Literary Criticism in the Exegetical Scholia to the Iliad: A Sketch
Author(s): N. J. Richardson
Source: *The Classical Quarterly*, Vol. 30, No. 2 (1980), pp. 265–287
Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of The Classical Association
Stable URL: https://www.jstor.org/stable/638496
Accessed: 26-11-2018 07:09 UTC

LITERARY CRITICISM IN THE EXEGETICAL SCHOLIA TO THE *ILIAD*: A SKETCH

The Homeric Scholia are not the most obvious source for literary criticism in the modern sense. And yet if one takes the trouble to read through them one will find many valuable observations about poetic technique and poetic qualities. Nowadays we tend to emphasize different aspects from those which preoccupied ancient critics, but that may be a good reason for looking again at what they have to say.[1]

The contribution of the Alexandrian scholars has often been discussed, and I do not propose to deal with this here directly. In the course of establishing the text of Homer Aristarchus in particular recognized and made use of several important observations about Homeric technique. The Venetus A Scholia give us much of our information about Aristarchus' views. But the other main Scholia, in Venetus B, the Towneleian manuscript, and other related manuscripts, have much more to say about poetic and rhetorical aspects. The question of the sources of all this material is a very complex one, and except in the occasional cases where a particular scholar's name is quoted, it is usually impossible to say from what precise period or school of thought an observation derives. The principles of literary criticism laid down by Aristotle in the *Poetics* have clearly had a considerable influence, and so has the work of the Alexandrians (although these Scholia sometimes defend a passage which Aristarchus condemned). On these foundations has been built the work of many other scholars. But it seems likely that the majority of the exegetical Scholia (as they are sometimes called) derive from scholars at the end of the Hellenistic and the beginning of the Roman period, who were consolidating the work of earlier critics. They contain some later material, notably extracts from the work on Homeric problems by Porphyry, inserted into the B Scholia in the eleventh century. But in general they seem to reflect the critical terminology and views of the first century BC and first two centuries AD.[2] These have their limitations, and one may feel that the vocabulary of critical terms which the Scholia use lacks flexibility and at times verges on the naïve: but within their limits they nevertheless show a lively appreciation of some fundamental aspects of Homer's art.[3]

---

[1] I owe much to the suggestions and comments of Jasper Griffin, Doreen Innes and Colin Macleod. It will be obvious that I am dealing with a vast and complex subject in an impressionistic way, but I hope to suggest that it deserves more attention than it has received.

[2] Cf. K. Latte, *Philologus* 80 (1925), 171 (= *Kl. Schr.* 662), H. Erbse, *Beiträge zur Überlieferung der Iliasscholien* (Munich, 1960), pp. 171–3, G. Lehnert, *De Scholiis ad Homerum rhetoricis* (Diss. Freiburg–Leipzig, 1896), p. 69.

[3] On sources and transmission see Erbse op. cit., the preface to his edition of the

Scholia, and M. Van der Valk, *Researches on the Text and Scholia of the Iliad* (Leiden, 1963), I. pp. 414 ff. The most useful study of literary criticism in the Scholia is by M. L. Von Franz, *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen der Iliasscholien* (Diss. Zurich, 1943). See also A. Roemer, *Die exegetischen Scholien der Ilias in Codex Venetus B* (Munich, 1879), R. Griesinger, *Die ästhetischen Anschauungen der alten Homererklärer* (Diss. Tübingen, 1907), A. Clausing, *Kritik und Exegese der hom. Gleichnisse im Altertum* (Diss. Freiburg), Lehnert, op. cit., and M. Schmidt, *Die Erklärungen zum Weltbild Homers*

N. J. RICHARDSON

I. Μῦθος

In view of the ultimate derivation of much of the literary criticism in the Scholia
from Aristotelian principles it is reasonable to begin an analysis with plot, and
then go on to consider characterization and style. *Scale* and *unity* are the most
important aspects of composition. The Scholia occasionally refer to the length of
the poem as a fundamental epic feature, but they tend to take this for granted.
The central part of the poem (from Book 12 onwards), which for us can seem
the most tedious, is long because of the complexity of the fighting and the
impossibility of narrating separate events simultaneously (ABT 12.1; cf. BT
15.390). At the beginning of Book 13 one expects Achilles to return to the
battle, as the wall has been breached. But the poet 'creates length and variety
by the inactivity of Zeus' (BT 13.1). The principle of *variety* (ποικιλία) is an
essential corollary of size, and this is very frequently invoked. The poet moves
from one type of scene to another in such a way that our attention is not
wearied. This is often a reason for introducing a scene in heaven. Thus, for
instance, the gods' council in *Il.* 4.1 ff. gives 'dignity and variety' to the nar-
rative (BT 4.1). Equally, the gods' interest and interventions in the fighting
make it more dramatic, and relieve the monotony (BT 7.17). The narrative of
similar events is constantly varied, especially in the case of the battle scenes,
where single combats and wounds are never allowed to become a monotonous
catalogue. Thus 'one should admire Homer's ability to describe similar events
without appearing to do so', as when Patroclus cuts off the Trojans from the
city, just as Achilles does later (BT 16.394-5, cf. 21.3 ff.). Again, 'observe how
often he refers to Patroclus' death, without becoming monotonous' (BT 16.689).
Porphyry actually mentions that Homer was criticized for his repetition of
scenes and speeches, and defends him against this (B 18.309 = *Quaestiones
Homericae* I, ed. Sodano, No. 20). The sequence of battles in the poem as a
whole also displays this variety: 'after describing every type of battle, in the
plain, around the wall, and at the ships, he invented a new kind in Achilles'
combat at the river', and as the barbarians alone are no match for Achilles and
he does not want an anticlimax, 'he introduces the Theomachy and the battle
with the river, taking as a plausible pretext the choking of the river with the
dead' (B 21.1 = T 21.18). The poet is essentially φιλοποίκιλος (BT 13.219)
and hence he also likes to contradict our expectations, thereby increasing the
dramatic effect (BT 7.29, 13.219, 14.153, 18.151, 22.274).[4]

Related to the principle of variety is that of *relief*. The tension of dramatic
scenes and the sustained narrative of battle require interludes of a quieter

*und zur Kultur der Heroenzeit in den bT-
Scholien zur Ilias* (Munich, 1976), pp.
39 ff., who rightly criticizes Von Franz and
Lehnert for excessive emphasis on Stoic
origins. The Index to the Scholia by J. Baar
(Baden-Baden, 1961) is useful, and should
be consulted for full references to critical
terms. My own references are not intended
to be complete. I have taken most of my
examples from the B and T Scholia, with
some glances at A where relevant. I have not
on the whole added illustrations from the
other Scholia such as G. For further infor-

mation on technical terms of rhetorical
theory see H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der
literarischen Rhetorik* (Munich, 1960).

[4] For ποικιλία cf. also BT 5.70, 143,
523, 6.37, ABT 6.371, B 8.5 (Porphyry),
T 10.158, BT 11.104, T 11.378, 498, BT
11.722-5, T 12.129, BT 13.1, 219, 340-2,
408, 14.1, 147, 153, 476-7, T 15.333, BT
15.390, 16.320, 339, 345, 593, 17.306-7,
600, 18.1, A 18.314, ABT 20.372, BT
20.383, T 20.397, BT 20.463, T 20.473,
BT 21.34, 24.266.

nature. In particular, a gap in time in the main narrative is 'filled up' by another scene, which also provides a rest from the action. Thus, in Book I Thetis leaves Achilles, promising to visit Zeus on the twelfth day, and in the middle of the verse (430) the poet turns to Odysseus' journey to Chrysa to return Chryseis to her father. By this judicious alternation of the two strands in the narrative he gives relief to his audience from monotony (BT 1.430). This interweaving of strands is a fundamental feature of Homer's art.[5]

Another good example of relief is the mission of Hector to Troy in 6.116 ff. The scenes in Troy offer a welcome contrast to the battle (Eustathius 650.7 ff.), and the narrative gap caused by the journey of Hector is also filled by the meeting of Glaucus and Diomedes, which itself brings relief (BT 6.119, 237). Eustathius points to the dramatic qualities of Hector's meetings with his family and with Paris and Helen, thereby answering the criticism that he should not be removed from the fighting at such a crisis (cf. BT 6.116, Jachmann, *Homerische Einzellieder*, pp. 1 ff.). Likewise in Book 14 the deception of Zeus gives new life to the narrative after the long scenes of battle (BT 14.153). Changes of scene become more frequent when a crisis approaches, as for instance in the battle at the ships (BT 15.390). This, however, is seen as a way of building up tension rather than relieving it.

The corollary to this alternation of narrative strands is the well-known principle governing the narration of *simultaneous events*, whereby in describing a complex scene the poet relates these events successively, and never goes back in time in his main narrative. The Scholia are well aware of this, as we have seen (BT 12.1).[6] Aristotle had already made the basic observation about the freedom of epic in contrast to tragedy to build up a detailed picture of several events occurring together. This is one of the ways by which its scale is increased (*Poet.* 1459[b] 22 ff.).

The other main factor contributing to length is the introduction of *episodes* which are subsidiary to the main plot. Again, the Scholia follow Aristotle's lead here (*Poet.* 1459[a] 30 ff.). Homer's unity consists in his taking a single theme for his narrative, and drawing in other events wherever appropriate (AT 1.1, B 2. 494, A 3.237, T 11.625). One can link this with another important observation about the way in which individual stories are related, that he states the main facts first and then goes back to causes and other related circumstances (BT 11.671, Porphyry *ap.* B 12.127). In one case (12.127 ff.) this helps to explain what at first sight is a very confused order of narrative (see Leaf's note on 131, although he does not agree with Porphyry). Equally, the poet will often give a summary of what he is about to relate before going on to the detailed narrative (e.g. BT 11.90–3; 15.56 ff. which Aristarchus athetized); and he also briefly recapitulates before moving on to a new scene (BT 9.1, 16.1).

These devices help to bind the story together, and they introduce two other very important principles, those of *anticipation* and *foreshadowing*. This is related to the whole question of οἰκονομία, i.e. the unified organization of a

---

[5] Cf. BT 4.539, 5.693, 7.17, 328, 8.209, T 11.599, BT 11.619, T. 13.20, 168, BT 14.1, 14.114, 15.362 (similes), 405, 16.431, 666, 793, 17.426, 18.148, 22.147.

[6] Cf. also ABT 10.299, T 12.199, A

14.1, BT 22.131, T 22.437. Modern scholars have made great capital out of this simple principle. Cf. T. Zieliński, *Philologus Suppl.* 8 (1899–1901), 407 ff., D. Page, *The Homeric Odyssey* (Oxford, 1955), pp. 65 ff., 77 n. 11, etc.

complex work. In modern terms, one might say that the *Iliad* as we have it is the product of long and careful premeditation, and the poet has the whole structure in mind from the beginning, just as we are told that Mozart could have a whole symphony in his mind from the start. The main plot moves forward with stately leisure, but the poet is always sowing the seeds of future events. This constant build-up of expectation helps to create the suspense and excitement which carry us forward to the climax of the work. The various battle-scenes which constitute the bulk of the poem are carefully ordered so as to form a progression towards the climactic scenes of Achilles' intervention, culminating in the fight with Hector. Thereafter the poem moves towards a close which is dramatically quiet but charged with emotion, like the ending of a tragedy. Thus episodes which may at first seem irrelevant to the main structure of the work are in fact architectonic elements contributing to the effect of the whole.

   This is an elaboration of the Aristotelian view which the Scholia follow, and they do not put it so explicitly. But they do assume that the poet has a clear idea from the beginning of the direction in which his narrative is moving. It is particularly illuminating to see how they comment on the role of Patroclus in the poem. He is first mentioned at 1.307, when Achilles returns with him and his companions to their tents after the quarrel. Here they note that his introduction at this early point in the narrative already prepares the way for his later intervention to plead with Achilles to return to the battle. Again the fact that Achilles entrusts Briseis to him (337) indicates their closeness, and his silence here (345) is picked up in the Embassy by the way he remains in the background, which suggests his gentleness (BT 1.307, 337, 345). The Scholia compare his healing of Eurypylus, his distress at the Greek misfortunes, and the description of him as 'gentle' by Menelaus (17.670). When we come to the series of events leading up to Patroclus' intervention, they are fully aware of the careful way in which this is prepared. The wounding of the heroes in Book 11 leads to the Greek rout and battle by the ships (BT 11.318, 407, 598).[7] Machaon goes back to the ships in his chariot when wounded, and so passes Achilles' view rapidly: Achilles therefore sends Patroclus to find out what has happened (BT 11.512; cf. ABT 11.604). Achilles has been watching the battle from his ship, clearly longing for the moment when he can return (BT 11.600). Patroclus goes to Nestor, and this ensures that Nestor's eloquence will succeed where the Embassy had failed (AB 11.611). Nestor's long story is designed οἰκονομικῶς, i.e. as part of the poet's plan, because this gives time for Eurypylus to return and meet Patroclus. This delays Patroclus and allows the poet to introduce the battle at the wall which follows (BT 11.677–8, 809). Patroclus is respectful (αἰδήμων), and so he listens politely, in spite of the urgency of the situation. The wounding of Machaon has removed the doctor who could have treated Eurypylus, and so Patroclus does so instead (T 11.833; cf. also BT 11. 813). His kindness leads him to stay with Eurypylus after treating him (BT 12.1).

---

   [7] Cf. especially BT 11.598: τοὺς πλείους τῶν ἀριστέων τρώσας πλὴν Αἴαντος τοῦ Τελαμωνίου ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀπέστειλεν, Ἀγαμέμνονα Διομήδην Ὀδυσσέα Μαχάονα Εὐρύπυλον καὶ τὸν Τεῦκρον ἑξῆς, ἵνα εὔλογον τοῖς Ἀχαιοῖς τῆς ἥττης παρασχῇ αἰτίαν. εἶτα τούτους ἐπὶ τὰς ναῦς ἀπαγαγὼν εἰς ἔπαινον Αἴαντος τὰ λοιπὰ καταναλίσκει ἕως τῆς Πατρόκλου ἐξόδου· καὶ τὸν Πάτροκλον ἀνελὼν ἐπὶ τὸν Αἴαντα ἐπανέρχεται μεχρὶ τῆς ἐξόδου Ἀχιλλέως· καὶ τοῦτον ἐπὶ τὴν μάχην προαγαγὼν εἰς τὰ ἀνδραγαθήματα αὐτοῦ τὴν Ἰλιάδα τελειοῖ.

Finally, we return to Patroclus and Eurypylus at 15.390, when the intervening great battle has made the Greek plight far more desperate and Patroclus' sympathy for them all the greater (BT 15.390 and 12.1). Later, after Patroclus' death, Hector drags his body in order to cut off his head and give the corpse to the dogs (17.125-7). This barbaric intention is often overlooked, but the Scholia observe that it helps to justify Achilles' mistreatment of Hector's body (BT 17.126-7). Whether or not Achilles is justified the motif surely does look forward to his retaliation.[8]

Thus, we can see that (unlike some modern critics) the Scholia are aware of the large-scale architecture of the poem. On a smaller scale, they are quick to pick up points of detail which anticipate what is to come in a subtle and un-obtrusive way: for instance, when at 5.662 Tlepolemus wounds Sarpedon, but 'his father (Zeus) *still* protected him from destruction' (BT); or when, after the Embassy, Diomedes says that the Greeks should fight next day, 'and Agamemnon himself among the foremost', which neatly anticipates his *aristeia* in Book 11 (A 9.709).[9]

Not only does the poet anticipate events later in the poem: he also looks forward to what is to come afterwards, the death of Achilles, the fall of Troy, and also some of the events in the *Odyssey*. The foreshadowing of Troy's fall helps to make the poem an *Iliad*, as do the references to earlier events in the war.[10] Their comment at 24.85-6 is particularly fine (BT): ἐπειδὴ μέλλει καταστρέφειν τὸν λόγον εἰς τὰς Ἕκτορος ταφάς, προλαβεῖν τι ἐπιχειρεῖ τῶν ἑξῆς καὶ τὸ κέντρον ἐγκαταλιπεῖν, ὡς ὁ κωμικός φησι, τοῖς ἀκροωμένοις, ὥστε ποθῆσαί τι καὶ περὶ τῆς Ἀχιλλέως ἀναιρέσεως ἀκοῦσαι καὶ ἐννοεῖν παρ' ἑαυτοῖς, οἷος ἂν ἐγένετο ὁ ποιητὴς διατιθέμενος ταῦτα.

Anticipation of what is to come sustains the audience's interest, and the poet aims throughout to arouse his audience and keep them in a state of expectation or *suspense*. At the opening of his poem τραγῳδίαις τραγικὸν ἐξεῦρε προοίμιον· καὶ γὰρ προσεκτικοὺς ἡμᾶς ἡ τῶν ἀτυχημάτων διήγησις ἐργάζεται . . . (AT 1.1). The statement of the theme of the poem and summary of its tragic consequences are a model for the *prooemium* of a work, arousing the expectations of the audience by the solemn grandeur of the subject (cf. Quint. 10.1.48). Likewise the invocation of the Muses calls attention to the importance of what is to follow, as well as inviting the audience to be less critical of the poet's own

[8] Cf. also BT 7.79, 13.831, 18.176-80, Eust. 1098.29 ff., 1136.17 ff., 1136.53 ff., and J. M. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad* (Chicago, 1975), p. 169.

[9] For other references to οἰκονομία and anticipation (προσυνιστάναι, προοικονο-μεῖν, προαναφώνησις, πρόληψις, etc.) cf. T 1.45, 213, BT 1.242, 247, BT 2.39, 272, 362, 375-7, 416, A 2.718, B 2.761, B 2.787, 872, BT 3.261, AB 3.363, BT 4.2, 421, 5.116, T 5.348, BT 5.543-4, 6.116, 490-1, 516, 7.125, 274, T 10.274, 276, 332, AB 11.17, BT 11.45, T 11.798, BT 12.37, 113, 116, T 12.228, 13.241, 521, BT 14.217, 15.56, T 15.64, BT 15.258, ABT 15.377, BT 15.556, 594, 610, 16. 46, 71, 145, 752-3, 17.215-16, 236, T 17.351, BT 17.695, A 18.215-16, BT

18.312, 372, 395, T 18.418, A 18.483, T 20.7, 21.515, 22.5, 22.385, BT 23.62-3, A 23.616, etc. Cf. also Schol. G *Il*. 2.36, 5.674, 10.336, 16.71, and G. E Duckworth, 'Προαναφώνησις in the Scholia to Homer', *AJP* 52 (1931), 320 ff. As he points out, anticipation (προοικονομία) is really distinct from explicit foreshadowing (προαναφώ-νησις), although they are often confused in the Scholia.

[10] Death of Achilles: BT 1.352, 505, 18.88-9, 458. Fall of Troy and other later events: AT 2.278, BT 6.438, ABT 6.448, BT 12.13-15, T 13.156, BT 13. 411, BT 15.56, 21.376, ABT 22.61-2, G 12.10. *Odyssey*: T 2.260, ABT 4.354, T 5.561, T 10.247, 252, 260, 12.16, BT 24.804.

defects (AB 2.484; cf. BT 11.218, 14.508, 16.112, etc., Quint. loc. cit.). The introduction of Paris at the very opening of the fighting, challenging the Greeks, 'arouses the listener, as the cause of most dangers to others is himself the first to take the risk' (BT 3.16). After the truce in Book 7 Zeus thunders all night, planning trouble for the Greeks: thus προκινεῖ καὶ ἀγωνιᾶν ποιεῖ τὸν ἀκροατὴν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐσομένοις ὁ ποιητής (BT 7.479).[11]

Creation of suspense is related to the poet's tendency to bring the action to a point of crisis and then provide a resolution. Aristotle had already observed this in connection with Agamemnon's testing of the army in Book 2 (fr. 142; cf. Porphyry ap. Schol. B 2.73). In Book 8 Nestor is nearly caught by Hector when the Greeks are routed and one of his horses is wounded. Here the Scholia very observantly comment on the poet's use of language, which by calling Nestor 'the old man', and bringing up 'the fierce Hector', puts the listener in suspense (ἐν ἀγωνίᾳ). The use of the imperfect ἀπέταμνε and present participle ἀΐσσων, describing Nestor's desperate efforts to cut the horse free, brilliantly illustrate the weakness and slowness of the old man (ABT 8.87). This fondness for cliff-hanging situations is noted again at 8.217 (BT) when 'Hector would have burnt the ships, if Hera had not inspired Agamemnon . . .'. The same applies to the crisis in Book 11 when Odysseus is isolated by the Greek retreat and debates whether to stand or flee (T 11.401, BT 412–13).[12]

Such crises often require the intervention of a god to resolve them, anticipating the later *deus ex machina* resolutions of Greek tragedy. This applies to the scene in Book 2, where the army rushes for the ships and Athene has to intervene: here the Scholia comment on Homer's invention of the μηχαναί used in tragedy (BT 2.156). Athene's intervention in the quarrel in Book I is a similar case: εἴωθε δὲ εἰς τοσοῦτον ἄγειν τὰς περιπετείας, ὡς μὴ δύνασθαι παῦσαι ἄνθρωπον αὐτάς (BT 1.195; cf. 3.380).

It will be clear by now that the Scholia follow closely the lead of Plato and of Aristotle in regarding Homer as the 'first of the tragedians'.[13] Not only was he the inventor of μηχαναί and περιπέτειαι:[14] he was also the first to use κωφὰ πρόσωπα (the silent heralds at 1.332: ABT) and children (BT 6.468). The idea of Homer as a tragedian underlies much of the language used by the Scholia, especially when they are discussing vividly dramatic scenes and those which arouse emotion (πάθος, οἶκτος, ἔλεος, etc.). τραγῳδεῖν and ἐκτραγῳδεῖν are commonly used, although they often mean little more than 'to represent dramatically'.[15] When Agamemnon is compared to Zeus, this is an example of idealization, as in tragedy (ABT 2.478). In the description of Hephaestus at work in Book 18, δαιμονίως τὸν πλάστην αὐτὸς διέπλασεν, ὥσπερ ἐπὶ τῆς σκηνῆς ἐκκυκλήσας καὶ δείξας ἡμῖν ἐν φανερῷ τὸ ἐργαστήριον (BT 18.476). The moving and graphic

---

[11] Cf. BT 8.62, T 8.470, BT 10.38, 11.604, 711, 12.116, 297, 330, T 14.392, BT 15.594, 610, 16.46, 431, AB 20.443, BT 22.274, T 23.378, 383.

[12] Cf. T 11.507, BT 12.52, T 14.424, K. Reinhardt, *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*, pp. 107 ff., discusses Homer's fondness for such situations.

[13] Cf. A.Trendelenburg, *Grammaticorum graecorum de arte tragica iudiciorum reliquiae* (Bonn, 1867), pp. 70–85, L. Adam,

Die aristotelische Theorie vom Epos . . . (Wiesbaden, 1889), pp. 30 ff.

[14] For περιπέτεια cf. also AB 2.484, BT 10.271, 11.464, 23.65, and esp. BT 21.34 πρῶτος οὖν τὸ τῶν περιπετειῶν εἶδος ἔδειξε, ποικίλον ὂν καὶ θεατρικὸν καὶ κινητικόν.

[15] e.g. ABT 2.73, BT 2.144, T 7.424, ABT 8.428–9, T 13.241, BT 17.209 (τραγῳδίαν ἔχει), 20.25.

portrait of Briseis in Book 19 shows her with a 'chorus' of captive women, of whom she is the leader (BT 19.282). Achilles' pursuit of Hector is prolonged, ἵνα ὥσπερ ἐν θεάτρῳ νῦν μείζονα κινήσῃ πάθη (A 22.201). On the other hand, when Agamemnon with a harsh and shocking speech persuades Menelaus not to spare Adrastus, they comment that such things as this killing are not shown on the stage in tragedy (BT 6.58). The rapidity of the announcement to Achilles by Antilochus of Patroclus' death also contrasts with the leisurely messenger speeches of tragedy (BT 18.20).[16]

Poetic invention obeys its own laws, as Aristotle had observed, and the Scholia are aware of this. They defend *poetic freedom* to 'follow the myths' however shocking or odd these may seem later. Thus, for instance, on the gods: ὅταν εἰς τὴν ἀξίαν ἀτενίσῃ τῶν θεῶν, τότε φησὶν αὐτοὺς μὴ κινεῖσθαι περὶ θνητῶν, ὡς οὐδὲ ἂν ἡμεῖς περὶ μυρμήκων · ὅταν δὲ ἐπιλογίσηται τὴν ποιητικήν, ἕπεται τοῖς μύθοις καὶ τὴν ὑπόθεσιν ἐκτραγῳδεῖ, συμμαχίας καὶ θεομαχίας παράγων (ABT 8.428-9; cf. BT 14.176, A 18.63). At *Il.* 19.108, on the problem of why Hera insists on Zeus swearing an oath when his word alone should suffice, they cite Aristotle (fr. 163 = Schol. A) for the view that within the framework of the story about the birth of Heracles it is natural for Hera to ask Zeus for an oath, as she wishes to be absolutely sure of the outcome. At *Il.* 14.342-4 they distinguish three forms of poetic narrative, realistic, imaginatively convincing, and fantastic (ὁ μιμητικὸς τοῦ ἀληθοῦς, ὁ κατὰ φαντασίαν τῆς ἀληθείας, and ὁ καθ᾽ ὑπέρθεσιν τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ φαντασίας). The third includes such details as golden clouds in heaven, as well as the Cyclopes and Laestrygonians (BT). [17]

Alternatively, the poet may reflect customs of his own time (B 3.291, ABT 8.284, B 10.153 quoting Aristotle fr. 160; cf. *Poet.* 1461ᵃ 1 ff.). This explains Achilles' dragging of Hector's corpse, a Thessalian practice (A 22.397 and B 24.15 quoting Aristotle fr. 166). They also quote Aristarchus' common-sense view that some things are due simply to chance inspiration (κατ᾽ ἐπιφοράν) and one should not look for ulterior reasons for them: for instance the fact that the Catalogue of Ships begins with Boeotia (AB 2.494), that Hector foresees Andromache carrying water for the Greeks in captivity, which led later poets to show her actually doing this (A 6.457), and that Sleep is found in Lemnos by Hera (ABT 14.231). Aristarchus had also formulated the important idea of τὸ σιωπώμενον (or κατὰ συμπέρασμα), whereby the poet takes many things for granted or refers to them in passing, and one should not question them. Thus he mentions washing before a meal but not after, Athene gives her spear to Telemachus and never takes it back (*Od.* 1.126 ff.), and so on (BT *Il.* 1.449).[18] He does not aim to give a fully-documented historical narrative, διδοὺς τοῖς ἀκροαταῖς καθ᾽ ἑαυτοὺς λογίζεσθαι τὰ ἀκόλουθα (BT 1.449).[19] A corollary to this is the rhetorical technique for giving grandeur to a theme κατὰ συλλογισμόν, whereby an oblique reference leaves us to infer its size or importance, as when Zeus' nod alone makes Olympus tremble (T 1.530), or Achilles' spear cannot be brandished by another hero (BT 16.141-2).[20]

---

[16] See also p. 281 on 17.695 ff. and *Od.* 11.563.

[17] Cf. also Quint. 2.4.2, for this division of types of narrative. Criticism of Homer's fantasies was of course common (cf. 'Longinus' 9.14, etc.).

[18] Cf. A 2.553, ABT 5.127, A 5.231, 6.114, 11.506, 12.211, AT 16.432, ABT 16.666, ABT 17.24, A 18.356.

[19] Cf. Demetrius, *On Style*, 222 (quoting Theophrastus).

[20] Cf. BT 5.744, 13.127, 343, 15.414,

Such observations show a proper awareness of the distinctions between fictional and factual narrative, and they formed the conventional armoury for dealing with criticisms of the poet. They can be linked with the general rhetorical principle of πιθανότης, the need for the narrative to be credible even where the poet is describing the extraordinary or miraculous. The role of the gods often serves this purpose: the speed of the assembly of the Greek army is ascribed to Athene's assistance (BT 2.446); the killing of the chimaera is due to divine aid (BT 6.183 τὸ ἄπιστον ἰάσατο), and so on.[21] But credibility is more often achieved by qualities which one would class under style, and can be considered more closely in that context.

II Ἦθος

Turning to characterization, we find that the Scholia are constantly aware of Homer's subtlety in this respect. They frequently comment on the way in which *speeches* reveal character, or observe that a particular thing is spoken or done ἠθικῶς. Thus at 1.348 διὰ μιᾶς λέξεως (i.e. ἀέκουσα) ὁλόκληρον ἡμῖν ἦθος προσώπου (of Briseis) δεδήλωκεν (BT).[22] Different types of character speak in different ways: Hera's speeches are typical of a woman scorned (ABT 1.542, BT 1.553, 557; cf. BT 4.20, ABT 4.53, BT 8.199, 201, 204); the speech of Andromache after Hector's death is in perfect imitation of a woman's character (BT 22.477, 487), and Hecuba's virulent words about eating Achilles' liver are suitable to an old woman whose son has been killed and insulted after death (BT 24.212). Again, when she begs Hector to drink wine and rest at 6.260 this is typical of a mother (BT). They are quick to observe points of characterization of the individual heroes. Patroclus' gentleness has already been noted (cf. also BT 11.616, 670, 677-8, 814, 12.1, 19.297). The poet's sympathy for him is shown by his use of *apostrophe*, addressing him in the vocative (BT 16.692-3, 787; cf. Eustathius 1086.49). He uses the same device for Menelaus: προσπέπονθε δὲ Μενελάῳ ὁ ποιητής (BT 4.127; cf. 146, 7.104, T 13.603). The Scholia regard him as a moderate and gentle character (BT 6.51, 62), who evokes the sympathy of his companions (BT 4.154, 207, 5.565, 7.122). He is called a 'soft fighter' (17.588), but this is said by an enemy and is not the poet's own view (ABT). His φιλοτιμία is displayed in his dispute with Antilochus after the chariot-race (BT 23.566).[23] Paris is contrasted with him, as cowardly, effeminate, and disliked by his own people (BT 3.19, AB 3.371, Porphyry *ap.* B 3.441 quoting Aristotle, fr. 150, BT 4.207, 5.565, 6.509, etc.). Agamemnon is also contrasted, as noble and commanding, but arrogant and brutal: the Scholia reflect attempts to defend him from criticism, as he is the Greek leader and so ought to be a model of kingship, but they cannot whitewash him entirely

24.163, Quintilian 8.4.21 ff. Homer's praise of Nestor's honey-sweet eloquence also subtly implies his own poetic charm, κατὰ συλλογισμόν (AB 1.249)! Cf. BT 6.357-8.

[21] Cf. T 10.482, A 18.217, 230.
[22] Cf. ABT 8.85-7 (Nestor's physical weakness shown in action), and *Vita Sophoclis* § 21 for a similar comment on

Sophocles. Homer and the tragedians seldom waste words on 'character sketches'. They know how to convey character in action and speech.
[23] That *apostrophe* is a sign of sympathy was argued independently by Adam Parry in his sensitive analysis of the characters of Patroclus and Menelaus (*HSCP* 76 (1972), 9 ff.).

(cf. especially BT 1.225, and T 1.32, ABT 2.478, BT 6.58, 62). His defeatist speeches to the army, suggesting return home, are interpreted as having a covert intention which is the opposite of their apparent one (Porphyry *ap.* B 2.73, BT 2.110 ff., 9.11, 14.75).[24] This may be true of 2.110 ff., but fails to convince us that Agamemnon is not being portrayed as a weak and vacillating leader later.

Odysseus is a complex character who had always aroused much debate. His intelligence and rhetorical skill were clear enough (BT 3.212 ff., 9.225 ff., 622, Book 10, *passim*, etc.): but there were some who detected signs of cowardice. In particular, in the Greek flight in Book 8 he did not stop to rescue Nestor: did he not hear Diomedes' call, or did he hear and not respond (8.97)? Aristarchus seems to have thought that he heard, but others defended him (ABT 8.97; cf. BT 7.168, ABT 8.226, ABT 10.139–40, T 10.149, etc.). Telamonian Ajax, on the other hand, is straightforward: honest, open, and generous (BT 7.192, 199, 226-7, 284, T 13.77, B 13.203, ABT 17.645, A 17.720), whereas his namesake the Locrian is hot-tempered and boastful, faults for which he is duly punished (B 13.203, BT 23.473).

Achilles is the most difficult to assess. Homer will not let us forget him in his absence, and these constant references not only anchor the narrative to its central theme, but they also build up his importance (αὔξησις), leading up to his return (BT 4.512, 5.788, 7.113, T 11.273, BT 11.600, 13.324, 16.653). Plato and Aristotle recognized his inconsistency (cf. Pl. *Hippias Minor* 369E ff. and ABT 9.309, Aristotle, fr. 168 and *Poet.* 1454ᵃ 26 ff.), and the Scholia echo these criticisms and suggest answers (BT 18.98, 24.569). He is the noblest of the Greeks, but also cruel and ruthless: the Scholia have a hard time defending him, when the poet himself seems to disapprove of his brutality, especially in his revenge for Patroclus (cf. BT 11.778-9, 20.467, AB 22.397, BT 23.174). In the Embassy they characterize him as φιλότιμον, ἁπλοῦν, φιλαληθῆ, βαρύθυμον, εἴρωνα (BT 9.309), and view his great speech in answer to Agamemnon's offer as a masterpiece of nobility and angry pride (ABT 9.429). The abruptness of the sentence-structure admirably conveys his emotions (A 9.372, ABT 375 ff., 429). And yet, ἀεὶ δὲ πρὸς Ἀχιλλέα προσπαθῶς ἔχει (B 2.692).

Lesser characters receive some attention: Menestheus' kindness, for instance, is noted (BT 12.334-6). Antilochus is the first to kill a Trojan (4.457 ff.), perhaps to honour him as he will not have an *aristeia* later, or because of his youthful boldness (BT). He is quick to help in a crisis, as when he goes to aid Menelaus (BT 5.565): they were neighbours at home (BT 15.568). His fondness for Patroclus is vividly shown by his speechlessness at the news of his death and the way he announces it to Achilles (BT 17.695-8, 18.18). His behaviour in the chariot race shows the character of a noble young man, over-eager for victory, but able to reconcile Menelaus to himself afterwards (BT 23.543, 589, 591-2, 594).

On the Trojan side Hector receives most attention, and the Scholia give him a poor press. This is the extreme example of their general view that Homer wishes to present the Greeks as favourably as possible, whereas the Trojans are barbarians, and so are shown in a bad light. This notion (ἀεὶ φιλέλλην ὁ ποιητής) seldom appears in the A Scholia, whereas it runs through the BT Scholia. In its more extreme form, therefore, it does not seem to derive from the Alexandrian

---

[24] Cf. p. 281 below.

scholars.[25] Although at times Homer undoubtedly shows more sympathy for the Greeks, they push this idea to absurd limits.[26] In particular, they often distort the way in which Hector is portrayed, claiming that he is arrogant, cruel, and cowardly. In the duel with Ajax they give all the credit to Ajax and none to his opponent, and in the battle which follows he is tyrannical, boastful, and indecisive.[27] He blames others for his own mistakes, and his boasts and threats will rebound upon himself (BT 13.768, 824, 831).[28] His successes are due to divine aid or good fortune (BT 15.418, 644-5), and he is destroyed by his ambition and folly (BT 22.91, 99). But as his death approaches we begin to feel more sympathy for him (BT 15.610, ABT 17.207-8), and Achilles' treatment of his corpse increases this, so that we are relieved when the gods protect it (BT 23.184). There is a good deal of truth in all this, but it neglects those scenes which show Hector more favourably, and exaggerates the contrast between his behaviour and that of the Greek heroes.

The idea that the poet is always φιλέλλην leads to the assumption that he adapts his narrative in order to play down Greek disasters and magnify their successes (BT 7.17, ABT 8.1, BT 8.2, 78, 131, 274, 350, 486-7, etc.). The audience's sympathies are all on the Greek side, and so they are pleased when they do well and sorry when things go badly.[29] This seems childish to us, but if we think of the reactions of any audience watching a war film we will soon realize that it was hard for the Greeks not to adopt this attitude.[30]

It is easier for us to sympathize with their admiration for the *realism* of Homer's characters. Truth to life is one of the fundamental virtues of Homer which they admire: the poet is ἄκρως μιμητὴς ἀληθείας (BT 5.667). The scene of Hector's meeting with Andromache and Astyanax receives special praise, and when the child is scared of his father's helmet they comment that ταῦτα τὰ ἔπη οὕτως ἐστὶν ἐναργείας μεστὰ ὥστε οὐ μόνον ἀκούεται τὰ πράγματα ἀλλὰ καὶ ὁρᾶται· λαβὼν δὲ τοῦτο ἐκ τοῦ βίου ὁ ποιητὴς ἄκρως περιεγένετο τῇ μιμήσει (BT 6.468; cf. 472, 479).[31] It is often such scenes of *pathos*, contrasting so strongly with the brutality of fighting, that arouse their approval (e.g. BT 22. 512, 24.744). The power to portray emotion and evoke feeling is the most important link between Homer and tragedy, according with the Aristotelian view of tragedy as arousing 'pity and fear', and the Scholia are full of comments on Homer's ability to create sympathy in this way.[32] One reason why the poem opens with the word 'Wrath' is ἵν᾽ ἐκ τοῦ πάθους ἀποκαθαριεύσῃ τὸ τοιοῦτο μόριον τῆς ψυχῆς (AT 1.1): here they echo the Aristotelian theory of κάθαρσις.

[25] Cf. W. Dittenberger, *Hermes* 40 (1905), 460 ff.

[26] Cf. J. T. Kakridis, *Homer revisited* (Lund, 1971), pp. 54 ff., who criticizes Van der Valk for supporting the view of the Scholia. See also Van der Valk, *Researches*, I, 474 ff.

[27] Cf. BT 7.89-90, 192, 226-7, 284, 289, 8.180-1, 197, 216, 497-8, T 515, BT 523.

[28] Cf. also BT 14.366, 15.346, T 15.721, BT 16.833, 17.220, A 17.225, 227, 240, ABT 17.248, BT 18.285, 293, 296, and Van der Valk, op. cit., pp. 475 f.

[29] This view is attributed to the scholar

Pius (T 6.234). His date is not known (*RE* IIA 662), *pace* Van der Valk (op. cit., I, 437 n. 120).

[30] There are parallels in the tragic Scholia (cf. Trendelenburg, op. cit., p. 131). The historians were also criticized for lack of patriotism (Dionysius, *Thucydides* 41, Plutarch, *De malignitate Herodoti*).

[31] For βιωτικῶν μιμητικὰ etc. cf. ABT 1.547, BT 5.370, 12.342-3, A 18.12; also 'Longinus' 9.15, etc.

[32] Cf. J. Griffin, 'Homeric Pathos and Objectivity', *CQ* N.S. 26 (1976), 161 ff. for a full and sensitive discussion.

In the opening scene with Chryses the poet 'searches after pity by all means' (BT 1.13–14). The presence of Priam and Hecuba as spectators of Hector's duel with Achilles increases the pathos and dramatic effect (B 3.306). Words such as περιπαθῶς are often used to describe such scenes (BT 4.146, 153, 154–5, etc.).[33] ἦθος and πάθος are frequently combined (BT 4.153, 6.411, etc.). The portrayal of Andromache laughing amid tears is 'powerfully expressed and impossible to analyse' (δυνατῶς ῥηθὲν ἀνερμήνευτον), because of its conflicting emotions (ABT 6.484). The poet himself sympathizes with his characters, minor as well as major ones, and sometimes even with inanimate objects. When Briseis tears 'her breasts and tender neck and lovely face' the poet 'seems to share in grieving at her disfigurement' (BT 19.285). The death of Iphidamas (11.221 ff.) admirably displays his narrative skill, for he divides the details of his autobiography, mentioning his marriage briefly to begin with, and only dwelling with sympathy on his loss of his new wife and her great value when he is killed (T 11.226, 243, BT 242).[34] The scene of Andromache's lament when Hector has been killed is a masterpiece of pathos. Her quiet preparation of the bath for Hector's return, her ignorance of what has occurred, her reactions when she hears the sounds of lamentation, still uncertain of what has happened, the poignant recollection of happier times in the reference to her wedding-veil, her fainting and narrow escape from death, and her long speech, mourning her own fate and that of her child, with all its touching and lifelike details: all this makes a scene which cannot be surpassed (ABT 22.443–4, BT 448, 452, 465, 468, 474, 487 where they defend a passage condemned by Aristarchus, 500, 512). And just as the whole work began with the ominous reference to the passion of anger, and a portrayal of the sufferings it caused, so 'he closes the *Iliad* with the greatest effects of pathos' (ἐπὶ πλείστῳ δὲ ἐλέῳ καταστρέφει τὴν Ἰλιάδα), providing a model for orators in their closing appeals (T 24.746).

III Λέξις

After ἦθος and πάθος we should consider style. Naturally Homer was regarded as a master of all the styles which later rhetorical theory distinguished (cf. Demetrius, *On Style* 37, Quint. 10.1.46 ff., Ps.-Plut. *On the Life and Poetry of Homer* ii.72 f.). Of these, the *grand or powerful style* might be expected to be most prominent. Demetrius sees Homer chiefly as an exponent of this, and Homer is the prime model of sublimity for 'Longinus'. The Scholia admire the grandeur or solemnity of certain passages. Elevation is especially aided by introduction of divine scenes or the supernatural (e.g. ABT 2.478, BT 4.1, 439, B 7.59, BT 10.5, T 15.599, T 18.204, BT 20.4, 21.325, 23.383). But heroic greatness of soul is also admired, as in Ajax's famous prayer that they may die at least in daylight (ABT 17.645–6; cf. 'Longinus' 9.10 where this example follows a series of passages about the gods).[35]

---

[33] Also περιπαθές, παθητικῶς, etc. (see Baar s.v.).
[34] Cf. B 2.692, BT 4.127, 146, 7.104, 13.180, T 13.603, ABT 16.549, BT 16.692–3, 775, 787, T 17.301. At BT 15.610–14 they defend these lines against rejection by Zenodotus and Aristarchus, observing that they show the poet's sympathy at Hector's impending death.
[35] On this 'hierarchy of sublime themes' see D. C. Innes, 'Gigantomachy and natural philosophy', *CQ* N.S. 29 (1979), 165 ff.

Elevation of everyday scenes and actions by means of dignified language is also frequently praised, and this is especially a feature of similes (cf. BT 3.385, 9.134, 206, 13.589, 14.347, 16.7, 17.389, 570, 18.346, 21.12, 24.266). More generally, the notion of αὔξησις, which runs through the Scholia, has an important part to play here. As this means the art of making something seem more significant, it can refer to a large variety of devices. Some of these are compositional on a large scale, for instance the aggrandizement of Achilles' combat by the Theomachy (T 21.385). But others are more limited in scope. Similes, for example, are often regarded as serving this purpose. In general, the expansion of standard themes and addition of details adds to the importance of what is being described, or what is about to be described. Thus divine assemblies, 'typical scenes' such as those of arming, invocation of the Muses, an accumulation of similes and other devices can be used to signal a major episode, whilst details of wounds or a hero's background are used to draw special attention to a character or scene in the midst of the battle.[36]

Powerful or striking effects are noted by the use of such epithets as δυνατός, δεινός (e.g. ABT 6.484, BT 14.437, 15.496, T 16.283) or the terms ἔκπληξις, κατάπληξις (BT 1.242, 3.182, T 18.51; 20.62, which is praised extensively by 'Longinus' 9.6; BT 21.388, which is quoted together with 20.61 ff. by 'Longinus', loc. cit., 24.630). But it is surprising that these terms are not more often used.

The *middle style* is rarely mentioned. The much-admired portrait of Briseis in 19.282 ff. is said to be 'in the middle style' (μεσοῦ χαρακτῆρος), although it is also 'dignified, graphic and pathetic' (σεμνῶς πέφρασται καὶ λίαν ἐστὶ γραφικός, τῷ δὲ μιμητικῷ συμπαθὴς καὶ γοερός: BT). The idea of κόσμος may be relevant here (although it can have much wider uses). The Scholia are aware that this can serve a functional purpose. For example, their comment on the passage describing the return journey of the Greeks from Chrysa after the appeasement of Apollo is surely very acute (BT 1.481): 'the poet shares in their joy and now paints a fair picture (καλλιγραφεῖ) of their return-journey, in contrast to the journey out. He does the same in the case of Poseidon'. This must in fact be one reason why Homer expands in a lyrical way the 'typical scene' of a voyage at this point, whereas the outward journey to Chrysa is very matter-of-fact.[37] The reference to Poseidon is to his journey to help the Greeks at 13.17 ff., another lyrical passage whch is said to be introduced for relief from the battle (T 13.20), whereas at 15.218-19, when his forced departure is described in only two lines, they say that Homer cuts short the description, 'since it is with sorrow' (BT 15.219). Again this shows a sensitive awareness of the poet's subtle variation of 'typical scenes' to suit the dramatic situation.

The Thersites-episode is seen as designed in part for comic relief (ABT 2.212;

[36] Cf. BT 3.182, 190, 4.1, 2, 35, 153-4, 422, 435, 439, 452, 512, 5.23, 70, 87, 543-4, 703, 801, T 6.234, BT 6.413, 499, 7.208, 214, 8.2, 77, 131, A 9.14, ABT 11.475, AB 11.548, A 12.4, BT 12.23, T 12.154, BT 12.430, 465-6, T 13.345, BT 14.394-8, 15.258, 312-13, 414, 16.58, 98-9, 549, T 16.810, BT 16.814, AT 17.206, BT 17.671, 676, B 19.388-91, BT 20.213, T 21.385, BT 22.294, 371, AB 22.443-4, BT 23.222, 24.214, 490.

See also N. Austin, 'The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*', *GRBS* 7 (1966), 295 ff., and G. M. Calhoun, 'Homeric repetitions', *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 12 (1933), 1 ff.

[37] The Scholia also note that this is the only voyage described in the *Iliad*, and so receives a good deal of attention (BT 1. 434 f.). Structurally, this scene provides an effective contrast with the narrative of Achilles' anger.

cf. Demetrius 163). In the Catalogue of Ships the variety of epithets and formulae embellishes what would otherwise be lifeless (B 2.494).[38] They have a good comment on the death of Otrynteides, whose life-history is described with lapidary pathos (20.382 ff.): although this episode could be seen simply as an instance of ποικιλία, it is particularly apt here, as the embellishment of the incident brings relief from the monotony of so many battles and killings, and also shows that Achilles' first victim was not insignificant (BT 20.383).

κόσμος is seen also as a function of the *similes*. The Scholia sometimes identify a single point of comparison and regard the rest as ornamental (e.g. T 12.41, or BT 21.257, where the poet is said to move 'from the powerful to the refined and flowery style': ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁδροῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ἰσχνὸν ἔρχεται καὶ ἀνθηρόν).[39] More often, however, they insist on the detailed and precise correspondence between simile and narrative (see pp. 15 f. below).

The *plain style* is not often mentioned explicitly, but many features which are supposed to characterize it are referred to. Occasionally the *simplicity* of a passage is praised: Ajax's retreat at 16.101 ff. makes a vivid effect without the use of any rhetorical devices, the narrative directly reflecting the action (BT). Priam's brief catalogue of the horrors of a fallen city (22.61 ff.) has no ornamental epithets to complicate its stark realism (BT). *Brevity* is often noted as effective: ἐν βραχεῖ δὲ πάντα πέφρασται.[40] Thus, when Achilles sees the wounded Machaon passing his hut, and calls Patroclus out, Homer says of Patroclus κακοῦ δ' ἄρα οἱ πέλεν ἀρχή (11.604). This pregnant interjection by the poet 'puts the hearer in suspense to know what this trouble means, and begets attention by the brevity of the reference' (BT). Later they comment again on this passage: ἐναγώνιος δέ ἐστιν ὁ ποιητὴς καί, ἐὰν ἄρα, σπέρμα μόνον τίθησιν (T 15.64). Likewise, *rapidity* is praised, as in Antilochus' announcement to Achilles of Patroclus' death: 'he gives the bad news quickly, in only two lines, and has revealed all briefly, the dead man, those who are fighting over him, his killer' (BT 18.20).[41] *Clarity* (σαφήνεια) is sometimes mentioned (e.g. BT 5.70 σαφη-νίζει, A 5.9, AB 11.548 as a function of similes, BT 4.154, 11.722–5). More often the term ἐνάργεια (vividness) is used to characterize a passage. On 4.154 (χειρὸς ἔχων Μενέλαον, ἐπεστενάχοντο δ' ἑταῖροι), in the context of Agamemnon's address to Menelaus after his wounding, they comment: ἄφελε τὸν στίχον, καὶ οὐ βλάψεις τὴν σαφήνειαν, ἀπολέσεις δὲ τὴν ἐνάργειαν, ἥτις ἐμφαίνει τὴν Ἀγαμέμνονος συμπάθειαν καὶ τὴν τῶν συναχθομένων ἑταίρων διάθεσιν (BT).[42] Again it is especially the similes which are said to have this quality of making the scene come to life before our eyes.[43]

[38] Cf. Dionysius, *On the Arrangement of Words* 16.

[39] Demetrius, however, praises 21.257 ff. as an example of accurate and vivid description (209). Cf. also BT 4.482, T 11.481, BT 17.666, 22.193. Demetrius (129) chooses the simile at *Od.* 6.105 ff. as an illustration of 'dignified and lofty elegance' (αἱ λεγόμεναι σεμναὶ χάριτες καὶ μεγάλαι).

[40] Cf. BT 1.505, A 2.765, 3.200–2, BT 4.125, 222, ABT 4.274, BT 6.460, 8.87, T 10.297–8, 314, BT 11.239, 300, 13.249, 15.219, 496, 16.112, T 16.630,

ABT 20.372, BT 20.395.

[41] Cf. also T 10.409, BT 15.6–7, 16. 293, 415–16, 17.605, 20.456, T 20.460.

[42] Cf. also 6.467–8, 10.461, T 11.378, AB 11.548, BT 12.430, 14.438, 454, 15.381, 16.7, 17.263, 389, 20.394, 21.526, 22.61–2, 23.362, 692, 697.

[43] Another related term is ἔμφασις (cf. ἐμφατικῶς, which is similarly used, though different in origin), of any striking or vivid effect or expression: BT 1.342, 2.414, 3.342, 4.126, 5.744, 8.355, 9.206, ABT 9.374–5, BT 11.297, 12.430, 15.381, 624, 740, 16.379, ABT 17.652–3, BT

The other main quality of this style is said to be πιθανότης, the ability to make one's narrative credible (cf. Demetrius 208, 221 f.). We have already seen this associated with the use of divine interventions to account for extraordinary events, and the principle that one should not over-elaborate but leave one's audience to fill in some details themselves is also said to be an aspect of πιθανότης (Demetrius 222). πιθανότης is in fact an aspect of Homer's style in general, but it is especially shown in the way he gives realistic and circumstantial details of places or characters, as for example in the brief sketch of Simoeisius: ταῦτα δὲ εἶπε πολλὴν πίστιν ἐπιφέρων τῷ λόγῳ ὡς αὐτόπτης ὤν (BT 4.473; cf. 470, 2.673, T 11.167, 772, BT 13.171, 14.225-7, T 16.328). Elsewhere, a small touch gives life and persuasiveness to an incident, as when Odysseus forgets his whip after the killing of Rhesus (BT 10.500), or when Patroclus routs the Trojans and the Greek ship is left 'half-burnt' (BT 16.293-4). Extraordinary events, so often the material for criticism of Homer's credibility, are also defended, sometimes in a way which seems to us literal-minded: for instance, when Mydon falls on his head in the deep sand and remains there upside down, they give an elaborate explanation of how this could really happen (BT 5.587)! On the other hand, when Achilles alone is nearly washed away by the river, they admit that this is ἀπίθανον, but follow the Aristotelian principle that its dramatic effectiveness is such that the hearer does not stop to reflect on its probability (BT 21.269; cf. Arist. Poet. 1460ᵃ 11 ff., especially 26 f. and 35 ff.).

πιθανότης and ἐνάργεια are closely linked, and both depend on the power of visualization (cf. Arist. Poet. 1455ᵃ 22 ff.). The visual or sometimes pictorial qualities of a scene are often noticed. The sacrifice on the shore at Chrysa is an 'impressive spectacle' (B 1.316), the white fat mingling with the dark smoke φανταστικῶς (ABT 1.317), and the poet 'paints a fair picture' of the return voyage (BT 1.481). The famous nod of Zeus to Thetis was the inspiration for the works of Pheidias and Euphranor (AT 1.538-30). The comparison of Menelaus' wounded thigh to ivory stained with purple gives us an ὄψιν γραφικήν (BT 4.141), and the scene of Hector smiling at his child and Andromache crying is also 'graphic' (BT 6.405). The description of Hera dressing and making herself beautiful is contrasted with the work of artists who show women naked: Homer does not do so, but 'he has portrayed her in words more effectively than in colours' (BT 14.187). Ajax's retreat in Book 16 is 'more vivid than a painting', and the forceful repetition of words in 104-5 is not imitable by artists (BT 16.104, T 107).⁴⁴

Another term to describe any especially vivid or striking image or visualization

21.9-10, 361, 362, 22.146, 24.212. ἐνέργεια (vigour) can be used in a similar way (and the MSS confuse this with ἐνάργεια). Cf. esp. BT 12.461: πανταχόθεν ἐκίνησε τὴν ἐνέργειαν, followed by a detailed catalogue of all the elements in the scene which make it so vivid and dramatic. Cf. also BT 10.369, T 20.48. Normally, however, ἐνέργεια is used for personification of inanimate objects. These qualities could really be classified as well or better under the grand or powerful style, and this shows the essential artificiality of the whole system.

⁴⁴ Cf. also A 3.327, BT 4.541, 5.82, 6.468, 10.524, 11.282, 12.463-5, T 13.11, BT 13.281, 597, T 14.285, BT 16.470, T 17.85, 136, 18.586, BT 18.603-4, 19.282, T 20.162, BT 21.67-8, T 21.175, BT 21. 325, 22.61-2, 80, T 22.97, 367, BT 22.474, T 24.163. Comparison between literature and the visual arts was common in antiquity. Cf. also R. W. Lee, 'Ut pictura poesis, The humanistic theory of painting', The Art Bulletin 22 (1940), 199 ff., for the development of such ancient parallels in the Renaissance.

is φαντασία.[45] The famous scene before the Theomachy, when Zeus thunders, Poseidon shakes the earth, and Hades leaps up in terror, is an obvious example of φαντασία (T 20.56; cf. 'Longinus' 9.6). Quieter, but equally effective, is the portrayal of Thetis coming out of the sea 'like mist' (BT 1.359). The opening of the fighting is marked by the appearance of the deities of war, Ares, Athene, and their associates Terror, Panic, and Strife, creating a μεγαλοπρεπὴς φαντασία (BT 4.439), and Zeus holding his hand over Troy is another striking image of this kind (ABT 9.420). Such scenes involve gods (cf. BT 3.385), but this is not always so, and vivid images of battle or contest have a similar effect (cf. BT 7.62, 8.62-3, 11.534, 15.712, 21.3). Thus, the description of the chariot race in 23. 362 ff. is so well portrayed that the poet's audience see it as clearly as the spectators (BT; cf. Demetrius 209 f.).

The *similes* have already been mentioned several times, and many of the most appreciative comments of the Scholia concern them.[46] Their general functions are seen as contributing ἐνάργεια, αὔξησις, κόσμος, and relief from the narrative. Unlike many (but not all) modern scholars, however, the Scholia tend to regard the detailed elaboration of the similes as adding significantly to the effect of the scene with which they are compared, and they often admire their close correspondence or ἀκρίβεια. For example, when Athene deflects Pandarus' arrow and saves Menelaus, as a mother deflects a fly from her sleeping child, they say: 'the mother indicates Athene's favour towards Menelaus, the fly suggests the ease with which it is swatted away and darts to another place, the child's sleep shows Menelaus being caught off guard, and the weakness of the blow' (BT 4.130). In the same book the meeting of the two armies is compared with the confluence of two mountain torrents (452 ff.).

Here you can hear the sound of the two rivers, and the whole description adds to the effect (ηὔξησε) of the sound. For they do not flow through the plains but from a mountain, thus creating not a flow but a rush of water; and they come down to the same place, making the sound great by the collision of their streams; and he adds 'from great springs', thus evoking a harsh din by the quantity of the torrential water; and the hollow place which receives them is called a μισγάγκεια, making a harsh *onomatopoeia* and adding to the threatening impression of the stream. Perhaps also he has used a comparison with two rivers not only for greater effect (αὔξησις), but also because there are two armies clashing with each other (BT).[47]

A simpler instance where they detect a correspondence which the poet surely intended is in the comparison of the fall of Simoeisios, who was born by the banks of the river Simoeis, to the fall of a tree growing beside a river (BT 4.484). When Hector pursuing the Greeks is compared to a dog in pursuit of a single fleeing lion or wild boar, they defend the details of the simile: Hector pursues them one at a time, 'always killing the last man' (342), and the comparison is primarily one of speed, the dog being quicker, but the Greeks are also compared to the stronger and more valiant animal (ABT 8.338). The comparison of the retreating Ajax with a donkey being driven from a corn-field by children is praised for its detailed correspondence (BT 11.558). The simile suggests Ajax's

---

[45] Cf. Quint. 6.2.29 ff., 'Longinus' 15 with D. A. Russell's commentary, and Von Franz, op. cit., pp. 19 ff.
[46] For an extensive discussion see the work of Clausing (op. cit., above, p. 265 n. 3).
[47] Cf. Virgil's echo of this simile, to describe Aeneas and Turnus raging over the battlefield (*Aen.* 12.523 ff.).

contempt for the Trojans, and their feebleness. The beast's greediness indicates his stubborn stand, and the fact that he is grazing shows the slowness of Ajax's retreat. The donkey is described as lazy and inured to much beating, having had many sticks broken on his back: all this adds to the effect of stubbornness. When the Greeks defending their gates are compared by Asios to wasps or bees defending their homes on a road, the simile both shows their spirit and also is slightly derogatory, which is suitable in an enemy's mouth (BT 12.167). When the Trojans pouring over the Achaean wall are like a great wave pouring over the sides (τοίχων) of a ship in a violent storm, they comment that ἀεὶ ἑαυτὸν παρευδοκιμεῖ ὁ ποιητὴς ταῖς ὁμοιώσεσιν · τί γὰρ ἐναργέστερον ἢ ἐμφαντικώτερον ἢ καθάπαξ συμφωνότερον ταύτης τῆς εἰκόνος; (BT 15.381). In the comparison of Patroclus to a marauding lion, wounded in the chest, 'whose valour brought his doom', they rightly admire this foreshadowing of Patroclus' death (BT 16.752–3), and when Achilles' grief for Patroclus is compared to that of a lioness whose cubs have been stolen by a hunter, and who searches the glens for the man who has taken them, they note the appropriateness of this elaboration, suggesting Achilles' desire to take vengeance on Hector (BT 18.318). Again, when his lament for Patroclus is like a father's for the death of his newly-married son, this shows not only the depth of Achilles' love but also the poignancy of the loss, as the son had come of age and the father had lost not only his child but his hopes of grandchildren (BT 23.222). These and many other examples[48] show their sensibility to the less obvious implications and wider resonance of the similes. It it easy to disparage this approach, as the product of a more sophisticated literary age, judging Homer by standards suitable for Apollonius Rhodius or Virgil. It would be more valuable to return to the *Iliad* itself, to see how often the Scholia do in fact appreciate more fully than we do the way in which the similes enhance the poem.

They are also sensitive to what one might call the symbolic aspects of the similes: for example, when Hector's onslaught is like a reckless boulder bounding down a mountain, 'the barbarian and irrational onrush' is appropriately compared to an inanimate weight rolling onward unchecked (BT 13.137; cf. 13.39, etc.).[49] Another function of similes is to make visible what cannot easily be described or imagined, because of its extraordinary character. Hence they are drawn from material familiar to the audience, and often from commonplace things, dignified by Homer's language, such as the child's sand-castle (BT 15. 362), or grasshoppers flying from a fire (BT 21.12; cf. 16.7, A 16.364, BT 17.389, 570). The Scholia are also appreciative of the relationship of different similes to each other, and of the way in which multiple similes are used to build up a complex picture (ABT 2.455, BT 2.480, 6.513, AB 11.548, T 12.132, ABT 12.278, BT 14.394–8, 15.618, 624, 17.4, 133, ABT 17.657, BT 20.490).[50]

On the relationship of simile to *metaphor*, and the way in which metaphorical language may anticipate or answer a simile, there are some interesting observations by Porphyry (*Quaestiones homericae* I, ed. Sodano, Nos. 6 and 17 = B

---

[48] Cf. ABT 2.87, BT 3.222, 6.509, ABT 9.4, BT 11.113, ABT 12.278, BT 12.433, 13.39, 137, 298, 14.394–8, 15.324, 618, 679, 690, 16.406, 633, T 16.756–7, BT 17.53, 61, 263, 434, ABT 17.657, BT 17. 676, 747, 755, 18.161, 207, B 18.220, BT 20.490, T 20.495, BT 21.12, 22, 522–3, 22.199–201.

[49] On this see R. R. Schlunk, *The Homeric Scholia and the Aeneid* (Ann Arbor, 1974), pp. 42 ff.

[50] On this aspect see H. Fränkel, *Die homerischen Gleichnisse* (Göttingen, 1921), and C. Moulton, *Similes in the Homeric Poems* (Göttingen, 1977).

11.269, 4.447). He notes that there can be an interchange of language between narrative and simile, as (for instance) when swarms of bees are called ἔθνεα in a comparison with the Greek troops (2.87), or κορύσσεται is used of a wave compared to the advancing army (4.424), and vice versa where Achilles' voice compared to a trumpet is called ὄπα χάλκεον (18.222). Thus a 'cloud of foot-soldiers' immediately suggests and is followed by the simile of a storm-cloud moving over the sea, whose language in turn suggests the movement of troops, and a comparison of Penelope's cheeks wet with tears to melting snow brings in its train the metaphorical τήκετο καλὰ παρήϊα δακρυχεούσης (*Od.* 19.205 ff.). This kind of interaction has attracted the attention of modern critics also.[51]

In their analysis of *speeches* they reflect the prevalent ancient view of Homer as a model for orators.[52] Thus the 'three styles' find their representatives in Odysseus, Nestor, and Menelaus (ABT 3.212–16). The styles of the four speakers in the Embassy are well defined (BT 9.622): Ὀδυσσεὺς συνετός, πανοῦργος, θεραπευτικός · Ἀχιλλεὺς θυμικός, μεγαλόφρων · Φοῖνιξ ἠθικός, πρᾷος, παιδευτικός · Αἴας ἀνδρεῖος, σεμνός, μεγαλόφρων, ἁπλοῦς, δυσκίνητος, βαθύς. The Scholia also analyse their speeches in detail in accordance with rhetorical techniques (BT 9.225 ff.). Speeches of persuasion are often interpreted as highly artificial and sophisticated, suggesting something covertly (λεληθότως), in contrast to their surface meaning. Thus Agamemnon's speech to the army in Book 2 is really intended as an encouragement to remain at Troy (BT 2.110).[53] Helen's speeches are designed to win the Trojans' favour (Aristotle, fr. 147 *ap.* B 3.237, BT 6.344). Zeus and Hera bargain rhetorically with each other, emphasizing the extent of their concessions (ABT 4.51). This approach may well seem out of place to us, but we recognize how much of Homer's individual invention is invested in the speeches. A particular device which is noted is the use of παραδείγματα or μῦθοι for persuasion or consolation, as in the reminiscences of Nestor and Phoenix:[54] their observations here are very pertinent, and they are quick to note not only the parallelism of the Meleager story with Achilles' situation, but also the relevance to this of what Phoenix says of his own past life (448 ff.).[55] Notice too their first-class observation about *silence*, when Antilochus is speechless at the news of Patroclus' death: πανταχόθεν ἐπεσημή-νατο τὸ πένθος, μάλιστα δὲ ἐκ τοῦ μηδὲ πυθέσθαι τὸν τρόπον τῆς τελευτῆς. γίνεται οὖν ἡ σιωπὴ παντὸς λόγου μείζων (BT 17.695–8). There is a similar comment on Ajax's famous refusal to answer Odysseus at *Od.* 11.563: δῆλον οὖν ὅτι καὶ τῶν παρὰ τραγῳδοῖς λόγων βέλτιον αὐτοῦ ἡ σιωπή.[56] The dramatic effect of these episodes has some bearing on the question of silences in tragedy.[57]

There are many other features of Homeric style and technique on which the

[51] See especially the elaborate treatment of the whole subject by M. S. Silk, *Interaction in Poetic Imagery* (Cambridge, 1974). His note on ancient views of Homeric imagery does not mention Porphyry (211 f.). See also D. A. West, *JRS* 59 (1969), 40 ff. on interaction and transfusion in the similes in the *Aeneid*.

[52] See G. A. Kennedy, *AJP* 78 (1957), 23 ff., H. North, *Traditio* 8 (1952), 1 ff.; and for a modern analysis D. Lohmann, *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias* (de Gruyter, 1970).

[53] Cf. BT 14.75, and [Dionysius of Halicarnassus], *On Contrived Speeches* (*Opuscula* ii.310 ff.) and p. 273 above.

[54] BT 1.262, 7.132, 155, 9.448, B 9.452, 480, BT 9.527, 11.670, 717, 785–6, A 18.117, BT 24.601–2.

[55] Cf. Austin, op. cit., above (p. 276 n.36).

[56] Cf. 'Longinus' 9.2, and W. Bühler, *Beiträge z. Erklärung der Schrift vom Erhabenen*, pp. 15 ff.

[57] Cf. O. Taplin, 'Aeschylean Silences and Silences in Aeschylus', *HSCP* 76 (1972), 57 ff.

Scholia have useful observations to make, and I will mention here only a few
which seem to me particularly valuable. It was Aristarchus who first observed
the well-known Homeric principle of ὕστερον (or δεύτερον) πρότερον, itself
only one form of the device of ring-composition, whereby the items in a list
are picked up and repeated in reverse order.[58] Aristarchus, however, also noted
contrary examples, and a collection of these by Epaphroditus is quoted by the
Towneleian Scholia (15.6–7).[59] They seem to reflect controversy over this
point, saying ὅτι ἀεὶ πρὸς τὸ πρῶτον ὑπαντᾷ ὁ ποιητής (i.e. the reverse of
ὕστερον πρότερον), although this is obviously wrong. They also note instances
of *chiasmus*, a related structural device (e.g. T 22.158), and *antithesis* (e.g.
BT 12.417 ff., where there is also *chiasmus*). Complex sentence structure and
parenthesis are observed (e.g. BT 3.59, A 17.608, and also A 2.745, P. Oxy.
1086.115 on 2.819 ff., etc.).[60] A particularly involved example, with a paren-
thetic expansion of thirteen lines, is noted in Achilles' speech at 18.101 ff. (BT;
cf. Leaf ad loc.). They also observe the use of *asyndeton* and extended *paratactic
sentence-structure* in speeches of anger (BT 3.50–3). Asyndeton has perhaps never
been used more effectively than where Hector in his last fight loses his spear and
calls to Deiphobus for another:

στῆ δὲ κατηφήσας, οὐδ᾽ ἄλλ᾽ ἔχε μειλινὸν ἔγχος.
Δηίφοβον δὲ κάλει λευκάσπιδα μακρὸν ἀύσας ·
ἤτεέ μιν δόρυ μακρόν · ὁ δ᾽ οὔτι οἱ ἐγγύθεν ἦεν   (22.293–5)

Here they comment: ἡδέως χρῆται τῷ ἀσυνδέτῳ · ἀλλὰ καὶ τῇ ἐπιφορᾷ (repeti-
tion) ἐλεεινότατον (T 22.295).

Repetition and *anaphora* can be used for effect in many ways. The most
famous rhetorical example was that of Nireus, with its double epanalepsis and
asyndeton (2.671 ff.; cf. Arist. *Rhet.* 1414[a]2 ff., Demetrius 61–2, A 2.671).
When the confused noise of the advancing Trojan army is compared with the
cries of cranes, the triple repetition of κλαγγή emphasizes the continual din
(ABT 3.5). When Andromache foretells Hector's death, the repetition of the
pronoun 'you' suggests her love and dependence (BT 6.411). In the description of
Ajax's retreat, the insistent repetition of different parts of βάλλειν (βάλλοντες
. . . βαλλομένη . . . βάλλετο) creates a powerful effect (BT 16.104).[61] Epanalepsis
of a half-line, which occurs only three times (20.371–2, 22.127–8, 23.641–2),
each time with what seems to be a slightly different purpose, is noted in the first
case as emphasizing the force of fire and strength of iron, in the second as
suggesting the long-drawn-out conversation of the young man and girl (ABT
20.372, BT 22.127).[62] Repetition in a catalogue of an emphatic word or simply

---

[58] Cf. A 2.629, 763 and P. Oxy. 1086
i.11 ff., A 4.451, 7.276, AT 11.834–5,
A 12.400, T 15.330–3, A 24.605, Cicero
ad Att. 1.16.1, and S. E. Bassett, *HSCP* 31
(1920), 39 ff.

[59] Cf. A 2.621, 6.219, T 15.330–3,
16.251, 22.158.

[60] Cf. Schmidt, *Erklärungen*, pp. 36–8.

[61] Cf. also 2.382–4
εὖ μέν τις δόρυ θηξάσθω, εὖ δ᾽ ἀσπίδα θέσθω,
εὖ δέ τις ἵπποισιν δεῖπνον δότω ὠκυπόδεσσιν,

εὖ δέ τις ἅρματος ἀμφὶς ἰδὼν πολέμοιο μεδέσθω,
for *epanaphora* and *homoeoteleuton* together
(ABT 2.382).

L. P. Wilkinson observes that anaphora
is relatively rare in Homer, and hence all
the more striking when it does occur
(*Golden Latin Artistry* (Cambridge, 1966),
pp. 66 f.).

[62] Eustathius regards such repetition as
spontaneous (ἐνδιάθετος) and realistic
(1211.44, 1321.44).

of connective particles is recognized as a feature of archaic style (T 10.228, BT 17.216–18).[63]

A different form of repetition is that of *formulaic epithets*. Milman Parry acknowledged that Aristarchus had already recognized the general or formulaic character of many epithets, in cases where they did not seem to fit the immediate context.[64] The BT Scholia and Porphyry echo his views, although they are aware of other attempts to explain such cases (e.g. BT 8.555). Eustathius also has a good comment on the use of θρασὺν Ἕκτορα at 24.786 (1376.12): 'the poet preserves the fine epithets for the heroes in a dignified way, even when they cannot act in accordance with them, and in this way as it were keeps them as treasures (κειμήλιοι) for them'. At the same time we can now see that Parry was too vigorous in denying that such epithets could ever have a more specific effect. We can also sympathize with such comments as that on 21.218, where Scamander complains that his lovely waters (ἐρατεινὰ ῥέεθρα) are choked with corpses: 'the epithet is well-used to show that it is waters of such quality which are polluted' (BT). Parry unjustly criticized this comment (op. cit., p. 120). He ought to have noted that this phrase is in fact unique in Homer!

Another important aspect of Homeric language which ancient scholars appreciated was the poet's tendency when using rare or archaic words to add a phrase which explained their sense, or alternatively to suggest their *etymology* by a related word, as with ἤτοι ὁ κὰπ πεδίον τὸ Ἀλήιον οἶος ἀλᾶτο (6.201). Porphyry has a long discussion of this, which begins with the famous statement that as Homer often explains himself one should interpret him by his own evidence (Ὅμηρον ἐξ Ὁμήρου σαφηνίζειν), and he lists many other examples.[65] This Homeric technique of etymology has been seen as a kind of foreshadowing of later scholarly work on epic language.[66]

The Scholia also observe the poet's ability to *invent names* for his characters which suit their situation. Thus the daughters of Agamemnon in 9.145, Chrysothemis, Laodice, and Iphianassa, all have names appropriate to a ruling family (ABT). Aristarchus noted that the poet was ὀνοματοθετικός.[67] Interest in Homeric names goes back at least to Prodicus, who observed that Bathycles was so-called because of his father Chalcon's wealth in bronze (T 16.594 f.).[68]

IV. *Sound and rhythm*

Finally, there is an aspect of Homeric verse which seldom receives the attention it deserves, whereas the Scholia have many useful observations on it. This is sound and rhythm.[69] The modern tendency to pay special attention to the

[63] See also Demetrius, *On Style* 54, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *On the Arrangement of Words* 16 (*ad fin.*), on repetition and variation in the Catalogue of Ships.

[64] Cf. *The Making of Homeric Verse* (Oxford, 1971), pp. 120 ff.

[65] Schol. B 6.201 = *Quaestiones Homericae* I, No. 11. Cf. also A 6.200, T 7.278, A 9.137, BT 13.281, 14.176, T 14.178, ABT 14.518, T 15.536.

[66] Cf. Pfeiffer, *History of Classical Scholarship*, i, pp. 3 ff.

[67] Cf. A 5.60, A 6.18, AT 12.342, etc.

[68] Note also Democritus, D.-K. 68 B 24: Eumaeus' mother was called Penia! As Eumaeus' father is called Ctesios (*Od.* 15.414), it looks as if Democritus intends an allegory like that of Poros and Penia as parents of Eros.

[69] In general see W. B. Stanford, *The*

traditional or formulaic character of the verse does not encourage sensitivity
to the way in which the poet fits sound to sense in particular contexts, whereas
the ancient emphasis on *mimesis* naturally led to appreciation of this. The
Scholia often note the *harshness* or rough sound of lines or phrases, e.g.:
BT 2.210 αἰγιαλῷ μεγάλῳ βρέμεται, σμαραγεῖ δέ τε πόντος (simile),
BT 2.463 κλαγγηδὸν προκαθιζόντων, σμαραγεῖ δέ τε λειμών (simile),
BT 3.358 = BT 7.252 καὶ διὰ θώρηκος πολυδαιδάλου ἠρήρειστο, where the
last word 'suggests the force of the blow',
B 13.181 ὡς πέσεν, ἀμφὶ δέ οἱ βράχε τεύχεα ποικίλα χάλκῳ,[70]
BT 16.792 χειρὶ καταπρηνεῖ, στρεφεδίνηθεν δέ οἱ ὄσσε, where the unusual
compound of στρέφω and δινέω is said to produce a harsh effect, again suggest-
ing the force of the blow,
BT 23.30 πολλοὶ μὲν βόες ἀργοὶ ὀρέχθεον ἀμφὶ σιδήρῳ, where ὀρέχθεον imitates
their bellowing,
BT 23.396 θρυλίχθη δὲ μέτωπον ἐπ' ὀφρύσι . . . where θρυλίχθη describes the
face shattered in the crash, and at 23.392 they also comment on the imitation
of the sound of the breaking chariot in ἵππειον δέ οἱ ἦξε θεὰ ζυγόν (BT), presum-
ably referring to the harsh brevity of ἦξε.
    It is especially the similes which produce such effects, and of these most
commonly the sea and river scenes. Thus of 13.798 f.

> κύματα παφλάζοντα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης,
> κυρτὰ φαληριόωντα, πρὸ μέν τ' ἄλλ', αὐτὰρ ἐπ' ἄλλα

they say that by the harshness of composition of the letters the poet imitates
the noise, and the similar endings of the words also contribute to the effect of
incessant waves, whilst παφλάζοντα especially imitates their sound, κυρτά their
size, and φαληριόωντα their colour (BT). At 15.624 ff.

> λαβρὸν ὑπαὶ νεφέων ἀνεμοτρεφές · ἡ δέ τε πᾶσα
> ἄχνη ὑπεκρύφθη (etc.)

the κόμπος and ψόφος of the language 'do not allow one to see the ship, hidden
as it is by spray' (BT 15.625). In the simile of the flooded rivers pouring down
to a junction in the hills, already discussed, the language suggests the din:

> ὡς δ' ὅτε χείμαρροι ποταμοὶ κατ' ὄρεσφι ῥέοντες
> ἐς μισγάγκειαν συμβάλλετον ὄβριμον ὕδωρ
> κρουνῶν ἐκ μεγάλων κοίλης ἔντοσθε χαράδρης,
> τῶν δέ τε τηλόσε δοῦπον ἐν οὔρεσιν ἔκλυε ποιμήν ·
> ὡς τῶν μισγομένων γένετο ἰαχή τε πόνος τε   (4.452 ff.).

This is achieved especially by the harsh sound of some of the words, such as
μισγάγκειαν (BT).[71] The most celebrated of these similes was 17.263 ff., which
was supposed to have caused Plato (or Solon) to burn his poetry in despair:

Sound of Greek (University of California
Press, 1967), who discusses the views of
ancient critics such as Dionysius of Hali-
carnassus, and also L. P. Wilkinson, *Golden
Latin Artistry*, pp. 9 ff.

[70] Cf. *Od.* 21.48–9 ἀνέβραχεν . . . ἔβραχε
of doors, quoted at B 8.393 (on πύλαι
μύκον, where μύκον is also said to be 'ono-
matopoeic').
[71] Cf. p. 279 above, and also Dionysius,
op. cit., 16.

> ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἐπὶ προχοῇσι διιπετέος ποταμοῖο
> βέβρυχεν μέγα κῦμα ποτὶ ῥόον, ἀμφὶ δέ τ' ἄκραι
> ἠϊόνες βοόωσιν ἐρευγομένης ἁλὸς ἔξω,
> τόσσῃ ἄρα Τρῶες ἰαχῇ ἴσαν . . .

Here the sea's rush meets the water pouring from the river, swollen by rain, and the echo of their roar is expressed in ἠϊόνες βοόωσιν, with the *diectasis* of the verb (BT).[72]

A similar effect is produced in 14.394

> οὔτε θαλάσσης κῦμα τόσον βοάᾳ ποτὶ χέρσον (T).

This shows that *diectasis* was not necessarily merely a metrical device, but could also be artistic. Likewise they find that the metrical lengthening of the last word in 7.208

> σεύατ' ἔπειθ' οἷός τε πελώριος ἔρχεται Ἄρης (simile)

suggests the appearance and broad advance of Ajax (BT). Demetrius (48 and 105) finds grandeur in the harshness of sound of 16.358

> Αἴας δ' ὁ μέγας αἰὲν . . .

and vigour in the 'cacophony' of 12.208

> Τρῶες δ' ἐρρίγησαν, ὅπως ἴδον αἰόλον ὄφιν   (255),

a στίχος μείουρος which the Scholia also admire as expressing the consternation of the Trojans by its sudden ending (T)![73]

Long vowels in themselves can help to create an effect of size or grandeur, as in 12.134

> ῥίζῃσιν μεγάλῃσι διηνεκέεσσ' ἀραρυῖαι (simile; BT),

and 12.339–40

> βαλλομένων σακέων τε καὶ ἱπποκόμων τρυφαλειῶν
> καὶ πυλέων . . .

where the repeated genitive endings are emphatic (T).

The Scholia are quick to pick up other instances of *mimesis* and *onomatopoeia* in single words and phrases, such as λίγξε of a bow's twang (BT 4.125), ἀποβλύζων of a child bringing up wine (BT 9.491), βαμβαίνων and ἄραβος of chattering teeth (A 10.375), καρφαλέον . . . ἄϋσεν of a shield whose rim is struck by a spear (BT 13.409), αὖον ἄϋσεν ἐρεικόμενος of a bronze corslet torn by a spear (BT 13.441), λάκε of armour struck by swords and spears (T 14.25), ἀνεκυμβαλίαζον, a βομβῶδες ῥῆμα which suggests chariots being overturned (BT 16.379), and χρόμαδος of wrestlers' teeth (ABT 23.688).[74] They also

---

[72] Cf. Arist. *Poet.* 1458[b] 31, Dionysius 15.
[73] On 'cacophony' see also Demetrius 219, where he quotes as vivid *Od.* 9.289 κόπτ', ἐκ δ' ἐγκέφαλος χαμάδις ῥέε, δεῦε δὲ γαῖαν, and *Il.* 23.116 πολλὰ δ' ἄναντα κάταντα πάραντά τε δόχμιά τ' ἦλθον.
[74] Cf. Demetrius 94 and 220, quoting σίζε (*Od.* 9.394) and λάπτοντες γλώσσῃσι

(*Il.* 16.161). Demetrius admires Homer's ability to imitate sounds and to create new words. Dionysius (16) mentions βρέμεται and σμαραγεῖ (*Il.* 2.210), κλάγξας (12. 207), ῥοῖζον and δοῦπον (16.361), and ῥοχθεῖ (*Od.* 5.402). Quintilian cites λίγξε βιός and σίζ' ὀφθαλμός as 'justly admired' (1.5.72).

consider that ἀγκαλίδεσσι suits the smallness of the child being held in his nurse's arms (ABT 22.503), and (ingeniously) that *tmesis* can imitate the idea of an axe cutting in ἵνα τάμῃ διὰ πᾶσαν (BT 17.522), or of a lion tearing a bull to pieces in λέων κατὰ ταῦρον ἐδηδώς (BT 17.542). In the second case they point out that this was not metrically necessary, as one could have said ταυρὸν κατεδηδώς, and they compare Anacreon's διὰ δὲ δείρην ἔκοψε μέσην, and κὰδ δὲ λῶπος ἐσχίσθη (fr. 441 Page).

Smoothness and *euphony* were much discussed in antiquity, and although the Scholia notice such effects less often they have a few observations of this sort.[75] Conjunctions of vowels were thought to create a liquid sound, as in 22.135

<div align="center">ἢ πυρὸς αἰθομένου ἢ ἠελίου ἀνιόντος (BT),</div>

or 22. 152

<div align="center">ἢ χιόνι ψυχρῇ, ἢ ἐξ ὕδατος κρυστάλλῳ (BT).[76]</div>

When the death of Euphorbus is compared to the fall of an olive tree (17.53 ff.) they acutely observe the contrast between the smoothness of sound in the first part and the harshness of the pathetic close (BT 17.58):

<div align="center">οἷον δὲ τρέφει ἔρνος ἀνὴρ ἐριθηλὲς ἐλαίης
χώρῳ ἐν οἰοπόλῳ, ὅθ' ἅλις ἀναβέβροχεν ὕδωρ,
καλὸν τηλέθαον· τὸ δέ τε πνοιαὶ δονέουσι
παντοίων ἀνέμων, καί τε βρύει ἄνθεϊ λευκῷ·
ἐλθὼν δ' ἐξαπίνης ἄνεμος σὺν λαίλαπι πολλῇ
βόθρου τ' ἐξέστρεψε καὶ ἐξετάνυσσ' ἐπὶ γαίῃ . . .</div>

Special *rhythmic or metrical effects* are also noticed. When Zeus' nod makes Olympus tremble the speed of the syllables in the dactylic line

<div align="center">κρατὸς ἀπ' ἀθανάτοιο, μέγαν δ' ἐλέλιξεν Ὄλυμπον</div>

suggests the speed of Zeus' movement, and especially the trembling of the mountain (ABT 1.530). The brevity of ἆλτο δ' ὀιστός and κόψε suggests speed (BT 4.125, 12.204). They also note that 12.381 is entirely dactylic, although apparently for no special reason (BT).[77] The A Scholia observe that 11.130 is wholly spondaic:

<div align="center">Ἀτρείδης · τὼ δ' αὖτ' ἐκ δίφρου γουναξέσθην.</div>

They must therefore have scanned Ἀτρείδης as three syllables. They compare *Od.* 21.15, and add that such lines are rare and metrically unattractive.[78] *Il.* 23.221 is also noted as δωδεκασύλλαβος, i.e. spondaic (T):

---

[75] See esp. Demetrius 68 ff., Dionysius, op. cit., *passim*, Stanford, op. cit., esp. pp. 48 ff.

[76] Cf. Demetrius 69 ff. (citing Αἰακός, χιών, Αἴαη, Εὔιος, ἠέλιος, ὀρέων, etc.). On the other hand, a concurrence of long vowels between two words could produce an effect of grandeur and strain, as in the famous passage in the *Odyssey* about Sisyphus (cf. Demetrius 72, Dionysius 20,

Schol. *Od.* 11.596, Eust. 1701.55, 1702. 19–23).

[77] So in fact is 12.380 also. Dactylic lines such as 6.511, 13.30, 20.497, 24.691 are probably intended to suggest speed. Cf. also *Od.* 11.598 (Sisyphus' stone again), *Hom. Hy. Dem.* 89, 171, 184, 380.

[78] Cf. Demetrius 42, on spondaic rhythms in prose.

ψυχὴν κικλήσκων Πατροκλῆος δειλοῖο.

Here the heavy rhythm is obviously appropriate.

The *structure of the line* also receives occasional notice. 3.182

ὦ μάκαρ 'Ατρείδη, μοιρηγενές, ὀλβιόδαιμον

is unusual because 'the expression of praise is built up in a climactic way, each word being a syllable longer than the last' (BT). This 'rhopalic' verse is used at the other end of Classical poetry by Ausonius for a whole Christian poem of 42 lines beginning

Spes, Deus, aeternae stationis conciliator.

There is no doubt that Priam's exclamation is a unique and impressive line (the last two words of which occur nowhere else in Greek literature), whether or not the poet was aware of the special structure which he was producing.

Three-word lines are also rare and striking.[79] The Scholia note an instance at 11.427. Others are 2.706, 15.678, *Od.* 10.137, 12.133a, *Hom. Hy. Dem.* 31, *Hy.* 27.3, Hes. *Op.* 383. Most of these begin with αὐτοκασίγνητος or a similar compound of κασίγνητος.

Pauses (and perhaps also caesurae) already attracted some attention at an early stage. A pause after a trochee in the fifth foot is not permitted (A 12.49, BT 12.434), and a pause after the first long syllable of the fifth foot is rare (A 15.360; cf. Maas, *Greek Metre*, § 88).[80] A pause after the trochee in the second foot is also considered unusual in Homer (A 1.356).[81]

Finally, I have noticed one interesting instance of a remark about *recitation*. When Patroclus arms for battle they say that this passage should be recited quickly, to imitate his haste to prepare for the fight (T 16.131). As the lines are largely formulaic, this could presumably be done without fear that the audience would lose track of the sense.

Merton College, Oxford   N. J. RICHARDSON

[79] Cf. S. E. Bassett, *CP* 12 (1917), 97 ff. and my notes on *Hom. Hy. Dem.* 31. See also Bassett, 'Versus tetracolos', *CP* 14 (1919), 216 ff.

[80] This provides added support for Aristarchus' condemnation of 24.556, although this fact is not mentioned by the Scholia. 557 is also metrically suspect (cf. Leaf). Aristarchus' reading at *Il.* 9.394, γυναῖκά γε μάσσεται, avoids the rare trochaic caesura in the fourth foot which occurs with γυναῖκα γαμέσσεται (Maas, op. cit., § 87), but we do not know why he preferred this reading.

[81] It is not clear whether the Scholia distinguish properly between word-break and pause. According to Aulus Gellius (18.15) it was Varro who first noted the main caesura in the third foot, although it seems that metricians before him had already observed that the central part of the hexameter seldom consisted of a single unit of sense. See Bassett, *The Poetry of Homer* (University of California Press, 1938), pp. 145 ff., and *CP* 11 (1916), 458 ff. (where he shows that Arist. *Metaph.* 1093ª 30 f. does *not* refer to the caesura).