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I. PRELIMINARY DECLARATIONS

The objective of this survey is the same as that of its immediate predecessor: 1 to produce an exhaustive chronicle of scholarship in all areas of Homer studies for the period covered. Although absolute bibliographical control remains an impossibility, I have striven to be thorough. About 300 of the entries are not to be found in L’Année philologique. 2 Some few items published before 1978 (and one after 1983) are included to make good omissions in the earlier survey or for the sake of completing citations of multi-volume works. Excluded are unchanged or substantially unchanged reprints or translations of works first published before 1978. 3

As regards annotations, in the interest of saving space I have increased the proportion of bracketed, telegraphically concise comments immediately after citations. For the same reason, indications of book reviews are restricted mainly to fuller discussions by specialists.

For their various acts of assistance and kindness, I am most thankful to Robert Edgeworth, J. B. Hainsworth, Thomas Jahn, Joachim Latacz, Reinaldo B. Pérez, John Pisoni, James Redfield, and to the library staffs at the Universities of Michigan and Rochester. I owe a special debt to the Graduate School at Eastern Michigan University for a research fellowship and to its Dean, Dr. Ronald E. Goldenberg, for additional support and encouragement. The contributions of my wife, Jo Ann, continue to be indispensable to my work and to my life in general.

Abbreviations, etc.

Abbreviations herein are those employed in L’Année philologique or, especially in section VIII, the MLA International Bibliography, with the exception of the following, mostly of my own devising:

APA: Acta philologica Aenipontana.

1, 2, 3 See page 461.


Greek characters are transliterated as recommended in Appendix II of The Concise Oxford Dictionary, 7th edition (Oxford 1982).
II. EDITIONS, COMMENTARIES, TRANSLATIONS


WILLCOCK’s two-volume edition (2) of the Iliad contains a short introduction, text (essentially that of Leaf and Bayfield), and notes similar in quantity and content to those in Stanford’s Odyssey. Though “the substance of some of the explanatory notes has appeared...in A Companion to the Iliad [JPH 2.4]” (preface), the orientations of the two works are quite distinct and complementary; the reader with Greek will profit from each. The Greekless reader may turn to item 3, in which HOGAN has done for users of Fitzgerald’s Iliad what Willcock did for users of Lattimore’s; a fifty-five page introduction to Homeric poetry and to critical issues surrounding it makes good a deficiency in available editions of the translation. Colin MacLEOD’s commentary on Iliad 24 (7) is a model of clear explication informed by a refined and perspicacious literary sensibility. “I have attempted a commentary because that seemed the best way to bring out how variously Homer’s art is manifested and how firmly it is sustained; questions of style and expression, as well as of overall structure, have therefore claimed a great deal of attention. I have introduced more parallels than might be expected from later authors, in order to show how Homer’s language, artistry and thought are comparable to theirs” (p. vii). Besides the text and commentary, a substantial introduction has sections on “The Iliad as a Tragic Poem,” “Book 24 and the Spirit of the Iliad,” “Book 24 in the Structure of the Iliad,” “Language and Style,” “Metre and Prosody.” The result has been called “the best practical introduction to Homeric poetry in general” (Griffin, review).

Mondadori has brought out a very attractive six-volume edition of the Odyssey (6) with Italian translation by G. A. Privitera and text and commentary (in Italian) by several distinguished Homer scholars. This edition offers the fullest modern commentary on the Odyssey: it gives due attention to
points of accidence, grammar, syntax, meter, etc., but takes account of the best of twentieth-century formulaic analyses and literary critical studies (in many cases produced by the editors themselves). Its imminent availability in English (from Oxford) will make it a welcome alternative to W. B. Stanford’s “Macmillan Red,” particularly because it draws on a wide range of more recent scholarship (including ArchHom and Lfgre). The school editions in the Bristol Classical Press series (4,5,8) contain texts, grammatical notes, and vocabulary.

Item 11 contains an introductory essay on “The Iliad of Homer: Folkloric Tradition and Individual Creation” (in Russian) by V. N. Jarkho (pp. 5-21). The vocabulary of HULL’s unrhymed iambic pentameter versions of the Iliad (30) and the Odyssey (12) is that of “the language spoken by educated people”: “Sing, goddess, of Achilles’ ruinous anger/ which brought ten thousand pains to the Achaeans,/ and cast the souls of many stalwart heroes/ to Hades, and their bodies to the dogs/ and birds of prey.” SHEWRING’s Odyssey (25) is a plain prose translation—available in paperback—that better captures the sense of a poetic genre than does Rieu’s, which one hopes it will supplant. Items 26 and 28 are illustrated free adaptations suitable for grade schools. STONEMAN’s anthology (31) contains translations from the Iliad by Hobbes, Newman, Cowper, Hall, Tennyson, Chapman, Denham, Conington, Logue, Fitzgerald, Lowell, Pope, Bridges, Lord Derby, and from the Odyssey by Chapman, Cowper, Hobbes, Pope, Pound, and Elizabeth Barrett Browning. Item 23 has text and apparatus criticus and an introductory essay on fifteenth-century translations of Homer, while item 34 includes an annotated text of the Italian translation of II. 4 by Vincenzo Monti (1754-1828).

On Translation


The Byzantine *Iliad* of item 38 is that of Constantine Hermoniacus, who "was prompted by a despot of Epirus (1323-35) to produce in the language of daily life a new version of the *Iliad* written in short trochaic lines consisting of only four accentual feet" (Sandy's, *HCS* 1, 1.432). ROSSLYN (44) argues that Pope's ignorance of the meaning of *antuges* led him to change 21.44 from "Fig-Tree" to "Sycamore" in the second edition of his *Iliad*, while CONNELLY (47) discusses the pictorial quality of the visual images in his translation. Ugo Foscolo's *Esperimento di traduzione della 'Iliade' di Omero* (56) appeared in 1807; item 52 observes the variations of Homeric formulas employed there and in translations by V. Monti, G. Pascoli, and S. Quasimodo. Item 57 characterizes the intent and style of some seventy translations, all mediocre. Maretic's translations (41, 51) were first published in 1882 (*Od.*) and 1883 (*Il.*); Duric's (41) in 1963 (*Od.*) and 1965 (*Il.*). Leopoldo Lugones (42) was the most important Argentine lyric poet of the earlier twentieth century (Nobel laureate 1926); his translations into alexandrine verse of selections from Homer were published in *Estudios helenicos* and *Nuevos estudios helénicos* (Buenos Aires 1923, 1928). ILIEVSKI (58) informs that M. D. Petruševski's translation of the *Iliad* into Macedonian (Skopje 1982) incorporates "the rhythmic and prosodic features of the Macedonian language into the patterns of the classical verse" (p. 82).

See also items 1383, 1389-90, 1392-94, 1401, 1415, 1419, 1423, 1427, 1429, 1437, 1440, 1446-47, 1462, 1471, 1513, 1535-36, 1577.

III. HOMER

A. GENERAL TREATMENTS

Four rather elementary books are aimed at the educated lay person. Item 64 provides a general discussion of biography, history of criticism, plot descriptions, etc. CAMPS’ book (67), though written on the same restrictively small scale as his attractive Introduction to Virgil’s Aeneid (Oxford 1969), manages to present summaries of plot and essential information regarding Homeric narrative techniques, the role of the gods, etc. A particular enhancement is the attention given in “The Poetic Medium” (pp. 39-60) to meter, diction, use of epithets and formulas, similes, verbal music and so on, furnishing the Greekless reader with some sense of what Ezra Pound termed “melopoeic.” Thirty-eight pages of notes contain much interesting material that deserved presentation in the sixty-four-page text proper.

GRAFFIN’S Homer (68) proceeds at a rather higher level of generalization: “The warrior is of supreme value to these early societies, because they are constantly vulnerable and depend for their existence on the courage of their fighting men” (p. 43). While giving considerable insight into Homeric subject matter and the poetic quality of its narration, Graffin is more concerned “to explain the thought which underlies the poems” (p. 43) and provides some indication of its significance for posterity and for us” (preface). More in the vein of the history of criticism is item 74, which offers a concise introduction to two major critical movements in twentieth-century Homer studies—oral theory and neoanalysis—by examining how epic versions of the death of Achilles may be detected in our Iliad.

Among more scholarly works, Gregory NAGY’S remarkable (and controversial) book (66) fuses the presuppositions and methodologies of literary criticism (particularly oral-formulaic theory), linguistics, cultural anthropology, comparative religion, and intellectual history. “This is not a work of Wissenschaft but of vision” (Redfield, foreword). Nagy seeks to recover the specific world view encoded in the language and thought of a poetic tradition originating in the Iliad and informing the corpus of Greek poetry down to Pindar by focusing on particular systems and variations of words, phrases, and concepts (e.g., aiōn, neikos, aristos, kleos, dais, mēnis) about which revolve the basic, often interlocking thematic structures of the narrative. The
technique of selection is free associational: “whereas many researchers begin from many premises and work towards a single goal, Nagy proceeds like ivy up a wall, beginning from one point (Od. 8.75), ramifying, joining up, blanketing all” (Hainsworth, review). By contrast, Griffin’s book (69) is a throwback to the critical sensibility and methodology of C. M. Bowra, S. E. Bassett, and E. T. Owen. Exasperated by the emphasis in Homeric studies on “special and technical questions” of the intricacies of formulaic phraseology, the oral provenance of the poems, and Bronze Age history, Griffin approaches the Iliad and the Odyssey chiefly as literary masterpieces. He draws on the hints and insights to be gained from the scholia, from comparison with Near Eastern materials, and from notice of parallels with Germanic and Irish literature. He also maintains that characterization is more psychologically sophisticated in Homer than is often held, and tries to estimate the sort of response Homer’s audience may have had to the narrative, especially as regards pathos. TSAGARAKIS (72) stresses the primacy of plot: “The poet is not making hexameters as one is making bricks, he is...composing a poem, which requires that certain things be said and done by certain people at a certain point in time and place” (p. 147); he explains the ramifications of this as regards verse structure, thematic structure, battle narrative, and similes. The chapters on Homer in item 73 are “The Heroic Paradox,” “Association by Theme in the Iliad,” and “Some Anomalies in the Iliad and the Problem of Oral Transmission,” the general intent being to show “how much of Homer’s poetic art lies in his controlled use of themes, motifs, and kinds of story, and how, by association, modulation, and awareness of symbolic values he constructs his meaning” (p. 93).

Two books fall into a different category: item 70 is a survey of Homeric criticism designed “to make available to contemporary readers something of the poems’ infinite variety, but also to invite them to measure their responses against the responses of Homer’s other readers over the past millennium” (p. 11); chapters are “Homer Romanticized” (esp. Dictys and Dares and Benoît de Sainte-Maure), “Homer Allegorized” (Chapman and Pope [esp. in his notes], and the anti-allegorists Vico, Blackwell, and Wood), “Homer Criticized” (from Scaliger to the participants in the Querelle), “Homer Analyzed” (analysts, unitarians, and neoanalysts from F. A. Wolf down to the present), and “Homer Anatomized” (sections on The Historical Homer, The Anthropological Homer, The Geographical Homer, The Oral Homer, and The Literary Homer). The extremely well-conceived Vorge der Forschung volume edited by Latacz (65) has five sections: I, “Die Vorbereitung der Oral poetry-Theorie,” contains early studies of meter, formula, and “Volkspie” by Hermann, Ellendt, Düntzer, Witte, Murko, and Drerup. II, “Die Theorienbildung,” contains in German translation the first of Milman Parry’s Harvard Studies papers, his comparative study of whole formulaic verses, and his review of Arend’s book on typical scenes (JPH 1.6, 9, 11). III, “Die Rückwirkungen der Theorie auf die Homerforschung,” includes essays by Lesky, Lord, Kirk, Pope, Hainsworth, and Adam Parry (JPH 1.5, 19, 142, 180, 104, 147), and German translations of others by J. Russo (JPH 1.66) and Michael Nagler (“Oral Poetry and the Question of Originality in Literature,” Actes du V* Congrès de l’Association Internationale de Littérature Comparée [Belgrade 1969] 451-59). IV, “Die Theorie in der aussergrazistischen Forschung,” contains M. Curschmann, “Oral Poetry in Mediaeval English, French, and German Literature: Some Notes on Recent Research,” Speculum 42 (1967) 36-52. V, “Zwischenbilanz und Ausblick,” reprints A. Parry’s superb introduction to his father’s collected papers (JPH 1.1), a “Blick auf die neuer Forschung” by A. Heubeck (originally in a Greek-German edition of the Odyssey by A. Wehner), an extract in German translation from B. Fenik’s Studies in the Odyssey (JPH 2.519), and an original piece by Wolfgang Schadewaldt, “Die epische Tradition,” on the question of Homer’s place within a tradition of oral composition. Latacz himself contributes an


HEUBECK (75) provides a masterly, brief review of main trends in Homeric scholarship, mainly in German- and English-speaking countries, and contends that complexity of characterization and overall narrative structure in Homeric epic makes written composition very likely. Similarly, WILLCOCK (80) reviews what has and what has not been achieved by analysts and unitarians and—more recently—by oral theorists and neoanalysts: “if we can at the same time observe repeated themes and also the creative invention of the poet, we are getting nearer to Homer’’ (p. 34); he also stresses the modernity of the nontraditional, fully humanized Homeric heroes. In Jacqueline de ROMILLY’s elegant history of Greek literature (76), sections on “L’épopée et sa formation” and “L’épopée et sa perfection” treat issues respectively external: Bronze Age, comparative epic (Parry-Lord), peculiarities of the Dichtersprache, historicity, the Homeric Question; and internal: structure, plot, the gods, “l’idéal humain,” world view, and poetic artistry. The new Oxford Legacy volume is well served by GRANSDEN’s contribution (77), which discusses distinguishing traits of the poetry, changing trends in criticism, and, notably, the history of translation into English. C. A. TRYPANIS’ literary historical treatment (78) of epic has sections on “The Origins of the Greek Poetic Tradition,” “The Homeric Epics,” “The Poet Homer,” “The Iliad and Odyssey,” “The Homeric Narrative,” “The World of Men and the World of Gods,” “The Poetic Excellence of the Homeric Poems,” and “The Influence of the Homeric Epics.”

B. THE HOMERIC QUESTION, STYLE AND TECHNIQUE, COMPARATIVE EPIC


Luigia STELLA’s book (82) stresses two types of evidence favoring a continuous poetic tradition between Mycenaean times and Homer: many and exact memories of Bronze Age phenomena in Homer; proliferation of Trojan Cycle scenes in eighth-century art not due to influence of the Homeric epics. She also believes that the Troy sacked in epic was Troy VI, that the structural cohesiveness and high poetic quality of the epics militate against Parry’s theory of oral improvisation, and (with Kirk et al.) that a monumental poet gave the Iliad its ultimate form at the end of a long tradition. Compare item 85, which searches for the lineaments of Mycenaean epic poetry in the semantic, morphological, and metrical peculiarities of thirteen Homeric words as compared with Linear B material. On the Homeric Question, BROCCIA (83) rehearses its history from d’Aubignac onward and surveys the extensive critical comment attracted by selected “troubled” passages (II. 6.72-118, 325-41, Od. 1.267-97, 5.1-42) to disclose differences of orientation and opinion among feuding Homeric scholars. Broccia’s own preference is for a moratorium on extrinsic criticism in favor of intrinsic criticism informed by reasonable expectations regarding unity and continuity in the epics. SKAFTE JENSEN (86) believes in an oral dictated text of the sixth century (Peisistratus); the Greek oral epic tradition was vital right down to that time and even later. She adds the evidence of African (cf. item 84) and Albanian oral poetry to show that the size and complexity of the Homeric poems would have been within the abilities of an oral singer. After an assessment of such phonological data as double sibilants, assimilation, loss of initial and postconsonantal /w-/; and quantitative metathesis, MILLER (87) writes that “all of the relevant forms. . .belong to various stages of S/E Greek (mostly Ionic), and no evidence was found for a. . .‘phase’ anterior to the (Sub-Mycenaean-) Ionic. . . . There is. . .no linguistic evidence for an (Old) Aeolic phase in the tradition” (p. 139). In item 88, he aims to clarify Millman Parry’s theory of oral composition by eliminating misconceptions of unenlightened scholars; the new orthodoxy of the title is “hard Parryism” tricked out with some insights from cognitive science and comparative epic.


SOWERS (90) maintains that "the Homeric poems can fruitfully be understood in terms of a model drawn from the handicrafts—particularly weaving—rather than as a verbalization of visual or intellectual experience"; the dissertation analyzes a Dipylon funerary amphora and detects in the Iliad and the Odyssey "two halves of an artifact which in its totality depicts the symmetrical but opposing movements of disintegration and combination" (DAI). According to CLIFFORD (92), "the Odyssey...questions the purpose of storytelling, the status, function, and importance of the storyteller, and the influence or seductiveness of stories," while "the narrators of Genesis betray no suspicion of story; their aim is to make themselves transparent to the divine word" (DAI). Anthony EDWARDS (94) offers a convincing reconsideration of "the poetic relationship between the Iliad and the Odyssey in light of oral theory," arguing that "the text of our Odyssey preserves allusions by the tradition of the Odyssey to the tradition of the Iliad as part of a general critique of that poem" (DAI). PARKS (95) reveals that the Anglo-Saxon and Homeric perception of "epic narrative as the re-creation and the reenactment of pre-existing story lore...manifests itself on the level of narrative in Beowulf and the Homeric epos through multiform actualizations of traditional narrative paradigms" (DAI).


Item 96 is a sketch of the Homeric Question and of the impact on it of Milman Parry's work, which has similarities to Propp's structural analysis of Russian folktales, Morfologija skazki (Leningrad 1928; [2nd] Eng. ed.: Morphology of the Folktale [Austin, TX 1968]), which, like Parry's French theses, became influential only decades later. Item 97 shows that T. B. L. Webster's contention (accepted by Kirk) that certain texts of Hurrian and Ugaritic songs were dictated to scribes (à la Lord's theory of orally dictated Homeric texts) is vitiated by a mistranslation of the word imd, "apprentice" (not "dictated"), in the Ugaritic Nikkal.


Items 98 and 99 report on, among other things, the oral epic poetry gathered during fieldwork in Yugoslavia in the 1970s and its relevance to an understanding of other oral traditions, including Homeric. HEMMERDINGER (100) points out that, to judge from the evidence of a collection of Serbian popular songs (Narodne Srpske pjesme, publ. 1814-33) made by Vuk Stefanović Karadžić, the epic-length poem coaxed from Avdo Mededović by Milman Parry is quite atypical within the tradition, which, he claims, consists entirely of short songs or lays, rather than epics.


DUKAT (103) reasserts the value of comparison of Homer with Serbocroatian guslar and recommends critical attention for oral poems gathered during the nineteenth century. Along those lines, FOLEY (104) discusses "psycho-historical patterns" in Beowulf, the Odyssey, and Serbocroatian epic, with a view to disclosing the contribution of oral epic to the socialization of the individual. In item 105, he examines typical scenes in the themes of feasting and "readying the hero’s horse" in Homer and in the work of a Yugoslav guslar studied by Milman Parry. Item 107 includes analysis of the Gilgamesh epic and the Iliad, asserting the need for understanding of the psychological and social aspects of oral composition, while O’NOLAN (108) compares use of traditional devices of oral composition (noun-epithet formulas, etc.) in Homer and in Irish heroic tales. PINSENT (109) argues along Parryist lines that "explanations of [Homer’s] poems in terms of literary decisions made by a single poet who controlled his material in detail must be rejected as unhistorical, however congenial and illuminating they may be" (p. 10); the original contribution of "the Poet of the Iliad lay in organization rather than invention or characterization." WILLCOCK (112) retorts that Homer in fact displays consummate creative artistry, achieving "subtle and delicate effects . . . within the (at first sight) cramping conditions of formulaic composition" (p. 17). Item 111 continues RUSSO’s studies (e.g., JPH 2.61, 77, 83) of mathematical proportions in the distribution of books, passages, and lines in Homer.
118. Schwabl, H. “To probléma ton paradosiakón morphón suntheses ston Homéro.” EEAth 27 (1979) 94-104.

In a review-article of B. Peabody's Winged Word (JPH 2.43), HAVELOCK (113) describes the psychology and artistic techniques and procedures of oral composition. KELLOGG's discussion (114) of traditional (as opposed to high or popular) art focuses on rhythmic and formulaic composition, with examples from Homeric epic. Item 115 underscores Homer's position as an author transitional between oral and written traditions of literature. MOSER (116) argues that the existence of certain seemingly universal narrative themes, for example, “The Sailor Who Went Inland,” sheds light on the Homeric Question and the theories of Milman Parry. SCHWABL (118) demonstrates that formulaic phraseology is not simply a convenient system of prefabricated metrical/narrational stuff, but is rather subtly used to anticipate, cross-refer, and reinforce within the poetic structure of the Homeric epics. SEN (119) discriminates between narrative themes belonging to the pattern of the hero's life and those belonging to the narrative proper by analyses of many examples from oral compositions, including the Iliad and Odyssey. TSAGARAKIS (120) warns that it is “methodologically wrong to preface a discussion in Homer with a reference to inconsistency in a Yugoslav song and to infer from it that the Homeric inconsistency is also due to the same cause. For defects as well as merits have primarily to do with the poet's talent and training, not with oral or literary composition” (p. 23). He then shows that putative inconsistencies in both Yugoslav and Homeric poetry (e.g., Od. 5.85 ff., 15.145 ff.) are in fact psychologically and thematically suited to their poetic contexts. On a more theoretical plane, PERADOTTO (117) argues that “the antagonism between defamiliarization and myth suggests a possible approach to distinguishing convention from artistic intentionality in the Homeric poems” (p. 8), for example, in the inclusion of Book 11 in the Odyssey.


CIST'AKOVA (122) claims that certain fragments of Stesichorus point to a traditional poetry going back to pre-Mycenaean times, while Homer looks toward the new age of the polis; however, HORROCKS (127) speculates on the existence of dactylic poetry before and during the Mycenaean period. In three essays (124-126), John FOLEY provides a detailed rehearsal of the work of Milman Parry and Albert Lord as it relates to Homeric composition and traditional oral poetry in general, focuses on differences in formulaic phraseology between Homeric and Yugoslav poetry on the one hand and Old English on the other (ascrivable to differing metrical constraints), and stresses the importance of the principles of tradition- and genre-dependence in establishing a theoretical basis for the comparative method. In item 129, Albert LORD traces several narrative themes (absence and return, encounter with monsters, death of companion, etc.) in the *Gilgamesh* epic, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as well as—in modified forms—*Beowulf*. In 130, he treats the themes of adolescent heroic initiation and the absence and return of the mature human with familial and communal responsibilities in Sumerian, Homeric, medieval European, and Serbocroatian poetry. RENOIR (131) compares the *Odyssey*, *Beowulf*, and the *Hildebrandslied* to demonstrate the importance of development of a context within which to engage in aesthetic criticism. Item 132 is a review and critique of various definitions of oral formula proposed by a host of scholars, approving particularly Hainsworth's.

Item 133 includes comparative analysis of poems to Homeric epic and to SerboCroatian oral compositions, demonstrating a "principle of redundancy." FOLEY (134) uses an example of story-pattern evolution in the repertoire of a SerboCroatian singer to explain apparent structural anomalies in Beowulf and the Odyssey (esp. the two councils of gods in Books 1 and 5); in 135, he suggests a five-part set of critical techniques/axioms useful for the study of oral or orally evolved poems; the Odyssey, Old English, and SerboCroatian texts are among examples used to demonstrate proper explication. KAKRDIS (136) detects a consistently applied series of themes connected with return and rescue drawn from pre-existing poems for inclusion in both the Iliad and the Odyssey. In a comparative analysis of the Odyssey and selected SerboCroatian "return-songs," PARKS (139) analyzes "a particular narrative structure, the guest-host exchange with the 'identification theme' at its center, as this structure appears in various stages of elaboration throughout the poem" (p. 25). POSTLETHWAITE (140) argues against Konishi (607) that numerical precision of structure is not inconsistent with oral composition: "there remains the temptation to equate sophistication with literacy" (p. 280).

KULLMANN's (137) is the best brief account of neoanalysis, its essential concerns and principal successes, from Kakridis' work in the 1940s onward; investigation of "ältere Prototypen" of various themes in the Homeric poems results in better appreciation of the structure of the epics, is consistent with oral-formulaic theory, and is based on a hope "dass man mit dieser Position den Gegensatz zwischen Unitarien und Analytikern überbrücken könnte" (p. 6). Item 138 is a crisp review of modern Homeric criticism from d'Aubignac down to the aftermath of Parry; LLOYD-JONES finds too much "minute analysis of formulas...excessive preoccupation with material objects...exaggerated confidence in positive historical conclusions based upon the poems. That work has not been futile, but...it is time we took advantage of its results in returning to a detailed study of the poems" (p. 29); he cites approvingly items 7, 68, and 69. VANDERLINDEN (141) locates the composition of the Iliad in the eleventh(!) century within an ambience of Mycenaean decline and fall.

EDWARDS (144) demonstrates the application of the theory of oral composition to explication of the final scenes of the Odyssey. By an examination of such typical scenes as departure, dressing, and arming, SCHWABL (148) seeks to prove that their repetition and variation serve structural purposes on a large scale in a manner analogous to the poet’s use of traditional formulaic language on a smaller scale: “die motivische Verwendung gleichlautender und gleichgestalteter Bauelemente in einem Werk setzt das Wiedererkennen einer ganz bestimmten Gestaltung voraus. Diese mag traditionell sein, doch schliesst dies die Individualität der besonderen Formung, die als solche wiedererkannt werden kann, keinesweg aus” (p. 18). BLOCK’s careful comparative survey/explication (142) shows that the nature and effects of apostrophes “changed when they were adapted from a predominantly oral to a predominantly written literature” (p. 8); in particular, “while Homer’s narrator is straightforward and trustworthy, as he must be if addressing a listening audience, Vergil’s narrator, no longer the embodiment of interpretation, becomes another point of view that must be included by the reader in interpretation” (p. 10). Item 145 is an essay in Greek intellectual history, stressing—yet again—the importance of the shift from oral to literate culture. SEGAL (149) discusses that divide by contrasting the social value system of oral tradition, as embodied in Homer, with that of literate culture, as embodied in Greek tragedy, while item 150 cautions against the use of formulaic-density statistics as litmus to test for orality. Item 146, designed “to enlighten the Portuguese student on the Homeric epics” (p. 43), provides a “Who Was Who” guide to thirteen principal contributors of fuel for the engine of the Homeric Question, from d’Aubignac to John Scott.


FOLEY (151) contrasts the artistry of shorter oral poetic forms with the longer works (Homer and Muslim epics in Serbocroatian) that were the basis of Milman Parry’s theories, while MURRAY (153) remarks on the deliberate obscuring of his own biography by Homer through the discrepancy between the short songs sung by bards in his poems and the great length of the Iliad and the Odyssey. PUHVEL (154) details etymological and other accordances between Greek and Hittite lexica in the hope that “at least some Homerische Wörter [scil. steuto de dipsaön, Dios hira talanta, eion themonia, poti zophon eepoenta, keimelâ te probasin te] still dangling in the wake of Manu Leumann can be brought closer to elucidation” (p. 217). The majority of SLATER’s essay (156) is devoted to identification of simple and complex lyric narrative not in lyric but in epic poetry, especially as evidenced in the ring composition found in exempla and flashbacks: Il. 7.133-57, 9.447-84, 533-600, 11.671-762, 19.95-133, 21.35-52, 23.629-43, 24.601-19, Od. 14.463-503, 19.393-467. Item 155 contains a section on “Der ‘oral poet’ als Verwalter der Tradition” (pp. 110-12).

See also items 65, 73, 75, 162, 194, 239, 274, 325, 328, 386, 477, 532, 534, 557, 562, 595, 668, 672, 747, 749, 750, 775, 862, 890, 934, 1033, 1096, 1340, 1357, 1371, 1431, 1438, 1469, 1509, 1554, 1558, 1573, 1596.
C. POETICS, METRICS


CRESPO (157) argues that anomalies like hiatus and lengthening in arsis have their aetiology in such phenomena as quantitative metathesis and vowel contraction; he tries to discriminate which among the latter are (relatively) recent, which ancient. LENZ (158) scrutinizes the opening lines of Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, and Herodotus for such traits as traditional structure, hymnic patterns, catch phrases, notion of the Muses, etc. In Homer’s case, he finds friction between original function of the proem in an oral performance and the potentials of its use within a written tradition. CANTILENA (159) refines Milman Parry’s influential revelation (JPH 1.5) of enjambment frequency as means of differentiating oral from literate composition: statistics resulting from comparative examination of II. 9, Od. 12, the Homeric Hymns, the Batrach., and Callimachus’ hexameter Hymns show that hard enjambment is even less evident in Homer than Parry’s somewhat inexact analysis had shown. TSOPANAKIS’ treatise (161) demonstrates that metrical oddities such as “chasmodic long” (non-observance of corretion) and “chasmodic short” (non-elopeion of short vowel) are both features of oral creation and focri of divergent compositional forces, as the poet violates prosodical convention to make connections among formulas necessary for specific poetic and narrative effects. Item 160 contains several studies of interest to Homerists: R. Schmiel, “‘Rhythm and Accent: Texture in Greek Epic Poetry,’” pp. 1-32; R. Grotjahn, “A Statistical Model for the Analysis of the Coincidence of Ictus and Accente,” pp. 33-74; D. L. Clayman, “Sentence Length in Greek Hexameter Poetry,” pp. 107-36; G. Altmann, “The Homogeneity of Metric Patterns in Hexameter,” pp. 137-50; and C. Job, “Annotated Bibliography on the Statistical Study of Hexameter Verse,” pp. 226-62.


HARTIGAN (162) argues that Homer’s similes refer to the motivations and emotions of individuals or groups without implying moral judgment, while Vergil’s show innocence, defenselessness, or lack of human responsibility.


BERG (163) argues for the origin of Greek hexameter in a syllable-count verse system (15 syllables per verse) and suggests the following chronological development: Aeolic meters, hexameter, iambic, and trochaic spoken verse. Item 165 is a comparative analysis of fourteen books of Homer with other writers of hexameters. Item 166 includes discussion of the varying functions of "l'inversione speculari" in Il. 18.482-608, the Scutum, Aesch. Sept. 380 ff., Moschus 2, and Catullus 64.


FOLEY (167) promotes a "tradition dependent" concept of formulaic structure, and describes causes of variation in diction and prosody in Old English, Homeric Greek, and Serbocroatian. The purpose of item 168 "is to reaffirm the vitality of metaphor as a significant poetic device in the language of the epics, particularly the Iliad" and "to illustrate the range and sophistication of figurative language in Homer" (p. 279). NAGY (169) argues that Homeric meter and formulas must be understood through a combination of two perspectives: formula evolves diachronically from themes, but is synchronically controlled by meter.


MATTHEWS (170) shows that the thirty-four instances of apostrophe fall into just six colometric patterns, and asserts that avoidance of hiatus and of spondaic nominative names at line-end accounts for some twenty of the vocative phrases. By a theory of "zones of focus or exposure" within Homeric syntax, VIVANTE (171) seeks to establish that "the noun-epithet phrase conveys the sense of a concrete presence, whereas a noun without epithet (or a mere pronoun) rather reflects some superimposed meaning, connection, subordination, cause and effect" (p. 158).


HUBBARD (172) offers a review of the various types of paired similes, and explores the significance of those pairings within the contexts of poetic artistry and Homeric mental outlook. TICHY (174) argues, by an analysis of androteta and related words, that Berg's theory of the origin of the hexameter (see item 163) has important implications for our understanding of the language of the Homeric poems.


FOLEY (175) discriminates among metrical characteristics of Old English, Homeric, and Serbo-Croatian poetry, tracing various Indo-European features in all three. Item 177 is on Homer as the model for Vergil, and includes a catalogue of similae in the three epics.


BONNAFÉ (178) finds that comparisons to the human world and the divine world routinely have a purely ornamental function, while those involving nature or life in nature point to the existence for the poet of “un univers de référence privilégié.”

See also items 65, 72, 125, 148, 184, 192, 222, 274, 337, 417, 542, 571, 593, 609, 647, 666-67, 677, 690, 769, 782, 817, 836, 882, 889, 1103, 1260, 1280, 1284, 1290, 1312, 1317, 1407, 1438, 1465, 1579.

D. LANGUAGE, FORMULAS, WORD STUDIES

179. *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos*. Göttingen—.

   Fasc. 5: *an-anthōrpos* ed. E.-M. Voigt (1967).


In 1947, the Archiv für Griechische Lexikographie, founded at the University of Hamburg three years before, set itself the goal of producing “Speziellylexika und Indices zu altgriechischen Autoren, Literaturgruppen und Sachgebieten.” The *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (*LfgrE*) was to canvass Homer, Hesiod, Epic Fragments, the *Hymns*, and fragments of *Vitae Homerii* and the *Certamen Homerii* in twenty-five fascicles of ninety-six pages (= 192 columns) each, appearing at regular, relatively short, intervals. Alpha soundly defeated such expectations, requiring nine fascicles, some 1800 columns, and thirty years of work. The project was put on a new footing and given new management (the Academy of Science at Göttingen), beginning with fascicle 10, the “Einleitung” to which forecasts (p. iii) completion before the end of the millennium, with fewer but larger fascicles at closer intervals. For the sake of completeness, I list all fascicles published by 1983, and for each its “verantwortlicher Redaktor”; fascicles 1 through 9 also indicated general editor(s): B. Snell, the founding father (1-3), U. Fleischer (2-3), H. Erbse (4-6), and W. Bühler (7-9).
  Vol. 7: Das Fortleben altgriechischer sozialer Typenbegriffe in den Sprachen der Welt, Part 2 (1982). Esp.: M. Sadeniemi, “Zum Fortleben altgriechischer Typenbegriff (von Homer bis Aristoteles) in der finnischen Sprache” (pp. 111-15); E. Namowicz, “Das Fortleben altgriechischer sozialer Typenbegriffe (von Homer bis Aristoteles) in der polnischen Sprache” (pp. 326-45); R. Hošek, “Das weiterleben altgriechischer sozialer Typenbegriffe (von Homer bis Aristoteles) in der tschechischen Sprache” (pp. 537-83); A. Tietze, “Griechische soziale Typenbegriffe (von Homer bis Aristoteles) in ihrem Nachleben im Türkischen” (pp. 584-99).

This very large-scale work combines lexicography with intellectual history. A concordance (vols. 1 and 2) supplies the raw data of the (broadly conceived) vocabulary of social standing and of social and political relations; some thirty individual authors, including Homer, Hesiod, lyric poets, the tragedians, Herodotus, Thucydides, Aristophanes, Demosthenes, Plato, and Aristotle, among others, are canvassed. To give an idea of the scale of coverage: the entries for basileus occupy twenty-four double-columned pages, for doulos twelve, for idiotēs seven; included are even such rare words as astugeitoneis-thai (only at Aesch. Supp. 286) and zeugision (only at Arist. AthPol 7.4). Listings appear to be accurate and thorough: e.g., all 430 Homeric occurrences of hetairos (II. 197x, Od. 233x) are noted. The other five volumes of Soziale Typenbegriffe contain no fewer than eighty-eight essays on the semantic/conceptual range of selected terms in ancient Greek, and of Greek-derived terms or equivalents in ancient and medieval Latin, and in the languages of the modern world (including even “exotics” like Slovone, Swahili, Tagalog, and Vietnamese!).


Item 182 includes “Zu II. 23.1,” pp. 86-106; “Oregein,” pp. 107-46; “enerriptoun, Od. 13.78,” pp. 270-78; “Zur homerischen Flexion von neus,” pp. 279-302; “Zu II. 15.339,” pp. 303-06, on the name Mekisteus; and “Beobachtungen zur Synizese,” pp. 310-11, on Homeric khrêò. KURT’s book (183; orig. diss. Zürich) combines etymological dictionary with concordance of the terminology of ships and seafaring; it should be used in conjunction with D. Gray’s *Seeuwesen* in the ArchHom series (JPH 2.690). Item 184 offers refinement and correction of J. A. Scott’s “The Vocative in Homer and Hesiod,” *AJP* 24 (1903) 192-96, regarding Homer’s use of o or vocative: it does not connote emotional charge but heightens the apprehension of appeal in the mind of the addressee; purely metrical impulses to the usage are also identified. Also examined in MAWET’s very elaborate semantic-field study (185) are odunê, penthos, akhos, kêdos, ponos, and all words even remotely related to them. The second part of item 186 addresses the thorny question of the earliest meaning of the adjective. HORROCKS’ Cambridge dissertation (188), directed by John Chadwick, contains three chapters seeking to clarify distinctions in syntactic roles of prepositions and preverbs, to set Homeric evidence “against the broader background of other ancient Indo-European languages in general and of the Mycenaean evidence in particular” (p. 2), and to “provide a comprehensive account of the spatial and temporal senses of
Homeric prepositions” (p. 3). Though less sanguine than Stella (see item 82), NEGRI (189) argues that Mycenaean elements contribute to the dialect mixture of Homer and that “una simile mistione, è ovvio, esige, dal versante delle altre istituzioni umane, una situazione di coesione nazionale, d’intensità di rapporti interni e così via, che solo al mondo miceneo è possibile ascrivere. In questo senso il mondo miceneo rappresenta la più antica couche culturale di Omero” (p. 53); there are sections on “Lineamenti di preistoria linguistica greca,” “La struttura della lingua epica,” and “Poesia micenea, poesia omerica e tradizioni ‘parallele’” (résumé in ASGM 20 [1978-79] 2-3).

In her survey of the eikos word-family down through the fifth century, SYNODINOU (191) detects five semantic categories: similarity, seamliness/necessity, hypothesis, appearance, and stage of logical certainty; in the process, she makes excursions into socio-political and intellectual history. JANKO (192): “Although the Hymns are both the seed and bole of this work, the reader will discover ramifications in topics as varied as the relative and absolute dates of Homer and Hesiod; the ‘Contest of Homer and Hesiod’; poetry as a political weapon in the sixth century; the homogeneity of the Homeric epics; how and why the poets used archaisms and formular modifications; the prehistory of the epic, its relation to vernacular dialects, and the impact of writing on what was in origin an oral tradition: that is to say, the ‘Homerian Question’ in general” (p. ix). Of item 193, Chadwick writes that “within the limitations of thirty years ago von Kamptz conducted a satisfactory analysis” (review); those limitations include a lack of realization of the consequences of Linear B for such studies. Paolo VIVANTE (194) offers his most extensive revisionist exercise in tilting at the windmill of the “ornamental epithet” in three parts: I, “The Epithets and Poetry,” formulates an aesthetics of the epithet; II closely examines, with citations of hundreds of examples, “The Concrete Value of the Epithet” as applied to ships, horses, gods, persons, etc.; and III polemically reviews (in his view) defective “Theories of the Epithet” (and of formula and theme), mostly spawned by Parry and Lord. MARTIN’s book (195) shows that epic as well as lyric is concerned with the theme of helplessness: “Achilles as an amēkhanos hero, and Odysseus, by contrast the man of many devices, polymēkhanos, bear this out” (HSCP).


Thomas JAHN’s dissertation (197) is an extremely thorough semantic-field study of the lexical constellation comprising etor, thumos, kér, kradiē, menos, noos, prapidēs, phren/phrenēs, and psukhē. His goals are “(1) das Gesamtvolumen des Wortfeldes zu bestimmen, (2) durch Gegenüberstellung der einzelnen in Frage kommenden Lexeme eine erste Binnenabgrenzung des Wortfelds zu erarbeiten.” The result is both an extremely useful review of previous research from the late eighteenth century onward and a most precise tabulation of word occurrence with circumcision of exact semantic and metaphorical ranges. PERRY (199) argues that “explanations of Homeric formulae offered by Milman Parry and his successors are inadequate to explain the observed Homeric usage of narrative verbs” (DAI), and makes fine discriminations between aorist and imperfect indicative. By studying noun-verb rather than noun-epithet formulas, WOODLOCK (200) tries to counteract the tendency of
scholars since Parry "to generalize the problem [of defining 'formula'] in such a way that the original objects of interest are in danger of being lost in a mass of essentially unrelated expressions" (DAI).


Item 202 includes discussion of abnormalities in Homer's use of the plural, while item 206 argues that Homeric dē has a hypotactic force in certain environments involving proximity of an unaugmented historic verb; passages from *Il.* 1 and 2 and *Od.* 8 are adduced. VARA (208) notes telling parallels between the Homeric *Kunstsprache* and Mycenaean Greek in regard to traces of initial h in certain words. JACQUINOD (209) discusses the double accusative of the whole and the part. BONFANTE (213) argues that koiranos, restricted to Homer and Boeotian, entered Greek from Illyrian at the time of the Trojan War, while GARCÍA RAMÓN (214) detects archaisms of a
northwest dialect origin that contrast with Homeric innovations in Hesiod's *Kunstsprache*. Item 216 is on the Linear B tablets and Homeric usage. MICHELINI (217) examines in particular the force of middle endings in Homeric language. NAGY (218) investigates whether the etymology "*AkhilaFos" fits the meanings of *akhos* and *laos* in the epic tradition and to what extent such a reconstruction has validity with respect to the characterization of Achilles himself. PIGHI (219) makes distinctions among the sorts of zephyrs that appear in Homer, and WATKINS (222) examines the Nestor's Cup inscription from the perspectives of Greek and Indo-European linguistics and comparative metrics.


In item 224, inspection of the various dual endings encountered in Homer and in archaic dialects of Attica and the Peloponnese points to an ultimate locativial origin. EFFENTERRE (225) rejects previous interpretations of the *laos* word-group and contends that "vielmehr kann man aus dem Gebrauch bei Homer schliessen, dass es sich um eine Bevölkerungsmasse handelt, die zu jeder Art von Gefolgschaft bereit war. Man kann in Zusammenhang damit auf die römische Parallele plebs/populus hinweisen." MENKEN (228) adduces Homeric evidence that the conjunction may introduce a clause stating not the reason for taking the position in the main clause, but the reason for which the main clause was expressed. NAGLER (229) treats the Homeric formula *deinê theos audeeessa* (Od. 10.136, 11.8, 12.150, 449) as a device to mark scenes with similar thematic content, with remarks also on the attributes of the type of the "dread goddess" inherited from the Indo-European and Near Eastern mythological traditions. NEGRI (230) contests the derivation from root *korso- (cf. Lat. *curro*) proposed by F. Solmsen, and favors derivation from Mycenaean *e-pi-ko-wo, kouros* (= warrior).

In item 236, the Linear B word is explained by reference to the Homeric verb *prio*.

BREUIL (237) maintains Homeric incertitude about the denotation of the two words is due to diachronic semantic changes within the oral tradition. DICKIE (238) counters "the two main theoretical objections to *dike*’s having moral significance" [viz., absence of internalized moral feelings and the exclusively concrete signification of the word] and examines "a number of passages [e.g., *Il.* 16.386-88, *Od.* 14.83-84] in Homer and Hesiod in which... *dike* should properly be translated by ‘justice’ or ‘righteousness’..." (p. 91). According to DUNKEL (239), neither Indic materials nor the *IIiad* provides evidence that resumptive preverb deletion was an inherited phenomenon. FERRINI (240) maintains that apparent confusion in Homer’s use of color terms is disposed of by consideration of those terms within the context...
of formulaic technique of composition. FLOYD (241) considers that “several peculiar Greek third plural perfect and pluperfect forms in /d/" were caused initially by nasal dissimilation and “constitute direct evidence of a transitional stage between /n/ and /s/ in the perfect middle paradigm” (p. 15). FORSSMAN (242) shows that the Homeric verb forms he discusses have the force “to greet” and derive from the root deik. Item 243 identifies a host of idiolectal traits (phonological, metrical, semantic, syntactic, rhetorical) of Achilles’ speech, suggesting that the traditional linguistic repertoire of the poet could be deployed with considerable freedom (see also items 341, 329).

HAINSWORTH (244) outlines the process by which expressions “ossify” into formulas that thrive, beget derivative expressions and ideas, and pass into “the rust of archaism” finally to be replaced altogether. LAUFFER (248) argues for Semitic or pre-Greek Indo-European origin of the word family he examines; regardless of variation in semantic nuance, the basic irreducible meaning is “inner chamber.” Saul LEVIN (249) notes that Homeric oaths with né men were probably accompanied by a hand gesture. MATTHEWS (250) contends that “we need not seek a meaning for the epithet oloophrôn in the Odyssey different from the meaning it has in the Iliad. ‘Malignant’ clearly suits the aspects of Aietes, Minos, and Atlas which were displayed in other early epic poems” (p. 232). Item 252 demonstrates that “Homer employed ia and mia. . . to reflect the contemporary dialect geography of Greece” (p. 24). NOTHDURFT (253) combines semantic-field study with etymology to indicate that peirar/peirata carries the force “Ding, durch das Wirkung hindurchgeht” (p. 40). OPELT (254) reviews in particular the semantics of love/friendship and aggression/enmity, the latter more richly elaborated in both authors examined. Noting a parallel location in the Grettir Saga 47.20 meaning “nel colmo della notte” (p. 703), that is, the darkest part of the night, PISANI (255) goes on to argue a similar metaphorical import for the Homeric formula by virtue of the derivation of amolgos from molgos (see Pollux 10.187), which in the variant *bolgos (= “sack”, “bag”) has several German cognates. WYATT (258) lays out “the figures and statistics for the occurrence of the HomERICally attested forms in hopes of being able to draw some prosodic and linguistic conclusions” (p. 89); among the latter, that “proti (porti) is a secondary development. . . and . . . proto-Greek inherited only poti” (p. 123).

262. Cremona, M. V. “Hom. gerēnios.” ZAnt 29 (1979) 203-08. [From Gerēn, a toponym of Lesbos.]
275. Ivanov, V. V. “Foreign Parallels to the Homeric Words ikthhus and khthon” [in Russian]. In BBS (1979) 9-10.

Item 260 includes a table of the history of dative plurals in ancient Greek. COUGHANOWR (261) writes "the root mol- (mal-) seems to convey the meaning lack of hair, a disease (or moth) that affects the hair, and beggar, a
person afflicted by some or all of the above" (p. 230). DARCUS (263, 264, 304, 322) defines psychodynamics by scrutiny of key words as used in each grammatical case. Some conclusions: Homer saw *psukhē* as "(1) the object of some activity signified by a verb, the subject being a god, another person, [or] the person himself; (2) an active agent within man (at the time of fainting or death) and in Hades" (263, p. 33). *Phrēn*/*phrenes* (similarly *noos*) is "(1) the location where a person performed certain emotional, volitional, and intellectual functions. . . .(2) An accompaniment or instrument . . .[with] which a person acted. . . .(3) The object of some activity signified by a verb with subject generally not the owner of *phrenes* [or *noos*] themselves. . . .(4) Rarely. . . an independent active agent" (264, p. 165). "*Thumos* is a person's most prominent psychic organ. . . .[It] often appears as an agent which can determine a person's behavior and which, on occasion, he feels impelled to resist. . . .*thumos* functions as a location within a person, acts in subordination to him, functions harmoniously with him, or opposes him" (322, pp. 149-50). All four articles go on to reveal similarities and differences in later Greek usage. HOOKER argues in item 267 that in most of the six occurrences of the phrase discussed, "*ei* introduces a kind of anaphora, taking up a noun already expressed and adding a pathetic exclamation" and has the meaning "*so*" rather than "*if*"; in item 268 that *entupas*, a Homeric hapax at *Il.* 24.163, "had an active, not a passive, meaning [unlike *entupas*]—in the access of his grief, Priam thrusts himself into the ground as forcefully as a man impressing a seal upon damp clay" (p. 175); in item 270 that "the use of *gephura* in the sense of 'embankment' is purely poetical and . . . in post-Homeric Greek it has only the meaning 'bridge.' In these circumstances, it becomes quite likely that [Semitic] *gb* was absorbed in Greek not as describing an item of material culture but as existing in a specific literary context" (p. 397); in item 272 (against West) that *aiɡiokhos* = "aegis-bearing", (with Humback) that *diipetes* = "swiftly hurrying", (against Page) that *koruthaiolos* = "shaking the helmet." In item 271, he notes as an apparent exception to Waterlet's analysis (296) that, at *Od.* 4.87-88, *anax* "appears to mean little more than 'master' in the English phrase (now obsolete) 'master and servant.' "

INGALLS' statistical comparison (274) of formular densities in a selection of similes and a control passage of narrative "reveals a uniform formular texture in the *Iliad*" (p. 105), thus enlarging "the roster of evidence suggesting that the similes, too, were composed orally" (p. 106) and that they are, despite fineness, authentic. JANNO (277) presents the juxtaposition of *episkherō* with *aktē* in two of its three occurrences (*Il.* 18.68-69, 23.125-26) that "the adverb origin by a misunderstanding in the early epic tradition" (p. 21), and in item 278 contends that "in the epic diction *poti* and *proti* have been replaced by *pros*. . . .after the neglect of initial digamma began; the older forms originated in the Aeolic phase of the epic" (p. 29). The problem in item 281 "deals with the order in which (SYLLAB) and (ASSIM) must be applied" (p. 224) properly to account for derivations of particular case-forms of *basileus* and *psukhē*. Item 282 is a scrutiny of date and usages of substantive and verb "to determine. . . the productivity of the denominatives in comparison with the category of nouns in -eus, in each stage of the language" (p. 304). PETRUSEVSKI (284) argues that *wo-ra* refers to a chariot part designated by *eurai* (Pollux 1.146), unattested in Homer or classical Greek, but perhaps the source of Homeric *eurax*. According to POSTLETHWAITE (285), close comparative analysis (à la Hainsworth) of "the various types of formula modification" shows that the poets of the Hymns worked within an oral tradition similar to Homer's (*Il.* 1.176-611 and *Od.* 2.1-434 used as controls). RENEHAN (286) argues that "*sōma* means . . . not 'living body' and not 'dead body,' but 'body' plain and simple" (p. 278); thus, (pace Snell) the word "never was a legitimate foundation on which to build the thesis that Homeric man had only a very fragmented concept of
himsclf" (p. 280). TAGLIAFERRO (293) seeks to prove that the form *een was a "recent" invention: "al rapsodo, che aveva a disposizione la serie *een, *en, ed *een—quest'ultimo avvertito come privo di aumento—non ha fatto difficoltà allungare l'e di *een, stante la presenza di altri imperfetti a vocale iniziale lunga" (p. 350). Item 296 looks for possible correlations between Homeric usage and Linear B: "l'analyse...a montré qu'en ce qui concerne l'emploi de anax et de basilus on se rapproche de la situation attestée par les tablettes mycénienes quand on remonte dans la tradition formulaire de l'épopée grecque" (p. 40; see item 271). WILSON (297) has discovered in later authors' use of potential "*is-Reden" a "progressive restriction in scope...probably due to the development of a private ethic that rejects the appeal to a generalized *is" (p. 15).

[Mycenaein origin.]


304. Darcus, S. M. "How a Person Relates to noos in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets." Glotta 58 (1980) 33-44. [See above, on item 263.]


Item 299 is a thorough demonstration that sakos is a lexical archaism, with special attention to the formulas sakos heptaboeion, sakos eute purgon and to the word's association with Aias. CHEÝNS (302) scrutinizes passages where phrenes and prapides denote a bodily organ from an anatomical perspective. COHEN (303) detects quite distinct concepts indicated by the two words; notably, horkia serves to define relations of mutual obligation operative between parties of equal social status. DORIA's survey (305) of some forty-five examples of the adjective in the Knossos and Pylos tablets leads him to reject any "Aeolic hypothesis" in favor of direct Mycenaen origin. EIDE (306) claims the formula is properly used of Penelope to indicate "the tautness of muscles and sinews caused by a firm grip or a quick movement"—a firm grip because the "key" in Od. 21.6 is "a fairly long and heavy metal bar, which was inserted through a hole in the door so as to thrust aside the bolt inside" (p. 24). FLOYD (307) argues (against G. Nagy [JPH 2.104]) that the Homeric formula has a different meaning from its Indic cognate srāvas...dksitam. HAMP (309) writes: "we must have here a delocutive compound, perhaps of Indo-European date, resting upon a favorite structure which lent itself to Univerbierung" (p. 91; see also item 343). HOOKER (310) says the alternative names Briareus and Aeagaeon at Il. 1.103-04 perhaps arose "from a feeling on the part of the epic poets that, if they did not call attention to some respects in which gods differ from men, the distinction between them would become intolerably blurred" (p. 189). PALLARA (316) claims the Homeric influence on the language of the archaic elegiac poets has been overestimated. PETRUSHEVSKI (317) finds many Mycenaen elements in Homer, while Arcado-Cypriot seems descended from the Achaeen dialect. QUILLER (318) evaluates "the dual concept demiurgos," which, while meaning a craftsman in Ionia and Athens, denoted a magistrate in areas such as EPh, Locris, Arcadia, etc. . . . I find Murakawa's theory [of a unified social origin—see "Demiurgos," Historia 6 (1957) 385-415] too conjectural" (pp. 5:7); he prefers to treat the Homeric and Western Greek denotations as different institutions. The distinction found by RIEDINGER (319) is between aidōs as applied to a specific interpersonal relationship (affinities with time) and as applied to the larger social milieu (affinities with nemesis); these may sometimes conflict: "Hector, quand il attend l'attaque d'Achille, est partagé entre l'aidōs envers sa mère (Il. 22.82), et celle qui lui interdit l'humiliation publique (22.108)" (p. 69). THIEME (323) offers an etymological/semantic investigation of the question "ob die für die synchronische Betrachtung der homerischen Sprache durch ihren Sinn deutlich geschiedenen Präsenstämme mnae,- to wo etc.' und mnae,-'to be mindful' genetisch nicht doch zusammenhängen" (p. 126). Item 324 is on the syntactic and existential relations motivating Homer's distribution and modulation of formulas for dawn.


AVINO (325) maintains that "winged words" has a metaphorical religious reference to the equation of sacred words with birds (winged oracles; see esp. pp. 109-11). By analysis of both new and previously mis-evaluated isoglosses and of shared and independent innovations, DUNKEL (326) argues that "the ancestors of [Arcado-Cypriot, Aeolic, and Mycenaean] formed an innovating area which we will call Central Greek" (p. 132, see diagram on p. 142). According to ELLSWORTH (327), "in epic diction. . . agon means ‘assembly-
with-contests', and never designates any other kind of assembly, an unspecified assembly, or assemblies in general." (p. 104—see also A. Bamnesberger, "Agôn und ageirô," Sprache 28 [1982] 27-30). FRAZER (328): "I count six descriptive passages in Homer [Il. 3.162 ff., 4.20 ff., Od. 11.593 ff., 12.85 ff., 15.4 ff., 24.153 ff.] and one in Hesiod [Erga 161 ff.] where étol has a corrective force" (p. 265), which "give us the impression of the poet speaking and modifying his thought in mid-course. We seem to hear the voice of the oral poet." (p. 271). HEUBECK (331) sketches the evolution of opinion concerning the dialectal mélange of Homer, beginning with Bentley's discovery of the digamma. HOGAN (332) shows that, in distinction from the word's denotation in Hesiod, eris refers in Homer to competitive self-assertion in quest of kleos. Regarding Homer's use of alternative metrically equivalent formulas (e.g., boôpis potnia Hêrê / thea leukôlenos Hêrê), JANKO (334) maintains "another important factor in the choice is the memory of the previous choice" (p. 255); unusual concentrations of an option are due to waning in the poet's awareness of monotoy or to plain forgetfulness—such are the "faint fingerprints of authenticity" (p. 261). In item 335, JANKO contends "contraction of -ao- as a linguistic index" in the formula examined affords a rare chance "to see how many different modifications of a single formula are interrelated, and to chart their genealogy according to linguistic and modificatory approaches" (p. 382). Item 336 shows that ikhôr consistently means the serum that flows from wounds or ulcers, and not blood (of gods or humans).

LEVIN (338) maintains that "the founders of epic poetry were non-Ionians under Ionian patronage...[who], in their incomplete commitment to Ionic, expressed on the one side their deference to the Ionian audience, on the other side the poetic advantage of admitting words whose structure was alien to Ionic. The single most revealing example is thea'" (p. 243). Item 339 combines semantic-field study with geistesgeschichtlich inquiry into several key passages with erotic themes (Paris and Helen in Il. 3, Zeus and Hera in Il. 4, Ares and Aphrodite in Od. 8) or highlighting social or filial relationships. MESSING (341) disputes the contention of Friedrich and Redfield (243) that Homeric heroes had ideolec: "such a view is...inconsistent with the practices of oral poetry and with the classical doctrine of êthos. Their stylometric tests are unconvincing because of inadequate sampling, an unreliable textual tradition, and a defective rationale in applying stylistic criteria" (p. 888). Item 342 shows that "Homeric adjectives in -ops, among which meropes, are not traceable back to the root *ok-", but to the category of anthroponyms in -ops, while the masculine helikôpes...reveals a contamination between -op-, suffix of non i.e. origin and -ôp-, derived from *ok-" (p. 265). NAGY (343), responding to Floyd (307): "the basic difference between the kleos aphthition of Iliad IX 413 and the srâvas...ôksitam of RV 1.9.7 [is that] Homeric poetry has separated not so much the theme of material wealth from the theme of perpetuity but rather the theme of personal immortalization from the theme of immortalization by way of poetry" (pp. 115-16). RODRIGUEZ ADRADOS' study (344) of dialectal stratigraphy in Greek discusses evidence for an "epic Achaean" dialect of the second millennium; he identifies the chief dialect phases as "I. 1800-1250 B.C.: The Mycenaean dialect and the para-Mycenaean dialects which were the basis of later eastern Greek. II. 1250-1000 B.C.: Pre-Forms of Ionic-Attic, Arcado-Cyprian and Aeolic...III. 1000-700 B.C.: Definition of the three eastern dialectal groups and of their sub-dialects" (p. 15). WATHELET (349) argues that influence of (western) Ionic dialect forms in Homer attests to importance of Euboea (esp. Chalcis) in the eighth century.

351. de Bock Cano, L. “"Katharos, hagnos, aeikēs: Algunas correcciones a los léxicos desde el punto de vista de la semántica estructural." Emerita 50 (1982) 121-37. [In Homer, Hesiod, Tyrtaeus, and Archilochus.]


The form discussed in item 350 is not a replacement but the inherited form of a sigmatic aorist. Item 352 finds differences between divine and human speech to have historical, stylistic, parodic, and religious aspects. According to CANTARELLA (353), hubris in Homer does not refer to violation of a religious interdiction, but is connected with the notion of timē, denoting an abridgment of the honor of another. GARBRAY (355) suggests that “‘instead of categorising the [long and short dative] forms as 'early' and 'late', we classify them as 'vernacular Ionic' [-ois/-eisî] and 'poetic alternative to vernacular Ionic' [-ois/-eisî]' (p. 308). HAMP (356) notes that gloria is a collective in -ia analogous to Homeric eidar. Item 357 includes discussion of the name-suffix -sthenēs and the non-occurrence of the name-prefix aristo- in Homer. KOTOPoulos provides in item 358 an exhaustive survey of Homeric use of the formula (in the catalogue of ships and in combat scenes in which two brothers are victims of the same adversary) showing the originality of the poet's control of traditional materials. Item 360 is a survey of Greek usage (mainly Herodotus, but also Homer, tragedy, Thucydid, Plato) establishing a distinct difference of nuance (pace Kühner-Gerth, Schwyzer, and Smyth) between the two subordinating conjunctions in all categories of their usage. SKAFTE JENSEN (362) argues that a Homeric dictating c. 525 played on Athenian connotations of kranaos (a mythical king of Athens was called Kranaos, according to Scholiast D). "TEFFETELLER'S contextual analysis (363) of Od. 13.332, 18.128, and 21.306 supports the scholars' association of the words studied with epos rather than (pace Wackernagel) hepo. By reviewing the frequency of epithets relative to syntax, specifically with regard to case-forms, VIVANTE (364) reveals that "in...highlighting wine as object of acts intrinsic to it (to pour, to drink...), the epithet has a concrete value; on the other hand, the absence of the epithet results from
complications of construction or it points to an abstract sense of the noun: wine as a means to an end (‘filled with...’, ‘satiated with...’)" (p. 19).


378. Moreschini Quattordio, A. "‘Per l’interpretazione dell’etnico Kuk-


CHRISTOL (367) argues that tēi dekatēi is an old instrumental later construed as a dative of date; an appendix on pemptaioi (Od. 14.257). COSSET (368) demonstrates that the epithets polumētis, ptoliporthos, dourik-
lutos, and ìlemón are subtly appropriate to the hero’s behavior and abilities as well as to events narrated; context is also a factor in the choice of khalkeon or meilinon to modify spears. In item 369, he seeks to demonstrate that each of
several epithets based on méitis (viz. polumèitis Odusseus; Kronou pais ankulomètis; méitieta Zeus) "souligne et renforce le portrait psychologique des personnages"; though not proof that all formulas have literary justification, this does "constitue une confirmation supplémentaire de la souplesse du style formulaire et de la maîtrise du poète" (p. 274). DERÖY (370) maintains that the Latin prefix is "atténuative," corresponds to the Mycenaean adjectival prefix wē- (reduced to ē- in Homeric ἑρεδανος, οἰθεος, and εβαιος) and may represent an old borrowing of Latin from Greek. HAUDRY (371) shows that the words artipos (II. 9.505, Od. 8.310), artiphron (Od. 24.261) and artipèes (II. 22.281) all carry a metaphorical charge derived from woodworking. Item 372 shows how the phrase, in its twenty-six Homeric occurrences, "charges the speech it introduces with a decidedly minatory fervency and excitement" (p. 16). Item 375 sheds light on the Homeric idiom kharin idein (II. 11.243) by comparing it with Indo-Iranian and Armenian, where *weid-* carries the force "to obtain"; also *trekho* is shown to mean "turn on an axis" in both Armenian and Homer. RUTHERFORD-DYER (381) presents evidence that "oinops is an evocative and meaningful epithet to Homer and his audience, most appropriately translated 'sunset-red'. . . ; when used of ships and islands, it evokes the sunset departure of ships bound in night-time navigations by the stars" (pp. 127-28). According to STEPHENS (383), Homeric mē plus aorist imperative falls into two categories: 1) "retentions of an earlier syntactic construction" and 2) "a special development arising from processes peculiar to the epic Dichtersprache" (p. 71).


E. WORLD VIEW: SOCIETY, ETHICS, RELIGION, PSYCHOLOGY, ETC.


Ten of the nineteen chapters in item 386 deal with concepts of justice in Homer, who "constitutes the early Hellenic answer to the problem of oral storage: first, it is the society of early maritime Hellenism, not an antique Mycenaean model, which he reports...; second, the stories in the poems...include a mass of directive information covering the nomos and ethos...appropriate to the society to which the poems are addressed" (p. 13).

CANTARELLA (388) discusses particularly the adjudication of homicide cases, and postulates three phases in the evolution of judicial procedure: 1) imposed decision by the king in Mycenaean times, 2) voluntary conformity with heroic competitive standards of virtue (the norm in Homer), and 3) the more democratic and cooperative morality evidenced in the judgment scene on the shield in Il. 18. Item 389, originally a doctoral dissertation, examines the vocabulary and psychodynamics of repentance in the Homeric epics. Item 396, a volume in J. Vogt’s series Forschungen zur antiken Sklaverei, reprints (with additions) WICKERT-MICKNAT’s earlier study of prisoners of war and slaves in the Iliad, Studien zur Kriegsgefangenschaft und zur Sklaverei in der griechischen Geschichte, I: Homer (Wiesbaden 1954), together with a new treatise on "unfree" persons in the Odyssey.


By examining formulaic language applied to poleis in Homer, SCULLY (397) reveals "the generic image of the polis...in three basic categories: the unique sacred nature of the polis, its defensive system in terms of both its divine and its human derivation, and the people—warriors, rulers, women and children—who inhabit it" (DAI). WHITEHEAD includes the Odyssey in his study (398) of how "the idea of the telos, as well as the poet’s view of his role, is transformed under the growing influence of the logos, both in the Classical and Christian worlds" (DAI). STANTON’s dissertation (399) concludes that "Homer’s society was co-operative and moral at Stage 2 of the Kohlberg scale... measurement of moral stage... depended on motivation expressed by a particular character; on context, and on evaluations by the narrator and by other characters" (DAI).


Item 400 considers human pathological behaviors as symbolized in the Homeric gods. In observations prompted by the publication of the fourth edition of Bruno Snell’s *Die Entdeckung des Geistes* (Göttingen 1975), KRAUS (402) reflects that “Die Menschen der Ilias stehen an Würde und innerem Wert über die Götter. Es ist ein anderer Ernst um sie, eben weil sie den Tod vor Augen haben. Keine Erlösung wartet ihrer, keine erhöhte Existenz im Jenseits, nur ein Schattendasein, dem Achill das elendste Knechtsleben auf die Erde verzieht (Od. 11, 488 ff.). In diesem kurzen Leben müssen sie sich bewähren, unter den Bedingungen, die die Götter setzen” (p. 29). ROWE (403) contrasts the relatively unified pantheon in Homer and Hesiod on the one hand, with the diversity of religious worship in actual practice on the other, while DIETRICH (404) cautions against a facile equation of Homeric and Hesiodic myth with actual cult figures of Greek religion. FISCHER (405): “Hesiod knew more about astronomical phenomena than did Homer and applied his more precise knowledge to practical affairs.” FRIEDRICH (406) seeks to demonstrate that “honor and the honor-linked complexes were mainly predicated on keeping women relatively deprived of honor, on competing for women as symbolic of honor, and ritualized conflicts over women that intermittently revitalize the entire system of meanings”; thus, “the system of honor is primarily rooted in sexuality and the relations between the sexes” (p. 302). GIANGRANDE (407) contrasts Homeric humor, which is situational, with the word-play of Alexandrian humor. According to GORDON (408), “dual paternity, human and divine, was not a paradox in the realm of Near Eastern concepts, as in, e.g., Homer II. 10.144, and the double paternity of the pharaohs.” ROBERT (411) notes certain tensions in Homer’s narrative arising from the fact that no temples of Zeus existed in Asia Minor. ROMILLY (412) describes the evolution from acceptance of myth as literal truth in the Homeric poems to its acquisition of
symbolic force in later Greek literature. ZEPPi (413) holds that the Odyssey represents a monistic solution to the tension between sorts of society discussed.


BANNERT (414) refines some of the inferences of F. Dirlmeier, *Die Vogelgestalt homerischer Götter* (SHAW 1967.2), e.g., with regard to *Il*. 7.57-61, 13.62-65, *Od*. 1.319-20, 3.371-72. Item 416 demonstrates that Homeric precedents may be found for such philosophical or physical notions as the four elements, the primacy of divine reason, the unlimited, etc. FOLEY (417) discloses how the "reverse-sex" similes at *Od*. 19.108-14 and 23.233-40 (and elsewhere) serve to "clarify the overall structure and meaning of the relations between man and wife" (p. 8): they reinforce our sense of "a mature marriage with well-defined spheres of power and a dynamic tension between two like-minded members of their sex" (p. 21). Item 418 analyzes Homeric and Hesiodic notions of contrasting historical epochs, viz. godlike and heroic vs. merely mortal. Discussion in item 419 proceeds from analysis of the *Odyssey*, Hesiod, Empedocles, and Aristophanes; see critique in Bertelli *PPol* 15 (1982) 569-70. According to GRIFFIN (420), "We are able to share [the gods'] viewpoint and to see human life as they see it, in its double aspect of greatness and littleness. And the gods themselves acquire not least from their rôle of watchers their own complex nature: sublime heavenly witnesses
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and judges, and at the same time all-too-human spectators” (p. 21). Item 423 notes the tendency for humans (though not the poet) to speak of indefinite powers (theos tis, etc.) and suggests illuminating parallels with anthropological theories of mana. Item 424 is on the influence of Homer and Hesiod on Presocratic notions of the four elements. SEGAL (425) compares Homer's and Plato's use of a common tradition of myth: "Plato's journey... in its morphology, in its imagery, and even in some of its fundamental aims retains its roots in the experiences of Achilles and Odysseus. Both the epic poet and the philosopher embark upon voyages... toward the truth of life's essential and permanent character" (pp. 334-35). WATKINS (429) demonstrates the potential for mutual illumination of Homer and Indo-European, here as regards words for cereals, with attention "to the ethnic, and the poetic, side of what is in part an ethnobotanical, and in part a philological problem" (p. 9).


ANDREEV (430) argues that Homer's notion of the kingdoms of his heroes was highly abstract and had no basis in the realities of Mycenaean political
structures, reflected only in random bits of the poetic tradition; Homer himself had direct knowledge only of the autonomous polis. In item 431, he maintains that the "Volksversammlung" in Homer is not an incipient democratic system, but a mechanism for political decision making and resolution of disputes by aristocrats. DESCAT's semantic-field study (434) finds that "basileus est à anax comme démos à laos." It seems like the representation of the pouvoir se présente sous la forme d'un système cohérent où le dédoublement des expressions indique un jeu d'interactions réciproques" (p. 238); notably, basileus and démos denote a network of public authority by an elite, anax and laos effective dominance within the interpersonal sphere of the oikos. DIETRICH (435) believes Homer occupies a position in the history of Greek religious thought at the boundary between Aegean prehistory and the religion of the polis. LENVZ (437) offers reflections on Homeric anthropology, religion, society, and oral artistry. LEVY (438) illustrates that passages implying mortality of gods (e.g., Il. 1.593, 5.388-91, 395-402, 899-901) "represent not an extreme incursion into anthropomorphism but rather a contrivance by which the poet manages to save for his epic the cherished episodes of a tradition in which the gods were indeed mortal" (p. 218; see item 463). POSNER (441) demonstrates that "there is little functioning government in Homer:" we have to do with an "alternative structure of prepolitical institutions and values [e.g., hospitality, reciprocity, honor, gifts, revenge] that occupies the role...that the state plays in our society" (p. 28). Item 442 is on the centrality of the bride-price (hedna)—symbolizing in part an alliance of clans—in the Homeric depiction of marriage. VERNANT (447) compares Od. 12.312-446 (companions of Odysseus eating the cattle of Helios) with Herodotus 3.17-26 (Ethiopians) with a view to determining the Greek classification of foods (cf. item 428).

BERTMAN (449) traces changing notions about justice and the individual's relation to the community in authors beginning with Homer. KIRK (453) exposes the errors of cultural anthropologists who posit greater self-consistency and neatness of organization than is actually evident in societies whose rituals of sacrifice are analyzed. LITTLETON (455) places Greek mythology firmly in Indo-European tradition by discussions of Homer, Herodotus, Aeschylus (in the Eumenides), and Plato. MOSSÉ (457) maintains that Ithaca and the city of the Phaeacians exhibit embryonic forms of the classical city-state, unlike Pylos and Sparta, which are non-existent outside the palace walls. By linguistic analysis, NAGY (458) finds thematic precedents for elements in the crenation of Patroclus in certain Indic customs, especially the ritual of the Triple Fire. O'NEAL (459) concludes that "the idealized concept of fair play in the modern world did not exist in Homeric times. . . . To win was the important object, how was secondary" (p. 13). SCHOULER (460) traces permutations of the notion "dépasser le père" from two Iliadic passages—Agamemnon with Diomedes and Sthenelos, and Hector with Andromache and Astyanax (ll. 4.365, 6.371 ff.)—through Greek literature down to Libanius (and beyond—Kazantzakis). According to SCOTT (461), neither aidōs nor nemesis implies moral conscience in Homer; though they could at times dictate co-operative values, each was subordinate to the requirements of arete.


ANDERSEN (463) argues (against Levy, item 438) that scenes apparently implying the possibility of a god's death in fact do no such thing; moreover, the gods do not point back to "a still more anthropomorphic position" (Levy), but "testify to the . . . poet's modelling of the gods in his poems, according to the needs of his art" (p. 327). DONLAN (464) finds that "circulation of treasure. . . is the necessary instrument of enhancing reputation and of increasing political influence, and both are directly proportional to the
amount of prestige goods which a man controls” (p. 108); “one motive predominates: to win and to augment fame and influence for oneself and one’s oikos” (p. 109)—in part by engaging in various social-symbolic transactions. According to item 465, *Il. 5.339-42*, while it involves semantic play attesting to considerable linguistic sophistication, does not presuppose the use of writing in composition. KOKOLAKIS (466) shows that passages bearing on the issue of Homericanism attest some to metaphorical enhancements, others to “primeval animistic superstitions stratified in the surviving epics” (p. 113). KOTOPoulos (467) contends that the conflict between noble and king seen among Greeks, Trojans, and gods reflects historical anti-monarchical behavior by eighth-century aristocrats. Item 468 traces degeneration of women’s status from elevated and privileged in Minoan-Mycenaean times and in Homeric poetry through subsequent stages of degradation beginning with the misogyny of the Hesiodic poems. LESHER (469) argues that the oral character of the Homeric poems did not preclude their addressing philosophical questions: the uses of *mètis, noos/noein*, and *gignóskein* in the *Odyssey* “reflect an interest in sense perception, knowledge, and intelligence that was absent in the *Iliad*” (p. 19). Item 470 is on the considerable but carefully delimited spheres of activity of women (esp. Andromache, Helen, Hecuba, Clytemnestra, Penelope, Helen, and Nausicaa) in Homer. PETERSMANN (471) assesses work in the field and concludes by noting a critical difference between the heroes of *Märchen* and those of Homer, since in the latter “Gewöhnlich jedoch erstreckt sich das Eingreifen der Götter nur auf ihren Beistand in Kampf und Not, indem sie dem Helden vor allem Mut, Klugheit und Kraft einflössen; nicht ersparen sie ihm dabei persönliche Mühsal und Leid. Doch gerade dadurch eröffnen sich für den homerischen Helden zum grossen Unterschied vom Märchenhelden Wege zu wahrer Humanität. Ihr hat Homer in seinen Epen erstmals in der Geschichte der abendländischen Menschheit ein leuchtendes Denkmal gesetzt” (p. 68). QUILLER (472) discusses the dynamics of change from the self-destructive and progressively weaker monarchical system to aristocracy and the emergence of the polis. Item 474 “concentrates on the Dark Age and eighth-century attitudes” toward death, reflected in the language, imagery, and “funerary ideology” of Homer and Hesiod.

ADKINS (476): “[Achilles] does not realize how his values induced him not to be persuaded [by Nestor in II. 1, by the ambassadors in II. 9]. . . . Achilles knows that anger is sweeter than honey, but he does not realize why anger is so sweet to one who holds his values. He is living by the same values even . . . in Iliad 24. . . . He shows no realization that other values would be possible” (p. 321). Adkins reiterates that “the competitive martial excellences of Homer retain their precedence over other [cooperative, civic] values in later Greece. . . for a very long time” (p. 322). Item 479 is on ways in which “the physiology of the gods corresponds to and mirrors that of men” (p. 114), nectar and ambrosia sustaining the agelessness of the gods as earthly foods sustain mortals. DONLAN (480) views calculated generosity in Homer as an element in the social relationships operative in an “immature chiefdom,” perhaps reflective of cultural conditions in the ninth century. In item 481, he reaches the conclusion that “the society depicted in Homer. . . is ‘real’; and it is more likely that such a social structure existed in space and time [sic. Dark Age Greece] than that it was made up, or that it is an amalgam of institutions concocted from bits and pieces of social background extending over a period of time to centuries” (p. 172). GARLAND’s (483) object is “to determine why and to what extent people in Homer feel under an obligation to tend their dead. . . . to abstract and define the prevalent Homeric belief concerning the requirements of the dead and the feelings caused by them among the living” (p. 69). GREENHALGH (484) discriminates as follows: therâpôn “was a current Geometric Age dependent household servant who at his highest level could be a displaced nobleman who was his master’s most able and best loved hetairos and deputy commander-in-chief”; opâpon “was a Mycenaean survival. . . . meaning a hetairos outside the family and not living as part of the household but owing special duties of loyalty to the king who had established him as a lord on separate estates within his kingdom” (p. 86). KAKRIDIS (486) suggests the term metakenôsis (from metakenô = “pour from one vessel into another” [LSJ]) to denote instances when characters in the Iliad and the Odyssey possess information that logically should be known only to the poet. PEDRICK (488) advises caution in using Homer as evidence in socio-historical interpretations of the supplication ritual, since the poet subtly manipulates typical scenes for distinct literary effects in each epic: e.g., “In the Odyssey, Zeus’ protection for suppliants is used to illuminate the hospitality of various hosts. In the Iliad the most vivid scenes of supplication promote the theme of vengeance” (p. 140). The discussion of supplication, hospitality, and murder and exile in item 490 leads to the judgment that “the
power of . . . conventions was not absolute and that Homeric society offered ways to bypass the rules it imposed on its members’” (p. 40). SCOTT (492) reinforces theories developed by A.W.H. Adkins by showing that, in the society of the Homeric poems, “the world has taken a major step towards community and social organizations” (p. 17). According to VATIN’s research (493), poiēne denotes chastisement and compensation, timē goods given in homage or reparation establishing the equality of rights of two parties, thōē a communal sanction imposed on an individual. WILKERSON (495) contends that belief in controlling force of the gods inhibited development of the notion of persuasion by rhetorical ability in the archaic period. WYATT’S very thorough treatment of atē (496) includes sections on “Narrative,” “Description (Iliad IX),” “Social Aspects (Iliad XIX),” “Psychology,” “Physiology (Odyssey),” “Parallels and Later Developments,” and “Linguistic Form.”


Item 498 contends that the distinction between collaterality and linearity is more enlightening than that between patriarchal clan and restricted family: association based on age and/or (same) sex—*hetairia*—takes precedence over familial relations. CHEYNS (500) discusses the evolution of the meaning of
thumos from mere life-force to a faculty of volition within the hero’s psyche. DIETRICH (502) finds divine epiphanies problematic, neither easily classified nor occurring consistently in specific contexts (e.g., prayer, sacrifice, invocation); moreover, we may not read invariable religious meanings into them—they are rather “an extraordinary and largely poetic means of divine intervention” (p. 70). Item 503 is on the evolution of the vocabulary of psychology and ethics in Homer; includes discussion of areté and aithé. GERNET (504) scrutinizes the dynamics of clan and family in Homeric society, where certain individuals functioning as parents discharge the two key obligations of vengeance and proper burial; includes discussion of peós, opáon, etés. Item 506 includes some discussion of Homeric seercraft in the section “Mantische Prognosen und das Sicherungsverhalten des Menschen” (pp. 25-27). PINSENT (510) argues that hetairos preserves traces of very ancient military practice. RAUBITSCHEK (511) cites evidence for the “agonistic attitude” and the prestige of athletic excellence in the Homeric epics. ROWE (513) focuses on the central arguments of A. W. H. Adkins, Merit and Responsibility (Oxford 1960), and on the critiques devoted to it. SHARPLES’ examination (514) of Ili. 11.403-12, 22.98-131, and Od. 9.299-306, 22.333-39 shows that the Fränkel-Snell position regarding the absence of integrated self better suits the tripartite soul of Republic 4; certain Stoic notions of moral conflict as oscillation between opposing judgments have close affinities with Homer’s aithé and the intra-psi Psych studies in his characters. In comparing the Iliad with the Odyssey, WEINSANTO (515) finds that “le vocabulaire employé, les pratiques matrimoniales et la valeur sociale du mariage restent les mêmes, mais, d’un poème à l’autre, on décèle des nuances, des glissements, qui font que, si l’on se marie de la même façon... la représentation que l’on se fait du mariage a changé” (p. 45).


IV. THE ILIAD

A. GENERAL TREATMENTS


ATCHITY (517) uses the shield as a critical metaphor for analyzing the entire poem: "images of artifacts [e.g. spears, bows, scepters, shields] . . . serve as signposts in the vast but coherent landscape that shapes character, action, and symbolism into a clear expression of Homer's instructive theme" (p. xv). He gives special attention to "Helen and Her Galaxy," and to "Hephaistos and the Galaxy of Achilles"; appendices on "Homeric Hierarchical Structures" and "Horses in the Iliad." Item 518 offers a general discussion of the themes of divine knowledge and the human/heroic condition in the Iliad. The 700-page item 521 is a painstaking combination of Analysis and Neoanalysis: eschewing such newfangled notions as the theory of oral composition (Milman Parry is not listed in his bibliography), VAN THIEL explains various inconsistencies as signs of variants and conflation in our text. He posits an Early and a Late (Homeric) Iliad, the latter incorporating material from two shorter works, the Duel (= app. Books 3-4) and the Wall (= app. Books 12-15). Our text is the work of a post-Homeric Redaktor who conflated the Early and the Late Iliad, together with much matter of his own creation. A vast concordance-commentary occupies the bulk of this exercise in the substitution of (utterly unverifiable) text history for literary criticism. Epos discussed by JACKSON (522), besides the Iliad and Odyssey, are the Aeneid, Beowulf, the Chanson de Roland, the Cid, and the Nibelungenlied.

MacCARY (523) combines Freudian and post-Freudian psychoanalytic theory to interpret Achilles' personality and certain distinctive plot elements of the Iliad, including the role of mother-figure-goddesses, the special prominence of Patroclus and Hector, etc.: "The plot, imagery, and vocabulary of the Iliad reveal to us the earliest stage in the development of the ego, the ontology of the self in the phenomenological struggle of the mirror stage" (p. 233). Item 524 is a massive running commentary on the Iliad (Doloneia excepted); its master principle of interpretation is that the epic is an artistically evolved expression of a consistent heroic code. Thus the social and political dimensions of particular actions and words in specific situations are unfolded with greatest detail. THOMPSON'S dissertation (526) considers the apportionment of responsibility in the accounts found in Homer, Vergil, Benoit de Sainte-
Maure, Guido de Columnis, Chaucer, Caxton, and Shakespeare. NICOLAI (528) finds a dual outlook in the Iliad, evident in, among other things, the portrayal of its characters: "Der Dichter gestaltet die Charaktere seiner Figuren—überspitzt gesagt—as ein mixtum compositum, das einerseits über-menschliche Kriegerqualitäten aufweist (das ist das archaisierende Element) and das andere—jedenfalls bei den Hauptfiguren wie Achill, Agamemnon, Hektor—the allzumenschliche Neigung zu gemeinschaftgefährdenden Willkür- rakten besitzt (das ist das aktualisierende Element)" (p. 101).

B. INDIVIDUAL BOOKS, EPISODES, PASSAGES

Special Topics


Item 534 deals particularly with the gesture of thigh-slaping, disclosing the symbolic connotations of the act and the strands of connective tissue formed with such words and concepts as nēpios, pulai, therapōn, nostos, and moira. Item 535 reveals how animals in Homer, especially in the similes, are symbolically both the analogues of the heroes and mediators between the spheres of gods and men; the logic of such analogy is explicated along structuralist lines (536): "A priamel is a poetic/rhetorical form which consists, basically, of two parts: 'foil,' and 'climax'" (p. ix); among Homeric examples examined are Il. 9.378-91, 13.729-34, 14.315-28, 14.394-401, Od. 5.118-29, 8.167-77, 11.416-20, and 24.87-92.


OGILVY (541): "The Iliad shows the spiritual evolution of Achilles with a complementary development of his use of language: as his spiritual perception grows away from the norm of his fellows, his speech, while retaining the common vocabulary, becomes increasingly metaphorical" (DAI). RANDALL (542) analyzes adjectives applied to tears, deer similes, the eagle-hare simile at 17.673-81, images of little children and young animals, and the themes of weariness and wearlessness. MENKES (543) finds that Heracles "is viewed as a man of exemplary ability... which makes him an appropriate model to whom the Trojan War heroes can look" (DAI). Item 544 is "a fullscale study of" expressions like legetai and fertur, attempting "to characterize the specific uses to which they are applied by the major poets of all periods" (DAI). PEDRICK (545): "The entire series [1.12-32, 6.37-65, 10.373-457, 11.122-47, 15.463-69, 16.330-32, 21.34-114, 22.337-55, 24.552-71] plays a role in strengthening our impression of each character, because several motifs are explored... from different perspectives" (DAI). According to WOFFORD (547), "the heroic plot is constituted of those actions of which the characters in the poem are aware; it takes death as its subject. The counterplot is constituted of those events or images which the poet adds to the heroic story in order to explain or illuminate it" (DAI).


FENIK (551): "the four monologue scenes [11.401 ff., 17.91 ff., 21.553 ff., 22.99 ff.] are heavily stylized... yet each is unique. The men see their predicaments in strongly individual terms. Secondly, the characterization of each speaker is appropriate and consistent... Finally, each scene as a whole is closely tailored to its circumstances and context" (p. 89). MUGLER (554) argues that Homer applies ethical qualities to animals and even inanimate nature as well as to human beings.
DONLAN (555): “the crisis of the leadership-structure in the Iliad may reflect [the fact that]...position-authority and standing-authority are no longer mutually compatible but have begun to compete in a socially disruptive manner. ...” (p. 65). RUBINO (556) observes that “Achilles...ends by depending upon epic poets and their audiences (us) to preserve, protect, and revere his kleos...Zeus...becomes the first poet of the Iliad, for it is he, the god, who creates the plot (muthos) of the poem” (pp. 16-17). RUSSO (557) continues his studies of mathematical proportion in the structure of the Iliad, this time with reflections on the Doloneia and on three cases of insomnia: 2.1 (Zeus), 10.1 (Agamemnon), and 24.677 (Hermes). WALCOT (558) adds evidence from Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymn to Hermes that cattle raiding is part of an initiation ritual in Indo-European myth.


BADER (559) gives particular attention to distinguishing characteristics of the hero. BERGMEN (560) utilizes recent critical theory to study “suspended verisimilitude.” According to PUCCI (563), in Homer, “the presence of the Muses’ discourse emerges...as that which would mark and separate one form of repetition from another” (p. 163). STAGAKIS (564) seeks to “fill a lacuna...in Homeric scholarship” by compiling and commenting on “a roster of chariot drivers and paraibatai [which] may prove to be of use to the social historian” (p. 142). Item 565 provides an eight-page table charting book-by-book “la chronologie exacte des événements racontés dans l’Iliade” (p. 342).


Rubcova, N. A. “The Form of Invocation as a Principle of Organization of the Hymn (with Regard to the Invocations of the Iliad, the Homeric

BARRETT (566) argues against the case made (especially by Hans Licht) for the homosexuality of Achilles and Patroclus, adducing better analogues from writers (Aristotle, Cicero, C. S. Lewis) “who have...recorded their thoughts and experiences in regard to friendship in general and the comradeship of soldiers in particular” (p. 91). DUBAN (567) maintains that narratives of the three major duels (Menelaus vs. Paris in II. 3, Aias vs. Hector in 7, and Achilles vs. Hector in 22) are unconventional and unconstrained by the overall structural pattern of the Iliad. GARLAND (568) tabulates “240 recorded deaths on the battlefields,” concluding that cause of death is “the interruption of vital functions caused by the despatch of the thymos...indicated by the ‘loosening effect’ upon the gounata and guia... Homer was not concerned to...assign the psychē a vital role in the living body” (p. 51). ROMILLY (569) argues that the abominations committed by Achilles are less horrific than they might have been and have the effect of highlighting Achilles’ passion and his victory over it.


Item 571 is on the blurring of the distinctions among bird sign, bird simile, and metaphorical epiphany, in part conditioned by context (narrative vs. speech). DARAKI (572) discriminates between two warrior types, the one savage and “pre-cultural”, the other initiated and civilized. INGALLS (573) notes that evidence of linguistic lateness and formular modification supports the arguments of M. M. Willcock (JPH 1.168) for innovation in the mythical paradeigmata: “Homer was not a complete slave to his tradition.” RUTHERFORD (577) seeks “to focus attention on a number of elements in Greek tragedy which are already present in Homer, and especially on...the theme of knowledge—knowledge of one’s future, knowledge of one’s circumstances, knowledge of oneself” (p. 145).


ALDEN (579) finds traces in the *Iliad* of three versions of the return of Achilles to battle. ERBSE (581) argues that the wrath of Achilles and the fate of Patroclus are aspects of a single theme devised by the Iliasdichter; there was no pre-existing Patrocleia. JACKSON (582) reflects on the interrelations of plot and character as regards Achilles, Agamemnon, Hector, and Sarpedon. Item 583 is on interaction of mythological tradition and Homeric innovation: "whether an Iliad theme attracted old tales as exempla or an old tale inspired an Iliad episode for which the old tale was used as support, each would be liable over time to infiltration of details from the other" (pp. 163-64). LETOUBLON (584) discloses a consistent archaic age heroic value system in dialogues between heroes prior to single combats. NICOLAI (585) finds a tension between "eine affirmative Wirkungsabsicht" that "spricht vornehmlich die kriegerische Tüchtigkeit des Adels an" and "eine kritische Wirkungsabsicht" (p. 11) that reflects the changed political conditions of Homer and his audience. Item 586 shows that, in Homer, only the singer can confer immortality on the hero. WORONOFF (590): "méprisées parfois, plus souvent convoitées, rarement aimées, les femmes peuvent jouer dans l'univers épique un rôle déterminant, en raison du prestige de leur famille ou de leur personnalité." (p. 43).

See also items 72-74, 94, 109, 129, 136-37, 153, 178, 200, 387, 413, 416, 420-22, 437, 443, 454, 466, 469, 477, 488, 496, 508, 515, 728, 755, 787, 792, 798, 824, 889, 1111, 1117, 1132, 1570.

*Iliad*


FALUS (591) argues that the prooemia of Homer's two epics suggest their divergent world views: in the *Iliad* that of the twilight of the heroic age, in the
Odyssey that of the newly dawning era of the polis. Item 592 identifies the plague in II. 1 as equine encephalomyelitis, with the mosquito as vector (n.b. Apollo's stinging [ekhepeukes] arrow, line 51). REDFIELD (593) describes devices—personification, metaphor, and variation of tone—by which the proem conveys that the Iliad "will explore the relations between man, beast, and god; it will be a story of suffering and death, and...of the ultimate fate of the dead." (p. 110). In item 594, each scene is "considered as an example of a type-scene, whose standard elements will be identified. The individual features of the scene will be examined and compared with those found in other instances of the type-scene.... One may hope to see the genius of the individual poet at work." (p. 3). In item 595, analytical examination of opening passages of Book I leads to reflections about authorship and composition of the whole poem. TSAGARAKIS (596) points out the dimension of religious significance in Athena's intervention: humans require divine assistance if they are to avoid being victimized by uncontrollable forces within themselves or in their environment. LATA CZ (597) argues that the solution of certain narrative difficulties in the handling of time and sequential and simultaneous action is one more indication that the poet of the Iliad was a great master working late in the epic tradition. In separate model explications (598), GRIFF IN (pp. 127-35) and HAMMOND (pp. 135-42) scrutinize the opening of the Iliad and reflect on its suitability to the epic as a whole. VIVANTE (599) stresses the "concrete objective sense in the Homeric autos" (p. 1): it "conveys the god's presence in its wholeness" and figures in the "compact imagery" of II. 1.46-47. See also items 111, 206, 285, 310, 911, 943, 947, 976, 1130, 1140, 1233, 1319, 1334, 1590.

Iliad 2


LAZOVA (601) believes the mention at 2.595 of the Thracian singer—whose legend goes back to the end of the Bronze Age—is probably due to an editor. POWELL (602): "my purpose is to show that all entries in the Catalogue,
except for the spurious Athenian entry, follow one of three patterns, each striking for its structural rigidity" (p. 255). EDWARDS (605) seeks to show that "at some date prior to...the composition of the monumental Iliad a catalogue of the Greek forces...was composed (possibly by the Iliad-poet) using some traditional information of high antiquity...and some of which we cannot tell the date...; then a similar catalogue of Trojan forces was composed in the same style, though here much less traditional information was available and little (if any) use was made of contemporary Ionian knowledge" (pp. 82-83). KONISHI's paper (607) "proposes to show balanced structures in Iliad 2 and Odyssey 11... The catalogues, of Greek ships and Trojan allies...and of male and female ghosts... form irrefutable structural units" (p. 121; see item 140). According to LOPTSON (608), "Pelasgian Argos is...a Thessaly, together with the country immediately to the west, around Dodona" (p. 137).

See also items 140, 206, 274, 358, 557, 733, 891, 960, 1029, 1050, 1063, 1124, 1146, 1249, 1331, 1433, 1521, 1588.

Iliad 3


612. Ribson, R. "Some Thoughts on Cicadas." Prudentia 11 (1979) 105-7. [Il. 3.151 and loci similares in English literature.]


CRESSEY (609) on the simile at 3.221-23: "snow is strange, falls suddenly, conceals reality, and, importantly, it is also beautiful, treacherous, and transient" (p. 222). From the comparative study in item 610, KIRK concludes that there was "a single composer deciding to make two distinct scenes on the basis of a general narrative idea... Book 3, although it is outdone in certain particular respects by book 7, surpasses it as a unity and as a contribution to setting the scene for the action of the Iliad as a whole" (p. 40). VOX (611) observes that "with aphanartopoës...attention is turned not so much to the inopportune meaning of words...but only toward the unbecoming expressive form of words: by mistake it is understood as the lack of rhythm and of uniformly appropriate accents" (p. 192). DUSENBERY (615) speculates on the existence of plastic art in Homer's era as in the weaving of Helen in lines 125-28. According to TSAGARAKIS (617), Priam's (problematic) ignorance of the identity of Greek warriors is feigned: "he wants to give Helen a chance to say something and so to feel comfortable in the presence of her stern critics" (p. 71); the duel of Menelaus and Paris, too, is plausible in the tenth
year, since "it best belongs in a period of demoralizing weakness and decline" (p. 67).
See also items 339, 567, 820, 1106, 1249, 1544.

Iliad 4


EDGEWORTH (618) analyzes Book 4 in terms of the variety and disposition of thematic content, concluding that "virtually all of the themes which figure so largely in the climactic books [scil. 16, 22, 24]...are introduced here at the beginning of the fighting" (p. 90).
See also items 279, 339, 962, 1103.

Iliad 5


KIRK (620) focuses on the originality of the Homeric presentation of the aristeia of Diomedes, while recommending greater precision in the use of terms like "improvisation", "innovation", "creativity."
See also items 336, 465, 857, 956, 1310, 1313.

Iliad 6


ANDERSEN (621) carefully reviews all of the actions of Diomedes in the Iliad and contends that Homer shaped his character specifically for his role in the Trojan story, in which he and his family had not (pace the neoanalysts) figured prominently earlier. ARAVANTINOS (622) believes the "letter" of Proitos at lines 167-70 was written in Hittite hieroglyphs on a tablet of wood or clay; there is archaeological evidence for other (if not earlier) correspondence between Mycenaean Greece and the Near East. KRISCHER (623)
evaluates the Glaucus-Diomedes episode (it does not merely fill time while Hector returns to the city) and the distinctive elements in the interview of Hector and Andromache. HURST (625) maintains that beginning with Il. 6.130-40 and Herodotus 4.78 ff., one may detect an ambivalence of attitude toward Dionysus throughout Greek literature and culture. Item 627 is on the conflicting male and female psychologies underlying the interview of Hector and Andromache. WHITE (629) attempts “through an examination of the Bellerophon legend...to advance some new arguments in favour of the supposition (long maintained) of a Semitic origin for the hero and to connect him with the biblical Cain” (p. 120).

See also items 620, 1085, 1120, 1249, 1292, 1295.

Iliad 7


CHEYNS (630) argues that thumos here is an inner motivation that impels the hero to detach himself from the crowd in his valiant exploits.

See also items 156, 414, 567, 610, 1249, 1369.

Iliad 8


COMBELLACK (631) argues that Nagy (item 66, pp. 148-50) has misunderstood the idiom at lines 538-41 and 825-28 in supposing that Hector is aspiring to the timê of Apollo and Athena. Item 632 includes discussion of Il. 8.68-72 and 22.208-213, and compares Zeus with the Sumero-Babylonian Marduk.

See also items 950, 1103, 1238, 1484.

Iliad 9


637. Tsagarakis, O. “Phoenix’s Social Status and the Achaean Embassy.” Mnemosyne 32 (1979) 221-42.


STAHL (633) argues that certain Euripidean scenes, such as Admetus' realization of the full import of Acestis' death, have an analogue in the embassy in II. 9. THORNTON (635) contends that "in Homer the dual can denote not only two as a number, but also two groups or one item [scil. Phoenix] and a group [scil. Odysseus, Aias, and two heralds]" (p. 2), but KÖHNKEN (634) raises objections, especially the lack of corroborating examples, and argues—like, for example, D. Lohmann (JPH 1.158, pp. 227-31)—that "Der Grund für die Verwendung der Duale aber liegt in der sicher beabsichtigten Parallelität mit der Gesamtschaft des [II. 1.327 ff.]" (p. 13). On the same problematic duals, XYDAS (636) explains that only two went on foot—Phoenix rode in a chariot, GORDEZIANI (638) that they indicate two groups, not two individuals. Item 639 examines lines 185-94, particularly in light of comments by Diodorus Siculus 5.49.1-4, and Philostratus, Heroicus 11.11 ff. By close examination of Achilles' speech, SCHEIN (640) argues with A. Parry (JPH 1.114) and against M. D. Reeve (JPH 2.390) that "Homer has painted the first and perhaps the most powerful portrait in Western literature of absolute brilliance and excellence trying to come to moral and intellectual terms with a world that is not commensurate with it" (p. 131). BANNERT (641) demonstrates the filiations of Phoenix' speech with those of Odysseus and Aias as well as its links with themes (supplication, gift-offering, wrath) prominent elsewhere in the epic. ANDERSEN (642) claims that the sense "grant to the request of these Litai that recompense (i.e. Agamemnon's gifts) may be bestowed on thee"—mentioned but rejected by Leaf—is right. SCODEL (643) assesses resemblances in the motifs of anger and supplication in a) the story of Phoenix' departure from his home, b) the Meleager example, and c) the plot of the Iliad at large, while WEST (645) considers implications for Homeric text history of "the extra lines from Phoenix' autobiography preserved for us by Plutarch (aud. poet. 26 F)'". TARKOW (644) discusses Achilles' "protective recourse to Odysseus-like verbal subtleties and deceptions in his effort to recapture, and thereby to exact revenge for the honor which Agamemnon has cheated him" (p. 32).

See also items 156, 307, 343, 496, 536, 730, 1108, 1149, 1158, 1357.

Iliad 10


In item 647, "Chapter One explores the problem of ellipsis in Homeric similes. . . . Chapter Four takes up the problem of intertextual evocation in narrative by looking at the place of the Doloneia in the *Iliad* and in relation to. . . the *Odyssey* and the Epic Cycle" (DAI). DAVIDSON (648) argues that the Dolon myth, adapted in *Iliad* 10, is pre-Iliadic and derives from non-epic traditions about werewolves. Item 651 explores aspects of ambiguity in the character of Diomedes and the symbols associated with him: "À la fois neōlatus et gerōn, jeune homme et redoutable guerrier il évolue dans une temps aussi incertain que son espace particulier. Rien chez lui n'est jamais univoque" (p. 49). Van der Valk (652) presents a unitarian brief for the authenticity of *Iliad* 10 and 20: "Das Buch K hat meines Erachtens eine bestimmte Funktion im Ganzen der Ilias und ist daher vom Iliasdichter mit Absicht an seine Stelle gesetzt worden" (p. 136).

See also items 408, 557, 1309, 1569.

*Iliad 11*


Item 653 is on the ironic force lent to Patroclus' question "What need do you have of me?" (II. 11.606) by the chain of events that begins with his being sent by Achilles to inquire about Machaon (whose connections with Achilles are noted) in Book 11 and culminating in his being sent to substitute for Achilles in Book 16. PEDRICK (654) argues that the deviation of Nestor's paradeigma from the "categories established for the typical paradeigma" has a sinister outcome: it "ironically. . . works—on the wrong hero. Patroklos does not pass on the lesson to his friend; instead he attempts his own aristeia" (p. 68).

See also items 156, 277, 514, 551, 936, 957, 1010, 1030, 1064.

*Iliad 12*


According to Ruth SCODEL (656) "the association of the Achaean wall with the myth of destruction is clearly marked by the description of the heroes as hêmitheôn genos andrôn, and the actual presence of flooding waters makes this association surer. . . . The similarities between Poseidon's response to the building of the wall and his vengeance on the Phaeacians [Od. 8.564-70, 13.125-87]. . . . suggest that the latter is a further variant of the same theme" (p. 48).

See also items 556, 1086, 1249, 1250.
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Iliad 13


HOLOKA (657) establishes that Aias, son of Oileus, not Nausicaa, is the first character in European literature to play a ball game. Item 659, in a test of Zielinski’s Law, explores ways in which ‘the Achaean rally...is expanded differently in apparent and ‘real’ time’ (p. 14).

See also items 414, 536, 942, 1235, 1310.

Iliad 14


HURST (660) believes lines 171-74 allude to the perfuming of clothing (attested in the Pylos tablets) and reads heanoi rather than hedanoi.

See also items 536, 659, 788, 820, 1103, 1256, 1400.

Iliad 15


FRAZER (662) argues that the weapon whose point is cut off by Hector at 16.114-23 is “the same long ship-pike which Ajax first picks up at the end of Book 15...an object...symbolizing the final defense of the ships” (p. 127).

See also items 182, 659.

Iliad 16

BALTES (666) discusses the significance of the otherwise unexampled predator vs. predator similes of Book 16 (lines 428 ff., 756 ff., 823 ff.): "Für dieses in der Iliashandlung so entscheidende Buch hat also der Iliasdichter die in seinem ganzen Werk einzigartigen Gleichnisse reserviert" (p. 36). NAGY (668) interprets II. 16.419-683 from the perspectives of linguistics, archaeology, and oral poetics: [Sarpedon's] "Anatolian heritage helps the comparativist get a glimpse behind the veil of Homeric restraint" (p. 209).

See also items 662, 731, 916, 1243, 1561.

Iliad 17


STANFORD (669) shows that the imagery of light and darkness of Sophocles’ play shows Ajax realizing psychologically the prayer he utters at 17.645 ff. MOULTON (670): "Glaukos’ speech [17.142-68]...is aptly attuned to his character...and to the code of values to which he and Sarpedon subscribe...The return of Achilles to battle is foreshadowed indirectly through the suggestive device of paralleling Glaukos-Sarpedon with Achilles-Patroklos, and through emphasis on Hector’s failings" (pp. 5, 6).

See also items 551, 1259.

Iliad 18


LYNN-GEORGE (671) adduces evidence (in support of Solmsen’s argument) that 18.535-38 is an "interpolation from the Scutum, an unusual contamination of the original from its imitation" (p. 399), possible because of the "extremely fluid period of oral...transmission" (p. 404). PHILLIPS (674) argues that "Homer selects from 'all the stars which crown the heavens' a sequence of constellations [Pleiades, Hyades, Orion]...significant for its association with the agricultural year." TAPLIN (675): "I shall try to maintain that the shield of Achilles is much more than just 'a digression about armour' by looking at other ways in which in the Iliad war is set against a larger world view, other elements which confirm and give context to the striking effect created by the shield" (p. 14). SCHMIDT’s examination (677)
of the shield passage discloses an early instance of the traditional Greco-
Roman notion of the tripartite structure of the world (heaven, earth, sea),
derived in part from Near Eastern sources.

See also items 166, 277, 445, 1037, 1140, 1249, 1426, 1501, 1555, 1574.

Iliad 19


The thesis of item 679 is that the narrative context of lines 76-77 supports
the vulgate, in which Agamemnon speaks from his seated position, as against
Zenodotus, who makes him stand in the center. DAVIDSON’s paper (680)
refines George Dumézil’s discussion of similarities among Germanic Starkadr,
Indic Sisupal, and Greek Heracles.

See also items 156, 496, 938, 1088, 1103, 1167.

Iliad 20


See also items 652, 710, 714.

Iliad 21


685. Matthews, V. J. "The Meaning of enthade at Iliad 21.279 and
23.348." LCM 8 (1983) 61-62. ["'Here on earth,' not "'here at Troy.'"]

686. Salvioni, L. "Il livello stilistico dell’espressione del dolore e la natura

The allusion to ‘one life’ (683) presupposes the notion that some entities
possessed multiple psukhais; ZAJCEV cites the proverbial “three-lived dog” in
Greek, the Praenestine Erulus in Verg., Aen. 8.560-67 ff., and the Indian
notion of karma. Adducing Od. 12.66-68, DUBAN (684) argues that “the poet intends at II. 21.335-337 to augment the atmosphere of the fantastic as
fire and water prepare to do mortal combat. . .by conjuring up the image of a
quite extraordinary whirlwind. . .which, in its own right, also combines the
elements of fire and water” (p. 189).

See also items 156, 551, 688, 1175, 1369.

Iliad 22


688. Duban, J. M. “Distortion as a Poetic Device in the ‘Pursuit of

DUBAN (688) "intends to show how...distortions [of time and space] combine to produce a quite surrealistic effect" (p. 4), culminating in the death of Hector. Item 690 "lists the [fifteen] similes in Iliad 22, indicates why they are effective individually and what is their total effect on the book" (p. 22). DEVEREUX (691) considers the Achaean warriors’ participation in defilement of Hector’s corpse from an anthropological perspective.

See also items 448, 514, 551, 567, 632, 708, 957, 1484.

Iliad 23

692. de Martino, F. "Chi colpirà l’irrequieta columba...(L’intervento di Achille per la gara dell’arco)." Belfagor 32 (1977) 207-10. [Il. 23.855.]

Item 694 discloses thematic links with other parts of the epic that prove Book 23 was always integral to the story of Achilles. Item 695 is on epithet use, the representation of complex action, questions of human and divine motivation in Il. 23, and comparison with the footrace event in Aen. 5.315-61. De VRIES (696) argues (against item 392, pp. 49-51) that prosephe (23.438) does not denote or imply composure in Menelaus. SCHNAPP-GOURBEILLON (697) describes unique elements, including human sacrifice, that make the funeral of Patroclus "un rituel ambivalent qui oscille aux frontières de la mort et de l’immortalité, et qui installe le héros dans un espace intermédiaire entre hommes et dieux" (p. 87). Item 698 "accounts for the details of Antilochus’ strategy by connecting the description of his maneuver closely with his father’s advice" (p. 35).

See also items 156, 182, 277, 459, 581, 685, 708, 1008, 1025, 1038, 1169, 1244, 1275.

Iliad 24

C. CHARACTERS

Achilles


SINOS (705): “the hero in epos is himself multidimensional. For his epic existence, he draws on the resources of the entire tradition. He embodies the values of epos, affecting their development and being in turn affected by them. . . . Patroklos is intimately involved with Achilles in the values of Epic: Patroklos affects Achilles in values and reflects him in cult” (p. 10). CLARKE (707) writes “it is clear from the language, precedents and dramatic development of the Iliad that Achilles and Patroclus are not Homeric ‘friends,’ but are lovers from their hearts. . . . Homoeroticism, if not homosexuality, does indeed exist in the Iliad. . . . Only the name is absent” (pp. 395, 396 n. 38). DEVEREUX (708) deduces that, psychoanalytically speaking, Hector’s wearing the armor of Achilles makes him a self-surrogate of the latter and his slaying a symbolic suicide, while LEE (709) contends that Achilles relinquishes the old heroic code based on kleos in his appreciation of the value of personal relationships, while Hector foreshadows the chivalric hero.
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See also items 218, 243, 406, 467, 473, 476, 523, 547, 559, 566-67, 569, 582, 640, 644, 646, 653, 680, 692, 720, 728-29, 1065, 1129, 1134, 1140, 1228, 1279, 1375, 1395, 1401, 1468, 1525, 1546.

Aeneas


713. van der Ben, N. "Reactie." Lampas 14 (1981) 62-64. [To item 711.]


Van der BEN (710) holds that the evidence will not support the notion of court poetry honoring Aeneas among descendants living in the Troad, pace Wilamowitz, Jacoby, and many others. SMITH (714) cautions that especially German scholars have been too confident about the historicity of "Aineiadai" as patrons who influenced the composition of Il. 20: "disagreements in the second and first centuries B.C. over the actions and movements of Aineias after he left Troy...reflect a...conflict over the Roman claim to Aineias; and...prophecies for Aineias' future made by Poseidon and Aphrodite should be understood as integral to the poems in which they appear" (p. 18).

See also item 1210.

Agamemnon


BELLONI (715) believes the depiction of Agamemnon in the Iliad shows signs of a fusion of traditions; his status as basileutatos is a recent phenomenon.

See also items 467, 476, 582, 679.

Aias


Andromache


See also items 470, 623, 627.
Antenor


ESPERMANN's book (717) follows the method of E. Heitsch's Aphroditehymnos, Aeneas und Homer (Göttingen 1965): detected peculiarities in the presentation of a character—in this case a family of characters—are perceived as evidence of post-Homeric expansion of the content of the Iliad.

Antilochus

See also items 658, 696, 698.

Aphrodite

See item 1106.

Apollo

See also items 592, 1508.

Athena

See also item 596.

Bellerophon

See item 629.

Briseis

See items 716, 1191, 1305.

Diomedes

See items 620-21, 623, 626, 651.

Dolon

See items 648, 651, 1569.
Glaucus

See items 623, 626, 670.

Hecabe

See items 470, 475, 700, 716.

Hector


ERBSE (721) sees in Hector the representative of the new ethos of the polis-defender as against the outdated heroic code of Achilles. FARRON (722) argues that Hector's relative weakness on the battlefield—as contrasted with his strength at home—is designed to enlist our sympathy for him. The epithet discussed by WHALLON (723) "influenced the shape of the epic matter..., came to have greater contextual relevance than would have been the result of average luck, and also became more than ever true to the special nature of Hector" (p. 24).

See also items 473, 567, 578, 582, 623, 627, 631, 688, 691, 708-9, 1266, 1523, 1540.

Helen


In item 724, "it is shown that ethical thinking about the woman [Helen, Briseis, Andromache, Penelope] is organized around a central paradox: she is the cause of war, but not worth fighting over" (*DAI*). Item 725 is on close parallels between the stories of Sita, wife of Rama in Vedic myth, and Helen, especially as regards their *eidoλa*.

See also items 470, 560, 716, 1580.

Hephaestus

See item 728.

Hera


ALVINO (726) thinks Hera's true role as powerful goddess of Minoan times may occasionally be glimpsed in the *Iliad*, where she is relegated to a less important position.
Heracles
See items 543, 680.

Idomeneus
See item 1030.

Menelaus
See items 567, 696, 727, 1132.

Nestor
See also items 475, 559, 654.

Odysseus

FLAUMENHAFT (728) considers "what councils, embassies, and ambushes reveal about the heroic fighting which is the daytime subject of the Iliad" (p. 10).
See also items 1030, 1547, 1571.

Pandaros
See item 894.

Paris
See item 567.

Patroclus

FINLAY (729) shows that Patroclus' importance to Achilles is due to his reassertion of the values of Peleus: "as he leads the Myrmidons into battle, Patroklos surely reflects the patriarchal and communal values of his society rather than any aspect of the man to whom he says farewell" (p. 272).
See also items 458, 534, 566, 581, 664, 705, 707, 1228.

Peleus
See item 729.
Phoenix

See also items 634-35, 637, 641, 643, 727, 1357.

Priam

See items 475, 613, 727.

Sarpedon


Detailed analysis (731) of 16.419-683 and of both black- and red-figure vases (including the Euphronios krater in New York) indicates “Homer constructed the Sarpedon episode in the Patrocleia to replace the Memnonis” (p. 73).
See also items 582, 668.

Theano

See item 717.

Thersites


LOWRY (732) argues that the traditional view of Thersites as a disrespectful political agitator is misleading, and “proposes another interpretation which gives the misshapen speaker more than a few descendants in unexpected places in Greek literature and history [e.g. Solon]” (p. 309); so too, JOSSE RAND (733) contends that Homer’s account of Thersites does not obscure altogether the courage of the man who stands against abusive superiors. On the other hand FELDMAN (734) calls him “the archetype of the provocateur in literature” (p. 16) and compares him with Antinoös, Drances, and Unferth; and FUNKE (735) writes “Thersites ist der Lächерliche par excellence, der sich selbst in keiner Weise erkennt und Gegenstand des Spottes wird, als ihm seine Selbstverkennung handgreiflich zum Bewusstsein gebracht wird” (p. 25). ANDERSEN (736) contends that Thersites in cyclic epic tradition was, like Thoas, a leader of the Aetolians; Homer’s depiction is wholly original and owes nothing either to the Aethiopis or the Alcaeaonis.
See also items 1146, 1331, 1375, 1378.
Thetis

See item 1140.

Thoas

See item 736.

Zeus


WORONOFF (737) discusses Zeus’ "bienveillance à l’égard des Troyens," a benevolence frustrated because "Zeus est devenu... un arbitre impartial entre les deux peuples, paralysé par le destin auquel il doit soumettre le monde entier" (p. 90).

See also item 597.
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