Homeric Poetics in Keywords

Nünlist, R.; de Jong, I.

[Link to publication](#)

Homer's Iliad
The Basel Commentary

Edited by
Anton Bierl and Joachim Latacz

Prolegomena

With contributions by
Anton Bierl, Fritz Graf, Irene de Jong, Joachim Latacz,
René Nünlist, Magdalene Stoevesandt, Rudolf
Wachter, Martin L. West

Edited by
S. Douglas Olson

Translated by
Benjamin W. Millis and Sara Strack

DE GRUYTER

Homer's Iliad
The Basel Commentary

Editors
Anton Bierl and Joachim Latacz

Managing Editor
Magdalene Stoevesandt

General Editor of the English Edition
S. Douglas Olson

Homeric Poetics in Keywords (P)
By René Nünlist and Irene de Jong

The following glossary defines (and cites common alternative terms for) the most important and most common elements of Homeric poetics, insofar as they have been developed to date. The commentary will accordingly be unburdened in the area of poetics in the same way that it is in regard to grammar and meter.

The notes offer a selection of the relevant bibliography (with a slight preference for works drawn from Homeric scholarship).[1]

Throughout, the individual keywords are illustrated with examples from the *Iliad*, even if these involve general principles of narration.[2]

ABC-SCHEME: A scheme of scenes in three parts: part A brings together the essential point of the scene in the form of a →summary (e.g. 'X kills Y'). Part B supplies background information that is not immediately necessary (often regarding the origin of a character/object). Part C describes in greater detail the event anticipated in A (e.g. 5.49–58).[3]

ANALEPSIS ('flashback', 'Rückwendung'): Explicit or implicit reference to an event that *precedes* the point reached in the →primary story (counterpart: →prolepsis). A distinction can be drawn between (a) *external* analepsis (reference to events *before* the beginning of the primary story) and *internal* analepsis (reference to events *after* the beginning of the primary story); (b) *completing* analepsis (containing additional information) and *repeating* analepsis (containing no additional information).

For the *Iliad*, the following division of roles tends to be valid: The (primary) →narrator avoids external completing analepses, leaving them to his secondary narrators (e.g. the assembly of troops in Aulis: 2.303f.). External completing analepses thus appear in direct speech (exception: information about the origin of a character or an object, e.g. 2.101–108). In contrast, internal completing analepses are generally reserved for the (primary) narrator.[4]

ANTICIPATION OF SCENES/MOTIFS ('anticipatory doublet/echo', 'Motivdoppelung'): Special form of →prolepsis: through the depiction of a →scene / →motif, the subsequent depiction of a similar scene / motif is indirectly prepared for (e.g. the dishonoring of Chryses and Achilleus: 1.12–33 / 1.130–326). The anticipatory version is generally shorter.[5]

Focus can also be on a →character, in which case the passage is a CHARACTER DOUBLET (e.g. Tros and Lykaon: 20.463–472 / 21.34–136).[6]

ARGUMENT FUNCTION AND KEY FUNCTION: →Secondary stories can have different functions depending on the narrative level. ARGUMENT FUNCTION concerns the →character-level (e.g. by means of the →paradigm of Meleager [9.527–599], Phoinix wants to persuade Achilleus to fight again). The same paradigm has a KEY FUNCTION on the level of the author and the listener/reader (like Meleager, Achilleus will refuse).[7]

KEY FUNCTION can also include so-called 'dramatic irony': a discrepancy between the greater knowledge of the listener/reader and the more limited knowledge of the character, who acts accordingly.

The same holds true for a 'récit spéculaire' (also: 'mise en abyme'): a →secondary story that, in one form or another, reflects the (primary) →story (e.g. again the paradigm of Meleager).[8]

CATALOGUE: Frequent form of enumeration in traditional poetry, often in combination with appeals to the Muse and/or questions with a trigger function (e.g. 11.218–220; 16.692f.).[9]

CATCH-WORD TECHNIQUE: A special form of →word play used in direct speech. A respondent takes up one or more central terms from the speech of his interlocutor (e.g. 1.558/561 ὀίω/ὀίεαι).[10]

CHARACTER ('Figur', πρόσωπον, *persona*): The individuals within the text who are themselves part of the narrated events. Characters can function as secondary →narrators and/or →focalizers (cf. →secondary focalization).

---

1 The pioneering function of ancient scholarship in general, and the terms and concepts of literary criticism in the scholia in particular, is the subject of NÜNLIST 2009, to which regular reference will be made in the notes below.

2 An analogous glossary specifically tailored to the needs of a narratological commentary on the *Odyssey* can be found at DE JONG 2001, XI–XIX.

3 BEYE 1964; 'anecdote', his term for part B, is unfortunate, because it does not take account of the emotionalizing function (on which, GRIFFIN 1980, 103–143).

4 On external/internal and completing/repeating analepsis: GENETTE (1972) 1980, 48 f.; cf. also HELLWIG 1964, 46–53; DE JONG (1987) 2004, 81–90; RICHARDSON 1990, 95–99; REICHEL 1994, 47–98. For the treatment of analepsis in the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 45–48. – On the division of roles between narrator and characters: KULLMANN (1968) 1992, 224; KRISCHER 1971, 93 f.; STEINRÜCK 1992.

5 SCHADEWALDT (1938) 1966, 127, 148, 150; FENIK 1968, 213 f.; 1974, 101; EDWARDS 1987a.

6 FENIK 1968, 134; 1974, 142, 172–207.

7 The pair of terms 'argument function / key function' was coined by ANDERSEN 1987.

8 On 'dramatic irony', e.g. PFISTER (1977) 1988, 87–90; NÜNLIST 2000; 2009, 234 f. (on the treatment of dramatic irony in the scholia). – On 'récit spéculaire': SCHADEWALDT (1952) 1965, 166, 168 f., 172, 190 ff. (with a neo-analytical aim); REINHARDT 1961, 449; GENETTE (1972) 1980, 233; DÄLLENBACH 1977; LÉTOUBLON 1983; DE JONG 1985; ANDERSEN 1987.

9 MINTON 1962; BEYE 1964; KRISCHER 1971, 146–158; VISSER 1998, 31–35; SAMMONS 2010.

10 LOHMANN 1970, 95–156 (the term: 145); MACLEOD 1982, 52f.; RUTHERFORD 1992, 62; DANEK 1998.

CHARACTER DOUBLET: see ANTICIPATION OF SCENES/MOTIFS.

CHARACTER LANGUAGE: Words (often offering value judgments) that occur exclusively or primarily in →secondary focalization, but that are in large part avoided in the (primary) →narrator-text.[11]

COMPARISON (Vergleich): Functionally identical with →(long) simile, except that only the 'as' part is given. (The English 'simile' is insufficiently specific to be used here, since it also includes →(long) simile.)

COMPLEX NARRATOR-TEXT ('embedded focalization'): see SECONDARY FOCALIZATION.

'CONTINUITY OF THOUGHT' PRINCIPLE (Homeric hysteron proteron, πρὸς τὸ δεύτερον πρότερον ἀπαντῶν): One of two specifically Homeric forms of the →principle of succession: In connection with an enumeration of two (or more) characters, objects or thoughts, the second (or last named) is generally taken up first.[12] The structure A–B–(C ... C'–)B'–A' is often determinative for the sequence of scenes and speeches.
A special form of the principle comes into use in the →type-scene of choosing between two possibilities ('he considered whether A or B ...'): the character always chooses B (exception: 13.455–459).

'CONTINUITY OF TIME' PRINCIPLE (also: 'Zielinski's law', 'loi de succession'): One of the two specifically Homeric forms of the →principle of succession, according to which the →narrator-text narrates the course of events in essentially chronological order.[13]

'COVERING' SCENE ('"fill-in" technique', 'Deckszene'): A →scene that allows enough time to pass for an action taking place in the background (e.g. the Glaukos-Diomedes scene 'covers' Hektor's journey from the battlefield to the city: 6.119–236).[14]

DIRECT SPEECH: see SECONDARY FOCALIZATION.

---

11 GRIFFIN 1986; DE JONG 1988; 1992; 1997a.
12 BASSETT 1920; 1938, 119–128; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 326–337.
13 BASSETT 1938, 34–47; RICHARDSON 1990, 95; NÜNLIST 2009, 79–83 (on the treatment of simultaneous events in the scholia). – One ought not to speak of a 'law', since the principle does not always hold true: cf. the criticism of ZIELINSKI 1899/1901, DELBECQUE 1958 and KRISCHER 1971 in RENGAKOS 1995 and NÜNLIST 1998. – Further criticism of Zielinski in PATZER 1990; SEECK 1998; SCODEL 2008.
14 STÜRMER 1921, 600 f.; SCHADEWALDT (1938) 1966, 77–79; BASSETT 1938, 39 f.; BALENSIEFEN 1955, 26 ff.; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 83–87.

DOUBLE MOTIVATION: Actions and thoughts of human characters are often caused by both god and man simultaneously, and both thus bear responsibility for them (e.g. Pandaros' arrow-shot: 4.64–126).[15]

DRAMATIC IRONY: see ARGUMENT FUNCTION.

ENJAMBMENT: Clause-end does not coincide with verse-end. Kirk (following Parry) distinguishes three types: (1) Progressive enjambment: the preceding clause is complete, and the enjambment extends it with a grammatically unnecessary addition (e.g. 1.2: οὐλομένην). – (2) Periodic enjambment: the protasis of a sentence requires an apodosis in the next verse (a short pause, usually signaled by punctuation, occurs at verse-end; e.g. 1.57 f.). – (3) Integral enjambment: the preceding sentence remains incomplete and generally ungrammatical without the continuation (e.g. 1.9 f.).[16] Words in enjambment ('runover words') can have special emphasis (e.g. 1.2: οὐλομένην).[17]

EPIC REGRESSION (ἐξ ἀναστροφῆς, 'epische Regression'): Special form of →ring-composition, which in the Iliad outside of the proem is found only in direct speech (contrast: →principle of succession). The story refers to an event (normally climactic); goes backward in steps (normally explanatory) to a turning point; and from there events are narrated in a chronologically 'correct' (and generally more detailed) order until the starting point is reached again: C–B–A–B'–C'.[18]

EPITHET: Descriptive adjunct. M. Parry distinguishes between epithets with a contextually important meaning ('particularized'; here: 'context-sensitive' epithets) and those without one ('ornamental' epithets).[19] He further distinguishes between epithets that can describe an entire class of nouns generally, without differentiating among the individual representatives of the class ('generic' epithets), and those that make this differentiation ('distinctive' epithets).[20]

---

15 The term was coined by LESKY 1961; cf. JANKO 1992, 3 f. – SCHMITT 1990 stresses that the two motivating factors are not redundant but complementary.
16 KIRK 1985, 30 ff.; PARRY (1929) 1971 ('progressive' is called 'unperiodic' by Parry; both 'periodic' and 'integral' are subsumed under 'necessary'); BAKKER 1990. The six-part typology of HIGBIE 1990, 29 ff., is also based on Parry/Kirk.
17 EDWARDS 1966; 1991, 42 ff.
18 SCHADEWALDT (1938) 1966, 83 f.; FRAENKEL 1950, 2.119 with n.; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 87–92. – LOHMANN (1970, 26 with n. 34) explains epic regression in terms of the morphology of ring-composition. – The term is from KRISCHER 1971, 136–140; cf. SLATER 1983.
19 PARRY (1928) 1971, 118 ff. (including citations of ancient and modern forerunners), cf. FOR 27 ff. and esp. 39. – It is often difficult to assign a particular epithet to one of these types; Parry's principle, that every 'fixed' epithet must be 'ornamental', is controversial.
20 PARRY (1928) 1971, 145 ff.; NÜNLIST 2009, 299–306 (on the treatment of epithets in the scholia).

Generic epithet: Ships are fundamentally 'fast' (even when drawn up on land, 1.308 etc.). The ship of the Chryseis-expedition (1.308) is not specifically emphasized by this epithet. Distinctive epithet: πόδας ὠκύς (= Achilleus), κορυθαίολος (= Hektor; exception 20.38: Ares). On the other hand, e.g. βοὴν ἀγαθός (Diomedes, Menelaos, Hektor, etc.) is generic.

ETYMOLOGIZING: Favorite form of →word play, in which special emphasis is placed on the etymology of words. Particularly conspicuous is the etymologizing of personal names (e.g. in a family of craftsmen, the grandfather is called Ἁρμων 'Fitter', while the father is Τέκτων 'Builder': 5.59 f.).[21]

FABULA ('Geschichte', 'Fabel'): Reconstruction in chronological order of the events depicted in the text (counterpart: →STORY). This reconstruction forms the basis of the 'narrated time' ('erzählte Zeit') in contrast to the 'narration time' ('Erzählzeit') on the level of the story.[22]

FALSE PROLEPSIS: see PROLEPSIS, FALSE.

FOCALIZER: The agent in the text from whose perspective events are narrated. The focalizer can be identical with the →narrator (→narrator-text); in other instances, there is →secondary focalization.[23]

FORMULA: Parry's definition ('une expression qui est régulièrement employée, dans les mêmes conditions métriques, pour exprimer une certaine idée essentielle', normally cited in the English version: 'a group of words which is regularly employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea', despite all objections and modifications, remains the starting point.[24]

'FREE STRING' FORM: Structural principle employed in direct speech, in which elements are freely placed one after another: A–B–C–D–E (cf. →PARALLEL FORM, →RING-COMPOSITION).[25]

---

21 RANK 1951; VON KAMPTZ (1958) 1982, 18 f., 25 ff., 228 ff.; EDWARDS 1987, 120–123; HIGBIE 1995; LOUDEN 1995; NÜNLIST 2009, 243 f. (on the treatment of etymologizing in the scholia).

22 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 26–30, 33 (where, however, 'story' represents what is called 'fabula' here). – In a manner analogous to the distinction between internal and external →analepsis, the fabula can be differentiated from the prequel. The former distinction is of secondary importance for the Iliad, because the narrator largely leaves external analepsis to his characters, i.e. he does not report the background 'in his own name' (= narrator-text), but allows the characters to report it (e.g. the assembly of troops in Aulis: 2.303 f.).

23 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 189 ff.; DE JONG (1987) 2004, 101–148; NÜNLIST 2009, 116–134 (on the treatment of focalization in the scholia).

24 PARRY 1928, 16; (1930) 1971, 272. On this, cf. the detailed account in FOR, especially 27 ff.

25 LOHMANN 1970, 43, 283.

GAP (κατὰ τὸ σιωπώμενον, 'ellipsis', 'Leerstelle'): A 'place of indeterminacy', which the listener/reader can and should fill in as part of his participation.[26] The extent and significance of gaps vary considerably. The scale runs from the obvious (1.54 Achilleus calls the people to assembly [in order to do something about the rampant plague]) to problems of interpretation incapable of being settled objectively (does Hephaistos in 1.590–594 describe an episode in which he wanted to help Hera?).

HAPAX LEGOMENON: A word that appears only once.[27] The commentary indicates the common distinction as follows: (1) hapax (1x in all Greek literature); (2) Homeric hapax (1x in the Iliad or Odyssey); (3) Iliad hapax (1x in the Iliad). – A systematic labeling of the hapax legomena has not been attempted.[28]

'IF-NOT' SITUATION: Insertion of 'if-not' situations ('and X would have happened, if Y had not ...') heightens tension and/or pathos in the story. The intervention of the →narrator can be seen particularly clearly here, since he alludes to an alternative (admittedly contra-factual) course of events (e.g. 2.155 f.).[29]

ITERATUM(A): A verse that appears with identical phrasing in at least one other place in early Greek epic. Repeated verses are especially frequent in →type scenes and →similes. They are characteristic of oral poetry.[30] In the commentary, a distinction is made between repeated verses that are exactly identical (=) and those that are very similar (≈).

JÖRGENSEN'S PRINCIPLE: In contrast to the 'omniscient' narrator, human characters often attribute to an unspecified god (θεός, θεοί, δαίμων, Ζεύς generally as the father of the gods) events whose cause they do not precisely understand (e.g. 15.467–469, 15.473, compared with 15.461–464 in the narrator-text).[31]

---

26 ISER 1975; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 157–173.

27 RICHARDSON 1987.

28 The 'Four Indices of the Homeric Hapax Legomena' (KUMPF 1984) essentially document category 2. Words of category 1 are indicated there by '+' and are cited separately as 'Index IV', although caution is required, since Kumpf (1984, 20) relies exclusively on the information in the lexica of Pape-Benseler and Liddell-Scott-Jones.

29 FENIK 1968, 154, 175–177, 221; DE JONG (1987) 2004, 68–81; RICHARDSON 1990, 187–191; NESSEL-RATH 1992; MORRISON 1992, 51–71; LOUDEN 1993. – The ideas of the 'Beinahe' ['nearly'] (SCHADE-WALDT [1938] 1966, 15, 55, 70, 150, 154) and the 'Fast' ['almost'] (REINHARDT 1961, 107–110) are both understood more broadly than the 'if-not' situation.

30 A lack of appreciation for this improvisational technique (to some extent already among Alexandrian scholars, but especially apparent in the modern analyst tradition) led to attempts to determine where repeated verses were 'original' and where they were 'adopted' or 'interpolated'. This procedure is based on a fundamentally mistaken assumption, even if it is justified in individual cases (e.g. in the case of the so-called 'concordance-interpolations': completion of apparently incomplete scenes; cf. FOR 12 with nn. 14 and 15).

31 JÖRGENSEN 1904.

KEY FUNCTION: see argument function.

MOTIF: see THEME.

NARRATEE ('narrataire'): Agent in the text whom the narrator explicitly addresses (with verbs in the 2nd person, e.g. 4.223).[32]

NARRATOR (better primary narrator-focalizer): The narrative authority who 'performs' the text. Within the text, the narrator represents the (implied) author.[33]

(SIMPLE) NARRATOR-TEXT: All passages in which the (primary) →narrator serves as the exclusive narrator/→focalizer. Negatively defined, everything not narrated in →secondary focalization (complex narrator-text, direct speech). In the commentary, the term appears only as 'narrator-text'.

PAIR OF SPEECHES: Speech scene structured as a pair (speech – response). Dialogue sequences with multiple changes of speaker occur, but are noticeably less common.

PARADIGM (exemplum, 'Exempel'): →Secondary story, usually with mythological content, that has an argumentative/explanatory function for the primary story (e.g. the story of Meleager: 9.527–599; cf. →argument function).[34]

PARALEPSIS: The →narrator offers more information in the text (counterpart: →paralipsis) than is strictly 'permissible' given the chosen focalization type: e.g. when he intrudes with his superior knowledge into the →secondary focalization of a character and allows him to know more than he properly can (counterpart: →Jörgensen's principle).[35] Example: Although Priam does not mention it (24.194–199), Hekabe knows (24.203) that he will go alone to Achilleus (on the other hand, cf. Zeus 24.148 and Iris 24.177).

PARALIPSIS (παραλείπω): The →narrator omits important information in order to provide it only later on (essential for the crime novel; in the Iliad: the listener/reader learns late that Achilleus will receive satisfaction only at the cost of Patroklos' life [16.46f., intimated at 11.604]; the →characters first learn this at the moment itself [16.818ff.] or afterward [Achilleus: 18.20]). Cf. →principle of 'ad hoc narration'.

Two forms of paralipsis typical for the Homeric narrator are the 'principle of imprecision' (→prolepses kept deliberately vague) and 'piecemeal presentation'.[36]

PARALLEL FORM: Consecutive speeches are structured the same way: A–B–C–A'–B'–C' (cf. →'FREE STRING' FORM, →RING-COMPOSITION).[37]

PAUSE: The →narrator stops the narrated time ('erzählte Zeit'; the 'action'), e.g. to introduce →characters, to give descriptions, to insert a →(long) simile, etc.[38]

PERIPHRASTIC DENOMINATION (ἀντονομασία): →Characters are identified via a description (e.g. kinship term, title) rather than by a personal name. Periphrastic denomination can indicate →secondary focalization and/or have a thematic function (e.g. 1.23).[39]

POLAR EXPRESSION: An expression is combined with its 'opposite' (e.g. 'god and man', 'man and wife', 'day and night'). The emphasis often lies on only one of the two terms (e.g. 1.548).[40] – The term can also be applied to rhetorical polarity: combination of a positive expression with its negative counterpart (litotes; e.g. 1.416).[41]

PRINCIPLE OF 'AD HOC NARRATION': A form of →paralipsis: certain facts are (only) narrated at the point in the →story where they show the most significant effect (e.g. introduction of Polydamas: 18.249–252). (The counterpart is earlier preparation [→prolepsis, →seed], which is taken up again by means of →analepsis.)[42]

PRINCIPLE OF ELABORATE NARRATION: Important matters are elaborately narrated in Homeric epic. Elaborate narration is in the first instance an indication neither of epic verbosity nor of senile garrulousness (Nestor), but rather sug-

32 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 259–262; PRINCE 1973; DE JONG (1987) 2004, 53–60. – Explicit apostrophes to the listener/reader are not used in the Homeric epics.
33 The narrator represents the author; he is not identical with him: e.g. GENETTE (1972) 1980, 213f.
34 OEHLER 1925; SCHADEWALDT (1938) 1966, 83; WILLCOCK 1964; AUSTIN 1966; ALDEN 2000; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 261–264.
35 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 195–197; specifically on Homer: BASSETT 1938, 130–140; KAKRIDIS 1982; DE JONG (1987) 2004, 108f.; TAPLIN 1992, 150 with n. 4; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 123–126. – As a consequence of the analyst tradition, the extent and meaning of paralepsis in Homer is occasionally overestimated. Often an event can be easily deduced by a character: ROBBINS 1990.

36 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 195–197; RICHARDSON 1990, 99f.; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 161, 170f. – On the 'principle of imprecision' and 'piecemeal presentation': SCHADEWALDT (1938) 1966, 85 n. 2, 110, 112f., 140; HEUBECK 1954, 18f.; FENIK 1974, 122; LATACZ (1985) 1996, 104–106.
37 LOHMANN 1970, 43, 283; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 327–337.
38 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 99ff.; RICHARDSON 1990, 36ff.
39 Schol. T 13.154 (etc.); DE JONG 1993.
40 KEMMER 1903; MACLEOD 1982, 92 (with bibliography); NÜNLIST 2009, 222f. (on the treatment of polar expressions in the scholia).
41 The rhetorical polar expression is treated in KÜHNER/GERTH 2.586 under the misleading rubric 'antithetischer Parallelismus' (antithetical parallelism).
42 BOWRA 1962, 49f. (accepts a causal connection with the laws of oral poetry); RICHARDSON 1990, 99.

gests that what is narrated (event, facts, description of an object) has or will have special significance for the story as a whole. [43]

PRINCIPLE OF SUCCESSION ('Sukzessionsprinzip'): The principle of successive presentation generally valid for every form of literature has developed two specific forms in Homeric epic: (1) The →'continuity of thought' principle. (2) The →'continuity of time' principle. In Homer, this applies to the primary narrative only, not to speeches (contrast: EPIC REGRESSION).

PROLEPSIS (πρόληψις, [προ]αναφώνησις, 'Vorausdeutung', 'Vorgriff', 'foreshadowing'). Explicit or inexplicit reference to an event that *follows* the point reached in the →story (counterpart: →analepsis). *External* prolepsis (reference to events *after* the end of the story) and *internal* prolepsis (reference to events *before* the end of the story) are to be distinguished. External prolepsis in Homeric epic is performed almost exclusively by secondary narrators (→characters; exceptions: 2.724 f., 12.13–35). [44]

PROLEPSIS, FALSE ('misdirection'): An explicitly announced event does not occur (or not in the announced form: cf. 'principle of imprecision' [→paralipsis]). [45]

REFRAIN COMPOSITION ('Ritornellkomposition'): the recurrence of the same word or phrase in a continuous series of passages dealing with the same subject (often a catalogue), strengthening the connection between them (e.g. Agamemnon's epipolesis: 4.223 ff.). [46]

RETARDATION ('Aufschub'): An event announced by means of →prolepsis is delayed via (a) slowing down the narrative tempo, (b) temporary reversal of the action, (c) →pause. Retardation often produces an increase in tension. [47]

RING-COMPOSITION: A structural principle for relatively autonomous parts of the story (direct speeches, digressions, longer →similes), in which the end takes up the beginning once again (in terms of content/vocabulary/theme), or the beginning anticipates the end: A–B–A'. Particularly in the case of digressions and longer similes, the end of the ring-composition normally leads back to

the point where the primary story left off. – A more complex form of ring-composition is the 'onion' form: A–B–C–D–C'–B'–A'. [48]

SCENE: Portion of the text where the →narrator has his →characters act and (often) speak themselves (direct speeches). The result is a narrative that creates the impression of taking place over roughly the same amount of time that presenting it requires ('zeitdeckendes Erzählen'; counterpart: →summary). A scene is held together by the fact that the character(s) and/or setting are the same. Correspondingly, changes of scene are indicated by entrances, exits and changes of setting.
Determination of the scene boundaries is primarily in the interest of clarity and is to some extent arbitrary: in narrative literature – in contrast to drama – exits are not immediately evident unless explicitly reported.
'Scene' is also often used in a less restricted sense to designate a series of events related in terms of content (e.g. →type-scene).

SECONDARY FOCALIZATION: Two forms: (1) 'complex narrator-text': The →narrator reports the perceptions, thoughts, emotions or speeches of a →character (e.g. in indirect speech; the character is merely a secondary focalizer: 'embedded focalization'). (2) Direct speech: The character functions as a secondary narrator-focalizer. [49]
The difference in focalization between narrator-text and direct speech (with significant consequences: →character language) is indicated in the text volumes by placing direct speech *in italics*.

SECONDARY STORY ('metadiegetische Erzählung'): A story told by a character in direct speech and thus embedded in the primary →story: e.g. →paradigm. [50]

SEED (στέρμα, [προ]οικονομέω, 'amorce'): Narrative element (character, object, facts, etc.) mentioned in passing, whose full meaning is only understood in retrospect, when it is taken up again and developed further (e.g. 1.63 on the background of 2.5 ff.). [51]
The boundary between a seed and a vague →prolepsis is fluid.

43 AUSTIN 1966. – On the pioneering commentating in the scholia, cf. RICHARDSON 1980, 276.
44 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 67 ff.; ROTHE 1914, 239–244; DUCKWORTH 1933; SCHADEWALDT (1938) 1966, 15, 54 f.; HELLWIG 1964, 54–58; DE JONG (1987) 2004, 81–90; RICHARDSON 1990, 132–139; REICHEL 1994, 47–98; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 34–45. – On the exceptions: DUCKWORTH 1933, 54 n. 120.
45 DUCKWORTH 1933, 109 f.; MORRISON 1992; GRETHLEIN 2006, 207–257; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 150 f.
46 VAN OTTERLO 1944, 161–163.
47 SCHADEWALDT (1938) 1966, 15, 150; REICHEL 1990; MORRISON 1992, 35–49; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 78, 151.

48 VAN OTTERLO 1944; LOHMANN 1970, 12–30; STANLEY 1993, 6–9; STEINRÜCK 1997; MINCHIN 2001, 181–202; DOUGLAS 2007; NÜNLIST 2009, 319 f. (on treatment of ring composition in the scholia).
49 DE JONG (1987) 2004, 101–148; KÖHNKEN 2003; NÜNLIST 2009, 126–131 (on treatment of secondary focalization in the scholia).
50 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 231–234; ALDEN 2000; SCODEL 2002, 124–154. – The hierarchy is theoretically limitless: secondary, tertiary ... ('nesting-doll' principle).
51 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 75–77; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 39 f.

SILENT CHARACTER (κωφὸν πρόσωπον): A character mentioned as present who nonetheless remains silent.[52]

(LONG) SIMILE ('Gleichnis'): Narrative element of a comparative nature clearly separated from the story by means of an 'as' part at the beginning and a corresponding 'so' part at the end. The event that is primarily depicted is paralleled by a lengthy analogy (from nature, agriculture, hunting, etc.) that illustrates it further. Similes occur predominantly (but not exclusively) in →narrator-text.[53]

SPEECH INTRODUCTORY/CAPPING FORMULA ('chevilles'): Direct speeches are regularly explicitly introduced and concluded by the →narrator (normally with formulaic expressions). In an oral text, introductory and capping formulae function as quotation marks. When a responding speech follows immediately, the capping formula is often replaced by a new introduction.[54]

(PRIMARY) STORY ('Erzählung', 'récit', 'Sujet'): The reported events as depicted in the text (counterpart: →fabula). The story can be distinguished from the fabula in regard to: (1) order (events do not have to be narrated chronologically: →analepsis, →prolepsis); (2) speed (events can be narrated 'slowly' or 'quickly': →pause, →summary, →scene); (3) frequency (events can be narrated multiple times).[55]
Strictly speaking, one should speak of a 'primary story', in which →secondary stories are introduced. In accord with current usage, 'story' always refers to the primary story.

SUMMARY: A description of events (e.g. 'Nine days up and down the host ranged the god's arrows', 1.53) that covers a large amount of narrated time ('erzählte Zeit') in a small amount of narrative time ('Erzählzeit'; counterpart: →scene).[56]

52 BESSLICH 1966; DE JONG 1987a; for the scholia, see NÜNLIST 2009, 242f., 245, 343–345. – Explicit mention of silent characters is essential in narrative texts, as opposed to drama, where they are visible on stage: 'when a character drops out of the narrative [...] he simply ceases to exist' (FENIK 1974, 65–67).

53 FRÄNKEL 1921; LEE 1964; MOULTON 1977; EDWARDS 1991, 24–41; SCOTT 2009. (The English term 'simile' is not specific enough and also includes (short) simile, which is therefore referred to here as →comparison. The scholia already distinguish between long simile (παραβολή, βάλλω) and short simile (no consistent term, εἰκών/-άζω sometimes used also for long similes). The 'so' part, which is called (ἀντ)απόδοσις, appears to be decisive: e.g. schol. A 2.207–10; NÜNLIST 2009, 282–298.

54 FINGERLE 1939, 305–377; EDWARDS 1970; NÜNLIST 2009, 316f. (on treatment of speech introduction in the scholia) and 43–44, 317–318 (on capping formula).

55 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 33ff. On the terminology adopted there see n. 22.

56 GENETTE (1972) 1980, 95–99; HELLWIG 1964, 41, 44, 116; RICHARDSON 1990, 17–21. The

SUMMARY PRIAMEL: Special form of the priamel: the foil consists not of multiple terms but of a single summary one ('there are many X, but Y is the greatest/best/fastest etc.', e.g. 2.272–274.[57]

TERTIARY FOCALIZATION: see secondary focalization.

THEME: Recurrent sequences of events that are less clearly structured and less formulaic in their wording than actual →type-scenes, e.g. supplication, scenes of battle and killing, intervention of a god, recognition. Themes are considered important for oral poetry as a constitutive, macro-structural principle of composition ('composition by theme').[58]
Especially in German, but also in Anglophone scholarship, there is a resultant overlap with the term 'Motiv'/'motif', which is often used as synonymous with 'theme'. In the present context, 'motif' indicates short, recurrent narrative units present across genres (i.e. those less clearly tied to oral Homeric epic, e.g. 'the loyal follower', 'intelligence vs. strength'), yielding an escalating sequence (with fluid borders): 'motif' – 'theme' – 'type-scene'.

THREE-WAY CONVERSATION ('Übereckgespräch'): Character A seems to speak with character B, but actually addresses character C (e.g. 6.363).[59]

TIS-SPEECH: Direct speech by a →character not identified by name (τις), often as an expression of 'what the general public thinks'. Tis-speeches actually delivered (e.g. 2.272–277) are to be distinguished from those merely imagined by other characters (= tertiary focalization; e.g. 7.89f.). The latter primarily say something about the character doing the imagining.[60]

TRIADIC STRUCTURE: Tripartite construction of a scene (e.g. 11.91–148: Agamemnon three times kills two opponents).[61]

TYPE-SCENE ('typical scene'): A recurrent depiction of activities from daily life (e.g. eating, going to sleep, sacrifice) or heroic life (e.g. arming oneself) that is repeated multiple times. The scene is 'typical' because the depiction – often using elements of formulaic language – follows a more or less fixed scheme.[62]

scholia distinguish between summary (ἐν κεφαλαίοις vel sim.) and elaborate depiction (e.g. ἐξεργάζεσθαι): NÜNLIST 2009, 204–208.

57 RACE 1982, 10f.

58 As far as we are aware, no handy definition of 'theme' exists. In addition, 'theme' and 'motif' are often used synonymously. – On 'composition by theme': LORD 1960; EDWARDS 1980; 1991, 11–19.

59 SCHADEWALDT 1959, 16; FENIK 1974, 68–71; HOHENDAHL-ZOETELIEF 1980, 170–173; NÜNLIST 2009, 321f. (on treatment of three-way conversation in the scholia).

60 HENTZE 1905; DE JONG 1987b; SCHNEIDER 1996.

61 SCHADEWALDT (1938) 1966, 1, 49, 66 n. 1 (with bibliography).

62 AREND 1933; CALHOUN 1933; ARMSTRONG 1958; FENIK 1968; EDWARDS 1980; 1992; NÜNLIST 2009, 307–315 (on the treatment of type-scenes in the scholia).

New Trends in Homeric Scholarship (NTHS)
By Anton Bierl

In addition to the constants (order of the elements), the variables are also significant for a type-scene, because it is often impossible to recognize *one* basic type in the various forms (allomorphs). The border between less clearly structured type-scenes and →themes is fluid.

In the commentary, type-scenes are treated as follows: (1) At the first occurrence, a cumulative, consecutively numbered collection of the common scene elements is made. (2) The numbers of the elements actually present in the passage in question appear in bold. (3) Each subsequent occurrence refers back to the initial treatment and uses the numbering and bold type according to the same principle.

TYPICAL NUMBER: Assignment of numbers normally follows a typical pattern. The typical number is often divisible by three.[63]

WORD PLAY: Word play produces a connection between two or more words on the basis of analogy (phonetic, etymological, semantic), producing a special emphasis (e.g. 19.388–391). In addition to common forms of literary rhetoric (anaphora, assonance, homoioteleuton, polyptoton, rhyme, etc.), for Homeric epic →etymologizing and →catch-word technique deserve emphasis.[64]

---

[63] GÖBEL 1933; WALTZ 1933; BLOM 1936; GERMAIN 1954; NÜNLIST 2009, 314f. (on the treatment of typical numbers in the scholia).
[64] MACLEOD 1982, 50–53; EDWARDS 1987, 120–123; LOUDEN 1995. – On literary rhetoric generally: LAUSBERG (1960) 2008.