Oral Tradition, 21/1 (2006): 148-189

Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference

Jonathan Burgess

As with other schools of thought in Homeric research, neoanalysis has experienced experimentation and change.[1] Neoanalysts have slowly become aware of points of contact between their methodology and an oralist approach, and recently some oralists have enthusiastically accepted the compatibility of the two schools of thought. Intertextual theory can also provide much insight into the phenomena uncovered by neoanalysis, particularly motif transference. A central concept in neoanalyst methodology, motif transference involves the use of non-Homeric motifs within Homeric poetry. Neoanalysts have persuasively identified examples of motif transference, but their explanation of its mechanics and significance has been lacking. An oralist perspective modifies our understanding of how motif transference is produced and received, and intertextual theory can help explain the possible significance of Homeric reflection of non-Homeric material.

Three levels of narrative are posited for this examination: A) cyclic myth, B) cyclic epic, and C) Homeric epic. Level B (cyclic epic) is an epic version of Level A (cyclic myth).[2] Level C (Homeric epic) exists as a self-

[1] Kakridis (1949:1-10) first coined the term "neoanalysis" and defined its method. For a concise summary of its arguments, see Willcock 1997; for explanation of its methodology, see Kullmann 1981, 1991.

[2] The term "cyclic" when capitalized refers to the specific poems of the Epic Cycle and their earlier versions or performance traditions; otherwise, it refers to oral epic poems of their type (countless and mostly undocumented). Burgess 2001 establishes that the Cycle poems well represent pre-Homeric oral traditions, to the extent that the tradition of the Trojan war can be termed a "cyclic" tradition. On the origins of the Homeric poems I follow, to a large extent, Nagy's evolutionary explanation, which posits performance traditions that gradually became stabilized (e.g., 1996:107-14). The terms

conscious extension of Level A (cyclic myth) and Level B (cyclic epic). Levels B/C (cyclic/Homeric epic) are both manifestations of level A (mythological traditions) that share the same form (long narrative in dactylic hexameter), but Level C (Homeric epic) is a more complex manifestation. While Level B (cyclic epic) presents the narrative in Level A (cylic myth) directly, Level C (Homeric epic) plays off "cyclic" myth and epic in an allusive manner. In the sense that Level C (Homeric epic) employs Level A (mythological traditions) and Level B (cyclic epic) in order to implement its full meaning, we might say that Homeric epic is "metacyclic."[3] Homeric poetry is commonly portrayed as an overwhelming replacement of pre-Homeric tradition, but it is instead a respectful and dependent outgrowth of earlier myth and epic. The traditions from which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* stem are both assumed and appreciated by Homeric poetics.

Motif transference is the transposition of motifs from elsewhere into a Homeric context; the Homeric manifestation of the motif should be recognizably derivative and therefore considered secondary. In my analysis motif transference is not a passive accumulation of influences but an active narratological tool that evokes Trojan war material. Correspondence between Trojan war motifs and their secondary manifestations within the Homeric poems will therefore have implications in terms of meaning. For an audience informed about traditional Greek myth, the secondary Homeric motif will evoke the non-Homeric context, functioning as a subtle yet powerful allusive device. Motif transference so defined would appear to be a distinctive aspect of Homeric poetics. But it is not unrelated to typology and repetition in oral poetry, and it is comparable to such poetic phenomena as mythological *exempla*, or paradigms. Homeric motif transference is therefore an example of how Homeric technique extends oral poetics yet is not independent of it.

"pre-Homeric" and "post-Homeric" used below may seem inappropriate for this conception, but I use them to refer to material that existed before or after the Homeric poems stabilized into entities recognizably like what we think of as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* today.

[3] Cf. Finkelberg 1998:154-55, 2002:160, 2003a:79 on Homeric poetry as "meta-epic."

Neoanalysis

Neoanalysis is a methodology that employs analyst technique in pursuit of a unitarian interpretation of the *Iliad*. It assumes the influence of pre-Homeric material on Homeric poetry and attempts to discover indications of this influence within Homeric poetry. Trojan war episodes that fall outside the narrative boundaries of the Homeric poems have usually interested neoanalysts, especially material concerning the death of Achilles. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* directly refer to many events in course of the war, but it is the inexplicit reflection of these events that has been explored in neoanalysis.

As a source for the pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan war, neoanalysts have primarily used the Epic Cycle. Though the poems of the Cycle are now lost, what we know of them provides important information about the tradition of the Trojan war. Reconstruction of the cyclic tradition can be difficult, and using it as an indication of the pre-Homeric tradition has been controversial. But it is revealing that early Greek artists reflected cyclic themes (but not necessarily the specific Cycle poems themselves) much earlier and much more often than they reflected Homeric themes. It is also apparent that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* did not immediately dominate their tradition, and so post-Homeric evidence for the pre-Homeric tradition is not necessarily contaminated by Homeric influence, at least not at an early date.[4] Using information about the Cycle available to us, we can reconstruct the outlines of early Greek mythology that an early Greek audience would have known when they heard the Homeric poems. In this way we can most fully enjoy the evocation and reception of the Trojan war tradition that would have potentially occurred when Homeric poetry was performed.

The term “neoanalysis” makes reference to the analyst school of thought, dominant in nineteenth-century German scholarship, that argued for multiple authorship of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Neoanalysis actually belongs to the opposing unitarian camp, which insists on a single author for the Homeric poems, but it is built on the foundations of earlier analyst research and at times uses its techniques. Like analysts, neoanalysts look for discrepancies in Homeric poetry, and also like analysts, neoanalysts have speculated on the existence of hypothetical poems in the pre-Homeric past. Whereas analysts theorized compilation of material from various sources, neoanalysts have believed in a single poet strongly influenced by earlier poems.

[4] These points are argued extensively in Burgess 2001.

What neoanalysts have stressed is that certain motifs that apparently exist in both Homeric poetry and the Epic Cycle seem to belong most naturally to the latter. Their arguments have been directed towards the *Iliad* for the most part, though the *Odyssey* is not irrelevant to the methodology.[5] Many of the motif correspondences have long been noticed, though commentators used to routinely conclude either that the Cycle poems stole motifs from Homer or that Cyclic motifs had been interpolated into "late" parts of Homer.[6] Building on this earlier research, neoanalysts in the post-war period argued that Homer extensively re-used Cyclic material in a highly original manner.

Kullmann (1991) has linked to neoanalysis all material that has influenced Homeric poetry, including other mythological cycles (e.g., the journey of the Argonauts), non-mythological material (e.g., folktale), and even non-Greek material (e.g., Near Eastern). Fruitful research has certainly been accomplished in these areas, and its focus on vestigial remnants of influences within Homeric poetry is comparable to the methodology of neoanalysis.[7] But the influence of non-Trojan war material, folktale motifs, or Near Eastern concepts is essentially passive in effect. The audience is not expected to recognize the original context of the motifs, which are foreign to the story of the Trojan war. The Homeric poems may even have been composed without any conscious recognition of the origin of such motifs. Kullmann's collocation of all pre-Homeric influences revealingly fails to recognize any special significance for Trojan war motif transference and reflects a general disinclination among neoanalysts to consider the effect of the phenomena that they have uncovered. The influence of Trojan war material on Homeric poetry should be seen as distinctive, for its presence is

---

[5] Several *Odyssey* passages, notably in Book 24, are essential evidence for neoanalyst arguments. For a neoanalyst perspective on the *Odyssey*, see Heubeck 1992; Danek 1998. Katz (1991:7-14) refers to neoanalyst methodology in a postmodern reading of the poem's multiplicity of meanings.

[6] Some earlier scholars explored the similarities in ways that anticipated neoanalysis; see Kullmann 1960:1-3, 1981:6-7, 1991:428-29; West 2003:2-4. Davison (1962:254-58) and Kullmann (1986) discuss Mülder 1910 and Welcker 1865-82, respectively, as prototypical neoanalysts.

[7] *Argonautica* influence on the *Odyssey*: Meuli 1921. Folktales: Page 1955:1-20, 1973; Glenn 1971; Hölscher 1978, 1989; Hansen 1990, 1997; Burgess 2001:94-114. Near Eastern: Burkert 1992, 2004; West 1997; Cook 2004. *Gilgamesh* parallels: Burgess 1999; Bakker 2001.

likely to play an active role in signifying the larger story of the Trojan war in which the Homeric poems are situated.

Neoanalysis has provided many plausible arguments, even if some of its central tenets remain debatable (Burgess 1997). Yet the potential of its application has not yet been fully realized. More can be done, whether in directions that are either inherent in the methodology or are potential extensions of it. Below the possibilities of a progressive implementation of neoanalysis will be explored, though with no suggestion that there is a single best usage. The main purpose will be to provide further explanation of the cause and function of the concept of motif transference, as it exists in neoanalyst argument.

Neoanalysis and Orality

Neoanalysis developed in an atmosphere innocent of the oralist methodology pioneered by Parry and Lord, and at first glance the two schools of thought would seem incompatible.[8] But it has been increasingly recognized that oral theory is not necessarily inimical to neoanalysis.[9] Both oralists and neoanalysts presume a long pre-Homeric tradition. Whereas oralists focus on the poetic craft of this tradition, neoanalysts are interested in its narrative contents. In several respects, however, oral theory has challenged the practice of neoanalysis, and to some degree neoanalysts have responded to criticism with interesting revisions of their methodology. A survey of three key issues present in conflict between neoanalysts and oralists (texts, typology, and motif priority) will outline the possibilities of a neoanalyst methodology modified by an oralist perspectives.

---

[8] Kakridis (1971:19-20) doubted the South Slavic analogy and espoused a literate Homer. Though Kullmann has sought connections between neoanalysis and oralist method (see below), he has criticized the Parry/Lord comparative approach and insisted on a literate composition of the *Iliad*. See Kullmann 1960:2 n. 3, 152 n. 2, 372 nn. 2, 3; 1981:13-18, 27-42; 2002:170-73 (where the oralist perspectives on Homeric composition and transmission in Burgess 2001 are deemed outside the boundaries of neoanalysis).

[9] Comparison of the two schools of thought: Heubeck 1978; Kullmann 1984. Schoeck 1961 is the first neoanalyst study to employ oral theory extensively, while Fenik 1964 is an early melding of ideas from both schools of thought. More recent mixtures of the two include Slatkin 1991; Janko 1992; M. Edwards 1990, 1991 (the conclusions in M. Edwards [1990:323] are said to be "in accord with the results of the studies of Milman Parry and Albert Lord"); Danek 1998; Burgess 2001. Finkelberg 2003b celebrates the potential of oralist/neoanalyst research.

Texts

In early manifestations of neoanalysis the influences on Homer were considered written texts that Homer had "before his eyes." Neoanalysts postulated hypothetical poems like an "Achilleis" or "Memnonis" in written form and tried to reconstruct their contents. Schadewaldt (1965) outlined and graphed a "Memnonis" with no fewer than twenty scenes in four books. At times neoanalysts even argued that the poems of the Epic Cycle were pre-Homeric poems.[10] After these views were met with objections, neoanalysts tended to shy away from them. Occasionally, however, claims for the pre-Homeric date of Cyclic poems have been revived.[11] Recently new opportunities for this line of argument have arisen because of a general tendency to down-date the Homeric poems.[12] Although I am in sympathy with this trend in dating, I see no need to postulate the influence of the Epic Cycle poems on the Homeric poems. It is not just that our sources for the date of early Greek epic are missing or obscure. The oral context of the composition and performance of early epics should make us wary of pinning an early epic to a specific point in time. And even if early epics could be dated, one cannot assume that one poem at an early date would necessarily be known well enough to influence another. For these reasons it is not advisable to portray identifiable texts as the influences on the Homeric poems.

Some have intelligently posited the existence of oral Cyclic poems in the pre-Homeric tradition.[13] This is likely enough, though these should not be conceived of as static or single oral prototypes of later poems in the Epic Cycle. It is more likely that fluid performance traditions preceded the fixed epics in the Cycle of which we know. And there must have been many pre-Homeric epics that had no direct relationship to the Cycle poems at all, even

---

[10] For an overview see Kullmann 1991:428-30; Willcock 1997:175-76. Kullmann has long argued for a seventh-century date for the *Iliad*, but insists his arguments do not depend on a pre-Homeric date for the Cycle poems.

[11] Kopff 1983; Dowden 1996; Ballabriga 1998:22-32.

[12] For an overview and further bibliography, see Osborne 1996:156-60; Burgess 2001:49-53; van Wees 2002; Cook 2004:48-51. The tide has turned and an eighth-century date should no longer be viewed as the *communis opinio*.

[13] Dihle 1970:149-50; A. Edwards 1985:219-20; Davies 1989:5.

if they covered the same type of narrative (that is, cyclic). The Epic Cycle poems were essentially just verse manifestations—though perhaps particularly prominent ones—of oral mythological traditions that were known in various forms and media. In this sense it is best to regard “cyclic” mythological motifs, episodes, and narratives in general as the sources for the Homeric poems. Whereas neoanalysts have looked for specific Cyclic epics (in Level 2), whether oral or textual, as the source for motifs transferred into a Homeric context, I consider it most plausible to view oral mythological traditions (Level 1) as the primary or source material. The Homeric poems would have also been aware of cyclic epic (Level 2) that exemplifies such myth, but they probably do not allude to specific poems.

Focus on pre-Homeric oral traditions, not texts, eliminates the need for a practice once common in neoanalysis: the attempt to find in the *Iliad* word-for-word quotations of pre-Homeric texts. Though still occasionally attempted, identification of “quotations” of lost Cyclic verse within Homeric poetry is not only very speculative, but has dubious justification in the context of the early Archaic period.[14] It is sometimes tempting to associate certain phraseology with narrative contexts, but that does not mean that it belongs to a single text. Rather it might be regarded as phraseology that tended to be employed in connection with a specific narrative.

One aspect of the textual nature of the early work of neoanalysts was the assumption that motifs found in Homeric poetry reflect another narrative in a very exact manner. Neoanalysts as a result argued for very detailed correspondences between Homeric motifs and their non-Homeric counterparts. But one cannot suppose such a degree of detail if the motifs have been transferred from traditional myth (or generally from multitudinous cyclic epics) and not specific, fixed texts. Though traditional narrative will remain stable in its essential elements, minor details do not remain uniform, and minor details are likely to be omitted or modified when a motif is transferred. Once the possibility of textual sources for Homeric poetry is rejected, the old neoanalyst strategy of seeking as many detailed correspondences as possible becomes unconvincing. What remains plausible

[14] Surviving Cyclic fragments display a high degree of correspondence with Homeric phraseology. This most likely results from the typology of oral composition (Notopoulos 1964:18-45; Burkert 1981), as opposed to Cyclic imitation of Homeric features (Kirk 1976:183-200; Curti 1993) or *vice versa*. Formulaic typology in early epic constitutes an intertextuality of immanent meaning (Foley 1991; see also Foley 1995:42-47, 1999:13-34) but does not suggest a connection between texts. See Todorov 1981:24-25 on intertextuality that evokes not specific texts but an “anonymous ensemble,” such as technique, style, genre, and tradition.

is the identification of a shared central element, or "pivot" (Schoeck 1961:101).

Typology

Another issue that stems from oral theory that neoanalysis has had to confront is typology. Typology comes in many shapes and sizes. Parry focused on the noun-epithet formulaic system, which involves phraseology that usually is less than a line of verse. He also readily accepted the typology demonstrated by Arend of certain recurring scenes, like preparation of meals, arming, and so on. Lord extended the scope of typology to "themes," and certain kinds of typological structures have also been observed within similar narrative situations, like battles or speeches.[15]

Oralists tend to think of motifs in oral traditions as adaptable to any story, much as formulas and type-scenes can be employed in different situations. They therefore view correspondence between Homeric and non-Homeric motifs as insignificant. Especially objectionable from the oralist perspective is the argument that one example of a motif has priority over another. This is a serious challenge to neoanalysis: if there is no significant relationship between two forms of a motif, or it is unclear that one is primary and the other secondary, then much of neoanalyst theory is undercut.[16]

The term "motif" has been used variously, signifying a wide range of material.[17] This flexibility is certainly useful, but it can be vague and confusing. In the context of motif transference, the term for the most part refers to actions that are part of a narrative. This reduction of a narrative to a series of motifs owes something to the work of Propp, who broke the Russian folktale down to its basic elements.[18] But whereas Propp demonstrated the typology of motifs and stock characters in folktale,

[15] Parry 1971 (404-7 on Arend); Lord 1960; Fenik 1968; M. Edwards 1992.

[16] See Lord 1960:159; Page 1963:23; Fenik 1964:32-33, 1968:229-40; Nagler 1974:24-26; Jensen 1980:30-36; Nagy 1990b:130-31.

[17] See Todorov 1981:48; Bremond 1982.

[18] Propp 1984. Such an analysis follows the superficial narrative level of a story, to be distinguished from the hidden deep-structure elements in structuralist studies. Burkert (1979:5-14) compares the approach of Propp and Lévi-Strauss. Application of Propp's method to scenes in the *Odyssey*: Hölscher 1978:55; M. Edwards 1987a:62.

neoanalyst argument is concerned with specific characters committing particular actions.

In an important article Kullmann acknowledged that typical motifs exist, but argued that there are also "more specific motifs or specific nuances in general motifs" whose adoption by the Homeric poems can be recognized (1984:312). This argument is undeniably true to some extent. For example, Agamemnon's return from the Trojan war is not idiosyncratic; *nostos* is a general motif shared by a number of heroic myths. But the murder of Agamemnon upon his arrival is an aspect of his return that can be said to belong to him. Because the return of Agamemnon is generally similar to that of Odysseus, the two returns are repeatedly compared in the *Odyssey*. Yet a mythologically informed audience would be shocked by a narrative in which Penelope and a lover ambushed Odysseus upon his return. It is true that the poem effectively allows the question of Penelope's fidelity to emerge from time to time as a potentiality, and it is also true that the existence of variants would leave an audience in doubt as to how exactly Odysseus would achieve his successful return.[19] But the essential plot that resulted in Odysseus' successful return would normally be respected. The return tale is generic, but there are specific details for particular mythological versions of this tale-type.

Traditional mythological narrative always contains aspects of typology, but at some level is never completely typical. To be mythological it must have some stable and specific elements, such as major characters and a main plotline. Otherwise a myth-teller would be free to gather together a new collocation of motifs every time the story is told. Achilles could wear a lion skin and brandish a club, Odysseus could command the Argo, and Agamemnon could put out his eyes after marrying his mother. Such was not the case in Greek myth, for typology does not overwhelm the distinctiveness of individual characters and their stories. If specific elements regularly appear in a particular myth, then it should be noticeable when these specific elements appear in a different myth in which they do not belong. In this situation one myth has influenced the narration of another as a result of motif transference.

[19] Cf. Katz 1991; Ahl and Roisman 1996:205-72; Danek 1998. Foley (1999:115-67) demonstrates that return to a wife is a tale type in South Slavic and Indo-European oral epic.

A key criterion in the analysis of typology is degree of repetition.[20] A motif that reoccurs often in different contexts appears to be typical, and one cannot suppose that one instance has any relationship to another. Matters are not so clear when the repetition is limited. If there are only a few examples of a motif, it becomes tempting to investigate the possibility of a relationship between them. A pair of repeated elements suggests correspondence even more strongly. One instance may serve to foreshadow or prepare for a second instance, in what is called an "anticipatory doublet."[21] An example is the flame that burns around Diomedes' head (*Iliad* 5.4-8) that seems to anticipate the flame that burns around Achilles' head (18.205-14, 225-27). Encouraging one's inclination to see a connection between the two passages is the extensive manner in which Diomedes seems to be a doublet of Achilles.[22]

In a more extensive sequence of anticipatory doublets, scenes at Scheria in the *Odyssey* seem to provide extensive anticipatory mirroring of elements in Odysseus' later experience at Ithaca. The reception of Odysseus is pleasant and welcoming for the most part, but some unsettling details serve to foreshadow the trials of his homecoming.[23] In both situations Odysseus remains initially disguised, encounters a powerful but enigmatic queen, and engages young rivals in contests. Though the Scheria scenes have their own intrinsic value for the poem, certain motifs within them look forward to later material found in scenes at Ithaca. In effect, the Scheria motifs constitute a series of anticipatory doublets. From this type of significant repetition within the Homeric poems, it is only a short step further, *mutatis mutandis*, into the world of neoanalysis, where Homeric motifs are thought to reflect paradigmatic Trojan war material external to the

---

[20] On the various types of Homeric repetition and analogy, I have found the following especially helpful: Lohmann 1970; Austin 1975:115-29; Andersen 1987; M. Edwards 1991:11-23; Lowenstam 1993:1-12.

[21] Fenik 1968:213-14; M. Edwards 1987b:50-51, 1991:19-20.

[22] See Schoeck 1961:75-80; Alden 2000:169-75. Trojans explicitly compare the two at 6.96-101. Their prayer that Diomedes will fall at the Scaean gates at 6.306-7 could be an allusion to Achilles' fate.

[23] See Lang 1969; Lowenstam 1993:207-28.

Homeric poems.[24] Homeric motifs that reflect material outside the poem function in ways that are comparable to the anticipatory doublet.

Repetition of motifs in motif transference is not finite in the way it is in the case of anticipatory doublets. According to my analysis, motif transference involves a Homeric motif reflecting innumerable manifestations of a motif in oral myth. There are parameters to the repetition in motif transference, however. The Homeric instance of the motif will refer to a motif that is traditionally linked to a particular narrative context. The mythological context may be expressed multiple times and in various manners, but its basic contours remain stable. So motif transference is essentially limited to a Homeric instance and a source motif that is contextually bound, even if it occurs in a multiple and fluid manner. In this sense motif transference is a pairing, analogous to the pairing of anticipatory doublets within the Homeric poems.

Though oralists are correct to note that typology can undercut the arguments of neoanalysts, not all motifs are "building blocks. . .with which the oral poets could create an endless variety of scenes using the same basic materials" (Fenik 1964:33). Typological motifs coexist with other more specific elements. Typology with unlimited repetition resists the linkage of two instances of a motif, but limited repetition invites recognition of a correspondence between different manifestations. The existence of a wide spectrum of types of repetition is often recognized in oralist works, like the seminal *Singer of Tales* by Albert Lord. Though Lord states that the movement of motifs is so fluid that they cannot belong to a tradition (1960:159), in his arguments he repeatedly traces the transference of what neoanalysts would call specific motifs to new contexts in the Homeric poems. The essential pattern of withdrawal, devastation, and return that he discusses (186-97) is typical, and neoanalyst methodology could not be applied to it. But his comments recognize that sometimes correspondence is derivative, not merely parallel, as when Patroclus in his death is recognized as a double of Achilles (195). Discrepancies are cited as evidence for such phenomena. This type of argument, that there are motifs that belong to one context and their transference to the context of the Homeric poems is discernible, is essentially a neoanalyst argument.

Priority of Motifs

Neonalysts assume priority in their description of motif transference. One of two examples of a motif is considered primary and the other

[24] An analogy made by McLeod (1987:35).

secondary (the one that occurs within Homeric poetry). In the example of the flame motif, it seems certain that its application to Diomedes reflects its later application to the more major character Achilles at an important point in the poem. But it not always clear to whom a motif "belongs," and neoanalysts have expended much effort in establishing that certain motif manifestations are primary and others secondary.

Critics have complained about the lack of objective criteria in neoanalyst categorization of primary and secondary instances of motifs.[25] If a Homeric version of a motif seems as appropriate as a corresponding extra-Iliadic version, then the question of priority is not easily resolved. Arguably, motifs labeled "secondary" by neoanalysts were actually invented for their Homeric occurrence and then subsequently imitated elsewhere. Subjective neoanalyst arguments that portray the non-Homeric manifestation of a motif as somehow superior (more dramatic, more aesthetically pleasing) than the Homeric manifestation can be less than convincing. As a result, even scholars who have accepted correspondence between the *Iliad* and cyclic motifs have not always agreed with the neoanalyst premise that they are used in a secondary manner in the *Iliad*.[26]

For a neoanalyst argument about motif transference to be persuasive, priority or unequal status must be established. Neoanalysts have often plausibly established such status by stressing peculiarities in the re-use of motifs. Indeed, the uncovering of a secondary motif's inappropriateness lies at the heart of neoanalysis; in this activity it is heir to the analyst tradition. A close reading of the Homeric text is employed in search for evidence that a motif has been imperfectly adapted to a new context, and the Homeric instance is portrayed as a single and unusual manifestation of a motif that usually exists in a different context. Another method of recognizing motif transference is to identify the re-use of specific, as opposed to typical, motifs. Repetition is common in Homeric poetry and the Epic Cycle, but in itself is not necessarily significant.[27] Correspondence may indicate nothing

---

[25] E.g., Page 1963:22; Lesky 1967:75; Dihle 1970:11-26. For a reply to such criticism, see Kullmann 1960:29-50.

[26] For example, Evelyn-White (1914:xxx) assumes that the *Aethiopis* has taken motifs from the *Iliad*; West (2003) reverts to this type of argument, with a complexity comparable to the tangled pedigree of textual conflation at Reinhardt 1961.

[27] Homeric: Fenik 1964:148-54, 1974:133-232; Nickel 2002. Cyclic: Welcker 1865-82, 2:13; Pestalozzi 1945:34; Kullmann 1960:224; Fenik 1964:10, 38-39, 1968:237-38.

more than expansion of themes or roles, as for example the paired doublets Mentor/Mentes, Melantho/Melanthius, or even Circe/Calypso in the *Odyssey*. In Trojan war myth the early, failed Teuthranian expedition is essentially a doublet of the campaign against Troy (usually assumed secondary, though it has been argued that it is primary).[28] Other cyclic repetition includes the various foreign defenders of Troy (Rhesus, Penthesileia, Memnon, and Eurypylus), or conditions necessary for the fall of Troy (e.g., the stealing of the Palladium, the summoning of Philoctetes). Achilles and Memnon share characteristics (children of goddesses, Hephaistean golden armor) that seem more than coincidental, but it is not certain that one was created in imitation of the other; more likely, a degree of polarity or ironic correspondence developed over a long period of time. Motif transference needs to involve more than correspondence.

Priority does seem to be discernible in the case of several characters in the *Iliad* who appear to be Achilles doublets. Above it was noted that Diomedes has been considered a doublet of Achilles. Diomedes is a major character with his own important role in the poem, but several motifs associated with him seem to belong to Achilles. A number of very minor characters have also been considered to be doublets of Achilles because of certain characteristics readily associated with Achilles specifically (like foreknowledge of dual fates).[29] The most notable doublet of Achilles in the *Iliad*, however, is Patroclus. Motifs pertaining to Patroclus in the *Iliad* (e.g., his duel with a foreign defender of Troy, a death brought about with Apollo's assistance, an elaborate funeral with games) correspond to motifs we know were featured in the later life of Achilles. The sequence of motifs, which we might call the "Achilles *fabula*," features some motifs that are specific to myth about Achilles (e.g, death before the walls of Troy, with Apollo involved), and others that are typical but more appropriate for a hero of the stature of Achilles (e.g., funeral games).[30] The resemblance of Patroclus to Achilles seems to result from expansion of the traditional character of Patroclus so that his actions reflect events in the traditional story

---

[28] Carpenter 1946:54-64.

[29] Achilles~Euchenor: Kullmann 1960:309, 1981:4-25, 1991:441 n. 65; Fenik 1968:4, 148-49**.** Achilles~Menesthius: Schoeck 1961:54; Asius~Achilles (and Patroclus): Lowenstam 1981:115; Achilles~Hippothous: Rabel 1991.

[30] In narratological terms a chronological sequence of actions is a *fabula*, a narrative abstraction that is not identical to a specific poem's version of that *fabula*. See de Jong 1987:xiv, 31-32; 2001:xiv.

of Achilles. What distinguishes Patroclus as an example of an Achilles doublet is that the primary motifs are located outside the boundary of the poem, in myth about Achilles. Patroclus thus serves as doublet in true neoanalyst fashion, for the motifs attached to him are secondary and reflect a primary situation external to the *Iliad*.

In another type of motif transference, a specific motif is applied to the same character with whom it was originally associated but transferred to a new chronological time in his story. The reflection of Achilles' funeral in Book 18 of the *Iliad* is an example. Achilles lies in the dust, Thetis and the Nereids wail and surround Achilles, and Thetis cradles the head of her son in her arms. This behavior seems insufficiently motivated by the death of Patroclus, but is reminiscent of the mythological scene of the funeral of Achilles. A traditional event in his story has been chronologically displaced.[31]

Motif transference, the secondary Homeric reflection of a primary specific motif that exists in oral traditions, appears to be one aspect of Homeric poetics. It is a rather sophisticated poetic device, much different from mere repetition. The transference of specific motifs from one character or situation to another is not possible in the normal course of myth, for the stability of tradition precludes it (as discussed above; Agamemnon does not marry his mother, for instance). On the basis of the limited evidence that we have, motif transference does not seem be a feature of non-Homeric epic either (though below I argue it is not unrelated to certain phenomena in oral poetics). As such, motif transference is a distinctively Homeric device, and the central component of what I term the "metacyclic" nature of Homeric poetry.

Neoanalysis and Intertextuality

Neoanalysts have been more energetic in establishing correspondences between motifs in the *Iliad* and outside the *Iliad* than in explaining exactly how and why a motif is re-used by the Homeric poems. The effect and function of motif transference requires further exploration. It will be useful in this regard to introduce the term "intertextuality" into the discussion.

---

[31] Kakridis 1949:65-75; Pestalozzi 1945:26, 32, 42; Schadewaldt 1965:166; Kullmann 1960:331-32, 1984:310, 1991:441; Schoeck 1961:43-44; M. Edwards 1990:312.

Can one describe the relationship between the Homeric and non-Homeric that results from motif transference as a kind of intertextuality? A word featuring "text" might seem inappropriate for the Homeric poems, which in the very least stem from oral compositional techniques, were certainly not first publicized with the aid of texts, and were textualized at an uncertain date by unknown processes. And as discussed above, Homeric allusions to extra-Homeric narrative would not likely refer to specific texts, but rather to mythological traditions. But much depends on the meaning of the term "intertextuality," which has been variously employed. In its common, debased usage, intertextuality refers to literary allusion and influence. This will not fit the oral circumstances of epic composition in the Archaic Age very easily. A more theoretical formulation of intertextuality could potentially engage with oral circumstances quite well, though the appropriateness of this application needs to be scrutinized carefully.[32]

Most intertextual studies by classicists have focused on the relatively textual world of Roman literature and its sources. Several recent studies display an admirable theoretical sophistication and are generally helpful to our concerns here.[33] But the oral circumstances of early Greek epic present a different and more daunting challenge. Can oral poems influence one another? If that is conceivable, is the process of influence recoverable? "Weak" intertextual analyses that have modernized source criticism and yet remain textually bound cannot address such questions.

The fluidity of oral narrative poses no insurmountable difficulty for a postmodern exploration of intertextuality, however, since from this perspective all cultural constructs can be considered "texts" (though I will not refer to oral narratives as "texts" because of the high potential for confusion). On the other hand, the infinite regress of many postmodern approaches, in which everything potentially connects in an endless intersection of "texts," is inimical to reaching an understanding of the poetics at work. The challenge for an intertextual examination of oral epic is

---

[32] Peradotto (1997:10) distinguishes between the "weakest, least provocative sense of the word" comparable to old-fashioned *Quellenforschung* in classical studies (cf. the title of Kullmann 1960) and its "strong or postmodern sense." The term was coined by Kristeva; see espec. Kristeva 1980:36-91. Useful general discussions of types of intertextuality include Jenny 1982; Genette 1997:1-15; Allen 2000; Fowler 2000. See Danek 1998:13-15 for a sensible application of intertextuality to oral epic.

[33] Hinds 1998; Fowler 2000:115-37; Edmunds 2001. For an intertextual exploration of Hellenistic literature, see Hubbard 1998. Fowler (2000:131) notes that the issue of orality has made Hellenists more cautious than Latinists about intertextuality.

to respect the fluidity of the oral circumstances without losing the ability to discern the possible effect of correspondence.

The most ambitious and thorough attempt to delineate "intertextuality" in early Greek epic has been made by Pietro Pucci.[34] The focus is on how the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* "read" one another. The argument is subtle and rewarding, though some aspects remain problematic. Pucci employs the terminology of literacy ("texts," "reading") that, though applied with postmodern sophistication and acknowledgment of the poems' oral origins, can seem inappropriate.[35] An ahistorical approach, with only vague references to a formative period in which the two Homeric poems evolved together (1987:18, 41, 61), leaves many implications of the argument hanging. Though the intertextuality theoretically involves mutual interaction between both Homeric poems, the argument in practice tends to characterize the *Odyssey* as reactive in relation to the *Iliad*. This priority actually suggests a later historical date for the *Odyssey*, or at the very least assumes a secondary status for this poem.

More troubling in my view is the exclusively Homercentric manner of the explored relationship between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*. References in the *Odyssey* to the charm of the Muses, or the *klea andrôn*, or "giant texts (songs) of the Trojan war" are all interpreted as references to the *Iliad*.[36] But such passages more plausibly allude to the general tradition of the Trojan war, that is, the cylic epic tradition. A careful reader will find small signs that Pucci is conscious of this weakness in the argument, and occasionally he apologizes for the exclusion of the Cyclic evidence by reference to the paucity of its surviving evidence (1987:17, 143). This strikes me as at least defeatist in its disinclination to consider the wider expanse of early epic traditions.

Gregory Nagy has sought to explain apparent intertextuality in early epic within the context of orality. In Nagy's formulation, "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

[34] Pucci 1987; see also Pucci 1998.

[35] Nagy 2003:9-10. The practice is defended at Pucci 1988:27-28; Pedrick 1994:85, 94 nn. 38, 39.

[36] Pucci 1987:198, esp. n. 21, 209-13, 216, 220. See also Pucci 1998:5-6.

to another passage in another text."[37] Instead, Nagy sees longstanding poetic performance traditions continuously influencing and reacting to other longstanding yet still evolving poetic traditions (diachronic cross-references, in Nagy's terminology).[38] The denial of textualized reference is justifiable, since intertextuality at this time period cannot confidently be reduced to influence from one text to another. That leaves long-term intertextuality between fluid poetic traditions a possible form of poetic interaction, however difficult it may be to conceptualize.[39]

The *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* themselves are often portrayed as competitors, and this is a plausible possibility.[40] The "metacyclic" nature of the two Homeric poems places them in a special, circumscribed category (level C, Homeric poetry). Self-awareness of their metacyclic nature would allow and encourage interaction between the two poems (how this is conceived depends on a scholar's stance toward the Homeric Question). It may have sometimes happened that non-Homeric epics became so valued, not least for their sociopolitical functions, that they would be stabilized by re-performance, with identifiable performance traditions eventually resulting. Different performance traditions with different functions could conceivably lead to agonistic rivalry.[41]

But intertextuality between non-Homeric epics (or epic performance traditions) cannot be readily assumed in the Archaic Age. The ontological status of performance traditions is not clear at an early date. We speak of

[37] Nagy 1979:40; discussed further and given different emphasis at 2003:8-9; see also 1990a:53-54.

[38] This concept is applied to the Cyclic epics at Nagy 1990a:70-79. Cf. Lang 1983 on "reverberation," an argument that tends to assume that secondary Homeric motifs instantly received equal status with primary motifs in longstanding mythological traditions. But the Homeric poems did not immediately dominate their tradition in the Archaic Age; see Burgess 2001.

[39] For concerns, see Beye 1993:30-34, 262-65; Clay 1997:241-46 (reply at Nagy 2003:7-19).

[40] Besides Pucci 1987, see Burkert 1997; Usener 1990; Danek 1998:509-12; Schein 2001; Rengakos 2002. Page (1955:158-59) argued that the *Iliad* was unknown to the poet of the *Odyssey* because the *Odyssey* seems to avoid allusion to its material.

[41] For speculative attempts to recover the diachronic permutations of rival performance traditions, cf. Aloni 1986:51-67; Burgess 2002; Marks 2002, 2003.

early Greek epic poems with hindsight from the perspective of their fixed and recorded artifacts, and we cannot be sure that performance traditions would have had the self-awareness about either themselves or other performance traditions to engage in allusive intertextuality. It should also be wondered whether all early epic can be herded into particular performance traditions. Many poems would not have been re-performed to such an extent as to result in an identifiable performance tradition, and not every epic performer would have performed exclusively in a recognized poetic tradition.[42] Direct connections between evolving performance traditions within level B (cyclic epic) or between specific performance traditions in levels B (cyclic epic) and C (Homeric epic) may not have been common at a time when individual poetic compositions were not necessarily celebrated as distinct entities. Competition was an essential aspect of the performance of epic, as of so many areas of Greek culture, but this does not necessarily translate into competition between poetic traditions as distinct entities.[43]

What does all this mean for neoanalysis? Since neoanalysis can be mixed with oralist methodology, as was seen above, its practice need not depend on the literacy inherent in source criticism or in "weak" intertextuality. On the other hand, neoanalyst attempts to trace the process of motif transference cannot easily function within the world of postmodern intertextuality, at least as it is often practiced. Motif transference, even as modified by an oralist perspective, has certain parameters—for instance, the labeling of motifs as primary or secondary, with the secondary evoking the primary—that would be deemed overly restrictive by some theoretical

---

[42] One bard might potentially sing a wide range of various narratives: Woodhouse 1930:242-43; Lord 1960:151; Willcock 1976:287; M. Edwards 1990:316, 1991:17-18; Anderson 1997:56; West 2003:6.

[43] On competition and early Greek verse, see Griffith 1990 (especially relevant on narrative variation and contradiction); Ford 2002:272-93; Collins 2004. On this issue my analysis differs from that of Finkelberg, who argues that the "meta-epic" nature of Homeric poetry is intended to "supersede" or "neutralize" other traditions (2003a:75, 78-79). I see the metacyclic nature of Homeric poetry as more parasitic in nature, in the sense that the full extent of its potential meaning is dependent on cyclic myth. Scodel (2004) effectively questions the agonistic nature of Homeric poetry. I would add that it is misleading to conflate myth and epic; a Homeric stance on, e.g., Heracles is not necessarily directed towards an epic about Heracles. Agonistic rivalry at the level of narrative presentation need not entail hostility at the level of narrative content.

stances.[44] Within this range of possibilities, which is indeed rather wide, neoanalyst arguments can be reinterpreted as demonstrating an "intertextuality" between Homeric epic and mythological traditions (that is, cyclic traditions, but probably not the Cycle poems or specific cyclic epics). Intertextuality in early epic is doubtful in textual terms, and does not even need to be conceived as a relation between fluid performance traditions. Often it is more plausible to posit intertextuality between a poem (or its performance tradition) and mythological traditions variously expressed in different media and notionally known throughout the culture. This intertextuality involves paradigmatic correspondence between motifs outside of Homeric poetry and within it, most strikingly in the phenomenon described above as "motif transference."

An Oral, Intertextual Neoanalysis

What purpose can be served by neoanalysis practiced from an oralist perspective with consideration of intertextual theory? One hopes that it might better explain the poetic function of the phenomena that have been observed by neoanalysts. The purpose of motif transference has not been adequately addressed by neoanalysts, who have in fact often assumed that it is passive in effect. A different analysis is possible, one that perceives an actively allusive significance for motif transference, though such difficult issues as authorial intention and audience reception need to be taken into account.

Neoanalyses

In general, neoanalysts imply that they are uncovering a compositional process that was not recognized by the audience. The unitarian perspective of neoanalysis has emphasized not allusion to tradition but creative transformation of pre-Homeric material into something new and superior that leaves its sources behind.[45] Some neoanalysts have suggested

[44] But not all; e.g., Riffaterre (1978, 1983) offers a strong argument that a text produces intertextual significance through "ungrammaticalities" in a controlled and recognizable manner (see espec. 1978:195 n.27, 1983:6).

[45] For Willcock (1997:189) the ultimate value of neoanalysis is the isolation of creativity, which in turn is seen to point toward a single original poet.

that "Homer" was occasionally unsuccessful in his transformation of available material to a new setting, allowing us to discover his sources. This view is best exemplified by Schadewaldt, who speaks of looking over the poet's shoulder and discovering the secrets of his composition (1965:155). It is assumed that the audience, as opposed to the neoanalyst scholar, is not able to recognize inconsistencies resulting from motif re-use, or is not bothered if it does.[46] A variant of this view suggests that Homer was so thoroughly steeped in traditional material that he unconsciously slipped into it when he made his own compositions. His inappropriate use of this material allows the critic to discover influences on the poet, influences that the poet would not even have consciously recognized as he composed. This view is best exemplified by Schoeck.[47]

Whole War

But neoanalyst methodology can also allow for the possibility of active evocation by motif transference. The evocation by the *Iliad* of many past and future events in the Trojan war outside the boundaries of the poem has often been recognized. Much material in the *Iliad* does not seem to belong to the dramatic time of the poem but rather suggests mythological events outside the *Iliad.* This contextualization of the *Iliad* within the whole war is sometimes accomplished by direct reference, but it also occurs by means of indirect reflection that should be considered a type of motif transference.

Especially notable are scenes in Books 2-7 of the *Iliad* that seem more appropriate for the beginning of the war, such as the catalogue of ships, the marshaling of troops, the duel between Paris and Menelaus, and Priam's inability to recognize the Greek leaders from the wall of the city. Analysts found in such temporal discrepancies evidence of multiple authorship, and so sometimes unitarians have felt compelled to deny, rather unpersuasively, that they exist at all. A different approach has been to interpret these temporal peculiarities as mistakes made by a poet immersed in oral tradition.

---

[46] Cf. Kakridis 1971:17-18; Kullmann 1981:23.

[47] Schoeck 1961. At 1960:29-50 and *passim* Kullmann repeatedly speaks of a traditional or oral poet as unaware of his errors.

In oral composition, it has been suggested, the focus is only on the passage immediately at hand and chronological inconsistency is not noticed.[48]

Instead of thinking that the *Iliad* repeatedly "goes off track" in the opening books of the *Iliad*, we will better suppose that the early stages of the war are evoked by the use of motifs that obviously belong to a different chronological setting. This is secondary use of motifs to trigger recognition of the primary motifs belonging to the traditional narrative of the whole war, and it is comparable to reflection in the later books of the *Iliad* of events that occur after the end of the poem, like the death of Achilles and the fall of Troy. In effect, large-scale Homeric reflection of Trojan war events that occurred before the start of the narrative (external analepsis, in narratological terms) and after the end of the narrative (external prolepsis) is the result.[49]

The passages in question are not mistakes that require excision or toleration, but recognizable allusions to the early years of the war. That effect would be part of the general evocation of the whole Trojan war, upcoming events as well as past events, that many scholars have noticed in the *Iliad*.[50] This observation goes back to antiquity; in Chapter 23 of the *Poetics* Aristotle states:

> νῦν δ᾽ ἓν μέρος ἀπολαβὼν ἐπεισοδίοις κέχρηται αὐτῶν πολλοῖς, οἷον νεῶν καταλόγῳ καὶ ἄλλοις ἐπεισοδίοις οἷς διαλαμβάνει τὴν ποίησιν
>
> Focusing on one part [Homer] employs many episodes of other parts, such as the catalogue of ships and other episodes by which he breaks up the composition.

Else (586) comments: "Aristotle saw what modern scholarship has rediscovered: that Homer selected episodes from the whole course of the war

---

[48] Unitarian analysis: notably Scott 1921:167-71; Tsagarakis 1982. Oralist: Bowra 1930:110-12; Lord 1960:187-88; Kirk 1985:286-87. Kakridis (1971:31-39) and Jamison (1994) ascribe some of these scenes to a typology of bridal abduction independent of the Trojan war.

[49] For narratology and Homeric poetry, see de Jong 1987, 2001; Richardson 1990.

[50] Murray 1934:184-86; Whitman 1958:39-45, 267-71; Else 1957:585-86; Schein 1984:19-25; M. Edwards 1987a:188-97; Taplin 1992 (espec. 83-109, 257-84); Nickel 1997:307-12; Rengakos 2004. Danek (1998:511-12) links the phenomenon with oral poetics, citing South Slavic analogues.

and incorporated them into a story which, chronologically speaking, is incompatible with them."[51]

Aristotle's reference to the "breaking up" of the narrative (διαλαμβάνει τὴν ποίησιν) suggests, in intertextual terms, that as the *Iliad* proceeds in a horizontal or syntagmatic direction with its own story it is repeatedly interrupted by other narratives. These other narratives are connected to the *Iliad*'s story, but in a vertical or paradigmatic sense they challenge the immediate narrative at hand. In other words, the *Iliad* exists within a matrix of intertextuality. As far as Trojan war motifs are concerned, this is a recognizable intertextuality, with one part of the story of the war containing markers pointing to other parts of the story. Various inconcinnities or "ungrammaticalities" reveal this matrix. Though unitarians have sometimes resisted this portrayal of the poem, analysts, neoanalysts, oralists, and intertextualist scholars have generally agreed with it; what is disputed by these different perspectives is the degree of interruption, the effect on the narrative at hand, and the possibility of recognition by an audience.

In my view the chronological inappropriateness in the *Iliad* is a brilliant narratological manipulation of time. The complete story of the war is suggested by the narration of one incident in the war. But there is more to the phenomenon than an efficient narration of multiple events. Evocation of Trojan war material suggests the motivation and consequences of the characters' actions.[52] The inescapable past and the unavoidable future become conflated with the present, and the human condition is depicted as an ineffable and intense temporal implosion of longstanding causality and looming destiny.

The main interest of neoanalysts has usually been in Iliadic use of the Achilles *fabula* alone, not the whole war. When they have noticed Iliadic reflection of the whole war, they have done so with some sense of its allusive nature.[53] Yet this is seeemingly incompatible with standard

---

[51] Else 1957:586. The phenomenon is also recognized in Eustathios; see Rengakos 2004:292 for passages and discussion.

[52] For a brilliant analysis of the role of time for characterization in the *Iliad*, see Kullmann 1968.

[53] Cf. Pestalozzi 1945:39-41, 46-52; Kullmann 1960:5 n. 2, 366-68, 1968:17-18, 1981:42; Schoeck 1961:16, 117-20; Kakridis 1971:32, 61. The correspondences themselves between the *Iliad* and the whole war are exhaustively established by Kullmann 1960. Suggestive if inconclusive are remarks on "double time" in Kullmann

neoanalyst methodology, which posits creative, transformative adaptation, discernible only in its infelicities. If Iliadic motif transference actively suggests the whole war, as I believe it does, then it should also actively suggest the Achilles *fabula* as well. Of particular importance more recently has been the original reworking of neoanalysis by Slatkin, which has convincingly demonstrated the significant role that traditions about Thetis play in the *Iliad*, and the emphasis by Danek on the impact of non-Homeric material on reception of the *Odyssey*.[54] But although some have employed neoanalysis to perceive active signification, the essential methodology of neoanalysis assumes quite the opposite. It seems that the textual nature of early neoanalysis imposed limitations on a narrative's potential meaning, whereas neoanalysis employed from an oralist perspective has allowed perception of more meaningful poetic results of motif transference. What neoanalysts have considered mistakes discernible only by the critic are better seen as important signposts recognizable by the audience.[55]

Homeric poetry (Level C) does not try to obliterate the cyclic mythopoetic traditions (Levels A, B), but actively seeks to make connections to them in a complex and transformative manner (one that I call "metacyclic"). This is not stealing from cyclic tradition or accidentally misusing it; it is the employment of traditional material in a new context so as to evoke the original context. Inappropriateness does not result from unskillful composition, but rather is designed to force recognition of the context in which the material is usually set. In this way Homeric poetry achieves a sophisticated type of intertextuality.[56] Motif transference may be a distinctive characteristic of Homeric poetry, but it does not mean that Homeric poetry (Level C) overcame, vanquished, or superseded cyclic

---

1960:366-68, and also on time and characterization in Kullmann 1968, as noted above. Heubeck, an early adherent of neoanalyst methodology, insightfully demonstrated the *Iliad*'s portrayal of the whole war (1991, 1954:70-91).

[54] Slatkin 1991, espec. 107-10; Danek 1998, 2001, 2002.

[55] Clarke (1981:214) contends that neoanalysts demonstrate "how Homer preserved the power and the associations of the epic tradition" to give the *Iliad* "added resonances"; it is much less likely that Homer "borrowed from specific poems and somehow neglected to cover his tracks." Danek (1998:5) faults analyst and neoanalyst work on the *Odyssey* for ignoring the poetic effect of Homeric re-use of traditional material.

[56] I find my main points compatible with the characteristics of "intertextuality" as opposed to characteristics of an older sense of "allusion" in Fowler 2000.

traditions (Levels A, B). Far from it; instead of making the cyclic obsolete, the Homeric depends upon the cyclic for its poetic functioning.

Intention

An argument that favors the active significance of poetic phenomena may be found objectionable by those who suspect that this argument implies intentionalism. Identification of an author's intent that was deemed inappropriate in New Criticism had little chance of revival in later theory that proclaimed the death of the author.[57] Over time there has been a tendency to move the focus out from author to the text and on to the audience receiving the text. Intertextual studies that emphasize literary sources and influences often find this situation awkward: if there are observable connections between one text and another, how did they get there? Some classicists pursuing intertextuality have found it necessary to raise the possibility of authorial intention, usually with varying degrees of regret, embarassment, or self-justification.[58]

Neoanalysts, and their admirers among purveyors of the single genius theory, wish to ascribe phenomena uncovered by neoanalysis to a radically new technique of an inventive composer. But their arguments, persuasive or not, need not presume an author's intention. Recognition of motif transference requires the acceptance of a distinctive "metacyclic" nature for Homeric poetry, but not a monumental poet. We can sidestep the question of what was intended in composition and instead explore the effect of what neoanalysts have noticed. Using the textual evidence as a basis of such an exploration, we can conceive of meaning as something achieved by an audience in reaction to the poetry. Motif transference is not predicated upon the assumption of a master poet; its mechanics are discernible within the Homeric verse itself, and its significance can be approximated by focusing on the audience reception of the poetics involved.

---

[57] New criticism: Beardsley and Wimsatt 1954 ("The Intentional Fallacy"); more recently, Barthes 1986:49-55 ("The Death of the Author"). For a controversial defense of intention, see Knapp and Michaels 1985. For discussion of the issue, see Kermode 1983:201-20 (includes response by P. D. Juhl).

[58] Cf. Farrell 1991:21-23; Hubbard 1998:14-15; Hinds 1998:47-50; Thomas 1999:1; Edmunds 2001:viii-ix, 19-38.

Audience

Above I have made periodic reference to the reception of early Greek epic by an ancient audience. It will be helpful in this regard to employ reception theory. There have been many different and independent strands of theory oriented toward the audience. Of particular relevance to my concerns is the reconstruction of reception in particular historical periods. We will have a better sense of the early significance of Homeric poetics by trying to comprehend the parameters of its reception in the Archaic Age, or the "horizon of expectations" of that time, to use the well-known phrase of Hans-Robert Jauss.[59] A central aspect of early reception of Homeric poetry must surely have been the knowledge of mythological traditions that the audience brought to a performance. The Homeric poems were not performed within a narrative vacuum, but rather within the context of traditional myth. The collective knowledge of the audience provided a "horizon of expectations" that would have necessarily affected its reception. This means that motif transference, as long as it involved motifs from traditional narrative, would have been recognizable to the audience, with an active poetic effect as a consequence. Motif transference would trigger significant recognition of mythological information known collectively by the audience.

For the ancient audience familiar with the whole story of the Trojan war, motif transference as described by neoanalysts would be readily appreciated and would have an active, not passive, effect. The modern audience has not easily sensed this effect because it is dismissive of the traditional myth on which the *Iliad* is founded; indeed, critics have usually unconsciously reflected the Aristarchan attitude that was hostile to the non-Homeric Trojan war tradition as a threat to Homer's originality.[60] But familiarity with non-Homeric material can generally be assumed for an ancient Greek audience, which at an early date would be surrounded by the living oral traditions of mythology, especially as expressed by oral epic.[61]

---

[59] On audience-oriented theory, see Holub 1984. For the "horizon of expectations," see Jauss 1982:espec. 28-32 in reference to ancient literature. Also relevant is the concept of the "implied reader" of a text, on which see Iser 1974, 1978, and its application to oral tradition by Foley (1991:38-60).

[60] See Severyns 1928; Burgess 2001, index s.v. "Aristarchus"; Ballabriga 1998:11-22.

[61] A mythologically informed and actively interpreting ancient audience is assumed at Slatkin 1991; Danek 1998, 2001, 2002. One challenge to belief in extensive Homeric allusion to traditional material is the possibility of *ad hoc* invention, a concept

This may seem to grant priority to an ancient response over a modern response, which in modern literary theory is often seen as an objectionable.[62] Does the original audience of the time of the *Iliad*'s creation have an authority over meaning that trumps all later interpretations? No, the Homeric poems are eternally open to all the meanings that any audience will find in them. The reception uncovered by my use of neoanalyst methodology is not the only possible one, and it need not be championed as the best one. Different ancient audiences will have had different levels of ability and interest. Performer and audience would need to negotiate the process of communication, and much would depend on the knowledge, alertness, and cooperation of an audience at any given performance. Some, rather than seek out allusions, may have chosen to accept oddities or suppressions without question, perhaps out of generosity to the performer.[63] A modern reader uninformed of mythological traditions can find that the *Iliad* functions beautifully in the presentation of its own story. The narrative problems that neoanalysts stress—"triggers" to external narrative, in my analysis—can be ignored or tolerated, with an absence of significance resulting.

Yet there is the potential for mythological intertextuality, and there is no question that it was at its highest with the early ancient audience. Later audiences in antiquity would not necessarily have access to living mythological traditions, even if they were able to approximate the earlier experience through preserved, fixed manifestations of these traditions, like the poems of the Epic Cycle. Eventually non-Homeric traditions lost prominence to such an extent that an audience would not approach Homeric poetry in a mythologically informed way, a situation that continues to the modern period. It is in these circumstances that neoanalyst research, by reconstructing lost narratives and uncovering traces of them within the *Iliad*, has been very useful. Much of the argumentative cogency of neoanalysis is derived from its success in recovering neglected narratives and uncovering their presence in a Homeric context. This approach has restored Homeric poetry to its early historical circumstances. It is a desirable further step to

---

that can be overly celebrated because of a desire to emphasize innovation over tradition (see Burgess 2001:48-49, 154-55). For skepticism about the ancient audience's knowledge and interpretative abilities, see Andersen 1998 (opposed by Schein [2001, 2002]); Scodel 2002. See also Morrison 1992 on "misdirection" of the audience. Certainly an ideal audience cannot be assumed to be universal.

[62] E.g., Fowler 2000:131-34 deplores the "audience limitation" that results from interest in the production and reception of early Greek literature.

[63] Scodel 2002:1-41.

reconstruct significance that approximates that potentially realized by a more mythologically informed original audience.

One need not favor an ancient reception over a modern one, yet it would be incurious, if not self-depriving, to ignore the historical circumstances of the poem. These include not only the context of oral composition, knowledge of which has so enriched Homeric studies, but also the context of its early reception. This reception would at first have been through oral performance, and the performers and the audience would usually share a deep and longstanding knowledge of the mythological traditions on which early epic were based. The early reception of epic, in all its various forms, is now lost forever. But some sense of its potential can be re-created through reconstruction of the ancient traditions, so that we may approach the poems with some of the knowledge of the ancient audience. A sensitive reaction to the Homeric poems, then as now, would be alert to how motif transference provided the poems with a means to reflect their larger mythological contexts.

Oral Comparanda

A number of related phenomena suggest that the technique of motif transference grew organically from oral poetic traditions. It certainly is not an isolated phenomenon. In the discussion above, motif transference was related to various types of repetition, reflection, and doubling, which are common in oral traditions.[64] In a general way, motif transference is comparable to any instance of one thing being compared to a different thing. The Homeric simile, for example, involves the explicit comparison of one set of characteristics to another.[65] This may seem at first to have no relation to motif transference, but there are instructive parallels. In the simile correspondence is established between certain key elements, but many aspects remain dissimilar. In motif transference, correspondence also occurs (though is not signaled explicitly) through the correspondence of certain key elements, or a key "pivot," with most aspects of the respective situations remaining dissimilar. The primary/secondary status of motifs in motif transference also has its parallel in similes, where the primary situation of known phenomena, often of the natural world or of civilian human

[64] Cf. Lohmann 1970:209-12, 284, where the sophistication of Homeric "mirroring" is attributed to literate composition, though with an oral background.

[65] Austin 1975:115-18; Lowenstam 1993:4-7.

existence, is used as a model of orientation for less readily comprehended phenomena.

Other relevant phenomena are internal digressions within the Homeric poems that have often been seen to mirror themes of the main narrative. Mythological paradigms in particular provide an interesting comparison to motif transference. This is not just because the content of both phenomena involves traditional myth. Both also add metaphorical (that is, paradigmatic) significance to Homeric poetics.[66] Paradigms involve the use of known traditional tales by characters in the poems in order to make a point about a current situation.[67] As with motif transference, extra-Iliadic myth is brought into relation with the narrative within the poem (though explicitly). The whole process depends on recognition that the paradigm and the Homeric situation have certain key elements in common, despite much variation in particulars. There is also a discernible distinction between primary and secondary instances of motifs, as in motif transference, though the direction is inverted, since secondary motifs will be added to the manipulated extra-Iliadic myth so that it reflects the primary situation of the Iliadic narrative.

For example, many scholars have noticed that Phoenix's parable of Meleager in Book 9 of the *Iliad* resembles Achilles' situation.[68] If the parallel was only that two heroes withdraw from battle, that would be of little significance, for withdrawal from battle seems to be a typical motif.[69] But the withdrawal of Meleager is not very compatible with other aspects of his story that seem traditional, and Phoenix's account of it contains details that belong to the story of Achilles. It seems that Phoenix (and in a more

---

[66] On the similarity of mythological paradigms to other types of Homeric repetition and analogy, cf. Lohmann 1970:183-212; Austin 1975:124-26; Lowenstam 1993:3-4. Danek (1998:508) connects mythological paradigms to oral intertextuality. Alden 2000 examines mythological paradigms together with significant digressions in the narrative, labeling them all "para-narratives." See also Martin 2002 on the "intratextual" relevance of paradigms, espec. 52-54, and Dué 2002:5-8, 86-88 on "paradigmatic" connections between Briseis and other lamenting figures external to the *Iliad*.

[67] On mythological paradigms, cf. Willcock 1964, 1977; Lohmann 1970; Alden 2000.

[68] See espec. Kakridis 1949:11-42, 127-48; Willcock 1964:147-53; Rosner 1976; Morrison 1992:119-24; Hainsworth 1993:130-40; Alden 2000:179-290.

[69] Besides its association with Achilles and Meleager, the motif is mentioned briefly in the *Iliad* in connection with Paris (6.325-631) and Aeneas (13.459-61).

sophisticated manner, the narrator) has transformed a traditional story so that its circumstances reflect those of the *Iliad*. It is especially notable that the name of Meleager's wife, "Cleopatra," corresponds inversely to the name "Patroclus."[70] Phoenix's tale is designed to entice Achilles back onto the battlefield by outlining the negative consequences of the rejection of entreaties. On another level it probably foreshadows Achilles' later decision to rejoin the fighting, and perhaps even his death, as an audience with knowledge of the Meleager tale would recognize.[71]

There are certainly differences between the poetic techniques of mythological paradigms and motif transference. With paradigms, the correspondence is made explicit; with motif transference, it is implicit. The direction of movement from primary to secondary instances of motifs is different. The myths in paradigms tend to be from cycles different from the Trojan war, often featuring heroes of past generations, whereas the motif transference of neoanalysis involves later developments in the Trojan war story. Still, the similarities are striking. Both mythological paradigms and motif transference involve some manipulation of detail to enhance correspondence (with paradigms, manipulation of traditional narrative as it is retold so as to reflect the situation within the poem; with motif transference, manipulation of the poem's narrative to reflect traditional narrative). The use of mythological paradigms and motif transference are distinct yet comparable poetic phenomena.

The point is that motif transference is not some sort of idiosyncratic, unparalleled technique. It certainly is a subtle and sophisticated poetic device, and it can be considered a key component of the "metacyclic" nature of Homeric poetry. But it grew out of methods of comparison and "reflection" that were inherent in oral traditions and in everyday life itself. It did not come out of thin air; it is derived from observable phenomena in the poetic and known world. Motif transference is both traditional and distinctive, as is the "metacyclic" nature of Homeric poetry generally.

Recognition of the sophistication of motif transference does not lead to a conclusion that Homeric poetry is independent from its traditions. It suggests rather a dependence on the cyclic traditions of the Trojan war, to the extent that the poetic strategies of the *Iliad* assume that the audience will

[70] For bibliographical history on this issue, see Alden 2000:240 n. 152; the correspondence is now widely accepted.

[71] Nagy (1979:105-6) well distinguishes between the "message" that Phoenix gives to Achilles and the "code" that the audience perceives (cf. Andersen 1987:4-7 on "argument" and "key").

bring to the poem a sensitive and alert knowledge of traditional myth. Motif transference can be understood as a type of intertextuality. The intertextuality is not between texts but between the Homeric poems and pre-Homeric oral traditions. These traditions cannot be identified or equated with particular poems, and it is not text that is transferred, in the sense of words and phrases, but rather notional motifs (consisting of narrative actions) that have traditionally been applied to specific heroes. Intertextuality so described may sound imprecise, but motif transference involves certain parameters that would not be recognized by a post-structuralist concept of intertextuality. As neonalysts have established, the motifs are specific, being usually bound to the context of a heroic myth, and once transferred into Homeric poetry they are recognizably secondary. How recognizable is the key issue, however; whereas traditional neoanalysts have reserved discernment of motif transference to the scholar, it is more probable that the reflection would be recognized by a mythologically informed audience. In this case motif transference is more than coincidental, casual, or merely vestigial. It is significant allusion, at least in an oral, intertextually neoanalyst manner.[72]

University of Toronto

References

Ahl and Roisman 1996 — F. Ahl and H. M. Roisman. *The Odyssey Re-Formed.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Alden 2000 — M. Alden. *Homer Beside Himself.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Allen 2000 — G. Allen. *Intertextuality.* London: Routledge.

Aloni 1986 — A. Aloni. *Tradizioni arcaiche della Troade e composizione dell' Iliade.* Milan: Edizioni Unicopli.

[72] I would like to dedicate this article to the memory of Steven Lowenstam, whom I never met, but who engaged in extensive e-mail correspondence with me about many of the issues addressed here, and much more, shortly before his untimely death. I am grateful to the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada for financial support, and to my research assitant Michal Dziong.

Andersen 1987 — Ø. Andersen. “Myth, Paradigm and ‘Spatial Form’ in the *Iliad*.” In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Ed. by J. M. Bremer et. al. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner. pp. 1-13.

Andersen 1998 — ______. “Allusion and the Audience of Homer.” In *Homerica*. Ed. by M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou. Ithaca, Greece: Kentro Odysseiakon Spoudon. pp. 137-49.

Anderson 1997 — M. J. Anderson. *The Fall of Troy in Early Greek Poetry and Art.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Austin 1975 — N. Austin. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Bakker 2001 — E. Bakker. “The Greek Gilgamesh, or the Immortality of Return.” In *Eranos*. Ed. by M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou. Ithaca, Greece: Kentro Odysseiakon Spoudon. pp. 331-53.

Ballabriga 1998 — A. Ballabriga. *Les fictions d’Homère.* Paris: Presses Universitaires de France.

Barthes 1986 — R. Barthes. *The Rustle of Language*. Trans. by R. Howard. Oxford: Hill and Wang.

Beardsley and Wimsatt 1954 — M. Beardsley and W. K. Wimsatt. “The Intentional Fallacy.” In *The Verbal Icon*. Ed. by William K. Wimsatt. Lexington: University of Kentucky Press. pp. 3-20.

Beye 1993 — C. R. Beye. *Ancient Epic Poetry*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Bowra 1930 — C. M. Bowra. *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Bremond 1982 — C. Bremond. “A Critique of the Motif.” In *French Literary Theory Today*. Ed. by T. Todorov. Trans. by R. Carter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 125-46.

Burgess 1997 — J. S. Burgess. “Beyond Neo-analysis: Problems with the Vengeance Theory.” *American Journal of Philology*, 118:1-19.

Burgess 1999 — ______. “Gilgamesh and Odysseus in the Otherworld.” *Echoes du Monde Classique/Classical Views*, 18:171-210.

Burgess 2001 — ______. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Univeristy Press.

Burgess 2002 ______. "Kyprias, the *Kypria*, and Multiformity." *Phoenix*, 56:234-45.

Burkert 1979 W. Burkert. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Burkert 1981 ______. "Seven against Thebes: An Oral Tradition between Babylonian and Greek Literature." In *I poemi epici rapsodici non Omerici e la tradizione orale*. Ed. by C. Brillante et. al. M. Padova: Editrice Antenore. pp. 29-51.

Burkert 1992 ______. *The Orientalizing Revolution*. Trans. by M. E. Pinder and W. Burkert. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Burkert 1997 ______. "The Song of Ares and Aphrodite: On the Relationship between the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad*." In *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. Trans by P. V. Jones and G. M. Wright. Oxford: Clarendon. pp. 249-62.

Burkert 2004 ______. *Babylon, Memphis, Persepolis: Eastern Contexts of Greek Culture*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Carpenter 1946 R. Carpenter. *Folk Tale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Clarke 1981 H. H. C. Clarke. *Homer's Readers.* Newark: University of Delaware Press.

Clay 1997 J. S. Clay. *The Wrath of Athena.* 2nd ed. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Collins 2004 D. Collins. *Master of the Game*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Cook 2004 E. Cook. "Near Eastern Sources for the Palace of Alkinoos." *American Journal of Archaeology,* 108:43-77.

Curti 1993 M. Curti. "L'officina dei cicli." *Studi Classici e Orientali*, 43:33-47.

Danek 1998 G. Danek. *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der Odyssee*. Wiener Studien, 22. Vienna: Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften.

Danek 2001 ______. "Achilles and the *Iliad*." In *Eranos*. Ed. by M. Païsi-Apostolopoulou. Ithaca, Greece: Kentro Odysseiakon Spoudon. pp. 165-79.

Danek 2002 ______. "Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality." In *Omero tremila anni dopo*. Ed. by F. Montanari. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura. pp. 3-19.

Davies 1989 M. Davies. *The Epic Cycle*. Bristol: Bristol Classical Press.

Davison 1962 J. A. Davison. "The Homeric Question." In *A Companion to Homer*. Ed. by A. J. B. Wace and F. H. Stubbings. London: St. Martin's Press. pp. 234-65.

de Jong 1987 I. J. F. de Jong. *Narrators and Focalizers*. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner.

de Jong 2001 ______. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Dihle 1970 A. Dihle. *Homer-Probleme*. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Dowden 1996 K. Dowden. "Homer's Sense of Text." *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 116:47-61.

Dué 2002 C. Dué. *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Edmunds 2001 L. Edmunds. *Intertextuality and the Reading of Roman Poetry*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

A. Edwards 1985 A. Edwards. "Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad, Odyssey,* and *Aethiopis*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies*, 26:215-28.

M. Edwards 1987a M. W. Edwards. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

M. Edwards 1987b ______. "Topos and Transformation in Homer." In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*. Ed. by J. M. Bremer et al. Amsterdam: B. R. Grüner. pp. 47-60.

M. Edwards 1990 ______. "Neoanalysis and Beyond." *Classical Antiquity*, 9:311-25.

M. Edwards 1991 _____. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 5. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

M. Edwards 1992 ______. "Homer and Oral Tradition: The Type-Scene." *Oral Tradition*, 7:284-330.

Else 1957 G. F. Else. *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Evelyn-White 1914 H. G. Evelyn-White. *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns and Homerica*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Farrell 1991 J. Farrell. *Vergil's Georgics and the Traditions of Ancient Epic.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Fenik 1964 B. C. Fenik. *Iliad X and the Rhesus: The Myth*. Brussels: *Latomus: Revue d'études latines,* 73.

Fenik 1968 ______. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad.* Hermes Einzelschriften, 21. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Fenik 1974 ______. *Studies in the Odyssey*. Hermes Einzelschriften, 30. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Finkelberg 1998 M. Finkelberg. *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Finkelberg 2002 ______. "The Sources of *Iliad* 7." *Colby Quarterly*, 38:151-61.

Finkelberg 2003a ______. "Homer as a Foundation Text." In *Homer, the Bible, and Beyond*. Ed. by M. Finkelberg and G. G. Stroumsa. Leiden: Brill. pp. 75-96.

Finkelberg 2003b ______. "Neoanalysis and Oral Tradition in Homeric Studies." *Oral Tradition*, 18:68-69.

Foley 1991 J. M. Foley. *Immanent Art.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Foley 1995 ______. *The Singer of Tales in Performance.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Foley 1999 ______. *Homer's Traditional Art.* University Park: Pennsylvania State University Press.

Ford 2002 — A. Ford. *The Origins of Criticism.* Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Fowler 2000 — D. Fowler. “On the Shoulders of Giants: Intertextuality and Classical Studies.” In *Roman Constructions*. Ed. by Don Fowler. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 115-37.

Genette 1997 — G. Genette. *Palimpsests.* Trans. by C. Newman and C. Doubinsky. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press.

Glenn 1971 — J. Glenn. “The Polyphemus Folktale and Homer’s Kyklopeia.” *Transcriptions of the American Philological Association*, 102:133-81.

Griffith 1990 — M. Griffith. “Contest and Contradiction in Early Greek Poetry.” In *Cabinet of the Muses*. Ed. by M. Griffith and D. J. Mastronarde. Atlanta: Scholars Press. pp. 185-207.

Hainsworth 1993 — B. Hainsworth. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 3. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hansen 1990 — W. F. Hansen. “Odysseus and the Oar: A Folkloric Approach.” In *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Ed. by L. Edmunds. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. pp. 241-72.

Hansen 1997 — ______. “Homer and the Folktale.” In *A New Companion to Homer*. Ed. by I. Morris and B. Powell. Leiden: Brill. pp. 442-62.

Heubeck 1954 — A. Heubeck. *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias*. Erlangen: Palm und Enke.

Heubeck 1978 — ______. “Homeric Studies Today: Results and Prospects.” In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Ed. by B. C. Fenik. Leiden: Brill. pp. 1-17.

Heubeck 1991 — ______. “Studien zur Struktur der Ilias (Retardation-Motivübertragung).” In *Homer: Die Dichtung und ihre Deutung*. Ed. by J. Latacz. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. pp. 450-74.

Heubeck 1992 — ______. “Books XXIII-XXIV.” In *A Commentary on Homer’s Odyssey*. Vol. 3. Ed. by A. Heubeck et al. Oxford: Clarendon Press. pp. 313-418.

Hinds 1998 — S. Hinds. *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hölscher 1978 — U. Hölscher. "The Transformation from Folk-Tale to Epic." In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*. Ed. by B. C. Fenik. Leiden: Brill. pp. 51-67.

Hölscher 1989 — ______. *Die Odyssee: Epos zwischen Märchen und Roman.* Munich: Beck.

Holub 1984 — R. C. Holub. *Reception Theory.* New York: Methuen.

Hubbard 1998 — T. K. Hubbard. *The Pipes of Pan: Intertextuality and Literary Filiation from Theocritus to Milton*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Iser 1974 — W. Iser. *The Implied Reader.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Iser 1978 — ______. *The Act of Reading.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Jamison 1994 — S. W. Jamison. "Draupadí on the Walls of Troy: *Iliad* 3 from an Indic Perspective." *Classical Antiquities*, 13:5-16.

Janko 1992 — R. Janko. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jauss 1982 — H. R. Jauss. *Towards an Aesthetic of Reception*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Jenny 1982 — L. Jenny. "The Strategy of Form." In *French Literary Theory Today*. Ed. by T. Todorov. Trans. by R. Carter. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. pp. 34-63.

Jensen 1980 — M. S. Jensen. *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory.* Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press.

Kakridis 1949 — J. T. Kakridis. *Homeric Researches*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.

Kakridis 1971 — ______. *Homer Revisited*. Lund: C. W. K. Gleerup.

Katz 1991 — M. Katz. *Penelope's Renown*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Kermode 1983 F. Kermode. *Essays on Fiction 1971-82*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Kirk 1976 G. S. Kirk. *Homer and the Oral Tradition.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Kirk 1985 ______. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. 1. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Knapp and Michaels 1985 S. Knapp and W. B. Michaels. "Against Theory." In *Against Theory*. Ed. by W. J. T. Mitchell. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. pp. 11-30.

Kopff 1983 E. Kopff. "The Structure of the *Amazonia (Aethiopis)*." In *The Greek Renaissance of the 8th Century B.C*. Ed. by R. Häag. Stockholm: Aström. pp. 57-62.

Kristeva 1980 J. Kristeva. *Desire in Language.* Ed. by L. S. Roudiez. Trans. by T. Gora et al. New York: Columbia University Press.

Kullmann 1960 W. Kullmann. *Die Quellen der Ilias.* Hermes Einzelschriften, 14. Wiesbaden: F. Steiner.

Kullmann 1968 ______. "Vergangenheit und Zukunft in der *Ilias.*" *Poetica*, 2:15-37.

Kullmann 1981 ______. "Zur Methode der Neoanalyse in der Homerforschung." *Weiner Studien*, 15:5-42.

Kullmann 1984 ______. "Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research." *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 25:307-24.

Kullmann 1986 ______. "Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker über Homer und den epischen Kyklos." In *Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker:Werk und Wirkung*. Ed. by W. M. Calder III. Hermes Einzelschriften, 49. Stuttgart: F. Steiner. pp. 105-30.

Kullmann 1991 ______. "Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse)." In *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung*. Ed. by J. Latacz. Stuttgart: K. G. Saur. pp. 425-55.

Kullmann 2002 ______. *Realität, Imagination und Theorie.* Ed. by A. Rengakos. Stuttgart: F. Steiner.

Lang 1969 — M. L. Lang. "Homer and Oral Techniques." *Hesperia*, 38:159-68.

Lang 1983 — ______. "Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad*." In *Approaches to Homer*. Ed. by C. A. Rubino and C. W. Shelmerdine. Austin: University of Texas Press. pp. 140-64.

Lesky 1967 — A. Lesky. *Homeros.* Stuttgart: Druckenmüller. [Also in G. Wissowa et al., eds. 1893-1972. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Suppl. 11. Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler.]

Lohmann 1970 — D. Lohmann. *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Lord 1960 — A. B. Lord. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Lowenstam 1981 — S. Lowenstam. *The Death of Patroklos*. Königstein: Hain.

Lowenstam 1993 — ______. *The Scepter and the Spear.* Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Marks 2002 — J. Marks. "The Junction between the *Kypria* and the *Iliad*." *Phoenix*, 56:1-24.

Marks 2003 — ______. "Alternative Odysseys: The Case of Thoas and Odysseus." *Transactions of the American Philological Association*, 133:209-26.

Martin 2002 — R. Martin. "Wrapping Homer Up: Cohesion, Discourse, and Deviation in the *Iliad*." In *Intratextuality*. Ed. by A. Sharrock and H. Morales. Oxford: Oxford University Press. pp. 43-65.

McLeod 1987 — W. McLeod. "The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as Great Literature." In *Approaches to Teaching Homer's* Iliad *and* Odyssey. Ed. by K. Myrsiades. New York: Modern Language Association of America. pp. 34-40.

Meuli 1921 — K. Meuli. *Odyssee und Argonautika.* Berlin: Weidmann.

Morrison 1992 — J. Morrison. *Homeric Misdirection*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Mueller 1984 — M. Mueller. *The Iliad*. London: G. Allen and Unwin.

Mülder 1910	D. Mülder. *Die Ilias und ihre Quellen.* Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung.
Murray 1934	G. Murray. *The Rise of the Greek Epic.* 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
Nagler 1974	M. N. Nagler. *Spontaneity and Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
Nagy 1979	G. Nagy. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Nagy 1990a	______. *Pindar's Homer.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
Nagy 1990b	______. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.
Nagy 1996	______. *Poetry as Performance.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Nagy 2003	______. *Homeric Responses*. Austin: University of Texas Press.
Nickel 1997	R. Nickel. "Paris in the Epic Tradition: A Study in Homeric Techniques of Characterization." Unpubl. Ph. D. Dissertation, University of Toronto.
Nickel 2002	______. "Euphorbus and the Death of Achilles." *Phoenix*, 56:215-33.
Notopoulos 1964	J. A. Notopoulos. "Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 68:1-77.
Osborne 1996	R. Osborne. *Greece in the Making 1200-479 BC*. London: Routledge.
Page 1955	D. L. Page. *The Homeric Odyssey*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
Page 1963	______. Review of Schoeck 1961. *Classical Review*, 13:21-24.
Page 1973	______. *Folktales in Homer's* Odyssey. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Parry 1971 — M. Parry. *The Making of Homeric Verse. The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Ed. by A. Parry. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Pedrick 1994 — V. Pedrick. "Reading in the Middle Voice: The Homeric Intertextuality of Pietro Pucci and John Peradotto." *Helios*, 21:75-93.

Peradotto 1997 — J. Peradotto. "Modern Theoretical Approaches to Homer." In *A New Companion to Homer*: Ed. by B. Powell and I. Morris. Leiden: Brill. pp. 380-95.

Pestalozzi 1945 — H. Pestalozzi. *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias*. Zurich: Rentsch.

Propp 1984 — V. Propp. *Theory and History of Folktale.* Ed. by A. Liberman. Trans. by A. Y. Martin and Richard P. Martin. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Pucci 1987 — P. Pucci. *Odysseus Polutropos*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Pucci 1998 — ______. *The Song of the Sirens*. Lanham, MD: Rowman and Littlefield.

Rabel 1991 — R. Rabel. "Hippothous and the Death of Achilles." *Classical Journal*, 86:126-30.

Reinhardt 1961 — K. Reinhardt. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Ed. by U. Hölscher. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck und Ruprecht.

Rengakos 2002 — A. Rengakos. "Narrativität, Intertextualität, Selbstreferentialität. Die neue Deutung der *Odyssee*." In *Epea Pteroenta*. Ed. by M. Reichel and A. Rengakos. Stuttgart: F. Steiner. pp. 173-91.

Rengakos 2004 — ______. "Die *Argonautika* und das 'kyklische Gedicht'." In *Antike Literatur in neuer Deutung*. Ed by A. Bierl et al. Munich: K. J. Saur. pp. 277-304.

Richardson 1990 — S. Richardson. *The Homeric Narrator*. Nashville, TN: Vanderbilt University Press.

Riffaterre 1978 — M. Riffaterre. *Semiotics of Poetry.* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Riffaterre 1983 ______. *Text Production.* Trans. by T. Lyons. New York: Columbia University Press.

Rosner 1976 J. Rosner. "The Speech of Phoenix: *Iliad* 9.434-605." *Phoenix*, 30:314-27.

Schadewaldt 1965 W. Schadewaldt. *Von Homers Welt und Werk.* 4th ed. Stuttgart: K. F. Koehler.

Schein 1984 S. L. Schein. *The Mortal Hero*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Schein 2001 ______. "Homeric Intertextuality: Two Examples." In *Euphrosyne*. Ed. by A. Rengakos and J. N. Kazazis. Stuttgart: F. Steiner. pp. 185-201.

Schein 2002 ______. "Mythological Allusion in the *Odyssey*." In *Omero tremila anni dopo*. Ed. by F. Montanari. Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura. pp. 85-104.

Schoeck 1961 G. Schoeck. *Ilias und Aithiopis.* Zurich: Atlantis.

Scodel 2002 R. Scodel. *Listening to Homer.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Scodel 2004 ______. "The Modesty of Homer." In *Oral Performance and Its Context*. Ed. by C. J. Mackie. Leiden: Brill. pp. 1-19.

Scott 1921 J. A. Scott. *The Unity of Homer*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Severyns 1928 A. Severyns. *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*. Paris: Société d'édition "Les Belles Lettres."

Slatkin 1991 L. M. Slatkin. *The Power of Thetis*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Taplin 1992 O. Taplin. *Homeric Soundings*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Thomas 1999 R. F. Thomas. *Reading Virgil and His Texts: Studies in Intertextuality.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Todorov 1981 T. Todorov. *Introduction to Poetics*. Trans. by R. Howard. Theory and History of Literature, 1. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Todorov 1983 ______. *Symbolism and Interpretation*. Trans. by C. Porter. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Tsagarakis 1982 O. Tsagarakis. "The Teichoskopia Cannot Belong to the Beginning of the Trojan War." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica*, 41:61-72.

Usener 1990 K. Usener. *Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der Odyssee zur Ilias*. Tübingen: Gunter Narr.

van Wees 2002 H. van Wees. "Homer and Early Greece." *Colby Quarterly*, 38:94-117.

Welcker 1865-82 F. G. Welcker. *Der epische Cyclus, oder die homerischen Dichter*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Hildesheim: Olms. Rpt. 1981.

West 1997 M. L. West. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth.* Oxford: Clarendon Press.

West 2003 ______. "*Iliad* and *Aethiopis*." *Classical Quarterly*, 53:1-14.

Whitman 1958 C. Whitman. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Willcock 1964 M. M. Willcock. "Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*." *Classical Quarterly*, 14:141-54.

Willcock 1976 ______. *A Companion to the Iliad*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Willcock 1977 ______. "*Ad hoc* Invention in the *Iliad*." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 18:41-53.

Willcock 1997 ______. "Neoanalysis." In *A New Companion to Homer*. Ed. by B. Powell and I. Morris. Leiden: Brill. pp. 174-89.

Woodhouse 1930 W. J. Woodhouse. *The Composition of Homer's* Odyssey. Oxford: Clarendon. Rpt. 1969.