literature and art a mind which evolved from a flexible, loosely coordinated unity to an organic unity. The story is most evident in vases. The essential characteristic of

[37] Cf. H. D. Kitto, *Greek Tragedy* (London, 1939) 42.

[38] *The Nation*, London, May 16, 1908, cited by Norwood in *AJPh* 70 (1949) 319.

[39] Cf. W. Aly, *Volksmärchen, Sage und Novelle bei Herodot und seinen Zeitgenossen* (Göttingen, 1921) 263 ff.

Minoan vases is an inorganic paratactic field of decoration which yields in early Athens to a geometric organic unity which is so vividly set forth by J. L. Myres.[40] But side by side with this organic manifestation the large body of Eastern and Oriental vases persist in inorganic parataxis. The François vase is the *locus classicus*[41] for parataxis in vase painting and reflects in its storied bands, paratactically arranged, the same features as appear in Homeric parataxis. As we watch the development of vase painting in Attica we observe that the design of the vase suggests to the painter a hypotaxis far earlier than is observed in literature. For with the sixth century parataxis gives way to hypotaxis by reason of the fact that the main panel becomes the central scene and the ornamentation is subordinated to it in the rest of the vase. Thus vases are among the first manifestations of the concept of organic unity in Athens' intellectual development.

Sixth century archaic sculpture reveals the same concern for the parts rather than the organic whole. A study of pedimental sculpture[42] from the early temples until the Parthenon shows a parallel to literature in the evolution from a paratactical inorganic unity to the highly organic unity of the eastern pediment of the Parthenon. Sixth century archaic sculpture reveals in general the autonomy of the parts. Miss Richter in her discussion of the *kouroi* observes, "At first grooves, ridges, and knobs on the surface were used to indicate anatomical detail, of which the real purport was not understood. They were composed in a series of patterns, each distinct and separate from the other. Only gradually did the Greek artists comprehend the significance of the human shape and learn to model and interrelate its various anatomical parts."[43] The archaic sculptor works with a set of schemata, which are substituted for the irregular appearances of the real world, perfecting each part and gradually evolving an interrelation of these parts to the whole organic conception.[44]

Finally, in the field of architecture we find some outstanding examples of inorganic parataxis in the Acropolis itself in such

[40] Myres, *op. cit.* (above, note 4) 495 ff.

[41] M. H. Swindler, *Ancient Painting* (New Haven, 1929) 146–147, 165; cf. Webster, *op. cit.* (above, note 35) 11.

[42] E. Lapalus, *Le Fronton Sculpté en Grèce des Origines à la Fin du IV^e Siècle* (Paris, 1947).

[43] G. M. A. Richter, *Kouroi* (Oxford, 1942) 27.

[44] Rhys Carpenter, *The Esthetic Basis of Greek Art* (Bryn Mawr, 1921) 114 ff.

buildings as the Propylaea and the Erechtheum. The inorganic disposition of the buildings on the Acropolis,[45] no matter what the reasons were, can only be understood by the fact that the Athenians were used to inorganic parataxis in their literary and artistic traditions.

All this survey of parataxis in the various forms of Greek expression, paralleled by the oral literatures of other peoples, shows that parataxis and the type of mind which expresses it are the regular form of thought and expression before the classical period. Moreover, the use of inorganic qualities in a piece of literature as the basis for a divisionist school of criticism is false and has no relevance for pre-classical Greek literature. To apply to it the concepts of organic literature leads to Procrustean violence. Tate, in his review of Prof. van Groningen's *Paratactische Compositie*, sums up the case. "Plato," he says, "demanded that a literary work should have the unity of a living organism; the parts should be consistent with one another and subordinate to the whole. . . . The 'pre-classical' method of composition was not organic or hypotactic but paratactic. . . . Homer's aim is the perfection of the parts rather than the integrity of the whole; he thinks more of variety and abundance than of qualitative selection and the orderly disposition of the parts. To attack the unity of either poem . . . betrays a concern for literary canons which are irrelevant in the field of pre-classical Greek literature."[46]

The conclusion which has been reached yields immediately to a question. If the literary criticism which emanates from a literature which is essentially organic in composition is found, when applied to Homeric oral poetry, to be the source of Procrustean criticism, what kind of criticism shall replace it? It must proceed from Parry's favorite principle of Aristarchus: ἡ ἐκ τῆς λέξεως λῦσις, and account for the physiognomy of a literature which is oral in genesis and character.

Our first task is to understand the mentality behind parataxis. Organic literature is the result of a disciplined artistic mentality which plans the architecture of a work of art. It is logic and its preoccupation with cosmos which is the mentality of organic literature. The relation of the parts to the whole, carefully worked out by the

[45] G. P. Stevens, *The Periclean Entrance Court of the Acropolis of Athens* (Cambridge, Mass., 1936) 1–2.

[46] J. Tate, *CR* 51 (1937) 174–175.

leisurely method of composition with the written word, looking both fore and after, excluding the audience from immediate participation in the artistic illusion, is the *modus operandi* of organic literature. In sharp contrast to this, paratactic literature is the result of a flexibility of the mind produced by various factors in the composition of oral literature. "A boy's will is the wind's will," says Longfellow followed by Robert Frost,[47] and we must start with this flexible mentality in both the oral poet and his audience. The foundations of the new criticism must rest on the fact observed by students of the primitive mind[48] that the interest is in the particular first and foremost instead of the whole. This preoccupation with the particular is the natural state of mind of oral literature, and is also observed in advanced stages of culture such as the digressive literature of people like Fielding, Cervantes, and others. Absorption in the particular and unconcern with the logical relation of the parts to the whole is the unphilosophic condition of εἰκασία which Plato pictures for us in his account of the Cave. B. E. Perry has entitled this mentality "the early Greek capacity for viewing things separately,"[49] and his paper, which is one of the most important contributions to the understanding of pre-classical literature, must serve as one of the pillars in the structure of the new principles of literary criticism of oral literature.

In the formulation of this new critique we must realize that no one explanation for parataxis is final and conclusive. Besides this mentality which is, as Horace puts it, *totus in illis*[50] and non-referential we must examine a complex set of factors which are at work in the composition of oral literature and which contribute largely to the inorganic character of the Homeric poems. These are first, the poet; second, the audience; and third, the material of the poet. The relation and the conditions under which these factors operate in the creation of oral literature are not the same as in written literature. All three present a new and unique relationship which, in combination with the aforesaid mental capacity in the poet and the audience, account for parataxis and determine the inorganic quality of oral literature.

[47] Longfellow, *My Lost Youth.*

[48] Ernst Cassirer, *The Myth of the State* (New Haven, 1946) 27; Lucien Lévy-Bruhl, *Les fonctions mentales dans les sociétés inférieures* (Paris, 1910); *La mentalité primitive* (Paris, 1922); *L'âme primitive* (Paris, 1928).

[49] Perry, *loc. cit.* (above, note 26).

[50] *Sat.* 1.9.2.

The physical, technical, and psychological factors at work in the creation of oral poetry make the poet live largely in the moment and only secondarily in the larger framework of his material. When the poet composes by means of the formulaic diction, which Parry has shown in his studies, he must concentrate on the moment, on the immediate verse. Unlike creation with the written word, where the audience is a remote factor in the imagination, where sufficient time is at hand to coordinate the part written to the whole conception, with opportunity for revision, the oral poet is both physically and mentally bound to the moment, the immediate verse, and his intimate relation with the audience. The artistic illusion, which he creates by means of winged words, is ever in flux; neither the poet nor his audience can divert their attention for any period of time to the whole; they cannot pause to analyze, compare, and relate parts to the whole; the whole only exists as an *arrière pensée* which both the poet and his audience share as a context for the immediate tectonic plasticity of the episode. The spoken word, unlike the written word, must be winged, impelled ever onward by the spontaneity and urgency of verbalization in oral poetry. Creation by means of the spoken word leaves the poet little time to pause and appraise the lines he is shaping in terms of the larger pattern. The oral poet is a veritable Sisyphus; he can not let go of the immediate burden.

The imperious domination of the immediate verse and episode shapes in large measure the paratactic style as well as content of the oral epic. The poet's training extends from the noun-epithet formula to entire schemata.[51] This technique inevitably results in the λέξις εἰρομένη, the strung-along and adding style, and in the paratactic handling of his material. The effect of this technique on the mind of the oral poet is such that it develops a corresponding paratactic technique in handling his material. The poet thus tends to become episodic in his mentality because of his verbal technique. *Verba*, it may be said in paraphrase of Bacon, *abeunt in mores*. When the fifth century style changes from parataxis to hypotaxis the writer correspondingly changes from the paratactic to the organic structure in his art. Thus the relation of the style and method of expression to the creation of a similar mentality is one

[51] W. Arend, *Die typischen Scenen bei Homer* (Berlin, 1933), and Parry's review *CPh* 31 (1936) 357–360.

of the important approaches to the understanding of the inorganic oral poetry.

Furthermore, the spoken word, as every speaker knows, is conducive to digression. It is easier to digress and lose sight of the original purpose in the spoken word than in formal writing which follows an organized text with a beginning, middle, and an end; and so with the oral poet whose medium of communication is solely the spoken word. Digression in oral literature is even more the product of the inspiration to which both Homer's Phemios and oral poets in our own immediate times attest.[52] The inspiration of the moment, which Radlov observed in the oral poetry of the Kara-Kirghiz, is sensitive to the social context of the recitation. Inspiration and logic are frames of mind which do not readily mix and so inspired poetry, shaped by the mood of the moment, the psychological union of the poet and his audience, leads to digression. "Every minstrel," says Radlov, "who has any skill at all always improvises his songs according to the inspiration of the moment, so that he is not in a position to recite a song twice in exactly the same form."[53] When one seeks to find the reason for this he is led to variations and digressions which result from the character of inspiration itself and from the intimate interaction of the poet and his audience. "It seems clear," says Radlov, "that the Kara-Kirghiz minstrel, like the reciter of the Russian *byliny*, selects his incidents according to his own mood, and according to the temper of his audience, from the wealth of relevant incidents in his répertoire. And this is done with very varying talent and constructive ability, and also with varying success according to the minstrel's mood."[54] This emphasis on mood and social context is amply illustrated in the digressive and inorganic character of Demodocus' singing in the eighth book of the *Odyssey*. It explains why the stories of the Kara-Kirghiz poets consist, as Radlov says, of "a mass of material, a number of episodes, which can be arranged and selected from at will, and which are subject to infinite new combinations and groupings,"[55] and why different heroes are credited with the same exploit.[56] These episodes and their combinations are

[52] Chadwick, *op. cit.* (above, note 31) 1.635 ff.
[53] *Ibid.*, 3.181.
[54] *Ibid.*, 3.38–39.
[55] *Ibid.*, 3.181.
[56] *Ibid.*, 3.762, 771.

shaped by the immediate interest and the social context which swings like the magnetic needle around the compass of inspiration.

How intimate and sensitive the poet is to his audience[57] and how in turn this affects the inorganic quality of his poem is best illustrated from a very illuminating passage in Radlov concerning the Kara-Kirghiz minstrel.

"The external stimulus comes, of course, also from the crowd of listeners surrounding the minstrels. Since the minstrel wants to obtain the sympathy of the crowd, by which he is to gain not only fame, but also other advantages, he tries to colour his song according to the listeners who are surrounding him. If he is not directly asked to sing a definite episode, he begins his song with a prelude which will direct his audience into the sphere of his thoughts. By a most subtle art, and allusions to the most distinguished persons in the circle of listeners, he knows how to enlist the sympathy of his audience before he passes on to the song proper. If he sees by the cheers of his listeners that he has obtained full attention, he either proceeds straight to the business, or produces a brief picture of certain events leading up to the episode which is to be sung, and then passes on to the business. The song does not proceed at a level pace. The sympathy of the hearers always spurs the minstrel to new efforts of strength, and it is by this sympathy that he knows how to adapt the song exactly to the temper of his circle of listeners. If rich and distinguished Kirghiz are present, he knows how to introduce panegyrics very skilfully on their families, and to sing of such episodes as he thinks will arouse the sympathy of distinguished people. If his listeners are only poor people, he is not ashamed to introduce venomous remarks regarding the pretensions of the distinguished and the rich, and actually in the greater abundance according as he is gaining the assent of his listeners. One may refer to the third episode in *Manas* which is intended to appeal to my taste solely.

"The minstrel, however, understands very well when he is to desist from his song. If the slightest signs of weariness show themselves, he tries once more to arouse attention by a struggle after the loftiest effects, and then, after calling forth a storm of applause, suddenly to break off his poem. It is marvellous how the minstrel knows his public. I have myself witnessed how one of the sultans, during a song, sprang up suddenly and tore his silk overcoat from his shoulders, and flung it, cheerfully as he did so, as a present to the minstrel."[58]

Then Radlov illustrates how digressions like the catalogue of the

[57] For the importance of studying literature in the context of situation see T. C. Pollock, *The Nature of Literature: Its Relation to Science, Language and Human Experience* (New York, 1942) 57 ff.

[58] Chadwick, *op. cit.* (above, note 31) 3.184–185; for the varying physical strength of the singer in Jugoslav oral poetry cf. *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 109; *AJA* 52 (1948) 42.

"forty heroes," or the points of an ideal horse enumerated *seriatim*, are very popular with the audience.

This passage is an important laboratory in which to study parataxis in oral poetry. It illustrates aspects of the mentality and the factors which produce parataxis in oral poetry. The oral poet never by-passes or is forgetful of the audience in the shaping of his song. The poet interprets the community to itself which, unlike the audience of the cinema, takes an active part in and shares the illusion. So intimate is the connexion of the poet to the audience that Radlov mentions the case of a poet whose breakdown in the midst of a recitation ends in moral disgrace. The mood of his inspiration and the mood of the audience are more important than any detached and objective approach to the epic material. We who *read* the poems abstract the context and magnetic interplay of poet and his audience. That the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are great enough poems to transcend the oral audience of the poet and appeal to the reading audience of all times does not take away from the important fact that the parataxis and inorganic unity of the poems are intimately connected with a physical, psychological context of poet and his audience which inevitably results in parataxis. If we could project into our knowledge of the Homeric poems the part which his audiences played in the arrangement of the episodes we would gain much in our understanding of the poems.

Recent scholars like Bassett have shown the importance of the audience in the creation of the epic illusion and have accounted for inconsistencies which are explicable only by the silent partnership of the audience, such as, how Homer allows his characters to learn "off-stage" what Homer's audience already knew.[59] A study of the audience in Homer's poems and in the oral literature of other peoples shows that the audience in a large measure actively fosters parataxis. The audience imposes certain physical factors which result in the episodic nature of oral poetry. Important among these factors is the time alloted for the poet's recitation. A careful study of the oral poet Demodocus in the eighth book of the *Odyssey* shows that his singing is episodic and the time allowed for his singing is dictated by the social activity and interest of the audience. When the poet asks the muse *τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θυγάτηρ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν* (*Od.* 1.10) we find that this inorganic *ἀμόθεν* is caused not only by inspiration but also by the audience's manipulation of the

[59] Bassett, *op. cit.* (above, note 24) 3.114–140.

story. In the first instance of Demodocus' recitation of the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles (8.75 ff.) Alcinoos interrupts him by reason of his perception of the grief of Odysseus. The second instance of the bard's recitation follows Alcinoos' speech telling how the Phaeacians excel all other men in dancing and in song. After a dazzling performance of the dance by the Phaeacian youths Demodocus performs with the singing of the episode of Ares and Aphrodite. This yields immediately to the dancing episode of Halios and Laodamas. After the presentation of the gift and the feast, in which Odysseus endears himself with Demodocus by his offering, Odysseus bids him ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετάβηθι καὶ ἵππου κόσμον ἄεισον (8.492). The word μετάβηθι, "digress," from "The Woe of the Achaeans" to "The Arrangement of the Wooden Horse" illustrates concretely how parataxis is imposed by the audience and is paralleled by the Kara-Kirghiz poet in Radlov's account who is asked directly to sing a definite episode and by the poet's inorganic improvisation in response to a question by Radlov himself.[60] The word μετάβηθι yields to us a long overlooked factor and explanation of the inorganic character of the Homeric poems. It not only illustrates further ἀμόθεν (*Od.* 1.10) but also furnishes us with an important explanation of the origins of Homeric parataxis. If the episode is the smallest unit in the minimum time allowed by the audience to the poet it is also, as seen from the structure of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the basis of the expansion of the story when more time is allowed. Chadwick tells of an unnamed Icelander who is given twelve evenings of a Christmas festival to tell of the exploits of Harold III, King of Norway.[61] The king himself made the poet stop after a certain time, so as to make the story last out. This incident illustrates several important aspects of our problem. The episodic character of a poem is partly controlled by the audience; it tells us, as Parry illustrated in the case of Jugoslav oral poetry,[62] that the division of epics into books is a later editorial arbitrary act and that the poet stops at any part of the story for diverse reasons; and finally the important fact that the granting to the poet of a large amount of time results not in organic composition but a multiplication of the episodes over a proportionally greater period

[60] Chadwick, *op. cit.* (above, note 31) 3.29–30, 184; for a study of the interruptions of the audience in Jugoslav oral poetry cf. *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 108–109.

[61] Chadwick, *op. cit.* (above, note 31) 1.581.

[62] A. B. Lord, "Homer and Huso I: The Singer's Rests in Greek and Southslavic Heroic Song," *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 106–113.

of time. The unit of his technique is the episode, the irreducible minimum for a social occasion, and it is only through multiplication of episodes that the poet knows how to fill in the longer period of time. Thus the uncertainty of the time given to the poet by the audience and the poet's own physical strength in recitation fostered the development of the inorganic and episodic type of oral epic. These episodes are connected, as van Groningen shows, by means of transitions, recurring lines, echoes, and foreshadowing. Even though the poets have a comprehensive synthesis of their material, as illustrated by Homer, they present it in a detachable and linear style as illustrated by Demodocus and the diverse ways by which either the poet in his relation to the audience, or the audience in its relation to the poet, shapes the parataxis of the oral recitation.

Besides dictating the time at the disposal of the poet and manipulating the story in an active way the audience exercises a powerful control over the choice of the material and circumstance of recitation. As Bassett has pointed out, the poet is ever concerned with the partnership of the audience in the creation of the epic illusion. The audience must not be wearied or confused and therefore linear simplicity, digression, variety are essential in keeping the audience's interest. To enjoy each part for its own sake without the strain of complexity, as illustrated in a story like Conrad's *Nostromo*, where the reader is put to a strain to relate the parts to the whole, is essential in oral entertainment. When the audience is wearied or the poet realizes his own weariness or that the artistic illusion is broken he ends his recitation regardless of where he is with respect to the whole. Radlov gives several examples of such terminations.[63] Furthermore, by flexibly adjusting the tale to the interest of the audience the poet inevitably contributes to the inorganic quality of the epic. Genealogies and catalogues are common features in all oral literatures; but the audience's interest is the poet's interest, and it may be stated as a cardinal principle in oral literature that the interest of the audience rather than concern for the structure of his material is the object of the poet.

Both the poet and the audience in turn are intimately related to the material from which epic poetry arises. The absence in Greek religion of any priestly class or theology which shaped the material of mythology into an organic whole illustrates an important aspect of the epic material. The epic cycles are inorganic store-

[63] Chadwick, *op. cit.* (above, note 31) 3.183, 185.

houses for the poet and dramatist, and when Aeschylus speaks of τεμάχη τῶν Ὁμήρου δείπνων he mentions an important characteristic of his sources. The nature of the epic cycles, which are the "stuff" of the oral poetry, is such that the poet reflects the inorganic quality of his material. Unlike our own times where novelty of plot is supreme the oral poet was closely bound to his traditional material, from which he chose segments, expanded or contracted them in accordance with the requirements of the recitation. The segment may or may not have a unity, as Aristotle observed of epic poems. But a poet like Homer may impose, as we see from the preludes, a thematic unity to which he flexibly adheres. This unity, however, does not prevent him from making a veritable odyssey of digressions before reaching the Ithaca of his unity, whether this be the return of his hero or the destructive wrath of Achilles. Throughout the flexible unities of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* there is transparent the parataxis of the traditional material.

Both the poet and the audience are so intimately a part of this material that the large unity may exist as an undefined *arrière pensée* of both poet and audience. The poet selects his material and the unity of the larger whole may be in the minds of the audience, as Bassett has so skilfully shown. Therefore abrupt terminations in a social recitation, contradictions or unexplained knowledge of this or that, do not bother the audience as much as they do the critics. The unity is largely in the mind of the audience as is illustrated in the case of people whose conversation reveals that there is a wide and intimate background which they share but do not completely express. The oral recitation thus becomes a selection of parts whose whole is the inexpressed context of the traditional material. The flexible minds of the poet and the audience can enjoy parataxis more than the critics who do not share the background of the poet and his oral audience. Thus when the audience and the poet are intimate possessors of a storied heritage the poet is freed from always having to speak the literal to inspire the understanding of his audience. The parataxis of the parts is ever in a fluid context, understood, even if not expressed, by both poet and his audience. By having the audience share in the context the poet is left free to develop the part. How well the audience can participate in the knowledge of the whole material can be illustrated by Chodzko's collection of the unwritten poetry of the Turkomans of which Chadwick says, "It is obvious . . . that this tradition

appears to have been preserved with exceptional fidelity for three hundred years. Distinct cycles are kept strictly apart, and form the exclusive répertoires of professional reciters, whose memories are checked by those of their audiences, who are apparently by no means ignorant of the stories and songs to which they are listening."[64]

To one who would thus properly understand the grounds for inorganic parataxis in Homer and its *fortleben* in post-Homeric Greek literature a knowledge of the true nature of pre-classical mentality and of the forces at work on the poet and the conditions under which he creates is essential. Aristotle's λέξις εἰρομένη must be understood in the light of these factors and with their understanding we are reminded of the sea-god Glaucus in Plato's *Republic* "whose first nature can hardly be made out by those who catch glimpses of him, because the original members of his body are broken off and mutilated and crushed and in every way marred by the waves, and other parts that have attached themselves to him, accretions of shells and sea-weed and rocks, so that he is more like any wild creature than what he was by nature."[65] With the real and pristine nature of parataxis thus revealed Homeric criticism can proceed to formulate principles of criticism which explain the true physiognomy of oral poetry. Its guide must not be the well-worn concepts of Aristotelian criticism but the laboratory of the other oral literatures such as Parry's studies of Jugoslav oral poetry and new studies to be made by the writer of the oral poetry of Crete. Homer must be approached more with the results of field-work and less with *a priori* logical analyses; much more of the psychology of oral literatures, such as Marcel Jousse's[66] work, is needed as a foundation of the new critique. Exacting studies must be made of the field-work reports of Radlov, Parry,[67] and the numerous works quoted and used by the Chadwicks which shall serve as the context to study Homer and to elicit the concepts of a new critique. We must replace such concepts as characterization, which is meaningless for Homer, and ask why his characters are generic types,

[64] *Ibid.*, 3.177.

[65] *Rep.* 611D.

[66] M. Jousse, *Études de Psychologie Linguistique: Le Style oral rythmique et mnémotechnique chez les Verbo-moteurs* (Paris, 1925).

[67] See the unfinished chapter entitled "Aim and Method" of his unfinished book *The Singer of Tales*, *AJA* 52 (1948) 37–40.

why such people as Nausikaa shape up and fade unused.[68] We must study more thoroughly the social factors which bear upon the form of oral poetry. We must ask new questions, we must read works like James Joyce's *Ulysses*, Hemingway's novels, hear certain kinds of music, to get fresh insights into the inorganic mind, where the intellectual organic concepts are properly thrust aside and an attempt is made to record the undisciplined mind, the natural succession of its thoughts, its extreme naturalness, unconcern for cause and effect, coherence; the frame of mind which enjoys parataxis[69] with its intense preoccupation with the particular, which is the child's kingdom of Heaven. Such an approach, such investigations, such questions will not, as Hamlet says, pluck out the heart of Homer's mystery, but they will rid us of our long-obsessed false notions of *disjecta membra* and enrich our understanding so that we may enjoy the kaleidoscopic flexibility and variety of Homer's panorama, ever mindful of Parry's words: "The mind, since it cannot think in a vacuum, must necessarily carry over to its comprehension of its past the notions of the present, unless a man has actually been able to build up from the very details of the past a notion which must necessarily exclude the application of his habitual notions."[70]

[68] Cf. T. E. Shaw, *The Odyssey of Homer* (New York, 1932), Translator's Note; cf. J. A. Davison's remarks in *CR* 62 (1948) 116–117.

[69] For some interesting remarks on inorganic novels cf. W. Somerset Maugham, "What Makes a Good Novel Great," *New York Times Book Review* (November 30, 1947) 49; for the inorganic in the films see F. S. Nugent, "Writer or Director—Who Makes a Movie?", *New York Times Book Review* (December 21, 1947) 18.

[70] Quoted by A. B. Lord in *TAPhA* 67 (1936) 107.