

XV. Invocation and Catalogue in Hesiod and Homer

WILLIAM W. MINTON

HUNTER COLLEGE

Over a half century ago Gilbert Murray made the observation that "we have only recently specialized the handbook . . . and exiled it from the Muses. The real Muses did not recognize any generic difference between a handbook and an epic poem. Think of the Catalogues in Hesiod."¹ Though startling on its face, this statement is founded on an important perception: the Muses, and with them the earliest Greek poetry, are somehow to be associated with *information*. The association is reflected with remarkable persistence in the traditional formulae of invocation used by both Homer and Hesiod and is clearly very old in the oral poetry of Greece.

In a former article I attempted to show that invocations in Homer had all become associated with a narrative pattern of crisis, struggle, and defeat.² This is a secondary development. The actual form of these invocations, retained no doubt from the usage of an earlier time, gives no hint of it. Formally the Homeric invocations show precisely the same characteristics as those of Hesiod, characteristics which suggest very strongly that the invocation was in origin an appeal for information. In both the invocation is framed as a *question* in which the poet asks for the material of his poem, often in quantitative terms (who? what? how many?), and what follows has the form of an *answer*, characteristically supplying the information in the form of a catalogue or *ordered enumeration*.

The question-answer relationship is generally clear in both poets. The more significant association with catalogue material

¹ *The Rise of the Greek Epic* (Oxford 1907) 98. This statement does not appear in later editions, but the concept is integral to Murray's whole thesis, and there is no reason to suppose that he abandoned it.

² "Homer's Invocations of the Muses: Traditional Patterns," *TAPA* 91 (1960) 292-309, referred to hereafter simply as *TAPA* 91. For the importance of studying invocations as relatively fixed formulaic elements in the context of a long oral tradition see the introductory remarks there.

is quite real in Hesiod; in Homer with the important exception of the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2 it is generally little more than vestigial. The natural inference is that a common poetic tradition with a considerable if not dominant catalogue or informational element stood behind both. It is now known that most early oral poetry, associated with the activities of the "poet-seer," has in fact a wide-ranging informational character, and intimations that such singers once existed in Greece have been seen in both Hesiod and Homer.³ If such a parent tradition prevailed in Greece before the migrations eastward, it is not difficult to see how the subsequent evolution of extended epic narrative in Ionia would tend to obscure the informational element and its association with invocations, and so open the way for the new invocational alignment that arose there. Mainland song, on the other hand, remaining closer to the old roots, might well continue to preserve more nearly the character of the earlier tradition.⁴ Such a picture makes Murray's intuitive perception (based largely on the prominence of the Muses in Hesiod and in the invocation to the Homeric Catalogue of Ships) somewhat more plausible, not perhaps as a present reality for Homer, but as an intimation of that earlier tradition, still reflected to a considerable extent in Hesiod, in which the line between informational or catalogue material and narrative was not always clearly marked.⁵ In this context the Muses emerge as something

³ See in general H. M. and N. K. Chadwick, *The Growth of Literature*, 3 vols. (Cambridge 1932-1940); the synthesis in N. K. Chadwick, *Poetry and Prophecy* (Cambridge 1942) is convenient and particularly relevant. For the prior existence of the poet-seer in Greece see the valuable assessment of the Muses by E. R. Dodds, *The Greeks and the Irrational* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1951) 80-82 and notes *ad loc.*; cf. Chadwick, *Poetry and Prophecy* 1-3.

⁴ Cf. *TAPA* 91.292, note 2. The position that Hesiodic mainland and Homeric Ionian poetry represent two branches of a common tradition is also assumed and developed by T. B. L. Webster, *From Mycenae to Homer* (London 1958): see 178 and Chap. 6 generally. Though working along different lines, he too concludes (184-86) that enumerative or catalogue poetry was one of the dominant elements of that tradition (the other being an increase in narrative skill; but the major advance in this must belong to the later Ionian branch). Webster's restriction of the parent tradition to the period roughly 1100 to 900 B.C. (at Athens) seems a bit tight in its upper limit, but is at any rate suggestive.

⁵ See Murray (above, note 1, 3rd ed. [Oxford 1924]) 96-97. The partial character of Murray's Homeric evidence for the association of Muses and catalogue was sharply criticized by G. M. Calhoun in "The Poet and the Muses in Homer," *CP* 33 (1938) 157-66, with important results but with no appreciation of the value of vestigial evidence (see *TAPA* 91.293, note 3; 294, note 5). Recognition of the importance of

very like the embodiment of the traditional knowledge (and wisdom) of the past in all its factual precision and circumstantial detail, transmitted through generations of singers: the early Greek tradition (Hes. *Theog.* 53 ff., 915–17; *Hom. Hymn. Merc.* 429–30) that makes them the daughters of “Memory” is not, as Murray saw, an idle one.

Hesiod is then the conservative, Homer or his tradition the innovator. Other details of invocational form and usage point in the same direction. Most important, the Hesiodic invocations all have the form of proems. Now the proem, or “proem-invocation,” as it will be convenient to term it, has a remarkably fixed formal pattern, apparently of some antiquity; it is ultimately related to the hymn, and in Hesiod the association is still quite strong. The fact that Hesiod uses this essentially introductory invocation not only at the beginning but internally further suggests a kind of traditionalism not found in Homer, and raises questions of structure (in the *Theogony*) of some importance for this inquiry. Homer on the other hand uses the proem-invocation only at the beginning, elsewhere a shorter form apparently developed for use in continuous narrative. This is still through the force of tradition phrased in quantitative terms, but its purpose and orientation are primarily dramatic; in a final bold but logical step even this form is dropped and a new kind of invocation created that is more directly appropriate to narrative.

In the examination of individual invocations the focus will necessarily be on evidence of association with poetry of a catalogue nature. The question-answer relationship will be important chiefly as it illuminates this. It is usually quite obvious and will need little special comment later. A few illustrations at this point will suffice to indicate its significance and general character. The most important point to notice is that the poet does not ask for help or guidance in “how” he shall tell his story; there is no suggestion of a plea for “inspiration,” only for information.⁶

the catalogue element (*plêthos* of material) with invocations is at least as old as Eustathius (q.v. on *Il.* 2.484). During the nineteenth century the association of invocation and catalogue tended to be taken as a mark of Hesiodic poetry: the most obvious examples in Homer, the Catalogue of Ships and the briefer list at the end of *Il.* 14 (508–22), were branded as interpolations, while invocations which could be explained by the *megethos* or special importance of the context (see *TAPA* 91.293 and note 4) were left to Homer. Cf. G. B. Mocker, *De Musis a poetis Graecorum in componendis carminibus invocatis* (Leipzig 1893), e.g. 26–28, 45–46.

⁶ Awareness of the “question-answer” phenomenon as a distinct characteristic

Formally the question may be a direct one, but is more commonly indirect. The answer is sometimes a simple phrase. *Il.* 11.218–21:

Quest. *Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι, Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι,
ὅς τις δὴ πρῶτος Ἀγαμέμνωνος ἀντίον ἦλθεν . . .*

Ans. *Ἰφιδάμας Ἀντηγορίδης . . .*

More often the answer is expanded into a sentence that merely echoes the wording of the question or responds so closely that its character as an answer is unmistakable. Especially notable is the frequent appearance of *prōtos* in both question and answer, further suggestive of the ordered enumeration that is anticipated. Occasionally, as in the first and last examples below, the character of the answer *qua* answer is further pointed up by the use of introductory particles. *Theog.* 114–16:

Q. *ταῦτά μοι ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι . . .
ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καὶ εἶπαθ', ὅ τι πρῶτον γένητ' αὐτῶν.*

A. *Ἡ τοι μὲν πρῶτιστα Χάος γένητ' . . .*

Il. 2.761–63 and 768:

Q. *τίς τ' ἄρ τῶν ὅχ' ἄριστος ἔην, σύ μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα,
αὐτῶν ἧδ' ἱππῶν . . .*

A. *Ἴπποι μὲν μέγ' ἄρισται ἔσαν Φηρητιάδαι
.....
ἀνδρῶν αὖ μέγ' ἄριστος ἔην Τελαμώνιος Αἴας . . .*

Il. 14.508–11:

Q. *Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι . . .
ὅς τις δὴ πρῶτος βροτόεντ' ἀνδράγρι' Ἀχαιῶν
ἦρατ' . . .*

A. *Αἴας ῥα πρῶτος Τελαμώνιος ὕρτιον οὔτα . . .*

seems to be fairly recent: see O. Falter, *Der Dichter und sein Gott bei den Griechen und Römern* (Würzburg 1934), 4–5 and 55–56 for Homer; 12 for Hesiod. Falter's interpretation of its significance and probable origin is suggestive (55–56): “Freilich bringt der Sänger selbst die Antwort, aber es klingt wie ein Echo der Musenworte selbst, vielleicht nimmt der Vortrag des Sängers bei diesen Antworten auch einen anderen Ton an. Sicher hat sich diese Form aus der einmal wirklich vorhandenen Anschauung entwickelt, dass die Muse in der Tat antwortete auf die Fragen und Bitten des Sängers um Auskunft.” Cf. further W. F. Otto, *Die Musen*² (Düsseldorf-Köln 1956) 33–34 and Part 3 *passim* (especially 71, 85), and W. Marg, *Homer über die Dichtung* (Münster 1957) 8.

The quotations from the *Iliad* illustrate the shorter Homeric invocation. That from the *Theogony* is the final element of a proem-invocation. The proem-invocation always concludes with such a question, which thus becomes the key element in its relation to what follows. The basic pattern of this longer form, most familiar from the proems of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, is quite simple: (1) a general adjuration to the Muse or Muses, in the imperative, to sing or tell or celebrate the subject of the song to come (e.g. *Ménin aeide, Andra moi ennepe*), followed by (2) a relative clause (*hê myri' Achaiois . . . , hos mala polla . . .*) that leads into a more circumstantial but still general outline of the subject, after which (3) the poet returns to the Muses with a specific question designed to lead into the immediate point at which the poem begins.

Though Hesiod uses this form exclusively, its initial appearance in the *Theogony* is postponed for a lengthy celebration of the power of the Muses and their gift of song.⁷ The great hymn to the Muses—some hundred odd lines (1–115)—that introduces the vast catalogue-narrative of the *Theogony* is the best testimony we could have of their vital association with such material. It is not an invocation in any precise sense, though it culminates in one, and as a hymn its affiliation with invocational form was probably intended to be felt. But it is an invocation in spirit, and its alliance with enumerative song is clear not only from the poem it prefaces, but from the descriptions of the Muses' song it contains. Their gift to Hesiod is one of *knowledge*, the power to celebrate in song *ta t'essomena pro t'eonta* (32), and they themselves a few lines later (38) sing *ta t'eonta ta t'essomena pro t'eonta*, phrases which clearly suggest the wide-ranging informational poetry spoken of earlier.⁸ There is a similar suggestion in their singing (66–67) *pantôn te nomous kai êthea kedna / athanatôn*, “the ways of all men and the noble nature of the immortals.” More specifically enumerative is the “catalogue-hymn” (11–21) they sing as they rise above Helicon at night clothed in mist. But most telling is the account of their great song before Zeus, the divine

⁷ The Hesiodic invocations are: *Theog.* 105–15, 965–68, 1021–22 with continuation in *POxy.* 23.2354, *Op.* 1–10.

⁸ N. K. Chadwick, *Poetry and Prophecy* (above, note 3) 3, quotes in this connection the boast of a Tatar shaman or poet-seer that he “knows the future, the past, and everything which is taking place in the present, both above and below the earth.”

counterpart and preview (except for its final topic) of Hesiod's own *Theogony*: in this (43–52) they sing, *prôton*, the origin of the gods; *deuteron*, the glory of Zeus; *autis*, the race of men and Giants.

At its close the long introductory hymn modulates into the invocation proper (105–15).⁹ This has the strict form of a proem-invocation (indicated by underlining). *Theogony* 105–15 / 116–17 (answer):

κλείετε δ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἔόντων,
οἱ Γῆς τ' ἐξεγένοντο καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος

(Expansion: lines 106–13)

114 ταῦτά μοι ἔσπετε Μοῦσαι, Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι,
ἐξ ἀρχῆς, καὶ εἴπαθ', ὅ τι πρῶτον γένετ' αὐτῶν.

ῥ' Ἡ τοι μὲν πρῶτιστα Χάος γένετ', αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα
Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος . . .

The imperative to the Muses at the beginning cannot be taken as a separate invocation; it never appears apart from this form and is always caught up and modified at the end into an invocational question.

The request for an ordered enumeration, which of course does follow, is as obvious here as the element of question and answer. The material outlined in the expansion is little more than a list and fairly represents the substance of the poem, the origins of the gods (and the cosmos) culminating in the supremacy of Zeus. It is only this *material* that the poet asks for (*tauta*, 14) in a summarizing, transitional request that leads into the specific concluding question.

The other two invocations in the *Theogony* (965–68 and 1021–22) fall in an area of the poem that has suffered in transmission, may not be a part of the original *Theogony*, or even—some would say—by Hesiod at all. The division of prerogatives among the gods after the overthrow of the Titans (885) is the last event specifically mentioned in the invocation (112–13; cf. 71–75). The account of the divine marriages of Zeus that follows, 886–929, may still be part of the original poem, but the existence of an alternate version of a portion of it in antiquity (quoted by Chrysippus, in Galen) suggests an early confusion. The hodgepodge of divine

⁹ Line 104, usually printed as the opening of this invocation, is really part of the formal hymn closing. See below, note 19 and text *ad loc.*

and divine-human unions in the next section, 930–62, may reflect further uncertainties in transmission. With the invocation of 965–68 (preceded by a two-line “farewell” to the gods) we have what appears to be a distinct poem dealing with the unions of goddesses and mortals, and the fragmentary invocation of 1021–22 again indicates a new poem on a complementary topic, the unions of gods with mortal women. The abrupt termination of our text of the *Theogony* at this point suggests a final uncertainty. The last two lines appear in the original of only one manuscript and were added by a second hand in another.¹⁰ The reason for their addition is obvious: without them the poem would end (1019–20) with an awkward and inconclusive *men*-clause. The reason no more was added now seems clear from the publication of a papyrus fragment (*POxy.* 23.2354) that begins with and continues these two lines: it reveals an invocation of extraordinary length (at least fifteen lines), clearly the beginning of a poem of some magnitude, probably the *Catalogues of Women*.¹¹

These two invocations have illuminating similarities in form, both introduce catalogue material, and both are linked through transitional lines to the preceding material in our text of the *Theogony*. Before they are dismissed as non-Hesiodic additions it will be profitable to consider them together in the context of the whole work.

The first invocation lacks the full form of a proem-invocation, although it begins and ends like one. *Theogony* 965–68 / 969:

νῦν δὲ θεάων φύλον αἰείσατε, ἡδυνέπειαι
Μοῦσαι Ὀλμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο,
ὅσσαι δὴ θνητοῖσι παρ' ἀνδράσιν εὐνηθεῖσαι
ἀθάναται γείναντο θεοῖς ἐπιείκελα τέκνα.

Δημήτηρ μὲν Πλοῦτον ἐγένετο, δῖα θεάων . . .

The Muses are asked to “sing the tribe of goddesses . . . howsoever many . . .” We should normally expect a relative clause and expansion to follow *theaōn phylon*, with some further verb like *espete* to introduce the *hossai* clause and give it the more overt character of an indirect question. That this is indeed the underlying pattern is suggested by the second invocation, which begins

¹⁰ See F. Jacoby, *Hesiodi Theogonia* (Berlin 1930) on 1021–22.

¹¹ See *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part 23, ed. E. Lobel (London 1956).

almost identically and ends with a similar clause, introduced by *hossais*. *Theogony* 1021–22 plus *POxy.* 23.2354.1–15:

- 1 (= *Theog.* 1021) *Nῦν δὲ γυναικῶν φῶλον αἰέσατε, ἥδυέπειαι*
 2 (= *Theog.* 1022) *Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο*
αἶ τότ' ἄρισται ἔσαν[
μίτρας τ' ἀλλύσαντο . [
μισγόμεναι θεο . . [

(Expansion: lines 3–13)

- 14 *τῶν ἔσπετε, Μ[οῦσαι, Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι,*
ᾧσσαις δὴ παρελ[έξατ' (?Zeus . . . Poseidon . . .
Ares).¹²

“And now sing, O Muses . . . , the tribe of women who were in those days the noblest . . . and loosed their zones . . . mingling with the gods Of these women tell, O Muses . . . with howsoever many [Zeus] lay . . . (and Poseidon . . . and Ares).” The appearance of a relative in the first new line (3) of the papyrus leading into an expansion, and of a summarizing, more specific question-invocation at the end identify this as a true proem-invocation. The invocation of *Theog.* 965–68 will then be a condensed version of this form, better fitted to the relatively brief catalogue poem it introduces.

In both invocations the poet's overt recognition of the quantitative character of this material (*hossai*, *hossais*) is particularly notable. The enumeration in the first poem (*Theog.* 969–1018) follows a generally chronological order, beginning with the senior goddess Demeter and ending with Calypso. If the papyrus invocation does indeed introduce the *Catalogues*, we again have a poem of ordered enumeration, the order this time being a genealogical one, apparently tracing the descent of each branch of the Greek race from a common ancestor. As it is, however, the only hint of order that appears in the invocation itself is the list of gods, ?Zeus, Poseidon, Ares, whose unions are to be related. It is at least possible that the opening account followed this order of divine seniority; the same order is in fact used earlier in the divine unions of the *Theogony*: Zeus, 886–929; Poseidon, 930–33; Ares, 933–37.

¹² For line 15 I print the editor's conjectural restoration; the papyrus reads simply *ᾧσσαις δὴ παρελ[*. The subject, probably Zeus, has dropped out: the names of Poseidon and Ares appear in succeeding lines, apparently still part of the invitational question.

These poems are, I would suggest, semi-independent pieces intended from the first to follow the *Theogony* proper. The transitional lines joining the invocations of each to what precedes are consonant with this, though hardly conclusive in themselves. The form of invocation is somewhat more important. The use of the true proem-invocation, found only in Homer and Hesiod, betrays an early poet; even the neatly abbreviated form of it in *Theog.* 965–68 is more easily understood as the work of a poet thoroughly at home in the form than as the scissors-and-paste curtailment of a later hand, and it is simplest to suppose this poet was Hesiod himself. Furthermore, the closely related papyrus invocation contains a feature that links it directly with the invocation of the *Theogony* proper (105–15): the closing invocational question in both is introduced in almost identical fashion (papyrus, line 14: *taôn espete, Mousai*...; *Theog.* 114: *tauta moi espete Mousai*...). This must, I believe, be regarded as the distinctive Hesiodic formula for this element.

Such a series of interrelated poems would be bound to attract uncertainties, particularly if the first were especially popular. The problem would be where to cut it off. It was finally cut off, somewhat awkwardly, just at the point where the gods ceased to be of first importance and the history of the human race began. The whole would form a comprehensive history of gods and men, beginning with the *Theogony* proper, that is, the extant poem at least through its account of the divine unions of Zeus (929), perhaps including also some of the divine and divine-human unions that follow (through 962).¹³ The brief poem, 965–1018, retailing the unions of goddesses and mortal men, would then be a bridge to an account of the far more common phenomenon of unions of gods with mortal women, from which in the *Catalogues of Women* the origins and descent of the Greek race are traced. Such a comprehensive subject is in fact, as we have seen, outlined by Hesiod (*Theog.* 43–52) as the full range of the Muses' song

¹³ It is becoming increasingly clear that the *Theogony* proper must have included the "marriages" of Zeus as a natural culmination of the whole. See F. Solmsen, *Hesiod and Aeschylus* (Ithaca 1949) 55 and note 181. The analogy of eastern creation myth, in which the "divine marriage" of the victorious god occupies a similar position, cannot be disregarded; for a good brief account of the relation of this eastern material to Hesiod see G. R. Levy, *The Sword from the Rock* (London 1953) 100–10. Jacoby (above, note 10) preface, 27 ff., who places the end of the poem at this point, discusses the problem of these final portions at some length and cites other views on the subject.

before Zeus, and may well represent a traditional range of song as Hesiod knew it. Its first two parts, the origin of the gods and the glory of Zeus, coincide precisely with the *Theogony* itself; the third part (50), “the race of men and mighty Giants,” would (allowing for the “Giants” who are in any case mysterious) be sufficiently represented in the *Catalogues*. If Hesiod wrote both *Theogony* and *Catalogues*, he could hardly help conceive them as closely related parts of a traditional whole; and this is, I believe, precisely what the extant text of the *Theogony* tells us he did.

The last Hesiodic invocation, the proem to the *Works and Days*, presents some illuminating divergences from the proem-invocation form. It appears to be more of a hymn than an invocation, and lacks the usual invocal question at the close. *Works and Days* 1–10 / 11–12:

Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν ἀοιδῆσιν κλείουσαι
δεῦτε, Δί' ἐννέπετε, σφέτερον πατέρ' ὑμνεῖουσαι
ὅν τε διὰ βροτοὶ ἄνδρες ὁμῶς ἄφατοί τε φατοί τε

(Expansion, lines 3–8: celebration of Zeus's power as dispenser of divine justice to “humble the proud and raise the lowly.”)

ρεῖα δέ τ' ἰθύνει σκολιὸν καὶ ἀγῆνορα κάρφει
Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης, ὃς ὑπέρτατα δώματα ναίει.
κλῦθι ἰδὼν αἰὼν τε, δίκη δ' ἴθυνε θέμιστας
τῆν· ἐγὼ δέ κε, Πέρση, ἐτήτυμα μυθησαίμην.

Οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην Ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν
εἰσὶ δύω . . .

The opening in spite of its unusual “summoning” of the Muses and uniqueness of expression (there are no formulaic parallels) does conform to the standard proem-invocation opening. The relative in line 3 leads into an expansion celebrating the justice of Zeus, which is in fact the essential subject of the poem. The last two lines are of special interest: in 9, in place of a closing appeal to the Muses, there is a prayer to Zeus to “give straight judgements,” with some reference, we must presume, to the impending lawsuit, or perhaps more likely, to the out-of-court settlement (by the *itheîê(i)si dikê(i)s* of Zeus) Hesiod proposes to Perses in 35–36; this is followed in 10 by a direct declaration to Perses, for whom the wisdom of the poem is intended and whose

attention is thus invited, that the poet himself "would tell true things." The account of these "true things," the poem proper, then begins in 11 with the discussion of the two Strifes, for which as we shall see later the term *etêtyma* is specially fitting.

These final lines, it will be noted, fulfill precisely the same function as the usual closing question: they provide a transition from the body of the proem to the specific point at which the poem begins. But they have their immediate model in the formal hymn closing. In its full form this is composed of three elements: (1) farewell and (2) prayer to the god hymned, (3) the poet's personal declaration of transition to another song. All do not always appear and there are variations in order, but the pattern is clear enough. Here Hesiod uses the last two, which appear in just this sequence in five hymns (2, 6, 10, 30, 31); it is possible also that the preceding line (8) carries an echo of the "farewell," one feature of which is a second address to the god by his characteristic epithets. The *Homeric Hymn To Earth the Mother of All* (30) provides a good illustration:

Χαίρε θεῶν μήτηρ, ἄλοχ' Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,
 πρόφρων δ' ἀντ' ὧδης βίοτον θυμήρ' ὄπαζε·
 αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σέω καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' αἰοιδῆς.¹⁴

An alternate to the very common final line of declaration used here, which is found in about one-third of the *Hymns*, is the even more clearly transitional *seu d'egô arxamenos metabêsomai allon es hymnon* (*Hymns* 5, 9, 18). And in *Hymns* 31 and 32 the declaration actually specifies the kind of poem to follow, namely epic, just as Hesiod specifies *etêtyma* as his subject.

Hesiod's final lines are then an adaptation, though a free and individual one, of such hymn closings. Indeed if we look at the proem as a hymn rather than an invocation, its form presents little difficulty. The standard hymn opening contains (1) the name of the god, and (2) a relative clause leading from that into the body of the hymn; the latter is essentially a celebration of the god's attributes and power. When an invocation of the Muses is combined with this (*Hymns* 4, 5, 9, 14, 17, 19, 20, 31-33) the

¹⁴ The last two lines also appear at the close of *Hom. Hymn. Cer.* (2); it is instructive to note that while the formal "farewell" is omitted there, as it is in the proem to the *Works and Days*, the lines are still preceded by a final address to Demeter and Persephone chiefly by their epithets and places of worship.

result is very close to what we find here. The *Hymn to Aphrodite* (5), for example, begins:

*Μοῦσά μοι ἔννεπε ἔργα πολυχρύσου Ἀφροδίτης
Κύπριδος, ἧ τε θεοῖσιν ἐπὶ γλυκὺν ἥμερον ὥρσε.*

At this point proem-invocation and hymn are distinguishable only by specific mention of the god's name. Hesiod by representing the subject of his poem, divine Justice, in the person of Zeus has effected a unique and interesting fusion of the two forms. One should perhaps rather speak of it as a "re-identification," for a common background, whatever its precise nature, there must be: hymn openings like that just quoted suggest it, and it is the obvious inference from the proemic function of at least the shorter hymns, two of which as we have seen are expressly designed as preludes to epic song.¹⁵ In embarking on this poem of deep personal and religious conviction Hesiod has simply leaned more heavily on the hymnic affinities of the form and adapted the concluding transitional elements of the proem-hymn in his own individual way to express this more fittingly.

The closing question of the true proem-invocation has then been displaced, but it is possible that something of its impress still remained. If what follows is not an "answer" in context, it is at least a reply to a question that had arisen in Hesiod's mind: there are *two* kinds of Strife, one good and one bad, not a bad Strife only, as he had declared in the *Theogony* (225). And it is at the same time a kind of explanation of his boast to tell *etêtyma* in the last line of the proem. We might interpret line 11 thus: "There was not, *then* [*ara*: I say this to justify my statement and to rectify my earlier view], one kind of Strife only, but . . ." ¹⁶

The *Works and Days* is in one sense a new thing, a discovery of personal identity. The bald enumerative manner of the *Theogony* would have little place here. In the proem only the plural *etêtyma* gives any hint of a quantitative concept of the material and that can hardly be pressed. But just as the force of tradition makes itself felt in the apparently bold innovation of the proem,

¹⁵ On the latter point see further Allen-Halliday-Sikes, *The Homeric Hymns*² (Oxford 1936) xciii-xcv.

¹⁶ For this interpretation of the two Strifes see Wilamowitz, *Hesiodos Erga* (Berlin 1928) on *Op.* 12, and for its direct relation to the *etêtyma* of the proem, K. Latte, "Hesiods Dichterweihe," *Antike und Abendland* 2 (1946) 160-62.

so it does also in the poem that follows. It soon becomes apparent that despite their aura of "personal wisdom" the "true things" of which Hesiod tells are actually very old things: they form a substructure of enumerative material on which the poem is built. This is indeed more obvious in the latter part, the "Works" and the "Days" proper, with their hoary precepts and lists of age-old taboos. But it can be seen even under the moral teaching of the early section, in the account of the Five Ages, and more generally in the language and style itself which is built largely out of distinct proverbial apophthegms welded together in varying degrees of cohesiveness.

However far then Hesiod has advanced on the road to individual expression, whatever new poetic power he felt from his meeting with the Muses and their special gift of song (*Theog.* 22-35), the character and form of his poetry gives considerable evidence of an ingrained conservatism.¹⁷ It appears in the exclusive use of the formal proem-invocation, in the deep-seated association of this with catalogue material, and in the implication from its "internal" use for introducing distinct though related poems that Hesiod knew how to compose in only relatively brief units, even though he might have an over-all concept appropriate to a large-scale poem of Homeric proportions.¹⁸

Above all it appears in the hymnic associations of this invocational form. Even more illuminating than the invocation to the *Works and Days* is the long prelude to the *Theogony*. Exceptional though it is, postponing the formal invocation for some hundred lines, its construction as a proem-hymn gives it, as we

¹⁷ For the general acceptance of Hesiod's meeting with the Muses as a very real psychic experience of some sort see Falter (above, note 6) 13-16 and Latte (above, note 16) 152-63; cf. also B. Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind*, tr. T. G. Rosenmeyer (Cambridge [Mass.] 1953) 138 and note 10. Latte's interpretation of this (see especially 156-58) as a variety of the not uncommon supernatural encounter with nymphs (cf. *nympholēptos*), here those of Hesiod's "god-filled" Helicon whom the poet then identified with the Muses of his poetic tradition, is ingenious and attractive. I doubt that it is the whole story. Hesiod's Muses are far too vitally connected with the surely very old catalogue poetry, of the antiquity of which in Boeotia there is still further evidence (see below, note 30 and text *ad loc.*). I would rather suppose that their reality for Hesiod largely reflects the persistence of the reality of that tradition in mainland poetry.

¹⁸ The length of the Homeric poems is exceptional in oral composition: see A. B. Lord, *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge [Mass.] 1960) 153. Most oral song is, like Hesiod's, brief, a few hundred or a few thousand lines only: see Lord's "Homer, Parry, and Huxo," *AJA* 52 (1948) 41-42, and C. M. Bowra, "The Comparative Study of Homer," *AJA* 54 (1950) 189-90.

are now prepared to see, a legitimate claim to stand at the beginning. It functions in part as substitute for, in part as introduction to a proper invocation. The first lines (*Mousaôn Heliconiadôn archômeth' aeidein, / haith'...*) have not only the formal, even formulaic elements of a hymn opening (cf. *Hom. Hymn.* 11, 22), but are paralleled in the opening invocation of the *Epigoni* (Fr. 1: *Nun auth' hopoterôn andrôn archômetha Mousai*). Its body contains both the essential characteristics of a hymn (delineation of the character and powers of the goddesses) and some preview of the coming poem (43-49 [52]; cf. 71-75). Its conclusion leads directly and skillfully into the invocation proper, with a typical "farewell" and closing prayer to the deity (104: *Chairete, tekna Dios, dote d'himeroessan aoidên*; parallels in *Hom. Hymn.* [e.g.] 6, 10). The final element of a hymn close, statement of transition to "another song," must then be represented by the proem-invocation itself. Such an integrated manipulation of forms could be managed only by a poet for whom the relationship of hymn and invocation was a deep and meaningful one.¹⁹

In Homer the picture is a very different one. Of hymnic affinities there is hardly a trace. Narrative has largely displaced the enumerative style and developed into an instrument for longer compositions. The Muses continue to be invoked but, except for the proems, in a new and briefer form. The employment of invocations seldom has any meaningful association with enumerative material—perhaps only in that preceding the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2. The new alignment with narrative episodes of crisis, struggle and defeat has almost obliterated this; almost, but not completely, for vestigial traces of the old association still remain.²⁰ Even so these vestiges are often hardly

¹⁹ For a discussion of this prelude as a hymn see especially P. Friedländer, "Das Proömium der Theogonie," *Hermes* 49 (1914) 1-16. For the analysis presented above, comparison with *Hom. Hymn.* 25 (*To the Muses and Apollo*) will be particularly instructive. This hymn is probably a cento from the prelude to the *Theogony* (cf. Allen-Halliday-Sikes [above, note 15] 420) and is sufficient evidence that its character as a proem-hymn was recognized in ancient times.

²⁰ The radically different nature of the new alignment is at first sight puzzling; however, if its origin be sought, as I have suggested (*TAPA* 91.308-9) in funeral *klea*, recounting in precise detail the glory, struggles, and death of a hero, the ultimate link with enumerative poetry will be clear. The substantial period of development this presupposes can easily be seen in the century or two before Homer when Ionian song was finding its own way after separation from the mainland tradition, a period (9th-8th centuries), significantly, that saw the rise of the hero-cult in the Greek world: see e.g. Webster (above, note 4) 137-38, cf. 267-68.

noticeable, so well have they been integrated into the immediate narrative. In the end Homer discarded the enumerative form of invocation altogether for one more suited to his material, and the new form was to have, as we shall see, a significant later history.

In the proems the traditional form is now almost fully adapted to narrative. Question and answer remain, but in keeping with their narrative context are treated less formally. Of an association with enumerative material a certain concern for order is perhaps the only trace; but this must in any case have been a matter of direct interest to the narrative poet no less than to the composer of catalogues. *Iliad* 1.1–8/9 (answer):

Μῆνιν αἶειδε, θεά, Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε

(Expansion: lines 2–5, with modulation
 to the specific subject of the quarrel in
 6–7 and a question in 8)

6 ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε
Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.
τίς τ' ἄρ σφωε θεῶν ἕριδι ξυνέηκε μάχεσθαι;

Λητοῦς καὶ Διὸς υἱός·

Odyssey 1.1–10/11–12:

"Ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ
πλάγχθη, ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε·

(Expansion: lines 1–9)

10 τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν.

"Ἐνθ' ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες, ὅσοι φύγον αἰπὺν ὄλεθρον,
οἴκοι ἔσαν . . .

The concluding question in the proem to the *Iliad* is so loosely attached that it has come to be regarded and printed as the beginning of a separate section, apparently as a distinct, "rhetorical" question. Formally and contextually it belongs with the proem: from line 6 it is clear that the account is to begin from the point when Achilles and Agamemnon *ta prôta diastêtên erisante*, that is, from the beginning; to inquire then "what god" set the

quarrel in motion is a logical sequel to this. This is not, I think, an inquiry for ultimate *cause* like Vergil's first invocation (*Aen.* 1.8 ff.), which owes something to it, but simply reflects the poet's conformity with traditional usage that would prescribe a "who . . . (first)?" question at this point; the concern is with proper, straightforward narrative order. The simple "name" answer that follows is formally parallel to the first name in a catalogue.²¹

In the proem to the *Odyssey* the final question is suppressed. But "Tell us *of* these things" is really not very different from "Tell us *what* happened," and what follows is fairly clear as an "answer": the Muse has been asked to tell the tale "from some point or other" (*hamothen*); her "answer" starts with "*At that point*" (*Enth'*: as it were, "when I choose to begin"). Here any tradition of straightforward narration is pointedly cast aside. This proem like its fellow of the *Iliad* forecasts the chronologically earlier portion of the tale, the wanderings of Odysseus, with which the hearer would normally expect the poet to begin. He chooses instead to pick up the story toward the end of the wanderings and return to these later in flashback.²² In the final line of the invocation the poet indicates his awareness that this is an unusual procedure: "Tell us of these matters, *from some point or other at any rate* (*hamothen ge*)"—i.e., if not from the beginning as is usual.²³

The internal invocations in the *Iliad* (there are none in the *Odyssey*) present a common front. Four of the five have an identical formulaic base (2.484-93, 11.218-20, 14.508-10, 16.112-13): *Espete nyn moi, Mousai Olympia dômat' echousai, / hos*

²¹ So also in *Il.* 11.221; see below. It is suggestive to note that when Odysseus in beginning his long narrative asks (*Od.* 9.14) with similar awareness of the importance of order what he shall relate first, his immediate answer is his own name. That epic narrative by tradition and practice was expected to follow a straightforward chronological order is further suggested by the Cyclic poems: in addition to the fragments and Aristotle's criticisms (*Poet.* 1459A-B) see Webster (above, note 4) 273-74, summarizing the conclusions of J. T. Kakrides, *Homeric Researches* (Lund 1949) 91 f.

²² For the traditional character of these openings in relation to the normal or expected order of the poem that follows see *TAPA* 91.306-8.

²³ The emphatically placed quantitative adjectives in the early lines of both proems may not be significant for any association with enumerative material: the prominence here of the "many wanderings," "many men," and "many sufferings" to be met by the "much-traveled" Odysseus, and the "countless sufferings" and destruction of "many stout souls of heroes" to be caused by the wrath of Achilles can be reasonably explained as a means of pointing up the magnitude and importance of the subject. Even if it reflects, as it may, an awareness of the quantitative aspects of the poem, of the sheer mass of detail ahead, this is perhaps coincidental, not vestigial. Still the almost excessive emphasis is striking and should be noted.

tis... (*hoi lines*, 2.487; *hoppós*, 16.113). Though it may be expanded, this is essentially a two-line unit, in form an invitational question. The most reasonable inference is that it arose from an independent use of the final and most important element of the proem-invocation; its brevity makes it more suitable for continuous narrative where the longer, purely introductory form would be wholly inappropriate and possibly misleading.

In the ten-line invocation built on this pattern that introduces the Catalogue of Ships in *Iliad* 2, however, considerations of brevity certainly played no part. This is the only example in Homer where there is a direct and meaningful relationship between invocation and catalogue at all comparable to that found in Hesiod. Homer's tradition had not wholly forgotten the original function of the invocation. It could revert to it if occasion demanded, and this occasion, with the very special difficulties attendant on the catalogue, was enough to move the poet to an apparently genuine and lengthy appeal. It is significant, however, that the length does not derive from any adherence to proem-invocation form. This is a purely internal invocation of the Homeric type, elaborated from the two-line formula quoted above. The use is traditional, but the form is Homer's own, and the length comes from contemplation of the unique and formidable task ahead. *Iliad* 2.484-493/494:

- "Εσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι—
- 485 ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστέ τε, ἴστε τε πάντα,
 ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν—
οἳ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν
πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
 οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλώσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν,
- 490 φωνὴ δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,
 εἴ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι, Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
 θυγατέρες, μνησαίεθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον·
 ἀρχοὺς αὖ νηῶν ἐρέω νῆας τε προσπάσας.

Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον . . .

The underlined verses, 484 and 487, separated only by an obvious parenthesis, are the formal core; all the rest is elaboration. From a formal point of view the poet's problem was to preserve the character of a question imposed by this form to the end of the invocation, and then make the proper transition to the catalogue.

He does this partly by echoing the original question in 491–92: “[I would not be able to tell all the Greek leaders] unless the Muses *recalled* for me *how many* came to Troy.” This is then picked up by *archous* in the final line, which also recalls more specifically the *hégemones* and *koiranoi* of the initial question. As a result the first line of the catalogue, with its echoing *êrchon*, can be felt in some measure as a response to what precedes.

The invocation is then in form a skillful elaboration of the distinctively Homeric internal invocation. But its substance appears to be most un-Homeric: the Muses here have a reality that can be paralleled only in Hesiod; the poet’s appeal to them is obviously genuine and most unlike the bare formality of his other invocations; and, finally, by frequent use of the first person the poet brings himself into the poem in a way that conflicts with our ideas of “epic anonymity.” All this is true, but the explanation lies, I believe, precisely in the unique character of the Catalogue and not in any supposed “later addition” or interpolation.²⁴

The Catalogue itself is now known to be perhaps the oldest piece of traditional poetic lore in the *Iliad*, the nearest thing to a set piece in the poem, and there is no reason to doubt that its inclusion is due to the poet who composed the whole.²⁵ If the Catalogue is Homer’s, the invocation must be too: any poet who

²⁴ For the nineteenth century charge of interpolation—of both invocation and Catalogue—by a poet of the Hesiodic school see above, note 5, and the work of Mocker cited there (26), a charge no longer defensible as then conceived. For the charge of “late addition” see below, note 25.

²⁵ The basic studies establishing the antiquity of the Catalogue are T. W. Allen, *The Homeric Catalogue of Ships* (Oxford 1921) and V. Burr, *Néon Katalogos, Klio*, Beiheft 49 (Leipzig 1944); excellent summary and further elaboration in D. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1959), Chap. 4. However, in the form in which we have it, this Catalogue must belong to the eighth century (G. M. A. Hanfmann, “Archaeology in Homeric Asia Minor,” *AJA* 52 [1948] 146 ff.), a date fully in accord with that now generally accepted for the composition of the poem as a whole; the Catalogue has, moreover, an important place in the so-called “geometric pattern” that has been discerned in the poem (see C. H. Whitman, *Homer and the Heroic Tradition* [Cambridge (Mass.) 1958] 262–64), a pattern which, whatever its proper interpretation, is integral and cannot be wished away. There are, however, those who, still reluctant to give Homer the credit for including in his poem the greatest single *pièce de résistance* his tradition offered him, insist on considering it a later addition, notably Page (*op. cit.* above) 133–34 with 166–68, notes 44–48: it was “rather carelessly inserted” by a late poet, as the preceding passage (lines 459–93) shows by its late geography (late, but quite consonant with Hanfmann’s date), its repetition of the marshaling sequence of 444–58 (in the magnificent series of similes quite properly intended to heighten the effect of that action), and finally by the

retained the dimmest sense of traditional association between invocation and catalogue must see that here if anywhere an invocation was requisite, and the other internal invocations demonstrate that Homer was well aware of that association; its form, moreover, as we have seen, bears the clear marks of Homeric practice. The principal objection seems to be that Homer here suddenly becomes sincere and self-revelatory. The answer is that he had sufficient reason.

For the Catalogue, originating in late Mycenaean times and reflecting in considerable detail the geographical and political knowledge of that earlier period, seems to have been transmitted orally *with little essential change* through the intervening ages. It was inevitably altered somewhat in the course of transmission and recomposition and there are numerous evidences of its use in Ionian song.²⁶ But it retained over perhaps four hundred years the detailed information about the Mycenaean world that betrays its origin. Together with the related Trojan Catalogue it is unique in Homer, in extent, detail, and above all in the innumerable fixed and traditional place names with their *distinctive* epithets that occur only here, but must be traditional.²⁷ No matter how often it was sung it was something essentially foreign in Ionian heroic song and must have made considerable special demands on memory, often of necessity a rote memory, quite different from that required for free composition by formulae. Added to this, the strain on the voice under such conditions (cf. lines 489–90) must have made the task seem truly formidable. Hence the poet's deeply felt and genuine appeal: "for you (Muses) are goddesses and are present and have full *knowledge* (*iste . . . panta*) while we (mortals) hear only rumor and *know* nothing (*oude ti idmen*) . . . I could nowise [not even if I had superhuman courage and power of voice] tell the *vast number* (*plêthyn*) of the Greek leaders if the Muses did not recall for me *how many* (*hosoi*) came to Troy." The knowledge he asks for is enumerative knowledge of the sort still current and familiar in the tradition of the mainland poets, but almost lost to the

"highly abnormal intrusion of the poet's personality" in the invocation itself. Only the final objection has any real cogency and this, I believe, is more apparent than real.

²⁶ See Page (above, note 25) 153–54; cf. Whitman (above, note 25) 42.

²⁷ Page (above, note 25) 123–24, with 159–60, notes 22–24.

Ionian bard.²⁸ The "intrusion of the poet's personality" in this impassioned appeal is perhaps "highly abnormal," but so are the circumstances.²⁹

The Catalogue itself, from its antiquity and Mycenaean origin, adds further confirmation to the concept of an earlier parent tradition in which catalogue poetry (and with it the Muses) played a dominant role. The probability, furthermore, that it was actually composed in Boeotia, perhaps some sixty years after the Trojan War as a list of the forces gathered at Aulis, makes it even more interesting; this, indeed, together with the evidence of the Hesiodic catalogues and "the remnant of a Boeotian catalogue in the Eleventh Book of the *Odyssey*" (the catalogue of Heroines), has led to the independent suggestion that "Boeotia was the native home of poetry of this type throughout the Dark Ages."³⁰

It will be convenient at this point, before passing to the other overt internal invocations, to note briefly four quasi-invocational questions (5.703-4, 8.273, 11.299-300, 16.692-93) that regularly introduce short catalogues. The Muses are not addressed by name but the form is otherwise similar. Here the catalogues, simple lists of names clearly intended as answers, are regularly three lines long, though their effect may be extended by further

²⁸ Something of the mnemonic difficulty of the Catalogue can be appreciated from Lord's observation in *The Singer of Tales* (above, note 18) 86 that the Yugoslav guslar habitually uses the same "catalogue" of names from song to song whenever an assembly theme demands such a listing and regardless of the occasion of the assembly, whether "to gather an army or wedding guests": it "*relieves his mind of much remembering*" (italics mine). For a similar tendency in Homer elsewhere cf. *Il.* 7.161-69 and 8.253-67.

²⁹ Even the abnormality is less than it seems. The first person normally has a certain prominence in invocational questions and the length of this one could hardly help make it more prominent. Furthermore some of the occurrences Page lists (above, note 25) 167, note 45, are purely formulaic: *moi* in 484 is simply part of the two-line basic formula; line 488 (*egô*) is a formulaic line used three times in tales in the *Odyssey* (by Helen and Odysseus: 4.240, 11.328 and 517) and is apparently a storyteller's commonplace (cf. the similar sentiment in a strong "personal" statement by the poet later in the *Iliad* [12.176], which is in fact a one-line version of the whole idea in 488-90). Only the final line, with *ereô*, is conspicuously exceptional. Is it going too far to suppose that like the concluding line of the *Works and Days* proem this too has its model in the transitional declaration of a hymn closing?

³⁰ Page (above, note 25) 152; see further, on the character of the Catalogue as an "Order of Battle," 134 ff. The Boeotian origin seems clear from the special prominence of Boeotia in the Catalogue, which is in fact centered around it. The Catalogue indeed is an excellent example of the characteristic of *order* in enumerative poetry, in this case a geographical order which, starting from Boeotia, follows natural boundaries (coastlines, island chains, rivers) in a sweep around Greece, to Crete and the islands, and then to Thessaly, keeping Boeotia always in the center.

material.³¹ Such brief and uniform enumerations can hardly be regarded as anything but highly formalized vestiges of earlier usage; unlike the vestigial material after other invocations, however, they have not been absorbed in or adapted to the surrounding narrative. The introductory questions are as formal as the blocks of answers; all but one (8.273, a one-line variant) begin with the same tightly phrased formulaic line. A single example will suffice. *Iliad* 11.299–300/301–303:

Ἐνθα τίνα πρῶτον, τίνα δ' ὕστατον ἐξενάριξεν
Ἐκτωρ Πριαμίδης, ὅτε οἱ Ζεὺς κῶδος ἔδωκεν;

Ἀσαῖον μὲν πρῶτα καὶ Αὐτόνοον καὶ Ὀπίτην,
καὶ Δόλοπα Κλυτίδην καὶ Ὀφέλιον ἦδ' Ἀγέλαον,
Αἴσυμνόν τ' Ὠρόν τε καὶ Ἴππόνοον μενεχάρμην.

The formal rigidity and clarity of both question and answer are striking. The element of order is exceptionally explicit, with both *prōton* and *hystaton* in the question and a corresponding *prōta* (with one exception) followed by still further indications of order in the catalogue-answer.³²

The high degree to which these units display the formal characteristics of invocational usage makes it difficult not to regard the question as, in origin, a true invocation of the Muses; like all other Homeric invocations, furthermore, these too introduce narrative episodes of crisis, struggle and defeat.³³ But unlike the other Homeric invocations they have become static, largely no doubt because of the necessary limitation of subject imposed by their formula, and the restrictive formality of its phrasing. Slaying in battle is common enough in epic, and there would be ample occasion for the use of such a question; but it practically demands a catalogue and in the rapidity of narrative this would tend to become limited and fixed. Their anonymity, too, may

³¹ After 5.703–7 by an additional three lines and after 11.299–303 by six more; the multiples of three accent the highly formal character of the unit. The regular three-line catalogues following the other two questions are rounded off by a single summarizing line.

³² After 5.703–4 an *epi de* prefaced to the second name occurs instead of the usual *prōta*. The list following 8.273 is capped by the statement that Teucer killed all these men *epassyterous* (277). In the accounts following 11.299–300 and 16.692–93 an injected *autar epeit(a)* toward the end of each (11.304, 16.696) picks up and reinforces the sense of an ordered listing.

³³ See *TAPA* 91.304–5; cf. 307, note 23. For a parallel to the “anonymous” character of the invocation cf. *Il.* 1.8.

have tended to promote this, as it seems to have obscured their origin for the poet. Certainly, though they preserve all the essential characteristics of invocations, Homer does not associate them with the Muses: one is even addressed to Patroclus.³⁴

After the four remaining invocations the formal catalogue has practically disappeared. But whether obvious or vestigial it is always integrated with the immediate narrative and made to serve a narrative purpose. The first three of these have been quoted earlier in illustration of the question-answer phenomenon and need not be repeated.

In the invocation of 2.761–62 at the end of the Catalogue of Ships the Muse is asked to “tell who was far the best of them, the men themselves and the horses, who followed along with the sons of Atreus.” The poet then proceeds to answer in good traditional form, duly listing the best horses and the best man (Ajax) in the field at the time. But his real purpose is a dramatic one, to provide a bridge from the Catalogue to a telling and contrasting vignette of the man who is actually “the best” (769), Achilles, quietly encamped with his Myrmidons as the army moves into battle.³⁵

In the last three formulaically-similar invocations, the enumerative *prôtos* has a fixed place, as it did in the group of quasi-invocations. When at the crisis of Agamemnon’s *aristeia* in Book 11 the poet calls on the Muses (218–20) to tell “*hos tis dê prôtos* of the Trojans or their allies came against” the Greek leader, the *prôtos* rather leads us to anticipate a throng of attackers; but only two are listed, the brothers Iphidamas and Coön. It is a mark of Homer’s narrative skill that the ensuing duels with these two do not seem anticlimatic after such an introduction. The *prôtos* here is made to serve a narrative purpose. That the impression of a multitude of antagonists somehow persists is due, I believe, in no small measure to the fact that Agamemnon’s specific encounters in the earlier portion of the *aristeia* are also with *pairs* of men, Bienor and his companion Oileus (91–100), the brothers Isus and Antiphus (101–21), and the brothers Pisander and Hippolochus (122–47). The poet throughout the *aristeia* is using

³⁴ *Il.* 16.692–93. The address to Patroclus is no evidence against the invocational origin of the question: the poet addresses the hero directly throughout the *Patrocleia* at any opportunity and this is a particularly inviting one.

³⁵ Cf. further *TAPA* 91.302.

this motif of pairs, usually brothers, as an economical way of suggesting a multitude. The only distinct vestige of catalogue form after the invocation is the simple name *Iphidamas Anténoridés* in answer to the "who?" of the question, a kind of answer amply paralleled in the catalogues after the quasi-invocations.

The fact that after the next invocation (14.508–10) a true catalogue does follow is no indication of a reversion to the old form for its own sake any more than it is a mark of interpolation.³⁶ When at this one major success of the Greeks in the central battle the poet asks "Who of the Achaeans first won bloody spoils [from the Trojans]?", we fully expect some picture of the ignominious retreat of the opposing forces. The twelve-line catalogue (six lines of "close" catalogue and six lines of elaboration) that follows to the end of the book, listing the Greek pursuers and their Trojan victims, gives precisely this effect of pell-mell pursuit and flight back across the Greek wall and ditch. At the opening of Book 15 immediately after, the Trojans are already emerging from the ditch; even the recrossing of the wall is left to the imagination. Homer has replaced exposition with demonstration.

These invocations make it clear that the enumerative form had become of little importance in itself. Narrative considerations are uppermost. In the final and most important invocation in the *Iliad*, that heralding the coming of fire to the ships which leads to Patroclus' entry into the battle, the poet abandons the old form and phrases his question in a way more directly pertinent to the narrative. Instead of asking "who?" he asks "how?" The formula of the preceding invocations is still kept, but the substitution of this single word alters its entire character. We no longer have any expectations of an enumeration, but look simply for an account of what happened. *Iliad* 16.112–113/114–115:

"Εσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι,
ὅπως δὴ πρῶτον πῦρ ἔμπεσε νηυσὶν Ἀχαιῶν.

"Εκτωρ Αἴαντος δόρυ μείλινον ἄγχι παραστάς
πληξ' ἄορι μεγάλῳ . . .

It is notable that in spite of the alteration some of the enumerative elements associated with the old form still persist. The *prōton* is kept—but in its new context it takes on a quite different,

³⁶ See above, note 5, and *TAPA* 91.298, note 10.

dramatic force, something perhaps like "tell of the first *coming* of fire to the ships." Even more interesting is the fact that though the character of the question has been completely altered, the answer begins just as if a *hos tis* question had preceded, with a name. It might even be the beginning of a catalogue. Indeed its order of *attacker, attacked, verb of attack* is precisely the same as that in the first line of the catalogue after the preceding invocation: *Aias rha prôtos Telamônios Hyrtion outa* (14.511).

Homer never quite escaped the impress of the long invocational tradition that stood behind him, but in this last invocation the crucial development of his narrative moved him to create a new kind of invocation that was to have considerable importance in later times. For the invocation with *hop(p)ôs* or *pôs* eventually became the most characteristic representative of the so-called "prophetic" invocation that predominated in literary epic.³⁷ It first clearly appears in ?Choerilus of Samos (Fr. 1a Kinkel): *Hêgeo moi logon allon, hopôs...* Apollonius uses it for two of his three invocations, *Argon.* 3.1–5 (*Ei d'age...Eratô...moi enispe, / enthen hopôs...*) and 4.552–56 (*Alla, theai, pôs...*); and the third (4.1–2) is in the same spirit and might well have been so phrased. So prevalent does it seem to have become that it was used apparently as a matter of course in one of the late alternate openings supplied for the *Iliad*:³⁸

"Εσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι,
ὅππως δὴ μῆνις τε χόλος θ' ἔλε Πηλεΐωνα . . .

These invocations have nothing to do with appeals to memory; they lay the whole burden of the story on the Muse and, though the examples here are already conventional, they suggest the blanket appeal for "inspiration" that we are all too prone to associate with invocations generally. No such concept was

³⁷ For fuller discussion of the great significance of the Homeric invocation in the *Iliad*, a significance that might well lead to its imitation, see *TAPA* 91.299–301. For the "prophetic" invocation see G. E. Duckworth, *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil* (Princeton 1933) 7 and notes 17 and 18, where the present invocation is singled out as the only one in the *Iliad* aside from the proem to which this term might be applied. The only possible early parallel to the *hoppôs* here is the repeated (*eipate*) *hôs* in the proem to the *Theogony* (108, 112–13), but this occurs within the body of the proem-invocation and is merely part of the "forecast" of the subject proper to that form. The concluding invocational question, like the brief Homeric invocation that derives from it, is never so phrased.

³⁸ Cited by Aristoxenus; see A. Nauck, *Lexicon Vindobonense* (St. Petersburg 1867) 273,

known to the early poets of oral tradition (even Hesiod's Muses "taught" him: *Theog.* 22, *Op.* 662). But by the time of Plato the notion of poetic *enthousiasmos* or "possession" of the poet by the Muses was a familiar one.³⁹ The first reference to it appears in Democritus (Frs. B 17, 18, 21 Diels-Kranz), and its inception has been sought, with some reason, in influences from the Dionysiac movement of the seventh-sixth centuries.⁴⁰ I would suggest that Homer's coinage in his memorable final invocation was increasingly adopted and perpetuated as the vogue of this new idea spread.⁴¹ From a slight but essential alteration of the old enumerative invocation when it had ceased to serve its purpose came the formal seed of a new and very different view of poetic creativity.

³⁹ Plato's treatment of it in the *Ion* and the *Phaedrus* (see especially 245A) is well known; see also *Ap.* 22c, *Leg.* 719c.

⁴⁰ By E. R. Dodds (above, note 3) 82, who has much of value to say about the distinction between this concept and that which appears in Homer and Hesiod.

⁴¹ The first actual occurrence of *hopós* in an invocation after Homer is in the parody of Hipponax, Fr. 77.1-4, where in spite of the collocation *Mousa moi . . . ennepe', hopós*, the word is used to introduce a purpose clause. Parody implies familiarity. Can it be that the incongruous *hopós* is a travesty of the excessive use of this word in the early period: "Tell me, O Muse, of . . ., how that he may perish [i.e. through my efforts]"?