The Trojan Formulaic Theater

Françoise Letoublon

Publications of the Milman Parry Collection
of Oral Literature No. 7

SINGERS AND TALES
IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

SINGERS AND TALES
IN THE TWENTY-FIRST CENTURY

edited by

David F. Elmer and Peter McMurray

Singers and Tales in the Twenty-First Century

The editors and contributors dedicate this book to the memory of John Miles Foley.

ἔνθεν δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἀκαχήμενοι ἦτορ

Table of Contents

Table of Contents

2

The Trojan Formulaic Theater[1]

Françoise Létoublon

THIS PAPER STUDIES the epithets used in Homer for the city of Troy, called either Ἴλιος or Τροίη, in order to evaluate their role in the poems. We count thirteen epithets that can be considered "fixed epithets" in Parry's terminology, a number comparable to the figures for Homeric gods or heroes, which might lead us to consider the city a "character" in the epics. It is thus worthwhile to review the uses of the epithets with a view to their metrical value, place in the hexameter, and possible equivalence with another form.

Milman Parry emphasized the epithets for heroes, distinguishing fixed epithets and particularized ones and subdividing the first category into generic vs. distinctive epithets[2]; but he was not as confident in regard to epithets for objects and places. In his first dissertation, he actually considered some *generic* epithets for cities,[3] and

---

1   Many thanks to the organizers of the Parry-Lord Conference and the editors of the book, to Stephen Rojcewicz who carefully checked my English, and to the kind reviewer who read the first version of the text with a very positive *akribeia*. David Elmer deserves the epithet ταλασίφρων for his patience in several states of this paper.

2   In the *thèses* he submitted for the degree of Docteur-ès-Lettres at the University of Paris, Parry makes a series of binary distinctions between various possible kinds of epithet. He distinguishes in the first place between the *épithète fixe* or *ornementale* and the *épithète particularisée*; then, as subdivisions of the first category, he distinguishes the *épithète générique* from the *épithète spéciale*. (See, for example, Parry 1928a:25, 80–81.) "Distinctive" is the standard English translation, originating with Adam Parry, for Parry's label *spéciale*; we adopt it here, although the complementary relationship with the *épithète générique* might be better captured by rendering *spéciale* as "specific."

3   Parry 1971: "If we take a generic epithet of a hero, δαΐφρονος, which is said of 15 heroes, or μεγαλήτορος, which is said of 13 heroes, that each of these epithets, and each alone, presents one of the 21 different metrical values attested for generic epithets of heroes in the genitive case, may be regarded as certain proof that both epithets are integral parts of a traditional system. Or again, we have a certain proof of the traditional character of πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς in that this formula is, first, unique in metre among the 14 noun-epithet formulae used in the nominative case for this hero, and second, is of the same metrical value with a great many other noun-epithet formulae of heroes—we pointed out 40 of them (TE p. 10–13). But when we try to determine whether the epithets εὐρυάγυια and τειχιόεσσαν, to choose two examples, are traditional or original, whether

gave a list of them in a note,[4] but the combination of epithets with proper city-names did not particularly interest him, and he did not consider the possibility that a city might have a distinctive epithet.[5] After a historical examination of scholarship on the question, I will attempt, through a close examination of the formulaic epithets for cities, to show the system of epithets used for Troy and to determine whether it corresponds to the law of economy, as does the system of epithets used with the names of the epic heroes and gods demonstrated by Parry.[6] We shall try to see how the metrical distinction between the names Τροίη and Ἴλιος determines the choice of the epithets and their placement in the verse, being thus far in line with Parry's insights. But our study will show that the epithets used for Troy play a role in the construction of meaning for the epic plot, thus contradicting Parry's strong affirmation that the fixed epithets are "purely ornamental." The argument will lead us to concluding observations on the importance of the space between the Achaean ships and the city walls as the theater of war and a highly dramatized center of the epic.

1. A Survey of Scholarship

The formulaic phrases under examination here have not, to date, received sufficient attention in a Parryan perspective or otherwise. We must, however, mention Stephen Scully, who brilliantly pleads the *expressivity* of the epithets.[7] Scully actually takes the formulaic system of epithets for Troy into account, but he chooses to leave the Parryan distinctions aside and leans on Vivante, Amory Parry, and Finkelberg for developing the idea of the contextual

---

they are generic or distinctive, we no longer have this certainty. The different epithets of cities which are beyond doubt generic amount to only seven, in all the five cases" (102).

[4] Parry 1971: "In the genitive: ἐυκτιμένης (2), ἐρατεινῆς (2), ἱεράων (1). In the dative: ἐυκτιμένηι (3), ἠγαθέηι (3), ἱερῆι (2), ἐῦ ναιομένωι (1). In the accusative: ἐυκτίμενον πτολίεθρον (4), ἐρατεινήν (7), ἐρατεινάς (1), ἐυκτιμένην (2), ζαθέην (4), ἱερόν, ἱερήν (3), ἠγαθέην (1), ἐῦ ναιομένον (2)" (102). As Parry notes, "The figures indicate the number of different cities described by each form."

[5] An interesting historical view on the formula before Parry, in his work and afterwards, is found in Russo 1997.

[6] On this system, see Nagy 1990:22–23, esp. 23: "A distinctive epithet is like a small theme song that conjures up a thought-association with the traditional essence of an epic figure, thing, or concept. To cite an example that has deservedly become commonplace: Odysseus is πολύτλας 'much-suffering' throughout the *Iliad* because he is already a figure in an epic tradition about adventures that he will have after Troy."

[7] Scully 1990:4: "Epithets are generally considered to be the least expressive element in Homeric poetics. I argue for a contrary view. For epithets of place, one can claim that their use in speech, and occasionally in narrative, responds to the dramatic pressure of each particular episode. In addition to their metrical utility, they can be keys to interpretation. For example, the Iliadic epithet for Troy, *euteikheos* ('well-walled'), occurs only in speech, uttered only by those eager, but thwarted, in their desire to take the city." Compare with Whallon 1961:191 on epithets for heroes.

congruence of epithets (see particularly Scully 1990:74–80). We shall come back to his ideas later.

While William M. Sale's 1987 article, "The Formularity of the Place-Phrases in the *Iliad*," very deeply interested in epithets for cities, is very accurate and will be often quoted here, it may appear surprising that Sale does not check the system of formulaic epithets, though he still intends, in this paper, to *defend* Parry. The author seems to have ignored—not without good reason, in my opinion—a paper by C. M. Bowra published in 1960 (note the coincidence with the date of Lord's *The Singer of Tales*) in the *Journal for Hellenic Studies*, under the title "Homeric Epithets for Troy," which does not even mention Parry, nor German scholars such as Düntzer, whose importance in the analysis of fixed epithets Parry had recognized.[8] Bowra leans on archaeology and Mycenean studies for such assertions as the following:

> It is out of the question that Homer saw Troy in its heyday or even enough ruins of it to give him a clear notion of what it had been some five hundred years before his own lifetime. But this does not mean that he did not know the country round the hill where Troy had once stood. Indeed it is difficult to imagine how he could have composed the *Iliad* unless he had in his mind a far clearer picture of the Troad than that of Ithaca in the *Odyssey*, and the clarity of the picture, which helped him to some of his dramatic effects, must have been due in some degree to personal knowledge.[9]

However, without mentioning either Parry[10] or earlier German scholarship like that of Düntzer's and Witte's, Bowra somehow rediscovers the importance of the various kinds of generic epithets for Troy. His first section bears the heading "Conventional Epithets for Places," with the following list for Troy (without any questioning of the Greek form of the city name): ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον, ἐρίβωλος, ἐριβῶλαξ, ἐρατεινή, εὐρεία, ἱρή (this last case will be discussed below, since it is more complex than it seems in Bowra's paper: I see it rather as a distinctive epithet). Bowra's second section consists of "Epithets Confined to Troy," and contains the following, which could correspond to

---

[8]   Düntzer is quoted at least six times in Parry's theses, as well as Witte.

[9]   Bowra 1960:22-23.

[10] I first thought that Bowra did not read Parry or the German scholarship, but the anonymous reviewer of this paper remarked that he quoted Parry's theses written "some 40 years ago" in his posthumously published book entitled *Homer* (1972) and considered them fruitful. I recognize that Bowra endorsed Parry's findings in this book (particularly in Chapter 2, titled "Oral Composition"). However, he still believed that the epithets with place-names correspond to an essentially archaeological reality.

Parry's "distinctive" epithets: ἐΰδμητος, εὐτείχεος, εὔπυργος, ὀφρυόεσσα. Bowra connects this last with expressions such as ἐπ᾽ ὀφρύσι Καλλικολώνης (*Iliad* 20.151), and notes that "ὀφρυόεσσα is explained by the Townleian scholiast as ἐπὶ ὀφρυώδους τόπου κειμένη. It was used in the seventh or sixth century by a Delphic oracle for Acrocorinth (Herodotos 5.92 β 3)."[11] Bowra also mentions as relevant here ἄστυ μέγα and εὔπωλος. About εὐτείχεος and εὔπυργος, he writes:

> The walls of Troy VI, which survived with some patching in Troy VIIA, show how well deserved the epithet is, and it helps to explain why the Achaeans took ten years to capture the city.[12]

In his 1972 book, Bowra summarizes his position about epithets for places, staying faithful—while devoting a chapter to "Oral Composition," with reference to Parry 1971—to his belief in the concordance between poetic terms and archaeological findings:

> In dealing with places it was obviously convenient to have certain epithets which would be right almost anywhere, such as "goodly," "well-built," "beloved," "holy." But sometimes a real knowledge is displayed and confers a special prominence. The ruins of Tiryns show that it deserves "walled"; Pylos, with its enclosed bay, is certainly "sandy"; excavation has proved that Mycenae amply justifies "rich in gold"; Lacedaemon, under the mass of Taygetus, is aptly "hollow"; Egyptian Thebes, outside Greek experience, is "hundred-gated"; Boeotian Thebes, "seven-gated," accords with legend; Dodona is "stormy"; Calydon is "rocky." ... Troy presents a more interesting case. It shares with other cities such epithets as "lovely," "well-built," and "holy," and these do not mean very much. Much more distinctive are "steep," "with good horses," "well-walled," "with good towers," "beetling," "windy," "with lofty gates," "wide-streeted," all of which have been justified by the excavation of the site and show that the tradition was well informed on the look of Troy from without and within.[13]

Coming back to his earlier paper, we will see once more that the question is much more complex.

---

[11] Bowra 1960:18.
[12] Bowra 1960:18.
[13] Bowra 1972:21, in the very chapter entitled "Oral Composition."

His third category, "Epithets Suitable to Troy but not Confined to It," seems rather confused, with αἰπή, αἰπύ, αἰπεινή, ὑψίπυλος, ἠνεμόεσσα, εὐρυάγυια, εὖ ναιόμενον.

The main problem is, of course, that Bowra does not see that these more or less recurrent epithets necessarily imply a formulaic analysis and theory rather than a confrontation with some *reality* or with archaeological remains. We also note that he does not mention the peculiarity of the existence of multiple names for the same city nor the role of metrical constraints, whereas both of these facts absolutely need to be taken into account in this kind of study.

It may seem easy to mock such a way of finding epithets more or less *suitable* for the remains discovered by Schliemann, Blegen, and their successors, but this is still the kind of evidence used by the archaeological team on the site today (Korfmann 2001), albeit in a much more sophisticated manner (I am thinking, for example, of the exhibition *Troia: Traum und Wirklichkeit* ["Troy: Dream and Reality"], shown in Stuttgart in 2001).[14] We see there a very general tendency to look at landscapes through the mirror of well-known texts and, conversely, to illustrate those texts with pictures taken from *reality*.[15]

It is thus necessary to study the whole set of epithets used with each of the names given to Troy as precisely as possible. In Parry's writing, we think that the distinction between generic and distinctive epithets was a point very finely observed, though maybe not enough stated.[16] In the following study, we will try to apply this distinction to the city, starting with generic epithets in the first part and then discuss what would be called, after Parry, the "distinctive" epithets as seen above (n. 2). The specificity of Troy as a place will be eventually posited as the heroic space of the narrative.

Following the path opened by William Whallon (1961, 1969), we may now dismiss one of Parry's main assertions, that the fixed epithet is "purely ornamental," and admit its importance in constructing the *meaning* of the

---

[14]   For more nuanced positions on this point, see Kullmann 2002 and Montanari 2005, among a huge number of references.

[15]   See. for instance, Luce 1999.

[16]   See Parry 1971:88–96 on epithets "reserved for a single hero," 145–153 on generic epithets, and 153–165 on particularized ones. Edwards 1986:193–197 appears particularly clear on these distinctions. Parry does not say much about this use apart from the "thrift of the diction" mentioned in his 1930 paper, which for Nagy "is not really a conditioning principle," "not a cause but an effect of traditional diction" (Nagy 1990:23). Nagy goes further: "As for epithets that still function in a distinctive phase, one sees them from the diachronic standpoint as capsules of traditional themes associated with the noun described. A distinctive epithet is like a small theme song that conjures up a thought-association with the traditional essence of an epic figure, thing, or concept" (Nagy 1990:23), which fits with our analysis.

whole epic corpus: some epithets are used "almost exclusively for Hector and never for Odysseus," for example, "man-slaying" (ἀνδροφόνος), or "for Hector and a number of other men, but never for Odysseus," for example, "horse-taming" (ἱππόδαμος), whereas "counter-god" (ἀντίθεος) is used most often for Odysseus and never for Hector (Whallon 1961:134). On the same page, Whallon writes:

> The three epithets cannot be thought jejune, for the epic matter illustrates the appropriateness of their use. Hector seems destined to slay many men until he is himself slain in revenge for the slaying of one particular man; Odysseus throughout his career also slays many men, but is not so redoubtable in hand-to-hand fighting as Hector, and would not so fittingly be called *man-slaying.* Hector is closely associated with horses in two passages, and as a prince of a land of horses must himself be skilled with horses; but Odysseus comes from a land unsuitable for horses, and would not fittingly be called *horse-taming.* Hector on the other hand is not shown equal to the gods in cunning or an enemy of more than human hostility, and would not fittingly be called a *counter-god.* Parry found it notable that *counter-god* but not *horse-taming* should be used for Odysseus, yet the epic matter seems clearly to show that epithets cannot successfully be interchanged merely because they are metrically equivalent.

One of the finest discussions of the ornamental value of fixed epithets came from Richard Sacks, who studied "traditional phrasing and the characterization of Hector" through the distribution of the same epithets ἀνδροφόνος and ἱππόδαμος, as well as φαίδιμος, in the *Iliad* (Sacks 1987:105–226): used with other heroes' names and with υἱός, φαίδιμος is generic, whereas the nominative κορυθαίολος is the distinctive epithet for Hector. However, φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ occurs in "a certain marked ring. ... The most concentrated instances of it were in passages overtly emphasizing his defeats, delusions, and ultimate death" (Sacks 1987:142). Thus the epithet appears non-ornamental. For ἀνδροφόνος, it is used only in the genitive, "at moments of lamentation when he is not slaying, but slain," which assures us, it seems, of its ornamental nature. However,

> though the *Iliad* contains passage after passage depicting Hector's "man-slaying" exploits, only his deeds while dressed as Achilles are interspersed with the phrase Ἕκτορος ἀνδροφόνοιο. Elsewhere in the poem the phrase appeared either in lamentations over his death—real or imagined—or on the lips of his slayer—again, real or imagined. But it is totally excluded from other battle narratives in which he is

involved. ... Such a distribution cannot be either ornamental or, to repeat Parry's words, "an unconscious habit."[17]

Hector is said to be "man-slaying" when he is about to die at the "man-slaying" hands of Achilles (χεῖρας / δεινὰς ἀνδροφόνους 24.479, see Sacks 1987:175).

A third author, John Miles Foley, contributes to this discussion of the ornamental value of the fixed epithet. The meaning of the epithets may have been particularly relevant for an episode of the cyclic poems which is lost.[18] The Homeric epithets appear then to have a *metonymic* value, alluding to episodes and adventures other than those in which they are met. This is what Foley later called the "traditional referentiality" of an "immanent art."[19] We will try to test Whallon's, Sacks's, and Foley's insights by applying them to the system of formulae and formulaic phrases referring to Troy in the *Iliad*.

2. Generic Epithets for Τροίη / Ἴλιος

I propose to analyze αἰπεινή, ὑψίπυλος, εὐρείη, ἐρίβωλος and the derived form ἐριβῶλαξ as generic epithets, insofar as they also occur with other city names.

αἰπεινή 'lofty'

The data for αἰπεινή show the formula Ἴλιος αἰπεινή (always in this word order) declined at the beginning of the hexameter. We find it in the nominative in

> Ἴλιος αἰπεινή· νῦν τοι σῶς αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος (*Iliad* 13.773)

in the accusative in

> Ἴλιον αἰπεινὴν ἑλέειν κτάσθαι τε πολίτας (15.558; cf. 17.327)

and in the genitive in

> Ἰλίου αἰπεινῆς· μάλα γάρ ἕθεν εὐρύοπα Ζεὺς (9.419 = 686; cf. 15.215)

---

[17] Sacks 1987:170.

[18] Whallon 1961:139: "If the lays had survived, we might better realize why Hermes is *the slayer of Argus* (Ἀργειφόντης) or why Priam is described as a man *who has the good ash* (ἐυμμελίης)."

[19] Foley 1991:xv: "As firsthand experience with the oral traditional epic of the South Slavs will show, any single performance merely instances an unexpressed, and inexpressible, whole, a larger story that will forever remain beyond the reach of acoustically recorded, oral-dictated, or even written textualization. In that instancing, however, each performance also summons its traditional referent according to the contract that governs the generation of meaning in this art form, so that the necessarily partial reflection of the larger story is actually never incomplete. Even in the case of the ancient Greek and Anglo-Saxon epics . . . the whole tradition is still manifestly prominent."

We do not encounter the dative, but it is clear that nothing formally rules out Ἰλίῳ αἰπεινή, and its absence may be thus due to accident, though such scholars as Sale actually rely on a correspondence between semantic need and the existence of formulas more than we do.[20]

This epithet, αἰπεινή, is also met in conjunction with other city names, either at the same place in the verse, as in

Πήδασον αἰπεινήν. Φύλακον δ᾽ ἕλε Λήϊτος ἥρως (*Iliad* 6.35)

or at a different place in the verse, as for other places like Calydon and Gonoessa:

οἵ θ᾽ Ὑπερησίην τε καὶ αἰπεινὴν Γονόεσσαν (2.573)
ὃς πάσῃ Πλευρῶνι καὶ αἰπεινῇ Καλυδῶνι (13.217; cf. 14.116)

This epithet never appears with the name Τροίη, but no holder of the *realist* theory like Bowra would say that Ἴλιος was *lofty* and Τροίη was not.

ὑψίπυλος 'with high gates'

With Τροίη, the compound adjective ὑψίπυλος seems generic, since the formulaic hemistich ἔνθά κεν ὑψίπυλον, which occurs twice in the repeated verse ἔνθά κεν ὑψίπυλον Τροίην ἕλον υἷες Ἀχαιῶν (*Iliad* 16.698 = 21.544), has a metrical shape very similar to the beginning of 6.416, where the epithet occurs with Θήβην but in reverse order (Θήβην ὑψίπυλον· κατὰ δ᾽ ἔκτανεν Ἠετίωνα).

These few occurrences do not allow a strong conclusion but still suggest that ὑψίπυλος is generic with Τροίη, as αἰπεινή is with Ἴλιος.

εὐρείη 'wide'

More numerous instances draw more confidence for the adjective meaning "wide," though the relevance of this meaning may appear troublesome. It occurs with Τροίη as well as with other place names, hence its generic status: in addition to the 4 Iliadic and 3 Odyssean instances in which the epithet is applied to Τροίη (in the phrase ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ at the end of the verse or Τροίῃ ἐν εὐρείῃ at the beginning), there is a series of instances with the names Λυκίη, Κρήτη, and Σπάρτη and occasionally other ones like Κνωσός. With Τροίη we find examples such as:

---

[20]   Sale 1987, 1996.

> γῆμεν ἀνὴρ ὥριστος ἐνὶ Τροίη εὐρείη (*Iliad* 13.433; cf. 24.774, *Odyssey* 11.499, 12.189)
>
> Τροίη ἐν εὐρείη, τῶν δ᾽ οὔ τινά φημι λελεῖφθαι (*Iliad* 24.256 = 494; cf. *Odyssey* 1.62, 4.99, 5.307)

Line-final ἐνὶ Τροίη εὐρείη is built on the same fundamental schema as ἐν Λυκίη εὐρείη (*Iliad* 6.210), Λυκίης εὐρείης (*Iliad* 6.173), ἐν Κρήτη εὐρείη (*Odyssey* 13.256, etc.), and (with an even closer resemblance) ἐνὶ Σπάρτη εὐρείη (*Odyssey* 11.460) and ἐνὶ Κνωσῷ εὐρείη (*Odyssey* 18.591), all at line-end. With Λυκίη another schema is possible, exemplified by:

> κρίνας ἐκ Λυκίης εὐρείης φῶτας ἀρίστους (*Iliad* 6.188; cf. 16.455, 16.673, 16.683)

We observe here a "grammar of the formula,"[21] with three main possibilities, corresponding to spondaic place-names like Κρήτη and Τροίη or those with short vowels like Λυκίη:

> a. at verse beginning: ἐν εὐρείη – –
>
> b. at verse end: ἐνὶ / ἐν – – εὐρείη·
>
> c. Names with the shape ⌣ ⌣ – , like Λυκίη, can be situated at various positions in the verse, including in line-final formulas.

ἐρίβωλος 'fertile'

The epithet ἐρίβωλος forms with Τροίη a formulaic hemistich. The accusative is usual with the verb ἱκέσθαι,[22] as in Τροίην ἐρίβωλον ἵκοντο (*Iliad* 18.67) and Τροίην ἐρίβωλον ἱκέσθην (*Iliad* 23.215). As a variant of this formula, we find the second hemistich with the prepositional complement in the verse ending κατὰ Τροίην ἐρίβωλον (*Iliad* 9.329), unless the reverse could be said, since statistics are not proof with so few examples.

As evidence for the generic status of this epithet, we find it applied to the names Φθίη (*Iliad* 9.363), Σχερίη (*Odyssey* 5.34), Παιονίη (*Iliad* 21.154), and the common noun ἄρουρα (*Iliad* 21.232).

---

[21] The notion of "declension of the formula" is owed to the German scholar Kurt Witte (1913); see de Lamberterie 1997:18. As Edwards 1986:197–198 recognizes, Chantraine 1932 was the first application of Parry's ideas, "and for a long time the only one apart from Parry's own later work." We consider Nagler 1967 and 1974 an important step in taking a "generative" view of formulas. See Létoublon 1992a (on the phrase ἥβης μέτρον with various forms of ἱκέσθαι, in contrast with other phrases for the coming of old age, with such phrases as γῆρας ἱκάνει).

[22] Létoublon 1985:144–146.

ἐριβῶλαξ 'fertile'

Formally and semantically close to ἐρίβωλος appears the derived adjective ἐριβῶλαξ, with an interesting case of declension of the formula (we find accusative, genitive, and dative forms with different verbs). Alongside the first-hemistich formulas with the accusative

> ναίοιτε Τροίην ἐριβώλακα (*Iliad* 3.74; cf. 3.257)

we find interesting examples of the (locative) dative with preposition ἐν/ἐνὶ in a central position, for example:

> ἦσαν ἐνὶ Τροίη ἐριβώλακι τέκτονες ἄνδρες (*Iliad* 6.315)
> φθίσειν ἐν Τροίη ἐριβώλακι τηλόθι πάτρης (*Iliad* 16.461; cf. 24.86)

The generic status of this epithet is evident from the following examples of its use with other nouns:

> οὐδέ ποτ' ἐν Φθίη ἐριβώλακι βωτιανείρη (*Iliad* 1.155; cf. 9.479)
> τῆλ' ἀπὸ Λαρίσης ἐριβώλακος, οὐδὲ τοκεῦσι (*Iliad* 17.301; cf. 2.841)
> Βώρου, ὅς ἐκ Τάρνης ἐριβώλακος εἰληλούθει (*Iliad* 5.44)
> οἵ ῥ' ἐξ Ἀσκανίης ἐριβώλακος ἦλθον ἀμοιβοὶ (*Iliad* 13.793)
> τῶν ὅσσοι Λυκίην ἐριβώλακα ναιετάουσι (*Iliad* 16.172)
> ὅς ῥ' ἐκ Παιονίης ἐριβώλακος εἰληλούθει (*Iliad* 17.350)
> Ῥίγμον, ὃς ἐκ Θρήκης ἐριβώλακος εἰληλούθει (*Iliad* 20.485; cf. 11.222)
> κεῖθ' ἁλὶ κεκλιμένη ἐριβώλακος ἠπείροιο (*Odyssey* 13.325)

We may note that, while the epithet occurs in the genitive case with many toponyms (Λαρίσης, Τάρνης, Ἀσκανίης, Παιονίης, Θρήκης) and with the common noun ἠπείροιο, there are no occurrences with the genitive Τροίης.

εὐρυάγυια 'with wide streets'

With the epithet εὐρυάγυια, the most frequent formulas in the *Iliad* employ forms of the verb αἱρέω "take, capture." So, for example:

> πανσυδίῃ νῦν γάρ κεν ἔλοι πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν / Τρώων (*Iliad* 2.12–13; cf. 2.29–30, 2.66–67)
> οὐ γὰρ ἔτι Τροίην αἱρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν (*Iliad* 2.141 = 9.28)
> τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν αἱρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν (*Iliad* 2.329)[23]

---

[23] Note also *Iliad* 14.88–89: οὕτω δὴ μέμονας Τρώων πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν / καλλείψειν.

In the *Odyssey*, other city names warrant the generic status of the epithet (including Πριάμου πόλις "Priam's city," which of course refers to Troy):

> ἵκετο δ᾽ ἐς Μαραθῶνα καὶ εὐρυάγυιαν Ἀθήνην (*Odyssey* 7.80)
> ἠὲ διεπράθετο πτόλις ἀνδρῶν εὐρυάγυια (*Odyssey* 15.384)
> σῇ δ᾽ ἥλω βουλῇ Πριάμου πόλις εὐρυάγυια (*Odyssey* 22.230)

The epithet also occurs once with Μυκήνη at the end of the verse:

> Ἄργος τε Σπάρτη τε καὶ εὐρυάγυια Μυκήνη (*Iliad* 4.52)

Even though this is its only attestation within the Homeric corpus, εὐρυάγυια Μυκήνη should very likely be counted as a formula.[24] If we take into account Whallon's remark that an epithet may have been relevant in the cyclic epics, it is easy to suppose that Mycenae's wealth was concerned.

It would be relatively easy to exclude the examples with Ἀθήνην (and Μαραθῶνα) as more recent, and to observe that most other examples imply Troy in an indirect way, but it may seem more plausible to characterize the epithet as generic; its use with Μυκήνη seems a strong argument in this direction. Any wealthy city in the archaic period could likely merit a description as "having wide streets."

3. εὐτείχεος 'With Strong Walls': Generic or Distinctive?

The case of εὐτείχεος shows an interesting paradigmatic complementarity between Ἴλιος and Τροίη. The epithet occurs with no other toponym, which poses a challenge for Bowra's reasoning: why do we not find it describing Tiryns or Mycenae, where the walls are still now very impressive, and must have been impressive in antiquity?[25] This case is peculiar because the distinctive epithets mentioned by Parry generally correspond to one and the same name rather than one and the same reality, whereas this epithet could be specific for the city referred to by both names, Ἴλιος and Τροίη. The walls of the city, however, figure prominently in the Troy story: witness the myth of the gods Poseidon and Apollo together building them for king Laomedon (*Iliad* 21.441–446)[26] and

---

[24] See de Lamberterie 1997:19–20 for an analysis of formulas that occur only once, as at 1.554.

[25] See Polychronopoulou 1999:275–294, "Les murailles des Cyclopes." King Proitos of Tiryns was thought to have called the Cyclopes from Lydia or Thrakia to build the walls. In other traditions, they were built by the Pelasgoi.

[26] See Scully 1990:51. Scully's chapter 3, entitled "The Walled City" (41–53) deals with this question, noting first that only nine cities are said to be walled in the *Iliad*: Troy (Ilios), Thebes (in Egypt and in Boeotia), Lyrnessos, Tiryns, Kalydon, Phaia, and Gortyn. But none of these walls matter

Andromache's mention of a weak part of the wall, which may allude to the future fall of the city (*Iliad* 6.433–439).[27] Thus εὐτείχεος with reference to Τροίη or Ἴλιος represents a kind of "traditional referentiality," as John Foley would have said.[28]

The most frequent formula is a whole formulaic verse with the name Ἴλιος appearing four times in the *Iliad*:

> Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ᾽ εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι (*Iliad* 2.113, 2.288, 5.716, 9.20)

We also find two instances with Τροίην εὐτείχεον:

> αἴ κέ ποθι Ζεὺς / δῷσι πόλιν Τροίην εὐτείχεον ἐξαλαπάξαι (*Iliad* 1.129)
> ἱέμενος Τροίην εὐτείχεον ἐξαλαπάξαι (*Iliad* 8.241)

We may also note the alternative form εὐτειχής without either of the proper names, but with a clear reference to Troy through the word πόλιν in

> δουρὶ δ᾽ ἐμῷ κτεάτισσα πόλιν εὐτείχεα πέρσας (*Iliad* 16.57)

Arguably related is an isolated use of εὔπυργος "with strong towers" in

> εἰς ὅ κεν ἢ ὑμεῖς Τροίην εὔπυργον ἕλητε (*Iliad* 7.71)

Τροίην εὔπυργον has a different metrical shape from the more usual Τροίην εὐτείχεον, necessitating a different placement in the verse, but both phrases exhibit a similar distribution around the caesura (penthemimeral or hepthemimeral). Therefore Τροίην εὔπυργον may reasonably be considered a formula, entering the complex system of the formulaic epithets for Troy.

Εὐτείχεος and εὔπυργος refer to the walls and the towers of the Trojan city; they emphasize the strong defense apparatus, which should succeed in protecting the city against enemies. Therefore the more εὐτείχεος and εὔπυργος the city, the more tragic the Achaean attack against it appears. The interpretation of these words as distinctive epithets for Troy with both of its proper names seems possible, but we deem it more interesting to conclude that an ambiguity exists. Though we do not know any other cases in which the same epithet is used with two different names for one and the same reality, it cannot be formally

---

as much for the epics as Troy's wall. Scully devotes one section of his book to *euteikheos*, another to *hiera teikhea*. The formal complementarity of Ἴλιον … εὐτείχεον, Τροίην εὐτείχεον, and Τροίην εὔπυργον at different places in the verse, corresponding to Parry's law of economy, is not made clear enough in Scully's discussion, in my opinion.

27   Kirk 1990:217–218.
28   Foley 1991:38–60.

proven that the epithet is not generic. Anyhow, the reality of the walls and towers of Troy does not really matter here: rather, we are dealing with a kind of "traditional referentiality." We suggest that Troy's strong walls are not a specific characteristic of this city in themselves, since we know other cities that were endowed with very impressive walls and gates at that time; however, they take on great importance in the *Iliad*'s narrative because of the events that occur around them, and that could explain why these epithets seem quasi-specific for both of the names of the city.[29] Let us recall Scully's important remark quoted above: all of those examples occur in speeches by the Achaeans and carry a strong emotional weight.[30]

Before dealing with the possible cases of distinctive epithets, it must be noted that both Ἴλιος and Τροίη also occur without any epithet, as in

> Τροίη δὲ πεφήσεται αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος (*Iliad* 17.153)

Here, however, the adjective αἰπύς, modifying ὄλεθρος, could substitute for αἰπεινή (attested with Ἴλιος, not with Τροίη; see above) or αἰπύς, which also occurs once with Ἴλιος:

> ... εἰς ὅ κ' Ἀχαιοὶ
> Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἕλοιεν Ἀθηναίης διὰ βουλὰς (*Iliad* 15.70–71)

Note also the lines

> νῦν ὤλετο πᾶσῆς κατ' ἄκρης
> Ἴλιος αἰπεινή· νῦν τοι σῶς αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος (*Iliad* 13.772–773)

in which the formula Ἴλιος αἰπεινή at the beginning of the verse occurs in close proximity with the final formula αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος. We may consider this an indication of the relation between the elevation of the city and the abruptness of its destiny in the poet's mind. Thus the *abruptness* of the city becomes a

---

[29] A similar argument might be made for ἐρίβωλος and ἐριβῶλαξ: the epithets do not indicate that the Troad was an especially fertile territory, although the frequent emphasis on horses (see below on εὔπωλος) might suggest this, as for Pylos and Sparta.

[30] Scully 1990:4, quoted above; see also 74: "There are two formulaic phrases: 'to go home after having utterly destroyed well-walled Troy' (*Ilion ekpersant' euteikheon aponeesthai*), and 'if Zeus / grants us' (or 'desiring') 'to sack well-walled Troy' (*dōisi polin* [or *hiemenos*] *Troiēn euteikheon exalapaxai*). Thus it *always* appears in a context where desire (human or divine) plays against the seemingly impregnable defense of the city. Even more than highlighting a general sense of Troy's existence, the epithet with almost verbal energy of its own struggles against the sentence's actual verb, thwarting its telos. ... Counterpoint between verb and epithet not only is forceful but appears intentional as it sustains much of the dramatic tension within the line. When we recognize that all these examples occur only in the speeches by the Achaeans, it is hard to deny that the epithet carries emotional weight."

metaphor of its destiny, and the metaphor is achieved in the traditional formulaic style. In 17.153 (quoted above) the application of the epithet to ὄλεθρος alone, with the dramatic dative Τροίη standing alone at the beginning of the same verse, could thus emphasize the metaphorical value of the epithet, the high city becoming the victim of a high fall, as if there were a fitting proportion between its high walls and the fall. It is of course possible that we attach too much importance to the usual way an epithet occurs and to the contrast with the occurrence where it is missing: we just want to point out a possible stylistic and rhetorical device.[31]

Both Ἴλιος and Τροίη also occur without an epithet in a use we could call *neutral*, mostly with a preposition: compare, for instance, *Iliad* 8.131: κατὰ Ἴλιον; 21.295: κατὰ Ἰλιόφι; 24.67: ἐν Ἰλίῳ; 24.145: Ἴλιον εἴσω; 22.478: ἐν Τροίῃ; and particularly the following formulaic verse ending, which seems more expressive:

> ... οἳ Ἰλίῳ ἐγγεγάασιν (*Iliad* 6.493, 17.145)

Note that this is particularly the case for locative expressions: this could lead to support for Sale's observation that there are no formulas for the locative meaning "in Troy" and for departing from it, and for his hypothesis: the dramatization of the plot inside the city would correspond to the poet's period, when no more formulas were created anew.[32] We will come back to this issue.

4. Possible Distinctive Epithets and the Holy City

ἠνεμόεσσα 'windy'

Few epithets may be said to be distinctive of Troy, as either Ἴλιος or Τροίη, in the strong Parryan sense. It seems possible, however, to consider ἠνεμόεσσα a quasi-specific epithet for Ἴλιος since, apart from one instance in which it modifies another city-name, Ἐνίσπη, the epithet occurs (in the *Iliad*) only with Ἴλιος, in a formula confined to the second hemistich. The single exception, from the Catalogue of Ships, is:

---

[31] Those formulas with αἰπ- in diverse forms appear interesting in a comparative way: as C. Watkins remarked, Ἰλίου αἰπεινῆς could have a parallel in a Luvian phrase meaning "when they came from steep Wilusa" (1986:58–62). It is tempting to dream about a very ancient poetic use of the qualification of the city as steep before the Homeric epics. Quoting this article, Sale (1987:35n8) remarks: "If this phrase was an ancestor of Homer's, it went through several changes as it descended; for Homer speaks of Ἰλίου αἰπεινῆς only in formulae for the city's destruction, never for motion from the city."

[32] Sale 1987:32–38.

> Ῥίπην τε Στρατίην τε καὶ ἠνεμόεσσαν Ἐνίσπην (*Iliad* 2.606)

All of the other Iliadic instances reverse the order of name and epithet, as in

> ἤτοι ἐγὼν εἶμι προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν (*Iliad* 3.305; cf. 8.499, 12.115, 13.724, 18.174, 22.64, 23.297)

In the *Odyssey* the same epithet occurs in the same position with common nouns:

> ᾤκεον ἐν σπήεσσι δι᾽ ἄκριας ἠνεμόεσσας (*Odyssey* 9.400; cf. 16.365)
> Παρνησοῦ, τάχα δ᾽ ἵκανον πτύχας ἠνεμόεσσας (*Odyssey* 19.432)

As in the *Iliad*, the epithet occupies the last position in the verse, but the association with ἄκριας or πτύχας instead of Ἴλιος seems to indicate a disregard of the traditional formulaic system.

The formula προτὶ / ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν, as Sale notes,[33] occurs mostly in the "motion-to" use, which for him proves the role of semantic values of the formula.

εὔπωλος 'abounding in horses'

εὔπωλος occurs only with Ἴλιος, in a formula confined to the first hemistich. The hemistich, which occurs five times in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, is exemplified by the line

> Ἴλιον εἰς εὔπωλον ἅμ᾽ Ἀργείοισιν ἐπέσθην (*Iliad* 5.551; cf. 16.576, *Odyssey* 2.18, 14.71, 11.169)[34]

Thus εὔπωλος could be a distinctive epithet for this city, known in mythology for the divine horses given by Zeus to Tros as compensation for the taking of his son Ganymede (*Iliad* 5.266). That is not to say that other places were not also known for their horses, such as Argos, for which the epics use other formulas, especially employing the epithet ἱππόβοτος (the word probably characterizes Argos as a large country rather than a city, as may be the case for Ἴλιος when it is said to be εὔπωλος).[35]

---

[33] Sale 1987:30.

[34] Note that in several of these examples, going "to Ilios abounding in horses" is associated with the idea of combat (cf. ἵνα Τρώεσσι μάχοιτο / μαχοίμην in *Iliad* 16.576, *Odyssey* 11.169, 14.71), in accordance with the Achaean point of view. On Homeric formulae with horses, see Whallon's "Equestrian Epithets" (1961:118-120), Fagan 2001, and Platte 2014 and 2017. Though old-fashioned, let us also mention the "lexique du cheval" of Delebecque 1951.

[35] Two formulaic schemes are found for Argos, the horse-nourishing place. The first occurs at the end of the verse with a genitive: ἀπ᾽ Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο (*Iliad* 2.287, 19.329); μυχῷ Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο (*Iliad* 6.152); ἑκὰς Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο (*Iliad* 9.246). The second occurs at the beginning

It is not surprising to find formulas that likewise associate the Trojan people with horses. Phrases with the epithet ἱππόδαμος "horse-taming" in the first part of the verse in the dative or the accusative exhibit variations showing how the formula may adapt to both meter and morpho-syntax:

> Τρωσὶν ἐφ' ἱπποδάμοις (*Iliad* 8.110, 8.516)
> Τρωσὶν ἐφ' ἱπποδάμοισιν (*Iliad* 4.355, 19.237, 318)
> Τρῶας ἐς ἱπποδάμους (*Iliad* 17.230)
> Τρῶας θ' ἱπποδάμους καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιούς (*Iliad* 3.343, 4.80)
> Τρώων ἱπποδάμων (*Iliad* 2.230, 4.355, 6.461, 11.568)
> Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν (χαλκοχιτώνων) (*Iliad* 3.127, 3.131,
>   4.352, 8.71)

In the whole-verse formulas Τρώων θ' ἱπποδάμων καὶ Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτώνων and Τρῶας θ' ἱπποδάμους καὶ ἐϋκνήμιδας Ἀχαιούς, *clustered* in Books 3 and 4, and each denoting the same two groups, note that, although the first hemistich is identical, the second shows a change of both word-order and epithet.

The nominative proper is not attested, but the vocative occurs twice in a verse-initial formula that exhibits a significant shift in both meter and word-order:

> ὄρνυσθ' ἱππόδαμοι Τρῶες (*Iliad* 4.509, 12.440)

The other formulas quoted above may also, with slight variations, be encountered at other places in the verse, as in

> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ Τρώεσσι μεθ' ἱπποδάμοις ἀγορεύσω (*Iliad* 7.361, 8.525)
> πῶς γὰρ νῦν Τρώεσσι μεμιγμένοι ἱπποδάμοισιν (*Iliad* 10.424; cf.
>   17.418, 20.180)

The epithet also occurs with the names of several individuals, including Hector and Antenor among the Trojans, and Tydeus, Diomedes, Nestor, Thrasymedes, and Atreus among the Achaeans (all fighters in the Trojan War or their ancestors) but with no other collective name. So it can be concluded that it is a distinctive epithet for the Trojans, as εὔπωλος is with Ἴλιος, showing once more the complementarity between Ἴλιος and Τροίη.

---

of the verse with an accusative: Ἄργος ἐς ἱππόβοτον (*Iliad* 3.75, 3.258, 15.30). Cf. also the formula Δαναῶν ταχυπώλων at the end of the verse (*Iliad* 4.232 etc.), and one occurrence of Μυρμιδόνες ταχύπωλοι at its beginning (*Iliad* 23.6): all of this material seems to obey Milman Parry's laws.

ὀφρυόεσσα 'with overhanging brows'

The very intriguing epithet ὀφρυόεσσα, with the nominative Ἴλιος, is a *hapax*:

> τῷ δὲ μάλιστ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἔην ἐναλίγκιον ὡς εἰ ἅπασα
> Ἴλιος ὀφρυόεσσα πυρὶ σμύχοιτο κατ᾽ ἄκρης (*Iliad* 22.410–411)

The phrase Ἴλιος ὀφρυόεσσα at the beginning of the verse looks like a formula, and though we find no other instance of it, we would be less confident than most "hard Parryist" scholars about excluding its formulaic status:[36] in a tradition that can be traced back to Meillet,[37] we admit the possibility of formulas that occur only once in the Homeric corpus and could perhaps have had an important role in the Cyclic poems. Nevertheless, the opacity of the epithet, already problematic in antiquity for the scholiast quoted by Bowra (above, p. 44), leads us to conclude that this epithet may be very ancient and not at all an invention of "Homer," whatever its meaning is. The formal relation of ὀφρυόεσσα to ὀφρῦς seems clear, but does it mean "eyebrow" with an anthropomorphic meaning? Or is the meaning of "eyebrow" for the substantive itself derived from another meaning, which could be attributed to natural features as well as to eyebrows (as seems to be the case in English for *brow*)?[38] It happens elsewhere that semantically opaque expressions that can be illuminated by comparison with other languages and/or literatures appear in Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, etc., as very ancient formulas that were obviously not very well understood. Could ὀφρυόεσσα, then, be the sole attested instance of an old epithet distinctive of Ἴλιος? If we take into account the masculine form ὀφρυόεντα found in an oracle for Corinth preserved by Herodotos,[39] the epithet would be distinctive of this city situated on a steeper rock than Troy. It is impossible to go further with such evidence. But it might be important that this passage with a distinctive epithet deals in a very solemn tone with the tragic loss of the city, as was the case above with the "high disaster" (αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος) coming to the high city with its high walls. It might also be important to mention that *Ophryneion* is a toponym known in the Troad, at least through Strabo, who situates a grove sacred to Hector there (13.1.29):[40] our hypothesis would be that this name

---

[36] See Sale 1987; 1996.

[37] de Lamberterie 1997:19; see above.

[38] LSJ s.v. ὀφρυόεις: "on the brow or edge of a steep rock, beetling."

[39] Herodotos 5.92 (ὀφρυόεντα Κόρινθον). See also Strabo 8.6.23: χώραν δ᾽ ἔσχεν οὐκ εὔγεως σφόδρα, ἀλλὰ σκολιάν τε καὶ τραχεῖαν, ἀφ᾽ οὗ πάντες ὀφρυόεντα Κόρινθον εἰρήκασι καὶ παροιμιάζονται "Κόρινθος ὀφρῦᾷ τε καὶ κοιλαίνεται." Note also Strabo's use of ὀφρύς in geographical descriptions at 12.6.5.19, 17.1.33.2, 17.3.14.7.

[40] See Cook 1973:72–77, and particularly 74: "The Ophryneion site lies 1.5 km from the centre of Erenköy and just north of a precipitous ravine with banks of oolitic drift in which Calvert

derives from the same ὀφρῦς as the epithet ὀφρυόεσσα, based on a similar meaning of ὀφρυ-, let us say "brow" or "ravine," itself relatively frequent in geographical descriptions.

ἱερή / ἱρή 'sacred'

Let us develop a little more the association of Troy with two adjectives that seem very close one to another but nevertheless display very different behavior, ἱερή and ἱρή.[41] The first adjective occurs with other city-names or place-names, like Thebe, city of Eetion, Andromache's father. Though the location of this city might suggest that it is close to Troy and included in the Troad, this is not the case for Euboea, Zeleia, and Pylos, all places that receive the epithet.[42] ἱερή therefore appears to be a generic epithet, which also occurs with certain common nouns. It occurs with Ἴλιος only once:

> Ἴλιον εἰς ἱερήν· τῇ δ' ἀντίος ὄρνυτ' Ἀπόλλων (*Iliad* 7.20)

Especially worthy of note is the line

> Περγάμῳ εἰν ἱερῇ, ὅθι οἱ νηός γε τέτυκτο (*Iliad* 5.446)

Although, as we will see shortly, Πέργαμος is the name of the Trojan acropolis, ἱερὴ is a generic epithet in reference to the city of the Trojans.

In strong contrast, its apparent allomorph ἱρή seems strictly limited to Troy under the name Ἴλιος; metrically, it is strictly limited to the verse-final position. The whole formulaic verse

> ἔσσεται ἦμαρ ὅτ' ἄν ποτ' ὀλώλῃ Ἴλιος ἱρή (*Iliad* 4.164, 6.448)

occurs twice in the *Iliad*. There are other instances of the phrase in the nominative case:

> Κτίσσε δὲ Δαρδανίην, ἐπεὶ οὔ πω Ἴλιος ἱρὴ (*Iliad* 20.216; cf. 4.46, 24.27)[43]

as well as in the genitive:

> ὥς κεν Τυδέος υἱὸν ἀπόσχῃ Ἰλίου ἱρῆς (*Iliad* 6.96 ~ 6.277; cf. 21.128)

---

discovered remains of various creatures of the pliocene."
41   See Scully 1990, Ch. 2 ("The Sacred City"); Scully does not contrast ἱερή and ἱρή.
42   See *Iliad* 1.366, 2.535, 4.103, 4.121, *Odyssey* 21.108.
43   This instance proves that for the poet, Ἴλιος is different from Δαρδανίη, the first establishment known in the region. See below.

The epithet is most frequent in the accusative case. We observed two recurring whole-line formulas, and in these instances its *formularity* is evident:

> τεύχεα συλήσας οἴσω προτὶ Ἴλιον ἱρήν (*Iliad* 7.82; cf. *Iliad* 7.413, 7.429,
>   13.657, 17.193)
> βῆ δὲ κατ᾽ Ἰδαίων ὀρέων εἰς Ἴλιον ἱρήν (*Iliad* 15.169; cf. *Iliad* 24.143,
>   *Odyssey* 11.86, 17.293)

There are, as well, a number of instances of the verse-final formula Ἴλιον ἱρήν in other contexts (*Iliad* 5.648, 6.416, 18.270, 21.515, 24.383).

This clear evidence of a declined formula in the strongest Parryian sense (without any examples in the dative, which could support Sale's remarks on the absence of the locative value for "Troy-city") contrasts with the other name of the city, Τροίη, which does not occur at all with ἱρή, and is used with ἱερός only in the periphrases Τροίης ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα (*Iliad* 16.100) and Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον (*Odyssey* 1.2). Might we detect in this difference of usage a difference in meaning? ἱρός is usually understood to mean "sacred," like ἱερός, but some have proposed that it means, instead, "mighty, powerful."[44] ἱρή seems distinctive with the name Ἴλιος whereas ἱερή is generic with both of the city's names.

City-names are often constructed as derivatives of the name of the city's founder.[45] The famous genealogy of Aeneas in *Iliad* Book 20 (214–231) gives the list of his ancestors but does not seem to provide a key to Ἴλιος ἱρή: the main figures in the royal lineage outlined there are successively Dardanos (219), Erichthonios (219), Tros (231), his sons Ilos, Assarakos, and Ganymedes (232), Ilos' son Laomedon (236) and grandson Priam (237), and Assarakos' son Kapys and grandson Anchises (239).[46] Ἴλιος appears to relate to Ilos, Τροίη to Tros. The specificity of Tros' three sons, Ilos, Assarakos, and Ganymedes, excludes the hypothesis of a mistake or change in the tradition of which Aeneas preserves the memory. Pseudo-Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* (3.140), perhaps more accurately than the *Iliad*, mentions a first Ilos, eldest son of Dardanos, who died without heir so that his brother Erichthonios became king.

The tradition of the Palladion, which comes from the Epic Cycle but is not referred to in Homer, derives the origin of the statue either from Dardanos, the very first ancestor mentioned in *Iliad* 20 (who in most detailed traditions came

---

[44] See Chantraine 2009:1309.
[45] In this case, the city-names Ἴλιος and Τροίη both with suffix *-yo/ya*, as well as Δαρδανίη deriving from *Dardanos.*
[46] On this genealogy, see Wathelet 1989:97–101 and 1988:1.399–407 on Dardanos; 606–611, on Ilos, where he argues that, although Apollodorus mentions another person called Ilos, this Ilos is a "doublet" of Tros' son. Wathelet says that the city-name preexists the founder, which seems morphologically difficult. See also 1988:2.1028–1031 on Tros.

from Greece through Samothrace, still another problem that we cannot deal with here), or from Ilos, but never from Tros or Erichthonios. The point cannot be developed in this frame,[47] but the statue of the Palladion played a crucial role for the city as a protective talisman until a night expedition by Diomedes and Odysseus succeeded in stealing it. Therefore, I propose a strong link between the magical power of the statue and Ilos, recalling that he had his tomb in the plain near Troy, an important landmark in the surroundings of the city for the chiefs and soldiers of both camps. This Ilos could be the son of Dardanos omitted in Aeneas' genealogy rather than the son of Tros, about whom he has explicit knowledge.

The formulaic theater—located in our minds rather than reality—could then be first the place where oral poetry is still now "fighting" against the defenders of that "astonishing degree of reality" (Bowra's phrasing) found in the Homeric poems. But a step further can be possible with the help of Jenny Strauss Clay's studies of "Homer's Trojan Theater,"[48] in which the space between the Achaean ships and the city walls is described as a theater where the episodes of fighting move the narrative along with higher and higher intensity until Hector's men set the ships on fire, which leads Achilles to accept Patroklos' demand and send him to war in his own armor. It could be assumed that the formulaic style stresses and emphasizes this theater of war: the Achaeans want to take the city which, protected by its high walls and doors, is relatively safe. Conversely, the Trojans want to defend their holy city at all costs. In this connection, I would like to study more closely expressions such as the following:

> νῦν γάρ κεν ἕλοι πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν / Τρώων (*Iliad* 2.12–13; cf.
>   2.29–30, 2.66–67)
> εἴ κεν Ἀχαιοὶ / Τρῶας δῃώσωσιν ἕλωσί τε Ἴλιον ἱρήν (*Iliad* 4.415–416)
> εἰ γὰρ νῦν Τρώεσσι μένος πολυθαρσὲς ἐνείη / ... αἶψά κε Πάτροκλον
>   ἐρυσαίμεθα Ἴλιον εἴσω (*Iliad* 17.156–159)[49]

Sale aptly remarks that typical formulas exist for expressing a move towards the city (compare the examples of προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν and προτὶ/εἰς Ἴλιον ἱρὴν, noted above),[50] whereas there are virtually no formulas corresponding to the locative meaning of "in the city," nor to the expression of the movement away from the city. Sale explains this by a hypothesis concerning the relative

---

[47] See Faraone 1992, Létoublon 2009, 2014b.
[48] Clay 2007 and 2011. See Létoublon 2018.
[49] See Wakker 1994:388–389 for the relation of the wish with the conditional.
[50] Sale 1987:37.

chronology of the text, the Troy-scenes that imply the locative being composed, in his opinion, more or less at the date of "Homer." This conclusion might be in harmony with that of the importance of the space between the Achaean ships and the city walls as the theater of war, which we are exploring.

5. The Names of Troy and Formulaic Economy

In its sole occurrence in the *Iliad*, the name Δαρδανίη is given to the first settlement in the Troad, founded by Dardanos higher on the heights of Mount Ida than the future site of Troy (*Iliad* 20.215–218).[51] Six formulaic uses of the name Πέργαμος show that this was the name of the acropolis of Troy, standing in the same relation to the city as the Kadmeia to Thebes, for example:

> νεμέσησε δ' Ἀπόλλων / Περγάμου ἐκκατιδών (*Iliad* 4.507–508; cf. 7.20–21)
> Αἰνείαν δ' ἀπάτερθεν ὁμίλου θῆκεν Ἀπόλλων / Περγάμῳ εἰν ἱερῇ (*Iliad* 5.445–446)
> ὣς εἰπὼν αὐτὸς μὲν ἐφέζετο Περγάμῳ ἄκρῃ (*Iliad* 5.460, with reference to Ares; cf. 6.512–513)
> Πέργαμον εἰσαναβᾶσα φίλον πατέρ' εἰσενόησεν (*Iliad* 24.700, with reference to Cassandra)

While *Pergamos* appears to be the proper name of Troy's acropolis, ἐν πόλει ἄκρῃ can be considered a "minimal formula" for this part of the city.[52] Pergamos was probably the solemn, official name contrasting with the quotidian use of ἐν πόλει ἄκρῃ.

    The uses of the names of peoples are also very interesting: they seem to imply that Dardanians were a distinct population of inhabitants of the Troad, different from the Trojans but constantly fighting with them because of their close kinship.[53] Why no ethnonym deriving from the name of Ilos occurs in Homer, although Ἴλιος appears more sacred than Τροίη, remains a mystery.

    To conclude with this point, Ἴλιος and Τροίη refer to one and the same city under the name of a different founder: the more sacred Ἴλιος very probably refers to the first Ilos, whom Aeneas did not mention in his genealogy, rather than to the second Ilos, whom he remembers because that Ilos is closer to his own lineage, whereas the founder died without posterity. The use of the formulaic epithets implies that the city of Troy is, along with the Achaean camp,

---

[51] There is no entry for Dardania in the OCD, but the city is mentioned in the entry on Dardanus.
[52] Sale 1987:33n25. Occurrences of ἐν πόλει ἄκρῃ: *Iliad* 6.88. 6.297, 6.317, 7.345. See also *Iliad* 20.52.
[53] Space does not permit me to consider here the available research on the formulaic status of the names of Trojans and Dardanians, but see on this question Sale 1989.

the very center of the epics: its name occurs with some generic epithets that occur with other city names as well, but some epithets might have a distinctive status, just as heroes and gods have some distinctive epithets. This might mean, not that Troy is uniquely windy, rich in horses, or even holy, but rather that in the ongoing course of the epic plot, the whole interest of the characters, and by extension that of the audience, focuses on this very city. Meanwhile, the particular form ἱρή, associated solely with the name Ἴλιος, could be explained by particular features of Trojan myth, as extensively told in the Epic Cycle and alluded to in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*.[54]

Let us conclude with remarks on the formulaic system and its economy. The epithets for both Ἴλιος and Τροίη correspond to a very extensive and economic formulaic system, since no formulas expressing the same essential idea fit exactly the same metrical conditions. This system can be sketched as follows:[55]

Generic Epithets

> Τροίην ἐρίβωλον ἵκοντο [P 6–12] 1x
> Τροίην ἐρίβωλον ἱκέσθην [P 6–12] 1x
>
> ναίοιτε Τροίην ἐριβώλακα [P 1–8] 1x
> ναίοιμεν Τροίην ἐριβώλακα [P 1–8] 1x
>
> ἐνὶ Τροίη ἐριβώλακι [P 2b–8] 1x
> ἐν Τροίη ἐριβώλακι [P 3–8] 2x
>
> Τροίην αἱρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν [P 4–12] 2x
> πόλιν εὐρυάγυιαν [P 8a–12] 5x[56]

---

[54] See Fantuzzi and Tsagalis 2015, Létoublon 2011. The myth of Troy may have begun with the Judgment of Paris in the *Cypria* and may have included the construction of the walls by Poseidon and Apollo, hired by Laomedon; it ended with the sack of the city and the murder of Trojan males while women were enslaved in the part of the Cycle we know under the name of *Iliou Persis*.

[55] In the following list, I use the system outlined by Sicking 1993:69 (a modification of O'Neill 1942) to indicate the localization of phrases within the hexameter. Sicking's system assigns a number to each position in the hexameter as follows:

1 2a 2b 3 4a 4b 5 6a 6b 7 8a 8b 9 10a 10b 11 12
—   ⏑   ⏑   —   ⏑   ⏑ —   ⏑   ⏑ —   ⏑   ⏑ —   ⏑   ⏑   —   x

Thus "P 6–12," for example, indicates that the first syllable of the phrase falls in Sicking's Position 6 and the last syllable in Position 12 (which is the last syllable of the verse). The "masculine" (penthemimeral), "feminine," and hepthemimeral caesurae fall at the boundaries between positions 5 / 6a, 6a / 6b, and 7 / 8a, respectively.

[56] In four of five instances, the city is further specified as Τρώων "of the Trojans"; in the fifth instance (*Odyssey* 4.246), it is clear from the context that the city is Troy.

  Ἴλιος αἰπεινή [P 1–5] 1x
  Ἴλιον αἰπεινὴν [P 1–5] 2x
  Ἰλίου αἰπεινῆς [P 1–5] 3x[57]

  ὑψίπυλον Τροίην [P 3–7] 2x

With the idea "broad" appears a subsystem in the dative:

  ἐνὶ Τροίη εὐρείη [P 6b–12] 4x
  Τροίη ἐν εὐρείη [P 1–5] 5x

Another interesting subsystem appears with εὐτείχεος, which occurs with both names in different metrical patterns:

  Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ᾽ εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι [P 1–12] 4x
  Τροίην εὐτείχεον [P 4–8b] 2x[58]

Possible distinctive epithets:

  προτὶ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν [P 6a–12] 5x
  ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἠνεμόεσσαν [P 6a–12] 1x

  Ἴλιον εἰς εὔπωλον [P 1–6a] 2x

  ἱππόδαμοι Τρῶες [P 3–7] 2x
  Τρώων (θ᾽) ἱπποδάμων [P 1–5] 9x
  Τρωσὶν ἐφ᾽ ἱπποδάμοισι(ν) [P 1–6] 4x[59]
  Τρῶάς θ᾽ ἱπποδάμους [P 1–5] 3x
  Ἴλιος ὀφρυόεσσα [P 1–6a] 1x

ἱερή and ἱρή:

  Ἴλιον ἱρήν [P 9–12] 13x
  Ἰλίου ἱρῆς [P 9–12] 3x

  Ἴλιον εἰς ἱερήν [P 1–5] 1x
  Τροίης ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα [P 4–10a] 1x

---

[57] Ἴλιον αἰπὺ [P 1–4a] (*Iliad* 15.71) might be a variant, linked to the notion of αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος "steep destruction"; see above.

[58] This formula, whose constituents stand on either side of the penthemimeral caesura, is in an apparently complementary relationship with Τροίην εὔπυργον [P 6–10a, x 1], whose constituents are on either side of the hepthemimeral caesura.

[59] There are an additional 6 instances of Τρωσίν / Τρώεσσι with ἱπποδάμοις / ἱπποδάμοισι(ν) in various positions in the verse.

> Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον [P 6a–10a] 1x in the *Odyssey*
> Περγάμῳ εἰν ἱερῇ [P 1–5] 1x

Most of these epithets indicate that Ἴλιος and Τροίη, though located in the same geographical place, refer to different realities, maybe because they have different founders. Or possibly the poets used different metrical shapes, associated with different epithets, to single out different periods in the city's stratified history. We cannot explain why only Ἴλιος occurs in the nominative, but it might have to do with the fact that, in several cases, the formulas relative to this name are declined (Ἴλιος αἰπεινή and Ἴλιος ἱρή) whereas those with Τροίη are not, and with the fact that Ἴλιος and its paradigm often appear at the beginning of the verse, in an apparently emphatic position. Thus the formulaic system clearly functions according to Parry's characterization:

> The uses of noun-epithet formulae are varied and many, but their common utility lies in the fact that they fill exactly a certain portion of the verse where the noun, or its synonym, would not fit. The technique of the use of the fixed epithet as we find it in Homer reveals plainly an ancient and intense development. In those cases where the importance of a word, or a category of words, has brought about its use frequently, and in different combinations of words, we find that the noun-epithet formulae constitute systems characterized by a great complexity and by a strict economy.[60]

The numerous epithets that occur with both Ἴλιος and Τροίη (ἐρίβωλος, ἐριβῶλαξ, εὐρυάγυια, etc.) exhibit a variety of metrical shapes, providing considerable flexibility when joined with either name.

One last comment concerns Sale's analysis of place-name formulas. In his 1987 paper, he remarks on the strange absence of formulas with the locative meaning of the dative. I first believed I had discovered an error in this analysis with two cases: ἐν(ὶ) Τροίη ἐριβώλακι and ἐνὶ Τροίη εὐρείη / Τροίη ἐν εὐρείη. After looking more closely both at the whole list of the examples and his paper, it seems to me that the situation is more complicated.[61] Let us first quote his accurate phrasing:

> We have established, then, that there are few or no pre-Homeric formulae for "in Troy-city" and none for "from Troy." The formulaic tradition did not say these things. But what about the whole epic

---

[60] Parry 1971:246. The anonymous reviewer is once more to be thanked for having drawn my attention to this paper; I did not remark its importance.
[61] And the reviewer of my first version of the paper encouraged me to think so.

tradition, formulaic and non-formulaic?—for it is evident from Homer that not every time an idea is expressed will it be expressed in a formula. Did no poet before Homer ever say "from Troy"? Such an extreme view is surely very unattractive. What we *can* argue is this: in the last few generations before the composition of the *Iliad*, the oral poets did not *frequently* say "in Troy" or "from Troy." If they had, formulae would have developed.[62]

Sale then takes a further step (1987:37):

> ... pre-Homeric poetry did not say "in Troy" frequently because it did not frequently place the action in Troy. It did not say "from Troy" because, being rarely inside the city, it rarely had occasion to leave it. This would mean that the bulk of the *Iliad*'s Trojan scenes—there are 33 in all—could safely be attributed to Homer's own invention. Note that this does *not* mean that the Trojan scenes will be significantly less formulaic than the rest. Hector's helmet is just as bright, and the Achaean chitons just as brazen, whether referred to inside the city or out of it. It certainly does not make Homer a pen-poet who inherited the rest of the *Iliad*. It *does* mean that the parts of Troy which are not visible from outside will lack formulae—and this is in fact the case.

Sale does not analyze the formulaic system of the names for Troy because he is interested in what he calls the *formularity* of place-names (more generally than Troy) in the *Iliad*, which means the statistical proportion of formulas vs. non-formulaic uses of words. He concludes that "in Troy" does not occur in formulas, but he introduces a note of caution with the qualifiers "often" and "frequently." It is true that the uses of ἐν(ὶ) Τροίῃ with both ἐριβώλακι and εὐρείῃ are formulaic and are used to express that some event happened "in Troy." Nevertheless, in my opinion, these uses do not imply that Sale's intuition is wrong: they do not belong to the real *Trojan scenes* he had in mind, for instance the scenes on the wall in Books 6 and 22, in Priam's palace, etc. Rather, they all refer to the period before the war, when the "best man who was in Troy married Hippodameia" (*Iliad* 13.433), when Priam's sons were born, or when Hector was still protecting his family (three examples in Book 24), and further in the Odyssean examples. They all belong to a timespan before the period narrated in the *Iliad*, and they derive from that a nostalgic tone. The poet never uses those phrases when he tells, for instance, of Helen inside the palace or on the walls, of Hector's quest for Andromache and their meeting, or of the sacrifice scene to Athena. Actually,

---

[62] Sale 1987:37.

Sale does not notice some formulaic uses meaning "in Troy," but this does not compromise his conclusions.

Thus the various uses of fixed epithets with different names of the city of Troy show that the city can be counted as one of the heroic "characters" of the *Iliad*. We do not meet any other place with so many qualifications, which by itself contributes to the crystallization of the Myth of Troy, telling the city's "steep fall." We may quote Scully once more: "The *Iliad's* true center of gravity is Troy, the point where the threads of events crisscross and the metaphysical place on which the sacred fiction of the poem turns."[63] Moreover, Sale's analysis might show that the scenes inside Troy constitute the very bulk of Homer's work, distinct from the more traditional and formulaic theater of the war.

Is it possible that Parry's analysis of generic vs. distinctive epithets is still relevant, even as Scully's remarks about the role of Troy as the "well-walled city" in the speeches of the Achaeans who wish to sack and destroy it remain valid, as well as Sale's argument about a formulaic step in the evolution of epic language, contrasting with a greater freedom of the poet in the latest period? I do not see actual incompatibility between them, and my research in the linguistic field of motion verbs[64] taught me to accept different and even opposed theories according to the different issues that we have to confront.

[63] Scully 1990:118–119.
[64] Létoublon 1985.

Bibliography

Antonaccio, C. 1995. *An Archaeology of Ancestors: Tomb Cult and Hero Cult in Early Greece.* Lanham, MD.

Bakker, E. J. 1997. "The Study of Homeric Discourse." In Morris and Powell 1997:284–304.

Bakker, E. J., and A. Kahane, eds. 1997. *Written Voices, Spoken Signs: Tradition, Performance and the Epic Text.* Cambridge, MA.

Bowra, C. M. 1960. "Homeric Epithets for Troy." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 80:16–23.

———. 1972. *Homer.* London.

Bremer, J. M., I. J. F. de Jong, and J. Kaiff, eds. 1987. *Beyond Oral Poetry: Recent Trends in Homeric Interpretation.* Amsterdam.

Chantraine, P. 1932. "Remarques sur l'emploi des formules dans le premier chant de l'Iliade." *Revue des Études Grecques* 45:121–154.

———. 2009. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots.* New editon. Ed. A. Blanc, C. de Lamberterie, and J.-L. Perpillou. Paris. Orig. pub. 1968.

Clay, J. S. 2007. "Homer's Trojan Theater." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 137:233–252.

———. 2011. *Homer's Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the* Iliad. Cambridge.

Cook, J. M. 1973. *The Troad: An Archaeological and Topographical Study.* Oxford.

Delebecque, E. 1951. *Le Cheval dans l'Iliade.* Paris.

Dowden, K., and N. Livingstone, eds. 2011. *A Companion to Greek Mythology.* Malden, MA.

Edwards, M. W. 1986 "Homer and the Oral Tradition: The Formula. Part I." *Oral Tradition* 1:171–230.

———. 1988. "Homer and the Oral Tradition: The Formula. Part II." *Oral Tradition* 3:11–60.

———. 1997. "Homeric Style and Oral Poetics." In Morris and Powell 1997:261–283.

Fagan, P. L. 2001. *Horses in the Similes of the* Iliad*: A Case Study.* Toronto.

Fantuzzi, M., and C. Tsagalis, eds. 2015. *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion.* Cambridge.

Faraone, C. 1992. *Talismans and Trojan Horses: Guardian Statues in Ancient Greek Myth and Ritual.* New York.

Fenik, B., ed. 1978. *Homer: Tradition and Invention.* Leiden.

Foley, J. M. 1991. *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic.* Bloomington.

Giuliani, L. 2003. *Bild und Mythos: Geschichte der Bilderzählung in der griechischen Kunst.* Munich.

Hajnal, I. 2003. "Ụiluša—Tarhuiša. Sprachwissentschaftliche Nachbetrachtungen zum Beitrag von Susaenne Heinhold-Kramer." In Ulf 2003:169–173.

Heinhold-Kramer, S. 2003. "Zur Gleichsetzung der Namen Ilios-Wiluša und Troia-Tarhuiša." In Ulf 2003:146–168.

Kampakoglou, A., and A. Novokhatko, eds. 2018. *Gaze, Vision and Visuality in Ancient Greek Literature: Concepts, Contexts and Reception.* Berlin.

Kirk, G. S. 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary.* Vol. 2, *Books 5–8.* Cambridge.

Korfmann, M. 2001. "Troia, Traum und Wirklichkeit: Eine Einleitung in das Thema." In *Troia: Traum und Wirklichkeit*, 4–23. Stuttgart.

Kullmann, W. 2002. *Realität, Imagination und Theorie. Kleine Schriften zu Epos und Tragödie in der Antike.* Ed. A. Rengakos. Stuttgart.

Lamberterie, C. de. 1997. "Milman Parry et Antoine Meillet." In Létoublon 1997:9–22.

Leaf, W. 1900–1902. *The Iliad.* 2nd ed. London.

Létoublon, F. 1983. "Défi et combat dans l'*Iliade*." *Revue des Études Grecques* 96:27–48.

———. 1985. *Il allait, pareil à la nuit. Les verbes de mouvement en grec: suplétisme et aspect verbal.* Études et commentaires 98. Paris.

———. 1992a. "De la syntaxe à la poétique générative, ou grammaire et mesure." In Létoublon 1992b:93–103.

———, ed. 1992b. *La langue et les textes en grec ancien. Actes du colloque Pierre Chantraine (Grenoble, 5–8 Septembre 1989).* Amsterdam.

———, ed. 1997. *Hommage à Milman Parry. Le style formulaire de l'épopée homérique et la théorie de l'oralité poétique.* Amsterdam.

———. 2009. "Athéna et son double." *Pallas* 81:179-190.

———. 2011. "Homer's Use of Myth." In Dowden and Livingstone 2011:27–45.

———. 2014a. "Athena and Pallas, Image, Copies, Fakes and Doubles." In Martinez 2014:143–161.

———. 2014b. "Le Palladion dans la Guerre de Troie: un talisman du Cycle épique, un tabou de l'*Iliade*." In Scafoglio 2014:59–84.

———. 2018. "War as Spectacle in the *Iliad*." In Kampakoglou and Novokhatko 2018:3–32.

Luce, J. V. 1999. *Celebrating Homer's Landscapes: Troy and Ithaca Revisited.* New Haven.

Martínez, J., ed. 2014. *Fakes and Forgers of Classical Literature: Ergo decipiatur!* Leiden.

Mellink, M. J., ed. 1986. *Troy and the Trojan War: A Symposium held at Bryn Mawr College (October 1984).* Bryn Mawr.

Montanari, F. 1998. "Antichi commenti a Omero. Alcune riflessioni." In *Omero. Gli aedi, i poemi, gli interpreti*, 1–17. Florence.

———. 2005. "Les poèmes homériques entre réalité et fiction." *Gaia* 9:9–24.

Morris, I., and B. Powell, eds. 1997. *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden.

Nagler, M. 1967. "Towards a Generative View of the Formula." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 98:269–311.

———. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley.

Nagy, G. 1990. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca.

O'Neill, E. 1942. *The Localization of Metrical Word-types in the Greek Hexameter: Homer, Hesiod, and the Alexandrians*. New Haven.

Parry, M. 1928a. *L'épithète traditionnelle dans Homère*. Paris.

———. 1928b. "The Homeric Gloss: A Study in Word-sense." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 59:233—247.

———. 1930. "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making. I. Homer and Homeric Style." *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 41:73–147. Repr. in Parry 1971:266–324.

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

Platte, R. 2014. "Hades' Famous Foals and the Prehistory of Homeric Horse Formulas." *Oral Tradition* 29:149–162.

———. 2017. *Equine Poetics*. Hellenic Stuidies 74. Washington, DC.

Polychronopoulou, O. 1999. *Archéologues sur les pas d'Homère: la naissance de la protohistoire égéenne*. Paris.

Richardson, N. J. 1993. *The* Iliad*: A Commentary*. Vol. 6, *Books 21–24*. Ed. G. S. Kirk. Cambridge.

Russo, J. 1997. "The Formula." In Morris and Powell 1997:238–260.

Sacks, R. 1987. *The Traditional Phrase in Homer. Two Studies in Form, Meaning and Interpretation.* Leiden.

Sale, W. M. 1987. "The Formularity of the Place-Phrases of the *Iliad*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 117:21–50.

———. 1989. "The Trojans, Statistics, and Milman Parry." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 30:341–410.

———. 1996. "In Defense of Milman Parry: Renewing the Oral Theory." *Oral Tradition* 11:314–417.

Scafoglio, G., ed. 2014. *Studies on the Greek Epic Cycle*. Philologia Antiqua 7. Pisa.

Scully, S. 1990. *Homer and the Sacred City*. Ithaca.

Sicking, C. M. J. 1993. *Griechische Verslehre*. Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft II–4. Munich.

Ulf, C., ed.2003. *Der neue Streit um Troja: Eine Bilanz*. Munich.

Vet, T. de. 1996. "The Joint Role of Orality and Literacy in the Composition, Transmission, and Performance of the Homeric Texts: A Comparative View." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 126:43–76.

Wakker, G. C. 1994. *Conditions and Conditionals: An Investigation of Ancient Greek.* Amsterdam.

Watkins, C. 1986. "When They Came from Steep Wilusa: The Language of the Trojans." In Mellink 1986:45–62.

Wathelet, P. 1988. *Dictionnaire des Troyens de l'*Iliade. 2 vols. Liège.

———. 1989. *Les Troyens de l'*Iliade. *Mythe et Histoire.* Paris.

Whallon, W. 1961. "The Homeric Epithets." *Yale Classical Studies* 17:95-142.

———. 1969. *Formula, Character, and Context: Studies in Homeric, Old English and Old Testament Poetry.* Washington, DC.

Whitman, W. 1951. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition.* Cambridge, MA. Repr. New York, 1965.

Witte, K. 1913. "Homeros. B) Sprache." *Real-Enzyklopädie*, vol. 8, col. 2213–2247.

———. 1972. *Zur homerischen Sprache.* Darmstadt.