

OXFORD

HOMER'S ALLUSIVE ART



Bruno Currie

HOMER'S ALLUSIVE ART

Homer's Allusive Art

BRUNO CURRIE

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford, OX2 6DP,
United Kingdom

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide. Oxford is a registered trade mark of
Oxford University Press in the UK and in certain other countries

© Bruno Currie 2016

The moral rights of the author have been asserted

First Edition published in 2016

Impression: 1

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in
a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, without the
prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press, or as expressly permitted
by law, by licence or under terms agreed with the appropriate reprographics
rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction outside the scope of the
above should be sent to the Rights Department, Oxford University Press, at the
address above

You must not circulate this work in any other form
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer

Published in the United States of America by Oxford University Press
198 Madison Avenue, New York, NY 10016, United States of America

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Control Number: 2016934367

ISBN 978-0-19-876882-1

Printed in Great Britain by
Clays Ltd, St Ives plc

Links to third party websites are provided by Oxford in good faith and
for information only. Oxford disclaims any responsibility for the materials
contained in any third party website referenced in this work.

For Katrin, Hannes, and Mattis

Preface

‘The whole concept of “allusion” needs to be cleared up in Homeric studies’ (Andersen 1990: 37 n. 21); ‘[t]he whole question of archaic intertextuality needs further work’ (R. L. Fowler 2004: 230). This book is a response to these and similar calls, taking the perhaps optimistic view that ‘cleared up’ means ‘clarified’, not ‘disposed of’. It is hardly the first such response; excellent ones have been made by (for instance) Jonathan Burgess, Georg Danek, Seth Schein, and Christos Tsagalis. It is bound to be a controversial book, but I hope it will not be perceived as polemical or not excessively so. I have nevertheless tried not to shirk the duty of registering important disagreements with important scholars, who are in many cases also friends and colleagues.

Most of the material presented in this book is previously unpublished, but Chapter 2 is a heavily reworked version of ‘Homer and the Early Epic Tradition’, first published in M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie and †R. O. A. M. Lyne (eds.), *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford, 2006), pp. 1–45, reproduced by permission of Oxford University Press, and Chapter 3 likewise of ‘Perspectives on Neoanalysis from the Archaic Hymns to Demeter’, in Ø. Andersen and D. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Cambridge, 2012), pp. 184–209, reproduced by permission of Cambridge University Press. Chapter 4 develops an idea first explored *in nuce* in *Omnibus* 57 (January 2009), pp. 25–7. Chapters 1 and 5 incorporate some material first published in ‘The *Iliad*, *Gilgamesh* and Neoanalysis’, in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry = Trends in Classics Supplementary Volumes* 12 (Berlin and Boston, 2012), pp. 543–80. I would like to reiterate my thanks to those who advised me for the original publications and to record fresh thanks, for commenting on individual chapters, to Felix Budelmann, Michael Clarke, Denis Feeney, Irene de Jong, and Richard Rutherford. A special debt is owed to Jonathan Burgess, who read the whole manuscript minutely, made innumerable telling criticisms, and proposed remedies to several shortcomings. The text was also much improved by the suggestions of anonymous readers. As always, no implication of responsibility for, or endorsement of, any of my arguments accompanies these expressions of gratitude. I am also grateful to Mary Bachvarova, Georg Danek, Antonios Rengakos, Seth Schein, and Christos Tsagalis for sharing, often in advance of publication, their research with me. In Oxford I have benefited from many years of teaching early Greek hexameter poetry to some very stimulating students, and from many invigorating exchanges with my friend and colleague Adrian Kelly, a Homerist of very

different persuasion. I also had the great good fortune to learn Akkadian with Frances Reynolds. Charlotte Loveridge of Oxford University Press, to whom I once taught early Greek hexameter poetry, has guided the book through the publication process with great expertise and tact, and Donald Watt and Timothy Beck did a stellar job as copy editor and proofreader respectively. But the greatest support of all I have derived from my family, to whom the book is dedicated, in love and gratitude.

Contents

<i>List of Tables</i>	x
<i>Conventions and Abbreviations</i>	xi
<i>How to Use This Book</i>	xiv
1. Homer and Allusive Art	1
2. The Homeric Epics and their Forerunners	39
3. The Archaic Hymns to Demeter	79
4. Pregnant Tears and Poetic Memory	105
5. Allusion in Greek and Near Eastern Mythological Poetry	147
I. A Greek Transference: From Aphrodite to Hera	147
II. A Sumerian–Akkadian–Greek Transference: Inanna, Ishtar, Aphrodite	160
III. Mythological Catalogues, Seductions, Complaints in Heaven: Typology or Allusion?	183
IV. The Question of Awareness of Near Eastern Sources	200
V. Consequences for Greek and Near Eastern Poetry	213
6. Epilogue: Traditional Art and Allusive Art	223
Appendix A: Proclus' Summaries of the Cyclical Epics	229
Appendix B: Translation of the Berlin Papyrus (Commentary on the Orphic Hymn to Demeter)	235
Appendix C: Allusive Doublets and Incongruities	239
Appendix D: Pindar, the <i>Aethiopis</i> , and Homer	247
Appendix E: Prospective Lamentation	255
Appendix F: Typologically Generated Repetition versus Specific Reprise	259
<i>References</i>	263
<i>Index of Passages</i>	309
<i>General Index</i>	327

List of Tables

2.1. <i>Iliad</i> 24.281–508 and <i>Odyssey</i> 6.255–7.154	43
2.2. <i>Odyssey</i> 19.96–604 and a Reconstructed Alternative Homecoming of Odysseus	49
2.3. * <i>Memnonis (Aethiopis)</i> and <i>Iliad</i> , I: Achilleus in * <i>Memnonis (Aethiopis)</i> corresponds to Achilleus in <i>Iliad</i>	57
2.4. * <i>Memnonis (Aethiopis)</i> and <i>Iliad</i> , II: Achilleus in * <i>Memnonis (Aethiopis)</i> corresponds to Patroklos in <i>Iliad</i>	57
3.1. Death of Memnon in <i>Aethiopis</i> and Death of Sarpedon in <i>Iliad</i> XVI	90
3.2. Traditional Attic Version of Rape of Persephone and <i>HDe</i>	91

Conventions and Abbreviations

BIBLIOGRAPHICAL ABBREVIATIONS

ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i> i– (Berlin and New York 1972–).
Bekker	I. Bekker (ed.), <i>Photii Bibliotheca</i> i–ii (Berlin, 1824–5).
Bernabé	A. Bernabé (ed.), <i>Poetae epici Graeci</i> i (Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1987, 2nd edn, 1996); ii fasc. 1–3 (Munich and Leipzig, 2004–7).
BNJ	<i>Brill's New Jacoby</i> , ed. I. Worthington, http://referenceworks.brillonline.com/browse/brill-s-new-jacoby
BNP	<i>Brill's New Pauly: Encyclopedia of the Ancient World</i> , H. Canick, H. Schneider, and C. F. Salazar (eds.) (Leiden and Boston, 2002–10).
Courtney	E. Courtney (ed.), <i>The Fragmentary Latin Poets</i> (Oxford, 1993).
DDD	<i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> , K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P. W. van der Horst (eds.) (Leiden, Boston, and Cologne, 2nd edn, 1999).
D-K	H. Diels and W. Kranz (eds.), <i>Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker</i> i–iii (6th edn, Berlin, 1951).
Edelstein-Kidd	L. Edelstein and I. G. Kidd (eds.), <i>Posidonius</i> i– (Cambridge, 1972–).
EGM	<i>Early Greek Mythography</i> , R. L. Fowler (ed.) (Oxford, 2000).
ETCSL	<i>The Electronic Text Corpus of Sumerian Literature</i> , http://etcsl.orinst.ox.ac.uk/
FGrH	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , F. Jacoby et al. (eds.), i– (Leiden, 1923–).
IG	<i>Inscriptiones Graecae</i> , i– (Berlin, 1873–).
Kühner-Gerth	R. Kühner and B. Gerth, <i>Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache</i> i–ii (Hannover and Leipzig, 1898–1904).
KP	<i>Der Kleine Pauly. Lexikon der Antike</i> , K. Ziegler, W. Sontheimer, and H. Gärtner (eds.), i–v (Munich, 1979).
LfgRE	<i>Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos</i> , B. Snell et al. (eds.), i–xxv (Göttingen, 1955–2010).
LIMC	<i>Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae</i> , i–viii (Zurich and Munich, 1981–2009).
LSJ	H. G. Liddell, R. Scott, H. S. Jones and R. Mackenzie (eds.), <i>A Greek–English Lexicon</i> (9th edn, Oxford, 1940).
Maehler	H. Maehler (ed.), <i>Pindarus: Pars ii: Fragmenta</i> (Leipzig, 1989).

M-W	R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (eds.), <i>Fragmenta Hesiodica</i> (Oxford, 1967).
Pfeiffer	R. Pfeiffer, <i>Callimachus</i> i–ii (Oxford, 1949–53).
PGM	<i>Papyri Graecae magicae: Die griechischen Zauberpapyri</i> , K. Preisendanz (ed.) (2nd edn, revised A. Henrichs) i–ii (Stuttgart, 1973–4).
PMG	<i>Poetae melici Graeci</i> , D. L. Page (ed.) (Oxford, 1962).
PMGF	<i>Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta</i> , i M. Davies (ed.) (Oxford, 1991).
Pontani	F. Pontani (ed.), <i>Scholia graeca in Odysseam</i> , i– (Rome, 2007–).
RAC	<i>Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum</i> , i– (Stuttgart, 1950–).
RE	<i>Paulys Realencyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i> , G. Wissowa et al. (eds.) i–xxiv, i.A–x.A, Supplementband i–xv (Stuttgart, 1894–1980).
RLA	<i>Reallexikon der Assyriologie</i> , E. Ebeling, B. Meissner, et al. (eds.), i– (Berlin and Leipzig, 1928–).
Rose	V. Rose (ed.), <i>Aristotelis qui ferebantur librorum fragmenta</i> (Leipzig, 1886).
Severyns	A. Severyns, <i>Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus</i> i–iv (Paris, 1938–63).
SH	<i>Supplementum Hellenisticum</i> , H. Lloyd-Jones and P. J. Parsons (eds.) (Berlin and New York, 1983).
TrGF	<i>Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta</i> i–v, B. Snell, S. L. Radt, and R. Kannicht (eds.) (Göttingen, 1971–2004).
van Thiel	H. van Thiel (ed.), <i>Scholia D in Iliadem. Proecdosis aucta et correctior 2014. Secundum codices manu scriptos</i> . Elektronische Schriftenreihe der Universitäts- und Stadtbibliothek Köln, 7 (Cologne, 2014): http://kups.ub.uni-koeln.de/id/eprint/5586
van der Valk	M. van der Valk (ed.), <i>Eustathii Archiepiscopi Thessalonicensis Commentarii ad Homeri Iliadem pertinentes</i> i–v (Leiden, 1971–87).
Voigt	E.-M. Voigt (ed.), <i>Sappho et Alcaeus. Fragmenta</i> (Amsterdam, 1971).
Wehrli	F. Wehrli (ed.), <i>Die Schule des Aristoteles</i> i–ii (2nd edn, Basle, 1967–9); Supplementband i–ii (1974–8).

OTHER SIGNS AND ABBREVIATIONS

- see entry in the General Index
 ⇒ see entry in the Index of Passages

>	gives rise to
<	is derived from
*	a hypothesized entity
=	a relationship of identity
~	a relationship of similarity
Σ	scholion
AO	<i>Argonautica Orphica</i>
EM	<i>Etymologicum Magnum</i>
MB	Middle Babylonian
OB	Old Babylonian
OF	<i>Orphicorum fragmenta</i>
OH	<i>Orphic Hymns</i>
SBV	Standard Babylonian version

CONVENTIONS

Greek and Roman personal names have been transliterated (but ‘Hera’, not ‘Here’, to avoid confusion), except for authors and titles of works, where the usual English forms have been used.

How to Use This Book

The chapters of this book form an interlocking argument, but each can also be read in isolation. It is in the nature of the book that certain concepts and certain passages are recurrently referred to in different, but mutually informative, contexts; in such cases, the signs ' \rightarrow ' and ' \Rightarrow ' are employed to direct the reader respectively to the General Index and the Index of Passages, where references to complementary discussions elsewhere in the book may be found.

Homer and Allusive Art

1.1 The Problem in Practice

Μῆνιν ἄειδε θεὰ Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
 οὐλομένην, ἣ μυρὶ' Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε,
 πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν
 ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δέ ἐλώρια τεύχε κύνεσσιν
 5 οἰωνοῖσιν τε δαῖτα,¹ Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή,
 ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε
 Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς.

Sing of the wrath, goddess, of Peleus' son Achilleus,
 an accursed wrath, that made countless pains for the Achaeans,
 and hurled forth to Hades many strong souls
 of heroes, and rendered their bodies spoil for dogs
 and a feast for birds, in accomplishment of the plan of Zeus—
 from the point where those two first quarrelled and were divided,
 the son of Atreus, lord of men, and godlike Achilleus.

(*Iliad* 1.1–7).

Right at the start the *Iliad* suggests more than it narrates: 'Sing..., goddess,... from the point where...'.² A starting point is indicated out of a vast potential repertoire of song known to the Muse, the poet, and presumably (some members of) the audience. The *Iliad* takes as its specific theme not the Trojan War, but the wrath of Achilleus in the tenth year of the war, for which it earned the plaudits of Aristotle and Horace.³ Yet its subsequent narrative intimates the events of the whole war: the first muster of the troops, Helene's elopement, the first clash of the armies, the death of Achilleus, the sack of

¹ This reading of Zenodotus is defended by, e.g., Latacz 2000: 19–20; *πᾶσι*, the reading of the manuscripts, and of Aristarchus, is defended by, e.g., M. L. West 2001a: 173.

² Taking 6 ἐξ οὗ with 1 ἄειδε (e.g. Kirk 1985: 53; differently, e.g. Latacz 2000: 21); cf. ⇒ *Od.* 1.10 τῶν ἀμόθεν γε... εἶπε, 1.339 τῶν ἐν γε... ἄειδε, 8.500 ἐνθεν ἐλών.

³ Aristot. *Poet.* 1459a30–b7; cf. 1451a22–35; Hor. *AP* 136–52.

Troy, and so on.⁴ Seen in this perspective, the wrath of Achilles, caused by Agamemnon's abduction of Briseis and in turn the cause of the death of many heroes, suggests the whole Trojan War, caused by Paris' abduction of Helene and in turn the cause of the destruction of the heroes.⁵ There are grounds, then, to think that the *Iliad*'s proem connotes the story of the Trojan War. Just the story, though? Or does it actually allude to previous tellings of the story in hexameter verse? That possibility becomes more tangible once we observe similar phrasing in other early Greek epic poems on the Trojan War. The *Cypria* told of how Zeus caused the Trojan War to ease Earth's overburdening and of how 'the heroes began to be killed at Troy in accomplishment of the plan of Zeus' (fr. 1.6–7 Bernabé οἱ δ' ἐνὶ Τροίῃ / ἥρωες κτείνοντο, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή). The Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* tells in the context of the Trojan War of Zeus' intending that 'the bronze should hurl away to Hades many heads of heroes as they fell in battle' (fr. 204.118–19 M-W π[ολλὰς Ἀΐδη κεφαλὰς ἀπὸ χαλκὸν ἰάψ[ει]ν / ἀν[δρῶν] ἡρώων ἐν δηϊότητι πεσόντων). The *Iliad* itself speaks ten books later of Zeus as intending 'to hurl forth to Hades many strong heads' (Il. 11.55 πολλὰς ἰφθίμους κεφαλὰς Ἀΐδι προΐαψεν), and an ancient variant attested by Apollonius of Rhodes at Il. 1.3 reads 'and hurled forth to Hades many strong heads of heroes', with κεφαλὰς for ψυχάς, bringing the three passages still closer together.⁶ It might be conjectured that such phrasing was already used in hexameter poetry before the *Iliad* in the context of a plan of Zeus to annihilate 'the heroes'.⁷ In deploying such phrasing in the context of Achilles' anger at Agamemnon for his abduction of Briseis in the tenth year of the war, the poet would then more concretely signal how his restricted theme is modelled on the whole Trojan War. A disconcerting yet perspicuous 'plan of Zeus', a population control measure (*Cypria* fr. 1 Bernabé; compare Enlil's plan in the Babylonian poem *Atrahasis*), would have been transformed into something even more unsettling and enigmatic in the *Iliad*.⁸

On this view, the non-Homeric passages cited (*Cypria* fr. 1 Bernabé, 'Hes.' *Cat.* fr. 204.118–19 M-W) are taken to offer reflexes of earlier poetry to which the *Iliad*'s proem will be alluding. It is precisely this kind of possibility that this book will be concerned to justify in principle and to illustrate in practice. It involves various assumptions: that there was abundant Greek hexameter poetry preceding the *Iliad*; that the poet of the *Iliad* and (some of) his audience knew (some of) that poetry; that we, too, may occasionally glimpse that earlier

⁴ Kullmann 1960: 365–7; J. Griffin 1980a: 1; Dowden 1996: 55–6; Schein 1997: 352–5; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 44, 105–6, 118; Rengakos 2015a: 155–6.

⁵ The parallelism between the abductions of Helene and Briseis is made explicit by Achilles, Il. 9.339–41. Trojan War as a means to the heroes' destruction: Hes. WD 264–5, 'Hes.' *Cat.* fr. 204.98–100 M-W, *Cypria* fr. 1; cf. Eur. *Hel.* 23–41.

⁶ Il. 1.3 κεφαλὰς, if read, would cohere badly with 4 αὐτοὺς δέ (M. L. West 2001a: 173).

⁷ Redfield 1979: 101 = 2001: 465; Scodel 1982: 46–7; M. L. West 2011a: 82.

⁸ R. L. Fowler 2004: 230. *Cypria* and *Atrahasis*: Burkert 1992: 100–4; M. L. West 1997: 481–2.

poetry, however dimly; that Homer alludes to it; and that he does so, typically, in order to highlight differences in his own approach. It is very suggestive that the very first lines of the *Iliad* already raise this possibility; if accepted, it would follow that the possibility must be reckoned with in the rest of the poem as well. This book will in fact argue that allusion of this sort to earlier poetry is a significant feature not just of the *Iliad*, but also of other early hexameter poetry, the *Odyssey* and the ‘Homeric’ *Hymns*. The presence of allusion to earlier poetry in the proem of the *Iliad* would be interesting for another reason, too: it is well known that the proem of the *Aeneid* alludes to those of the *Odyssey* and *Iliad*, that the proem of *Paradise Lost* alludes to those of Virgil’s and Homer’s epics, and so on; it would be arresting to find that the *Iliad* in its proem alludes to earlier poetry as well, and in comparable ways—if Homeric allusion, to some extent, resembled Virgilian.

We have here, however, got some way ahead of ourselves. There are, of course, serious problems with interpreting the first lines of the *Iliad* in this way. Whether we should think of the *Iliad* as alluding to a specific earlier poem is unclear, rather than to an indeterminate number of fairly undifferentiated earlier poems which had used these or similar phrases in connection with the Trojan War. There are more radical doubts as well: did such earlier poetry really exist? Could an early Greek audience have known of it, if so? It was supposed in the preceding that other early Greek epics (*Cypria*, *Catalogue of Women*) preserve the older, more traditional, context to which the *Iliad* alludes; it could equally be other way round.⁹ Or is it wrong to posit any first occurrence from which the others depend? It is pointed out that it was standard in early hexameter poetry to indicate that the poem’s action happened by ‘Zeus’ will’.¹⁰ The phrase and the idea can therefore be argued not to be associated with any particular poem or any particular context.¹¹ One might suppose that there was a pool of traditional phrases and ideas to which poets would recur and could refer their audiences (the phenomenon of ‘traditional referentiality’, to which we will turn presently), but that they did not recur to

⁹ So M. L. West 2013: 57, 68, on *Il.* 1.5 and *Cypria* fr. 1.7 Bernabé.

¹⁰ *Il.* 1.5b = *Cypria* fr. 1.7b Bernabé = *Od.* 11.297b Διὸς δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή; cf. *Od.* 8.82, *HDem* 9, etc. R. L. Fowler 2004: 230 n. 40 ‘the recurrence of the phrase ... makes one suspect that it is a traditional equivalent to “the plot of this epic”’; cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 145; Murnaghan 1997: 25 n. 3; Allan 2008: 213–14; Petropoulos 2012: 297–8.

¹¹ Allan 2008: 210, 212 ‘the *Dios boulê* evokes a totality of stories characterized by Zeus’s dominance, but does so without referring to specific texts’. However, a ‘plan’ or ‘deliberation’ (*sic*, not ‘will’) of Zeus to destroy the heroes is a distinctive, full-bodied, and developed motif in the narrative of the *Cypria* (fr. 1 Bernabé, Summary Bernabé p. 38, l. 4; cf. *Eur. Hel.* 36–7, fr. 1082 *TGrF*) and the *Iliad* (8.470–7, 15.61–77, 19.270–4; cf. 3.164–5, 6.356–8, 11.79). Similar are the deliberations of Enlil to destroy mankind in the Babylonian *Atrahasis* (OBV I.352–60, III.iii. 36–9; = Foster 2005: 239, 250). These three texts (*Atrahasis*, *Iliad*, *Cypria*) are connected with one another thematically by a plan of Zeus/Enlil to destroy men in a way quite distinct from the vague generic sense in which any epic action occurs *eo ipso* by the ‘will’ of Zeus.

or refer their audiences to earlier poems or earlier poetry. Our example thus embroils us in a large controversy, which is central to this book. We must now step back from this specific example in order to explain the controversy and, more properly, the book.

1.2 Allusive Art, Traditional Art

The book's title conflates the titles of two very different and influential works: G. Pasquali's 'Arte allusiva' and J. M. Foley's *Homer's Traditional Art*. Pasquali's brief article, published in 1942, mainly addressed Latin poetry; but Pasquali insisted that allusion is much older than the Hellenistic age, that Homer too 'alludes', and that allusion is not just a parlour game in vogue in literary cliques.¹² Foley's book of 1999, complemented by numerous earlier and later studies, treated Homer alongside South Slavic and Old English poetry, arguing that Homer employed a technique of 'traditional referentiality' typical of oral poetry, and cautioning against the assumption that Homer alluded in the manner of literary poets.¹³ These two approaches continue to inform contemporary Homeric scholarship, though the former approach, which I have linked to Pasquali, is often sceptically regarded. *Homer's Allusive Art* contends that Homer does not only operate with a traditional art in Foley's sense, but also with an allusive art in Pasquali's sense that can be illuminated by comparison with unambiguously literary poets.

Foley's position asks us to reflect on two propositions, one general, that oral poetry does not allude like poetry in a literary tradition, but employs traditional referentiality; the other specific, that the Homeric epics in particular employ traditional referentiality either exclusively or characteristically.¹⁴

The first proposition, that traditional referentiality is the only mode of referencing in an oral epic tradition, appears to have the double underpinning of common sense and investigated oral traditions. On the one hand, common sense seems to dictate that long poems that are orally composed, orally performed, and orally transmitted are by their nature too evanescent to be the object of specific allusion.¹⁵ However, it cannot be assumed a priori that in a given oral tradition there are not sufficiently fixed texts to ground allusion,

¹² Pasquali 1951 (1942): 20.

¹³ J. M. Foley 1999: 27 'terminology of "allusion" and "oblique reference", to which we as textually trained scholars are driven, bespeaks our lack of acquaintance with the mode of signifying via traditional signs'. Cf. J. M. Foley 1991: 57. For the coining of the term 'traditional referentiality', cf. *ibid.* p. xiv. The concept goes back to A. B. Lord (Lord 1960: 148).

¹⁴ Danek 2002b: 5 interprets Foley as considering traditional referentiality 'characteristic of every type of oral-traditional epic'.

¹⁵ As summed up by Danek 2002b: 3, 'To put it simply: no texts, no intertextuality'; cf. Danek 1998a: 13.

nor need allusion necessarily demand a very high level of textual fixity. On the other hand, empirically investigated oral traditions have usually meant, for most Homerists, South Slavic oral poetry, of which A. B. Lord asserted: 'In the Yugoslav tradition stories are kept separate and, to the best of my knowledge, singers never refer in one song to the events of another.'¹⁶ More recently, J. M. Foley and J. Arft have reiterated that 'the [South Slavic] song-performances collected by Parry, Lord, and Vujnović did not speak directly to one another, and they were most certainly not related intertextually'.¹⁷ Yet these assertions have received significant qualifications. G. Danek argued for the need to distinguish in this respect between the Bosnian (Muslim) and the Serbian (Christian) strands of this tradition. On the one hand, 'Bosnian epic seems to confirm the idea that the only kind of intertextual relations to be found in oral-traditional epic is what Foley calls "traditional referentiality"', and '[i]t is never necessary to know a concrete song or a concrete story in order to understand another story'.¹⁸ On the other hand, according to Danek, in Serbian epic 'there are some impressive examples where an audience is assumed to be acquainted with a myth which lies outside the text'.¹⁹ Danek concluded: 'Serbian epic thus employs precise references to individual stories or parts of stories. I believe that, even in an orally-based epic tradition directed at a generally illiterate audience, it is thus proven that intertextual references are possible which go beyond the evocation of a generic model.'²⁰ Z. Čolaković, moreover, has detected specific allusions and cross references even in Bosnian epic: Avdo Međedović's *The Wedding of Vlahinjić Alija* alludes to his *Chieftain Gavran and Serdar Mujo*, and a similar situation is indicated for the songs of Murat Kurtagić.²¹ Čolaković observed that '[m]any [sc. Bosnian heroic] songs are completely incomprehensible, unless one knows many other songs within the region in question'.²² Part of the problem here, of course, is that the detection of allusion even in fully literate traditions is never a scientific matter; one interpreter may, quite legitimately, see an allusion where another, equally

¹⁶ Lord 1960: 159.

¹⁷ J. M. Foley† and Arft 2015: 86.

¹⁸ Danek 2002b: 12; cf. Danek 1998a: 18–19, picking up the discussion of *ibid.* 7–11.

¹⁹ Danek 2002b: 12. The example discussed by Danek 2002b: 12–15 (cf. Danek 1998b: 89–90) is Filip Višnjić, *The Beginning of the Revolt Against the Dahijas* (Karadžić 1841–62: iv no. 24 lines 96–106 = Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 280–1). We might add *Marko Kraljević and Mina of Kostur* as alluding to *The Wedding of King Vukašin* (Karadžić 1841–62: ii no. 62 lines 61–79 and no. 25 lines 134–52; Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 182, 185 n. 42); and Filip Višnjić's *The Battle on Mišar* as alluding to *Tsar Lazar and Tsaritsa Milica* and to *The Death of the Mother of the Jugovičes* (Karadžić 1841–62: iv no. 30 lines 1–189, ii no. 45 lines 119–204, and ii no. 48 lines 57–84; Holton and Mihailovich 1997: 299, 300 n. 54). Danek 1998a: 19–21; 2002b: 18–19 attributes this difference between the Serbian and Bosnian tradition to the historical perspective present in the former but absent the latter.

²⁰ Danek 2002b: 15. Cf. Danek 2002c: 22 n. 20.

²¹ Čolaković 2006: 169.

²² Čolaković and Rojc-Čolaković 2004, in Danek 2005c: 280 (translated). Cf. Danek 2005a: 19 n. 43; 2010b: 125. Elmer 2010 takes issue with Čolaković's characterization of Međedović as a 'post-traditional' poet.

legitimately, may not.²³ It is, moreover, difficult to be expert in one epic tradition, let alone several. Many Homerists would defer to expert opinion on the South Slavic heroic epics (though no more unanimous than on the early Greek epic tradition itself) in order to interpret Homeric poetry in its light. But is this not to put the cart before the horse? Arguably, we do not need formulations about South Slavic epic or oral epic in general to tell us what early Greek epic is (not) capable of. Rather, early Greek epic, if found both to be oral and to employ specific allusion, should be allowed the capacity to show us what oral epic is capable of, in one, perhaps limiting, case at least.²⁴

The truth of the second proposition, that the Homeric epics employ traditional referentiality (either exclusively or characteristically) follows simply on the truth of the first, granted that Homeric poetry is 'oral poetry'; but the sense in which Homeric poetry is 'oral poetry' needs to be clarified. Many scholars would see writing as playing a part in the composition of the *Iliad*.²⁵ For his part, Foley always insisted that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* were not to be viewed as 'oral', but 'oral-derived traditional texts'.²⁶ In this they would more closely resemble *Beowulf*, the *Nibelungenlied*, and the *Chanson de Roland* than the South Slavic oral epics.²⁷ Foley was thus readier than some scholars, notably A. B. Lord, to countenance 'transitional texts', to concede the compatibility of orality and literacy.²⁸ Here it is recognized that a purely oral Greek epic poetry is not attested in our extant texts, though the existence of a purely oral Greek epic poetry at an earlier unattested stage is not doubted.²⁹ It is curious that a scholar

²³ Edmunds 2001: p. xvii, citing E. Miner: 'The test for allusion is that it is a phenomenon that some reader or readers may fail to observe.'

²⁴ In this vein, Finnegan 1977: 152 emphasizes the need for empirical study of particular traditions, rather than theorizing about the behaviour of oral tradition in general.

²⁵ e.g. Lohmann 1970: 211–12; 1988: 76–7; Lloyd-Jones 1990 (1981); Garvie 1994: 16 and n. 51; Reichel 1998; R. L. Fowler 2004: 230–1; Rösler 2011: 208; M. L. West 2011a: 10–11; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 32 and n. 104; Kullmann 2015: 108.

²⁶ J. M. Foley 1990: 5, 14; 1991: p. xv, 22; 1995: 63; 1997a: 163; see esp. J. M. Foley 2011a. Other terms to describe the mixed nature of the Homeric poems: Čolaković 2006: *passim* 'post-traditional'; Sale 1996a: 24 'oralistic' (as opposed to 'oral') epic; Honko 2000: 7 'tradition-oriented'; R. L. Fowler 2004: 222 'transitional text'.

²⁷ However, we should not think of even the South Slavic songs as produced in a purely oral environment: Finnegan 1974: 57; Katičić 1998: 17, 22–3; Čolaković 2006: 178–9. Contrast J. M. Foley 1990: 3; Amodio 2005: 204.

²⁸ J. M. Foley 1999: 45; 1995: 63; 1997b: 59–60; Bakker 1997: 22, 23. Cf. Danek 2002a: 18, on the Bosnian singer Ćamil Kulenović, who wrote down his poems in the oral-traditional style, as disproving the thesis of M. Parry and A. B. Lord that a traditional singer lost his traditional style when he learned to write; cf. A. Parry 1966: 183, 213–16 = 1989: 109, 136–40. Differently, Lord 1960: 147: '[Homer] is not a split personality with half of his understanding and technique in the tradition and the other half in a parnassus of literate methods'; cf. *ibid.* 128–32, 149; Lord 1953: 131; Jensen 1980: 89–92; Nagy 1990b (1982): 40. Lord later modified his position (Lord 1995: 212–37), though not for Homer (*ibid.* 236); Janko 1998a: 3; Dukat 1998: 325.

²⁹ To refer to extant early Greek hexameter poetry as 'the pre-textual stage of early Greek epic' (Allan 2005: 14; 2008: 206) is problematic. Cf. M. L. West 1981: 58 = 2011b: 151 on the use of the phrase 'extant oral Greek epic'.

who would save the 'traditional oral idiom' for 'oral-derived texts' should exclude the allusive idiom from those texts.³⁰ Precisely the concept of 'oral-derived' poetry left the door open for the recognition of both distinctively oral (or 'traditional') and distinctively written techniques, assuming these *are* distinctive techniques. Foley indeed argued for such inclusivity of approach: 'Even when, in oral-derived and transitional texts, we are presented with mixed signals for the decoding of textual structures—with some oral traditional and some quite literary responses called for—it will be a mistake to level this hybrid character to the smooth surface of denotative, post-traditional, purely textual signification.'³¹ It ought to be an equivalent mistake to level this hybrid character to the smooth surface of purely oral, traditional-referential signification.³²

Foley's concern, of course, was with the traditional-referential model, whose operation he sought to illustrate in the Homeric epics, among others. He was interested in the capacity of oral-derived texts to continue to function in the manner of oral poems, preserving their oral traditional poetics.³³ However, this concern is at times responsible for a slippage from Foley's own declared position (the Homeric poems as oral-derived texts) to Lord's position (the Homeric poems as oral poems). One sign of that slippage is Foley's argument, inherited from Lord, that the Homeric poems were produced by dictation on an external stimulus, the only apparent rationale for which is to save a purely oral conception of these poems.³⁴ There is no reason why an oral-derived text should not have been written by the poet himself or, if dictated, dictated on the initiative of 'insiders' of the tradition.³⁵ Another sign of the same slippage is the exclusion of specific allusion from the Homeric epics. The possibility of specific allusion ought not to arouse consternation in the context of an oral-derived poetry with its 'hybrid character'. It is open for those who regard the Homeric epics as oral-derived poems to see them as employing traditional referentiality characteristically, but grounds for claiming that they do so exclusively are hard to see. It remains to be shown whether they in fact employ traditional referentiality more characteristically than they employ specific

³⁰ The exclusion is most explicit in J. M. Foley† and Arft 2015: 78–9, 83–4, 95.

³¹ J. M. Foley 1991: 57–8. Cf. *ibid.* 5–6: 'What we might expect to emerge... is an oral traditional poetics that will share some of its features with literary poetics but will differ in other features'; 15 '[the term and concept "oral-derived"] allows us to examine the traditional features of the work alongside its post-traditional characteristics'. Cf. J. M. Foley 1997: 163; 2011c: 608–9.

³² Cf. Mueller 2011: 741–2: 'It is likely that many interdependent repetitions result from a hybrid technology in which conventions of oral composition blend in new and sometimes awkward ways with the opportunities and conveniences offered by the new text technology of writing.'

³³ J. M. Foley 1997a: 163, 170–1; 1990: 5; 1995: 60–98, 137; 1997b: 61–2; J. M. Foley† and Arft 2015: 82–3; Amodio 2005: 204–5.

³⁴ J. M. Foley 2005a: 209; cf. 211; 2011b; Lord 1960: 152. Critiqued: Bakker 1997: 22.

³⁵ See § 1.4, pp. 21–2.

allusion. And it is another open question whether even 'purely' oral poems are by their very nature incapable of specific allusion.³⁶

Of course, we do not have to choose between traditional referentiality and allusion; we may embrace both.³⁷ To plead the case for 'Homer's allusive art' is not to impugn the case for traditional referentiality, the value of whose contributions, especially in illuminating apparently non-traditional applications of traditional language and uncovering conventionally conferred connotations, is not here in dispute.³⁸ One notable success of Foley's approach is to rescue the 'ornamental' epithet from meaninglessness, showing how, attractively, formulas can be chosen '*artis causa*, not *metri causa*'.³⁹ An arguable defect, however, is the absence of an attempt to balance the models of traditional referentiality and specific allusion. And an equivalent criticism might be levelled at this book. It might, for instance, have been possible to balance Foley's reading of the *Hymn to Demeter* in terms of 'traditional art' with my own reading of the same poem in Chapter 3 in terms of an 'allusive art'.⁴⁰ Yet, however desirable a synthesis or rapprochement may be, it is necessary for the respective approaches first to be illustrated and vindicated in their own right. Such vindication is clearly needed in the case of specific allusion, which is viewed with suspicion in much contemporary Homeric scholarship. But it needs to be clear that vindication of the one approach entails no necessary denigration of the other: the two approaches are not mutually exclusive, and their integration may become a proper concern of scholarship once the validity of each seems sufficiently secure.

It is a further question to what extent there are distinctively oral-traditional and distinctively written techniques, and to what extent 'traditional referentiality' fundamentally distinguishes oral from written poetry.⁴¹ In the words of one reviewer of Foley:

The traditional rules that F[oley] uncovers... are rules of oral-traditional poetry; this is axiomatic for him, since he does not offer comparative analyses of strictly literate poems. But his critics may well ask here, 'What if Virgil etc. also follow these very rules? And especially—what if Lucan or Statius follow them? Is it not possible that F[oley] is simply uncovering rules for composing epic—oral or oral-

³⁶ Dowden 1996: 60. ³⁷ So e.g. Danek 2002*b*: 17; 2005*a*: 19; Kelly 2007: 12.

³⁸ e.g. Sacks 1987: 3–4, 7, 8, 12; J. M. Foley 1997*a*: 168–9 and 1998: 171 (on the purely conventionally conferred connotations of *ὑπόδρα ἰδών* and *πυκνὸν ἔπος*); Kelly 2007: 4 and *passim*.

³⁹ J. M. Foley 1999: 7. Cf. J. M. Foley 1991: 142–3, on *πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς* (cf. Sale 2001: 70–1; Danek 2002*b*: 6; Graziosi and Haubold 2005: 51–3); 1995: 150–60, on *κρατὺς Ἀργεϊφόντης*.

⁴⁰ J. M. Foley 1995: 136–80.

⁴¹ J. M. Foley 1990, on a 'need for a new poetics'; cf. Lord 1995: 202 'on the level of aesthetics, one needs to know whether a text is oral traditional or not in order correctly to apply the criteria of referentiality. There is a difference between oral traditional poetics and written poetics.' On the question whether we need a special 'oral poetics', cf. Kirk 1976: 69–85; J. Griffin 1980*a*: pp. xiii–xiv; Janko 1998*a*: 11; R. B. Rutherford 2013: 28–9.

derived or written—in a given language? ... In any case, we need to know whether strictly literate writers follow the same rules.⁴²

Others have noted the resemblance of Foley's concept of 'traditional referentiality' to J. Kristeva's concept of 'intertextuality'.⁴³ The concept, in other words, would not be so much a peculiarity of oral-traditional poetry as a function of literature generally. The arguments over whether to recognize traditional referentiality or specific allusion in Homer can be compared with arguments over whether to recognize a *topos* or specific allusion in Latin poetry.⁴⁴ S. E. Hinds has defined the *topos* in Latin poetry in terms reminiscent of traditional referentiality: 'rather than demanding interpretation to a specific model or models, like the allusion, the *topos* invokes its intertextual tradition as a collectivity, to which the individual contexts and connotations of individual prior instances are firmly subordinate.'⁴⁵ Latin poetry, Hinds shows, employs both the *topos* and specific allusion. So too, many would now agree, does fifth-century Greek drama.⁴⁶ The assumption of advocates of the traditional-referential approach is that Homeric epic is made special by its use of traditional referentiality.⁴⁷ The worry is that we may rather end up impoverishing Homeric poetry if we regard it as capable of only the one form of referencing.⁴⁸

1.3 Typology and Allusion

There are, of course, difficulties with seeing specific allusion in early Greek epic as there are not in Latin poetry or even Attic drama. The existence

⁴² Sale 1996b.

⁴³ Danek 1998a: 14; 2002b: 8; Holmberg 1998: 456, 474; I. C. Rutherford 2012: 155.

⁴⁴ Cf. Hinds 1998: 34–47. ⁴⁵ Hinds 1998: 34.

⁴⁶ Tragedy: allusion to tragic *topoi*: R. B. Rutherford 2012a: 359, 399–400; cf. Easterling 1982: 21–2. Prime candidates for specific allusion to other tragedies are Eur. *El.* 487–584 (Cropp 1988: 134–41; Torrance 2013: 13–33) and Eur. *Phoen.* 751–2 (Mastronarde 1994: 360–1; cf. 9–10, 393; Torrance 2013: 94–129). Specific allusion in tragedy: Gregory 2005: 267–8; Garner 1990; Halleran 1997; Markantonatos 2007: 195–230; R. B. Rutherford 2012a: 360–1. Comedy: allusion to comic *topoi*: e.g. Ar. *Ran.* 1–2, *Pax* 734–5, 741–7, *Nub.* 538–43, *Acharn.* 628–9, *Eq.* 507–9, *Thesm.* 785. Allusion to specific comedies (and tragedies): Biles 2011: 134–66; Storey 2003: 291–300; Bakola 2010: 16–24; Wright 2012: 90–102.

⁴⁷ e.g. Dué 2002: 2: 'the very fact that the *Iliad* is "oral traditional" often allows even deeper and more complex levels of meaning than may be found in poetry that is composed in a literate, text-based culture'.

⁴⁸ Sale 1996a: 24: 'Adam Parry complained as long ago as 1971 that many an oralist was impoverishing the text by disallowing interesting interpretations on the grounds that no oral poet could have thought of them, and Anne Amory Parry engaged Albert Lord in a scholarly duel over this issue. This is not to deny that gratifying readings can be *added* by conceiving of the text as orally composed; but when clever interpretations are *subtracted* by this process, critics are naturally irked.'

of a common stock of phrases, motifs, and themes in early Greek hexameter poetry problematizes the attempt to identify specific allusion. Thus G. Nagy has said, 'when we are dealing with the traditional poetry of the Homeric (and Hesiodic) compositions, it is not justifiable to claim that a passage in any text can refer to another passage in another text'.⁴⁹ The problem is perhaps not so much that it is not justifiable to claim that they can as that it is not easily demonstrable that they do.⁵⁰ It is not easily demonstrable that a specific allusion is being made for the simple reason that even what presents itself a single recurrence among our texts may always be considered an underrepresented formula or other typical element.⁵¹ Hence it is open for oralists to claim as typical motifs what neoanalysts would claim as 'transferred motifs'.⁵² And so in general oralists' preference for 'typology' jostles with neoanalysts' preference for 'stemmatic' relationships of 'primary' and 'secondary' contexts of use.⁵³

Dichotomous thinking here, as with traditional referentiality and specific allusion, is again specious; there is room, of course, for both typical motifs and transferred motifs.⁵⁴ But a dichotomy would be spurious also for a more crucial reason: we must allow for interplay between the typical (formulaic) and the specifically allusive. It may be that we cannot even define the typical (or formulaic) in theory or identify it in practice without recourse to the specific reprise: a formula is a repetition that is not a specific reprise. According to M. Parry:

When the element of usefulness is lacking, one does not have a formula but a repeated phrase which has been knowingly brought into the verse for some special effect. Thus the definition [*sc.* of the formula] excludes the refrain... The definition likewise excludes the echoed phrase... Non-formulaic too is the verse which is borrowed because the poet's public knows it and will recall its former use... Finally a poet will often repeat a phrase after an interval in order to obtain some special effect.⁵⁵

⁴⁹ Nagy 1979: 42. Responses: Taplin 1990: 109 n. 2; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 125; Danek 1998a: 14 n. 24; Burgess 2006a: 163–4; 2009: 56–7; as well as Nagy himself: 1998: 79–80.

⁵⁰ So Hoekstra 1969: 8; Blößner 1991: 11–12. Similarly, G. P. Edwards 1971: 189, cited by Nagy 1979: 42, spoke only of such relationships between texts as being 'impossible to prove', but remained open to the possibility of a passage in one text depending on a passage in another (cf. *ibid.* 207, on 'imitation').

⁵¹ See, e.g., Mueller 2009: 154; Cantilena 2012: 84–5. But the opposite assumption is also fully viable: cf., e.g., Blößner 1991: 12 'wenn ein Iteratum überhaupt nur zweimal im frühgriechischen Epos begegnet, so ist seine Formelhaftigkeit zunächst eher zu bezweifeln'.

⁵² See Fenik 1968: 236, 239–40; Hainsworth 1969: 30; Hoekstra 1969: 8; Janko 1982: 225–6; M. W. Edwards 1990: 311–12. This is not to imply that neoanalytical and oral positions are intrinsically irreconcilable: cf. Kullmann 1984 = 1992; Danek 1998: 24–5; Burgess 2006a: 158.

⁵³ See, on these concepts and issues, Burgess 2006a; 2009: 56–71.

⁵⁴ e.g. M. W. Edwards 1991: 11–19.

⁵⁵ M. Parry 1971: 272–4 = 1930: 81–3.

Parry recognizes various types of 'repeated phrases', including what I would call (specific, unidirectional) allusion. But as well as defining the formula against the 'repeated phrase', we need to recognize the interdependence of the two. Formulas, we may take it, are created from repeated phrases.⁵⁶ And, conversely, formulas may be turned (back) into specific, allusive reprises. The latter occurs when the specific use of a formula or type-scene in one context is evoked by the use of the same formula or type-scene in another, related context.⁵⁷ It is, of course, never straightforward or uncontroversial to recognize when this has happened; but the case is there to be argued wherever the use of a formula or type-scene in context can be shown to be marked and the postulated relationship between the two occurrences to be meaningful. In the most convincing cases it is appropriate to abandon a typological explanation for the repetition and accept the likelihood of a specific reprise. This step is in general easiest to take for repeated elements within a single poem ('intratextuality').⁵⁸ But it is hard to see the grounds for refusing the further step from there to repeated elements across different poems ('intertextuality'). If specific reprise is possible over thousands of lines within a single poem, why then not across different poems, whether by the same poet or by different poets?⁵⁹

Arguments for allusion, then, are certainly capable of coexisting alongside recognition of the typicality of Homeric epic.⁶⁰ That said, arguments for allusion may be thought particularly compelling when they involve repeated elements that appear to be non-typical or non-formulaic.⁶¹ But there is no necessary tension between allusion and typology. To the extent that such a tension sometimes emerges in practice, it cuts both ways: just as arguments for the presence of a type-scene or formula have the potential (but no more) to undermine arguments for allusion, so do arguments for allusion have the potential to undermine any automatic assumption of typicality or formulaicity.⁶² Still, the relationship in general is better conceived as fluid and symbiotic than an exclusive and competitive one.⁶³

⁵⁶ Hainsworth 1993: 6: 'The phrase is repeated and becomes a formula because it is useful'; cf. *ibid.* 16, 17 on 'the process of becoming a formula'.

⁵⁷ Schwabl 1982; Pucci 1987: 35; Taplin 1990: 112; Usener 1990: e.g. 12, 210; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 140 n. 42.

⁵⁸ Heubeck 1974: 148–9: 'Die formelhafte Diktion ist aus einem Hilfsmittel für improvisierende Gestaltung an vielen Stellen zum Träger poetischer Funktionen geworden; wiederkehrenden Wortgruppen, Formelverse, Versgruppen können und sollen im Zusammenhang des Ganzen Erinnerungen wachrufen, gedankliche und inhaltliche Linien, Kontraste und Parallelitäten deutlich werden lassen.' Cf. Schwabl 1986: 43–4, 59; 1990: 99; M. W. Edwards 1980: 27; Willcock 1990a: 4, 9, 11; de Jong 1991: 413–17; Mueller 2009: 28–30.

⁵⁹ Cf. Schwabl 1982: 14, 18, 32–3; A. Parry 1971: *liv*; R. B. Rutherford 2001 (1991–3): 126; P. V. Jones 1997: 36–7; Kelly 2007: 12 nn. 41–2; Burgess 2009: 64. See Appendix F, p. 262.

⁶⁰ Fenik 1968: 237: 'Typical composition and direct influence are not incompatible.'

⁶¹ The approach of Usener 1990 (cf. 7–8); Kullmann 1991: 444–5 = 1992: 120.

⁶² Schwabl 1982: 17; Mueller 2009: 153–72. ⁶³ See Appendix F.

1.4 Allusion and Fixed Texts

There are quite various ways of conceiving allusion in early Greek epic; none need be exclusive of the others, though they differ essentially in what they identify as fixed enough to serve as an object of allusion. Traditional referentiality is one model, which looks to 'the Tradition' as fixed enough to serve as an object of reference (that is to say, to conventional uses of, for instance, formulas and type-scenes).⁶⁴ Another model, 'mythological intertextuality', takes the mythological tradition as the fixed reference point.⁶⁵ Another model again takes a 'simple story' (defined as 'the deducible *Urgeschichte* of a concrete narrative, its *Urform*'), as a notional fixed reference point against which all concrete tellings of a traditional story can be measured.⁶⁶ Alongside these is the model that will be primarily defended in this book, according to which individual poems may be fixed enough to serve as an object of allusion.⁶⁷

This model has seemed uncongenial to many, although, interestingly, not uniformly across the range of early Greek hexameter poetry. Thus, while many scholars are reluctant to grant that the *Iliad* may allude to specific earlier poems, several are content to allow that the *Odyssey* alludes to the *Iliad*, that the *Works and Days* alludes to the *Theogony*, that the *Catalogue of Women* alludes to the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, or that various of the *Hymns* allude to other specific early Greek hexameter poems.⁶⁸ Those prepared to accept some or all of these must face the question of what makes the *Iliad* sufficiently different to justify taking a fundamentally different stance to that poem. The *Iliad* does not seem to be substantially more oral-traditional than the other poems.⁶⁹ If it boils

⁶⁴ J. M. Foley 1991: 7 "Traditional elements reach out of the immediate instance in which they appear to the fecund totality of the entire tradition." 'Tradition' with a capital T: Janko 1998a: 7; Clay 1983: 243.

⁶⁵ Burgess 2012a: 168; 2006a: 154, 173; 2009: 56. Cf. Willcock 1983: 485 n. 8; Dowden 1996: 51.

⁶⁶ Quotation from Hölscher 1988: 27 (translated). Cf. *ibid.* 26, defining the 'simple story' (*einfache Geschichte*) as 'das pragmatische Gerüst einer Handlung, die Fabula'. Danek 2002c: 22 n. 20: 'I think we can grasp here an important aspect of a typical "oral" kind of intertextuality, the allusions referring neither to "texts" in the modern sense, nor to typology, but to the idea of a "story-line."' Danek 2005a: 15 n. 29.

⁶⁷ Dowden 1996: 48: 'I think it is worth envisaging a stronger case, where Homer interacts with specific implementations of the standard story'; 50 '[Homer] evoked particular stories at particular points for particular effect and could well have had particular tellings, "texts", in mind.' Cf. Danek 1998a: 484 '[die Odyssee hebt] sich nicht nur gegen die potentielle "einfache Geschichte", sondern gegen konkrete epische Versionen dieser Geschichte [ab]'. Danek 2002b.

⁶⁸ On the *Catalogue*, Ormand 2014: 119–80. On the *Hymns*, O. Thomas 2011; Brillat-Dubois 2011; Olson 2012: 16–24, 279–81; Faulkner 2008: 31–4, 35–8, 38–40; Baumbach 2012: 137–8; Hunter 2012: 94.

⁶⁹ On the respective degrees of orality/traditionality of the poems, cf. G. P. Edwards 1971: 190–1; N. J. Richardson 1974: 31, 337–8; Janko 1982: 18–19, 40–1; J. M. Foley 1995: 145–6, 164; Faulkner 2008: 25.

down simply to the fact that our evidence for ‘sources’ of the *Iliad*, as our earliest extant poem, is much scantier than for the others (in the case of the *Odyssey*, we at least have the *Iliad*), then the problem emerges as one of evidence rather than of principle.⁷⁰

Yet there is, of course, a principled objection to the model of poem-to-poem allusion in early Greek epic: specific allusion between poems presupposes the existence of sufficiently fixed texts to allude to, and the concept of a fixed text in an oral tradition is thrown into question by the phenomenon of (re)composition in performance observed for South Slavic singers by A. B. Lord.⁷¹ The application of this observation to the Homeric epics has seemed straightforward. Thus S. L. Schein has argued, ‘the poetic tradition of these [sc. the Homeric] epics was oral and hence... there was no fixed text of an earlier epic from which Homer could borrow’.⁷² However, Lord’s model has been challenged even for South Slavic song by Z. Čolaković, finding among the best singers of the Bosnian heroic epic tradition an interplay between improvisation and memorization, with some compositional elements being handled ‘freely’, others in a ‘fossilized’ manner.⁷³ And R. Finnegan and others have emphasized the existence of oral poetic traditions outside the Balkans where ‘near word-for-word reproduction’ was important.⁷⁴ Finnegan insisted that the fluidity of one oral poetic tradition cannot be inferred from the fluidity of another; each tradition requires to be approached on its own terms.⁷⁵ We need to know how much fixity there was in the early Greek epic tradition, where to situate the products of this tradition on a spectrum ranging from free (re)composition in performance to rigid, quasi-verbatim reproduction of fixed texts.⁷⁶

It is necessary to distinguish the question of variation in oral transmission (i.e. reperformance) from that of variation in the textual tradition.⁷⁷ This distinction has important, and asymmetrical, implications: variations in

⁷⁰ Dowden 1996: 48.

⁷¹ Lord 1960: esp. 99–101, 149; Garvie 1994: 6 and n. 17; Martin 2011a.

⁷² Schein 1984: 28. Cf. Burgess 2001: 133. The problems posed for allusion by the absence of a ‘fixed text’ are discussed by Andersen 1990: 44–5; Danek 1998a: 6, 13; D. L. Cairns 2001: 35; R. L. Fowler 2004b: 228.

⁷³ Danek 2005c: 281, on Čolaković and Rojc-Čolaković 2004: 293–4.

⁷⁴ Finnegan 1977: 73, 75, 144, 148; 1974: 60; Thornton 1984: 14–18. On the whole this goes for ‘shorter forms of poetry’, rather than ‘lengthy epic poetic narrations’ (Finnegan 1977: 78; Lord 1981: 459–60).

⁷⁵ Finnegan 1977: 152. Cf. J. M. Foley 1998: 150–1; 2005b: 55–7 (‘comparison must always be tempered by contrast’).

⁷⁶ Finkelberg 2000: 6: ‘The problem... is that, as distinct from the medieval and the South Slavic epics, we have no clear idea of the degree of variation allowed in Greek epic tradition itself.’ A relatively high degree of stability is assumed by Kirk 1960: 278–9; Dowden 1996: 47–8, 49–50; 2004: 188; D. L. Cairns 2001: 36.

⁷⁷ Powell 2007: 13–14; A. D. Morrison 2007b: 115 n. 9. Compare and contrast, e.g., Nagy 2011: 281.

poems as performed will not have had an obvious impact on the textual record; but texts, if used by performers, must have checked the variation that occurred in performance. That is, the poems experienced by audiences in performance are bound to have been subject to fluctuation; even poems learned by heart by rhapsodes cannot have been verbatim reproductions of the written texts.⁷⁸ But still, the presence of written texts is bound to have conferred greater stability than on a purely oral scenario of (re)composition in performance.⁷⁹ Moreover, if the poets used written texts, their ability to make allusions can have exceeded the (average) audience member's ability to perceive them.

There are some putative indications of the levels of fixity-fluidity of poems as performed in the early Greek epic tradition. The first nine lines of the fourth and the eighteenth poems in our corpus of *Homeric Hymns* have been seen as independent attempts to recreate the 'same' passage of a hymn to Hermes, and thus as indicative of the kind of variation to be expected in the performance of early Greek epic in its historical phase.⁸⁰ We may see these either as independent 'recordings' of two separate performances or, probably preferably, as two instances of rhapsodes reproducing written texts from memory.⁸¹ It is possible to emphasize the divergence between these two versions. Thus one scholar notes, 'only three lines are shared, exactly, between them'.⁸² On the other hand, the correspondence is extremely close: crucially, we seem obliged to recognize this as a situation where the poem 'is conceived of as a more or less fixed entity, with its own wording' and 'is itself transmitted as a verbal entity', rather than the situation generally assumed for 'oral traditional epics', where 'what is remembered is a story and/or themes' and where 'a poem, or song, means a story, not a given set of words, not a given text'.⁸³ There would seem to be little difficulty in making allusion to a poem whose text fluctuated within these parameters. Here our discussion is seen to turn on two key indeterminacies. First, the detection of fluidity or fixity is often subjective and

⁷⁸ Rhapsodes learning by heart: Xen. *Symp.* 3.5, *Mem.* 4.2.10; Plat. *Ion* 530b10–11, 537a4; cf. *Leg.* 810e12. For Homer in general being learned by heart, cf. Verdenius 1971: 6–7.

⁷⁹ Čolaković 2006: 181: 'One of Parry's Bosniac singers learned [a poem from a written source] by heart word-for-word, with close to 90% accuracy, though it is over 2,000 verses long.' Cf. M. L. West 1997: 600.

⁸⁰ *HHerm* 1–9 and *HHom* 18.1–9 thus regarded: Hainsworth 1988: 29–30; cf. Janko 1982: 3; Cantilena 1982: 241–2. Differently, M. L. West 2003c: 4–5, 18, seeing *HHom* 18 as an 'excerpt' from *HHerm*. The manuscript tradition of *HHom* 10 presents a similar picture (Olson 2012: 291). Cf. *HAp* 146–50, ⇒ 165–72, as preserved in the direct and indirect (Thuc. 3.104.3–6) tradition: Janko 1982: 2–3, 233–4; Aloni 1989: 110; N. J. Richardson 2010: 104.

⁸¹ In favour of the first option, cf. Janko 1982: 3: 'These cases show that versions of what is essentially the same poem could undergo substantial change, apparently by oral transmission involving some recomposition: these versions appear to be different recordings of the same underlying *Gestalt*.'

⁸² Hainsworth 1988: 30.

⁸³ Quotations from Lord 1995: 20.

relative; it is normal for one interpreter to see fluidity where another sees fixity.⁸⁴ Second, fixity and fluidity are vague terms; fixity is not all-or-nothing.⁸⁵ 'Between the two extremes of total fixity and utter fluidity lie various levels of semi-fixity.'⁸⁶ It is unclear how much fixity of text we may minimally require for specific allusion to be possible. But something well short of total fixity (exact verbatim reproduction) will suffice, especially where an allusion operates more on the level of motif or narrative structure than of phrasing.

The very existence of discrete poems in the early Greek hexameter corpus is called into question by the 'evolutionary model' influentially and controversially proposed by G. Nagy, positing a fluid transmission of early Greek epic throughout the archaic period and viewing variation in the textual tradition as reflecting ongoing composition in performance of the poems.⁸⁷ To this evolutionary model various types of objection have been made.⁸⁸ First, that it has not been established that variants in the Homeric textual tradition in fact reflect the multiforms of a performance tradition.⁸⁹ Second, that the extraordinary qualities that we find in the Homeric epics were bound to have been lost if Homer's songs had been left solely to singers to perpetuate, rather than being fixed straightaway in a written form.⁹⁰ Third, that a fundamental

⁸⁴ Scodel 2002: 43: 'From outside, it is impossible to know just how divergent songs that were recognized as "the same" could be.' Lord 1985: 321: 'I must say that I find Cope's summary comparison of the two versions of Hamu's praise poem rather inadequate. When he says, for example, ... "the first two lines correspond," he does not mean that they are identical, and I invite the reader to compare the texts and the translations for himself.' Goody 1987: 87: 'When we examined the different versions of the White Bagre recited by Sielo in 1975, ... [my collaborator] was surprised at Sielo's inconsistency, whereas I was struck by the similarities. In any case, we were a long way from verbatim reproduction.'

⁸⁵ Cf. A. Parry 1966: 189 = 1989: 115: 'This brings us to the vital question which no one has yet confronted clearly: what is the essence of the *Iliad*? How much would our vulgate text have to be changed before a reasonable student would have to say: "This is no longer the *Iliad*, it is a song sung in much the same style, treating of similar themes"? To this question no precise answer can be given. But until we are ready to give it some kind of answer, we have no right, I submit, to talk about *accuracy of reproduction*; for to talk about such matters at all, we must have some clear and rational notion of what is, or is not, being reproduced.'

⁸⁶ Dowden 1996: 48. Cf. Lord 1995: 20, 39–40, 212: 'more or less' fixed texts.

⁸⁷ Homer: Nagy 1996a: 29–63; 1996b: 107–52; 2004; 2012: 39–46; cf. Burgess 2001: 10–11; Dué 2009: 24–5; Dué and Ebbott 2010: 19–20.

⁸⁸ Janko 1998a: 12 n. 63; Finkelberg 2000; Blümer 2001: i.23–91; Scodel 2002: 61 and n. 43; Pelliccia 2003; R. L. Fowler 2004: 224–5; Reece 2005; Andersen and Haug 2012: 7.

⁸⁹ Finkelberg 2000; cf. Janko 1998b: 206; M. L. West 2001a: 11, 159 n. 2; 2001 = 2011b: 178; 2004; R. L. Fowler 2004: 231 and n. 47; Powell 2007: 13–14; Rengakos 2011: 168. Pelliccia 2003: 114–15 n. 36 instructively compares ancient variants in the tradition of other authors that do not imply an ongoing performance tradition.

⁹⁰ Danek 2012b: 41–2, esp. 42: '[M.] Parry's model of a comparison between Homer and the legendary *Āor Huso* misses the mark, since the specific quality of his performance was already no longer visible after a single generation of oral transmission of the epics in the songs of his successors. Thus the model of Nagy, viz. the gradual fixation of the form of the text over several generations of purely oral transmission, can be ruled out as unlikely: Homer's text was only able to remain preserved in its outstanding quality because the succeeding singers were able to be guided by the textually fixed form. The *Mededović* model offers a better analogue here: Homer's

difference between rhapsodes and singers (ᾄδοι) must be recognized: the rhapsodes who reperformed Homeric poetry in the archaic period did not practise composition-in-performance, but operated with a clear concept of a fixed text, which they aimed to reproduce faithfully.⁹¹ Fourth, that the linguistic evolution of the extant early Greek hexameter works was arrested at a fixed point in time: most suggestive, perhaps, is the finding that for both *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and for *Theogony* and *Works and Days* the second of the pair emerges as consistently more developed across a range of linguistic features, whereas, if the texts represented ongoing performance traditions, it should not be possible thus to identify older and younger compositions among them.⁹² Fifth, and the objection most germane to this book, that the significant allusive relationships are one-way: for instance, the *Odyssey* alludes significantly to the *Iliad*, but not vice versa; and the *Works and Days* alludes significantly to the *Theogony*, but not vice versa.⁹³ This finding, too, if granted, deserves respect. If fixed texts are a precondition for specific, unidirectional allusion, so the demonstration of specific, unidirectional allusion, if it can be made, will imply the presence of fixed texts in this tradition. In short, nothing prohibits us from believing in discrete and sufficiently stable poems, some of which would be capable of alluding to others, rather than multiform 'traditions' reciprocally influencing each other throughout the archaic period.⁹⁴ That is not to say that there was never contamination between what continued to be fundamentally discrete poems; but such contamination may have been a marginal and fairly contained phenomenon, and needs to be argued on a case-to-case basis, not taken for granted.⁹⁵

text obviously only remained preserved for posterity because it was frozen in book form' (translated). Cf. A. Parry 1966: 182–3, 189–201 = 1989: 108–9, 115–26; R. L. Fowler 2004: 224; Čolaković 2006: 162–9, 179.

⁹¹ Pelliccia 2003; cf. Powell 2007: 41–2. Differently, Nagy 1990*b* (1982): 42; 1996*b*: 112–13; 2004: 79; Burgess 2005*b*: 127; Martin 2005: 167 and n. 38.

⁹² Janko 1982; 2012; 1998*a*: 12 n. 63; cf. R. L. Fowler 2004: 225; Haslam 2011: 849–50. Criticisms of Janko's method: e.g. Olson 2012: 10–15; M. L. West 2012: 227–8.

⁹³ *Odyssey* and *Iliad*: see § 2.1. *Works and Days* and *Theogony*: Pucci 1977: 140–1; Rowe 1978: 104, 110; Janko 1982: 195; Verdenius 1985: 15; Most 1993: 76–91; Blümer 2001: esp. i.93–106, ii.137–200, ii.64; Scodel 2012: 512. Differently, Clay 2003: 6, 8.

⁹⁴ Nagy 1990 (1982): 79: 'Instead of referring to a *poem* in such a context, it would be better to speak in terms of a *tradition of performing a certain kind of poem*'; Nagy 1990*a*: 53–4 n. 8. Cf. Tsagalis 2008: 63 n. 2, 110, 146, 136; also Burgess 2001: 5, 11–12; 2006*a*: 148 n. 2; 2009: 2; Dué 2002: 2–3 n. 6; Marks 2008: 12–13; Cook 2009: 137. *Contra*: Danek 2012*a*: 121: '[the Iliadic *Doloneia*] proves the case that we are entitled to discuss chronological relations between different works in archaic epic, i.e. between texts with fixed wording, and not just story traditions'. (Differently, on the *Doloneia*: Dué and Ebbott 2010: 19–20; Bierl 2012*a*: 137–8.)

⁹⁵ See § 2.1, pp. 39–40 on the question of contamination between *Odyssey* and *Iliad*. Cross-fertilization between *Aethiopis* and *Iliad*: Willcock 1973: 8–9; Cook 2009: 137. Between *Cypria* and *Iliad*: Tsagalis 2008: 110. Between *Catalogue* and *Iliad* and *Odyssey*: Ormand 2014: 119–20. In general, Scafoglio 2004*b*: 295. Note, differently, Burgess 2001: 132–71, supposing little influence of the Homeric epics on the Cyclical epics.

Nagy's evolutionary model, incompatible with specific unidirectional allusion, is nevertheless accommodating to a very differently conceived bidirectional intertextuality.⁹⁶ (This version of intertextuality has also been dubbed 'intertraditionality', since it involves interaction not between—relatively fixed—texts, but between—fluid, evolving—song-traditions.⁹⁷) This conception of early Greek epic intertextuality enjoys popularity, but is not the subject of this book.⁹⁸ It is entirely likely that our extant early hexameter texts were each preceded by several poems on the same theme, and that these poems may have interacted with others on different themes, and vice versa. But we can and should also allow in this picture for (relatively) fixed texts that became the source- and target-texts of specific unidirectional allusion. In practice, as this book will aim to show, we will often want to say of many motifs or phrases that recur in different poems that one alludes to another, rather than that each alludes equally to the other. Moreover, with two texts A and B (say, the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*) there will often be a clear direction of influence: we will want to say, not that A alludes to B approximately as many times as B alludes to A, but that, overwhelmingly, A alludes to B. It is telling that a number of scholars theoretically disposed to find bidirectional intertextuality have in practice ended up seeing one text as alluding to the other rather than vice versa.⁹⁹ Specific unidirectional allusion between relatively fixed texts on this showing emerges as the dominant form of allusion, to which bidirectional intertextuality plays a subsidiary role.

It has been doubted 'that the Homeric poems know of other "fixed" poems', 'that they consciously recall these poems by quoting specific lines'.¹⁰⁰ One response is to say that the poet of the *Iliad* (and likewise the poet of the *Odyssey*) knows his own poem as a fixed text, and recalls parts of it by quoting specific lines. This is most strikingly seen with speeches.¹⁰¹ It is not difficult to

⁹⁶ Bakker 2013: 158 n. 1 sees Nagy's evolutionary model as 'providing a climate favorable to conscious quotation'; cf. 169.

⁹⁷ Tsagalis 2014b: 396.

⁹⁸ See Pucci 1987; Nagy 1990a: 53–4 n. 8; 1998: 79–81; Tsagalis 2008. Cf. Marks 2005: 13–14; Brillet-Dubois 2011: 131–2; Barker and Christensen 2014: 250–1.

⁹⁹ Note Pucci 1987, as critiqued by Burgess 2009: 57: 'Theoretically, the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* are said to "read" one another, but in practice usually the *Odyssey* is described as reacting to the *Iliad*. This suggests a later historical date for the *Odyssey* or, in the very least, assumes a secondary status for this poem—although such conclusions are denied.' Cf. Cook 1995: 4; Ormand 2014: 119–20, and 14.

¹⁰⁰ Barker and Christensen 2008: 5. Cf. Burgess 2001: 133; Allan 2005: 14.

¹⁰¹ An impressively long-range example is *Od.* 4.333–50, reprised at 17.124–41. In general, Lohmann 1970; and cf. Young 1967: 311–13; Mueller 1984: 150, 158; 2009: 165; M. W. Edwards 1987a: 23; de Jong 1987: 179–94. Differently, Clark 1997: 160, seeing here a 'technique of composition through the repetition of a large chain of formulas'; but a 'chain of formulas' is unlikely to show the necessary stability: Hainsworth 1993: 21. Our manuscripts may distort the degree of correspondence upwards (Janko 1990: 332–3; cf. Lord 1962: 195; 1995: 213) or downwards (Eide 1999: 113–14); but the limited parameters within which this may have occurred will not affect the main point.

imagine the 'sense of text' with which the poets operate here carrying over into their engagement with other poems.¹⁰² Hesiod in the *Works and Days* seems pointedly to engage with the *Theogony*, which he evidently knows as textually fixed, and probably fixed by writing.¹⁰³ The same is likely to be true of the *Odyssey's* engagement with the *Iliad*.¹⁰⁴ The *Iliad* is often argued to draw on existing hexameter narratives that had already attained a degree of textual fixity: for instance, in the Catalogue of Ships, the Embassy to Achilles, and the Catalogue of Nereids.¹⁰⁵ Our conception of the oral-derived poetry operating in our extant early Greek hexameter texts must accommodate some recall of elements of fairly fixed texts, though not necessarily 'memorization' of fully fixed texts.¹⁰⁶

If we allow that portions of specific text could be reprised from memory, not necessarily with exact verbatim accuracy, the status of the text recalled remains unclear.¹⁰⁷ It may be understood as coming from a particular, clearly defined poem.¹⁰⁸ Or it may be understood as the property of the tradition at large, without 'belonging' to any individual poem.¹⁰⁹ The question here is partly whether there was a concept of the clearly defined poem in the early Greek hexameter tradition. Could a poem attain sufficient prominence to become a 'classic', or were all compositions evanescent?¹¹⁰ There is a related question of the level of → self-consciousness a poem could possess about its own place in tradition. A parallel question concerns the prominence of individual poets in early Greek hexameter poetry. Nagy's evolutionary model, which prefers to speak not of a 'poem', but of a 'tradition of performing a certain type of poem', sees poets not as historical authors, but

¹⁰² 'Homer's Sense of Text' is the title of Dowden 1996.

¹⁰³ *WD* 11–26 and *Th.* 223–32; Scodel 2001: 122; and cf. Most 1993: 77–80; 2006: xxi; Blümer 2001: ii.35–8 (differently, Sinclair 1932: 3; Hooker 1992: 50–1; Zarecki 2007: 11–14). Hesiod and writing: Most 1993: 82; 2006: xxi–xxii; cf. M. L. West 1981 = 2011b.

¹⁰⁴ Usener 1990: 207; Kullmann 1991: 444–5 = 1992: 120–1; 2002: 154–5 = 1995: 51–2. See § 2.1.

¹⁰⁵ Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.484–760): Scodel 2002: 72; cf. Kullmann 2002 = 1993; 2009: 17; Mueller 2009: 175; with qualifications, Danek 2004: 63–6; cf. Sammons 2010: 137–9. Embassy (⇒ *Il.* 9.182–98): cf. Hainsworth 1993: 87; D. L. Cairns 2001: 36; Mueller 2009: 9. Catalogue of Nereids (*Il.* 18.39–49): Nieto Hernández 2011; M. W. Edwards 1991: 149; cf. N. J. Richardson 1974: 287.

¹⁰⁶ Heubeck 1974: 147; Austin 1975: 20–1, 259; Austin 1991: 229–30; Dowden 1996: 59; Scodel 2002: 41; Danek 2005c: 281; Blößner 2006: 19 n. 2, 20 n. 3 (compare and contrast Lord 1991a: 80–1). A. B. Lord dealt repeatedly with improvisation, memorization, remembering, composition in performance, and (relative) fixity of text: see Lord 1960: 58–63; 1985: 337–8; 1991a: 88–9; 1991b: 185; 1995: 11, 57–8, 62, 197–200, 167–82, 212–13.

¹⁰⁷ Danek 2010a: 237 'We have seen ... how specific texts achieve an extra meaning if they are related to other "texts" ... What status did these "texts" have?'

¹⁰⁸ Cf. Dowden 1996: 59.

¹⁰⁹ Burgess 2006a: 154; 2012a: 183; cf. Burgess 2001: 154; 2009: 61. Cf. Schein 1984: 28. See § 3.8, pp. 102–3.

¹¹⁰ Burgess 2012a: 170: 'Most oral poems would not have been performed so often as to influence other poems, or be the object of allusion.'

as personifications of the ‘tradition’.¹¹¹ To what extent did authors in this tradition assert ‘proprietary rights’ in their compositions?¹¹²

A well-known passage around which such issues crystalize is *HAp* 166–73:

170 χαίρετε δ' ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι· ἐμεῖο δὲ καὶ μετόπισθε
μνήσασθ', ὅπποτε κέν τις ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων
ἐνθάδ' ἀνείρηται ξείνος ταλαπείριος ἑλθών·
ὦ κούραι, τίς δ' ὕμνιν ἀνήρ ἥδιστος αἰοιδῶν
ἐνθάδε πωλεῖται, καὶ τέω τέρπεσθε μάλιστα;
ὑμεῖς δ' εὖ μάλα πᾶσαι ὑποκρίνασθαι ἀφήμους·
τυφλὸς ἀνὴρ, οἰκεῖ δὲ Χίῳ ἐνι παιπαλοέσση·
τοῦ πᾶσαι μετόπισθεν ἀριστεύουσιν αἰοίδαί.

Farewell, all of you [maidens of Delos], and remember me also hereafter,
when someone of men upon the earth,
a weary stranger, comes here and asks,
‘O maidens, what man is the sweetest of singers in your eyes
who frequents here, and in whom do you take most pleasure?’
All of you without exception make answer without giving my name:
‘A blind man, he lives in rocky Chios;
all of his songs are the best hereafter.’

It is not possible here to enter fully into the controversies of the passage; my interpretation largely follows that of W. Burkert.¹¹³ Lines 171–3 serve to inscribe, pseudonymously, Homer’s authorship in the text; the first-person speaker of the *Hymn* identifies himself as Homer ‘anonymously’ (171 ἀφήμους), that is, by antonomasia, rather than by giving his name.¹¹⁴ The circumlocutions ‘a blind man, he lives on Chios’ (172), ‘the sweetest of singers’ (169), and ‘his songs are the best hereafter’ (173) are evidently meant as uniquely identifying descriptions of Homer. We have here an antonomastic *sphragis* of the ‘Cean nightingale’ type (Bacchylides 3.97–8). It is understood that the poet thus namelessly introduced is anything but an anonymity. We can hardly be in any

¹¹¹ Nagy 1996a: 20–2, 92–3; cf. 1990b (1982) 47–51, 79; Lamberton 1988: 1–37; J. M. Foley 1998: 149, 169; 2004: 186. Differently, Most 1993; Scodel 2002: 28–9; Pelliccia 2003: 105–9; R. L. Fowler 2004: 227 and n. 28; A. D. Morrison 2007a: 57 with n. 108, 58, 60, 61, 66–7.

¹¹² Hainsworth 1993: 36. Cf. Scodel 2002: 59–60 esp. 59: ‘It is not the case... that performers in oral epic traditions cannot see their works as intellectual property’; Dowden 1996: 48 ‘A fixed text is more visibly owned and authored, and whoever borrows it owes an acknowledgement.’

¹¹³ Burkert 1979: 53–8 = 2001: 189–93 and M. L. West 1999: 368–72 = 2011b: 414–21. Cf. Graziosi 2002: 62–6; N. J. Richardson 2010: 13, 109; Nagy 2011; Sbardella 2012a: 86–9.

¹¹⁴ On ἀφήμους, see Burkert 1979: 61 = 2001: 196; 1987: 55 = 2001: 214–15; Aloni 1989: 112; differently, Carey 1980; N. J. Richardson 2010: 110. By contrast, the author-narrator of the *Theogony* at 22–4 ‘*Ἡσίοδον... με*’ (cf. Virg. *Geo.* 4.563 *Vergilium me*) identifies himself by name (*φήμους, as it were).

doubt that the constructed speaking persona is 'Homer', self-advertising and celebrity-conscious at that.¹¹⁵ Homer's blindness, his Chian origins, and his pre-eminence as a singer must then be assumed to be established elements of his biography and reception by the time of this hymn. The emphatic inscription of Homer's authorship in the *Hymn* should be understood in terms of Chian Homerid rhapsodes' wish to be taken to be repeating the *ipsissima uerba* of Homer: the presence of Homer's first-person *sphragis* is supposed to guarantee that this is so.¹¹⁶ We are asked to believe, moreover, that this is so after a long interval of time. In 173 and 166, μετόπισθε(ν) introduces a *post euentum* prediction: what the author-narrator, 'Homer', anticipated as a future prospect is now seen to be fulfilled in the *Hymn*'s late sixth-century reperformance and reception.¹¹⁷ It does not matter that we—and evidently some ancient readers—can easily penetrate the pseudonymous fiction.¹¹⁸ What is important for our purposes is that the hymn, thus interpreted, testifies to sixth-century rhapsodes' profession faithfully to preserve the precise text of a poem that is emphatically attached to a specific author, an author so famous his name need not be mentioned.¹¹⁹ As it happens, we know that this poem, its *sphragis* section specifically, was not transmitted with complete verbatim accuracy. That is a nice irony, but one that does not fundamentally affect the point being made: we are dealing not with substantial alteration introduced during free oral recomposition-in-performance,

¹¹⁵ See Mueller 2009: 12–13, emphasizing the competitive individualism of the passage. Similar, though not anonymous or antonomastic, is the *sphragis* of the celebrity-conscious Theognis (22–3).

¹¹⁶ The Homeridai appear to have passed off as 'of Homer' several works hitherto unknown to the wider public; cf. Plat. *Phaedr.* 252b4–5 ἐκ τῶν ἀποθέτων ἐπῶν, with Yunis 2011: 155: 'ἀπόθετος refers to items that are unknown to the public because they are held in reserve or secret'. Many such works may in fact have been composed by the Homeridai themselves; cf. Σ Pind. N.2.1c.

¹¹⁷ The *post euentum* prediction at the end of the 'Delian' section of the hymn balances the *post euentum* prophecy at the end of the 'Pythian' section, *HAp* 540–3. (On the unity of *HAp*, see N. J. Richardson 2010: 10–13; Faulkner 2011: 12; differently, Chappell 2011.)

¹¹⁸ Σ Pind. N.2.1c; Athen. 1.22b (Thucydides, 3.104.5, perhaps believed the fiction.)

¹¹⁹ My interpretation follows M. L. West 1999: 370 = 2011b: 417: 'Evidently he claimed to be reciting *verbatim* a hymn composed by Homer many generations earlier... After all, whenever a rhapsode recited Hesiod's *Theogony* or *Works and Days*, the audience must have understood and accepted that the references to "I" and "me" meant the original author, Hesiod, and not the rhapsode who was uttering the words.' Compare and contrast Janko 1982: 115: 'The pious fraud is at once comprehensible, indeed familiar, in an oral tradition, where poets may claim to be singing the song of a great predecessor, while altering that predecessor's song substantially during free oral recomposition-in-performance.' West's scenario of verbatim recitation by a rhapsode differs from Janko's scenario of free oral recomposition-in-performance by a poet-singer. For the situation alluded to by Janko, cf. Finnegan 1977: 53: 'a Somali reciter often makes it clear to his audiences that the poem he is delivering was composed not by himself but by another named poet'; J. M. Foley 1999: 51–2: '[the *Guslar* / "Isak" / "Hasan Čoso's"] songs were regarded by the Stolac *guslari* as the finest that had come down to them... [T]hey were unanimous in crediting the *Guslar* as the ultimate source for the best songs they knew.'

but with minor alteration introduced in the context of the concerted attempt to reproduce a fixed (and, in this case, written) text.¹²⁰

HAp 166–73, on this interpretation, presupposes the conception of a fixed text as the intellectual property in the first instance of an individual author, Homer, and subsequently as the carefully safeguarded property of associations of his self-styled heirs, the Homeridai. This situation with Homer and Homeridai appears to replicate itself with Kreophylos and Kreophyleioi, and Hesiod and Hesiodeioi.¹²¹ We would, of course, love to know how far back in the tradition such a conception of authorship goes.¹²² The Hesiodic poems give a strong sense of an author asserting ‘proprietary rights’ in his compositions.¹²³ Hesiod’s authorship is declared in the proem of the *Theogony* (lines 22–34, especially 22–4), a passage protected from suspicion of interpolation by the cross reference at *WD* 658–9 (unless we are willing to condemn both passages as un-Hesiodic). This situation generates a whole series of controversy-laden questions: how critical is writing for the creation of the concept of the poem and of the poet?¹²⁴ What level of concern for oral fixed texts preceded the creation of written fixed texts?¹²⁵ Was the impulse to create written texts intrinsic or extrinsic to the poetic tradition?¹²⁶ In other words, does the textualization of these poems reveal something essential to this tradition or something

¹²⁰ Rhapsodes, as learned and bookish (Xen. *Mem.* 4.2.10, *Symp.* 3.5–6), must be accorded a different level and conception of verbatim accuracy than the South Slavic singers discussed by Lord 1960: 27–8 and A. Parry 1966: 187–8 = 1989: 113–14. See esp. Pelliccia 2003: 103. On the textual variation introduced by rhapsodes (→ rhapsodic variation), see M. L. West 2001a: 15 and n. 35. The situation with ⇒ *HHerm* 1–9 and *HHom* 18.1–9 is similar.

¹²¹ In general, see Burkert 1972: 79–80 = 2001: 143–4 (differently, Nagy 1990b (1982): 51; Graziosi 2002: 201–34; Scodel 2002: 57–60; R. L. Fowler 2004: 227 n. 28. Homeridai: M. L. West 1999 = 2011b: 2001a: 15–17; Graziosi 2002: 208–17; Andersen 2011. Kreophyleioi: Burkert 1972: 77–8 = 2001: 141–2. Hesiodeioi: Beaulieu 2004: 112–13; Currie 2007: 190 n. 150; differently, Cingano 2009: 98; Nagy 2009: 307. For the interpretation of the inscription from Thespieae, *IG* VII.1785 (= Roesch 1982: 127 no. 7 = Most 2006: 234 T104), the comparison with *IG* VII.1790 (= Roesch 1982: 126 no. 6) is decisive.

¹²² Burkert 1972: 79 = 2001: 143, on the antiquity of Homeridai and Kreophyleioi. M. L. West 1999: 364 = 2011b: 408 considers that ‘[interest in the identity or the person of the author or authors of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*] only arose in the last decades of the sixth century’.

¹²³ Differently, Nagy 1990b (1982) 47–51, 79; Lamberton 1988: 1–37.

¹²⁴ Cf. Most 1993; 2006: xxi–xxii, on Hesiod and the Hesiodic poems.

¹²⁵ Mueller 2009: 176: ‘the concept of a fixed text does not depend on writing’; Tsagalis 2011: 235 and n. 86, esp. 238–9.

¹²⁶ Lord 1960: 152: ‘I feel sure that the impetus to write down the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* did not come from Homer himself but from some outside source’; Lord 1953: 130; 1962: 197; Jensen 1980: 92–3; 2000: 61; J. M. Foley 2005a: 209; 2011b: 604. Differently, Goody 1987: 93: ‘the text we possess was written down by insiders ... It is only recently, in general, that outsiders (as distinct from insiders) came and recorded oral forms, as Parry and Lord did in Yugoslavia’; cf. A. Parry 1989: 111 = 1966: 185; Austin 1975: 22–3, 259–60 n. 28; Garvie 1994: 17; Bakker 1997: 20. Contrast here the ‘analogy of modern-day oral epic’ adduced by J. M. Foley 2005a: 209 with the ancient Greek analogues (Hesiod, the lyric poets, Herodotus) adduced by R. L. Fowler 2004: 224–6.