

DETEXTUALIZING HOMER: INTONATION UNITS, BACKGROUND KNOWLEDGE, AND THE PROEMS OF THE *ILIAD* AND THE *ODYSSEY*

The proems¹ of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have attracted much scholarly attention² in respect of both their similarities and differences and their sufficiency, i.e. their appropriateness as introductions to the two epics respectively. The aim of this study is to briefly reconsider the similarities³ the two proems share from the interpretive angle of Oral Poetics, and in particular through discourse analysis. Discourse analysis, I will argue, is able to shed light on matters concerning the relation between the Iliadic and the Odyssean proems not in terms of a more or less sophisticated imitation of the former by the latter but as manifestations of the kind of discourse Homer is, i.e. as *special speech*.

* The text of the *Iliad* is that of M. L. West, *Homerus. Ilias*. Vol. I, rhapsodiae I-XII. Monachii et Lipsiae 1998. For the *Odyssey*, I have used the edition of van Thiel: H. van Thiel, *Homeri Odyssea*. Hildesheim-Zürich-New York 1991.

1. On how Greek and Roman poems begin, see Romeo (1985) and Race (1992) 13-38.

2. The secondary literature on the proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is vast. For the proem of the *Iliad*, see especially Griffin (1980) 118 ff.; Kirk (1985) 51-53; Latacz 1997³/ 98-104, (2000) 11-23. For the proem of the *Odyssey*, the best studies include: Bassett (1923) 339-348; van Groningen (1946) 279-294; Rüter (1969) 28-52; Μαρωνίτης (1971) 72-109; Clay (1976) 313-326; Lenz (1980) 49-64; Clay (1983) 9-53; Dimock (1989) 5-12; Ford (1992) 18-31; Pedrick (1992) 39-62; Walsh (1995) 392-403; Pucci (1998) 11-29; de Jong (2001) 5-8.

3. Due to lack of space, I will only examine the similarities between the Iliadic and Odyssean proems. The differences between these two proems are not important for my argument, since I am not against the idea of a poetic rivalry between the two poems at large. This polemic goes both ways, since Oral Poetics considers both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* to be open traditions, not closed systems; in this respect, their intertextual dialogue is truly interactive.

Structure

Even a cursory reading of the two poems reveals a number of resemblances in word-order and syntax. This striking likeness can be exemplified should we focus our attention on the following features:

1. The very first word (the accusative of a non-proper name used as the object of the main verb) of both poems describes the main epic theme (μῆνιν - ἄνδρα).
2. There is a divine invocation of an anonymous female deity, the Muse of epic poetry in the very first line (ἄειδε, θεά - Μοῦσα).
3. The basic epic theme denoted by the poems' first word is modified by a four-syllable word that stands in apposition (οὐλομένην - πολύτροπον).
4. This participle/adjective is used as a starting point for further elaboration and is expanded by a relative clause (ἣ μὲν Ἰλίου ἄλγε' ἔθηκε - ὅς μ' ἄλλα πολλὰ / πλάγχθη) adding more information about the initial theme (μῆνιν - ἄνδρα) and the way it has been characterized by the four-syllable words (οὐλομένην - πολύτροπον).⁴
5. The relative clauses are further elaborated by δέ-clauses, three in the Iliadic poem (πολλὰς δ' ... / ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δ' ἐλώρια ... / οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή), two in the Odyssean (πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ... ἔγνω, πολλὰ δ' ὅ γ' ἐν πόντῳ ... θυμόν).
6. In both poems the vastness of each poem's topic is systematically underscored through the use of adjectives modifying certain aspects of the main epic theme (μὲν ... ἄλγε', πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους - πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα, πολλὰ ... ἄλγεα).
7. Both poems emphatically indicate that the sorrow to be described is linked to the main epic theme (ἄλγε' ἔθηκεν - πάθεν ἄλγεα).
8. Some form of ring-composition⁵ can be detected in the poems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. This is more obvious in the *Odyssey* (μοι ἔννεπε Μοῦσα - θεά, εἰπέ καὶ ἡμῖν), where one can trace both the existence of an internal ring-composition pattern in respect to the order of the elements constituting the external ring-composition (A: [dative of personal pronoun - μοι], B: [verb - ἔννεπε], C: [vocative of invocation - Μοῦσα] / C: [vocative of invocation - θεά], / B: [verb - εἰπέ], A: [dative of personal pronoun - ἡμῖν]), and the transition from singular (μοι) to plural (ἡμῖν). In the *Iliad*, the ring-

4. Bassett (1923) 340.

5. On ring-composition, see Van Otterlo (1944); Gaisser (1969) 1-43; Lohmann (1970) 12-30; Thalmann (1984) 8-21; Edwards (1991) 44-48.

composition pattern is less obvious, but still the $\mu\tilde{\eta}\nu\iota\nu \dots$ 'Αχιλλῆος is repeated by $\epsilon\tilde{\rho}\iota\sigma\alpha\nu\tau\epsilon \dots$ 'Αχιλλεύς.

9. In both proems a god is involved ($\Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma \delta'$ ἐτελείετο βουλή - 'Υπερίονος 'Ηελίοιο ... ὁ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἦμαρ).

10. Both proems presuppose a general familiarity with epic tradition as a whole.⁶ The audience could easily locate Achilles' wrath in the tenth year of the Trojan War and, likewise, the reference to $\pi\omicron\lambda\upsilon\tau\rho\omicron\pi\omicron\varsigma \alpha\tilde{\nu}\eta\rho$ would make Odysseus emerge at once in the listeners' mind.⁷

11. In both proems one can easily notice the speed with which the poet brings the audience to the beginning of his tale.⁸

12. In both proems, there is an effort to determine a story departure point ($\epsilon\tilde{\zeta} \omicron\tilde{\upsilon} \delta\eta \tau\acute{\alpha} \pi\rho\omega\tau\alpha - \tau\omega\tilde{\nu} \alpha\mu\theta\epsilon\nu \gamma\epsilon$).

Homeric Discourse and Epic Openings

These similarities have been until now examined in a linear manner: the *Odyssey* poet composing his song after his *Iliadic* counterpart used the proem of the *Iliad* as his model "attempting an exercise of *auxesis* upon the *Iliadic* pattern".⁹ Such an approach presupposes not only that the *Odyssey* postdates the *Iliad*, but also, and more importantly, that both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are *fixed texts* in the modern sense of the word and that they are tightly linked to a fixed chronology, which stands for their literary birth. Oral Poetics adopts a different stance, one that examines what we call the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* not as *texts composed by writing* and, consequently, *tied to a fixed date*, but as oral compositions representing rival poetic traditions that coexist and grow in parallel during the archaic and classical periods. In addition, formal characteristics (as those listed above) are not to be interpreted from a *rhetorical point of view*, namely as traits pertaining to a literary perspective; paratactic or adding style vs hypotactic organisation, primitive vs developed are terms belonging to a philological approach to written literature and, as such, aim at explaining stylistic subtleties by adopting a historical or even genetic approach.

Egbert Bakker has convincingly shown how Homeric discourse functions as *special speech*. By using the path-breaking discoveries of the linguist

6. West (1988) 67.

7. Bassett (1923) 341.

8. Bassett (1923) 339.

9. Pucci (1998) 13.

Wallace Chafe, he divides Homeric passages into *intonation units*, speech-segments which verbalize relevant *foci of consciousness*.¹⁰ In this way, he is able to *detextualize* the salient properties of Homeric style and reevaluate them in "terms of the spoken discourse of which our text is a transcription".¹¹

Let us then proceed to analyse the two poems as speech-segments starting with the Iliadic poem.

- | | |
|---------------------------------|---|
| (a) Μῆνιν ἄειδε, θεά, | Sing of the wrath, goddess, |
| (b) Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος | of the son of Peleus, of Achilles, |
| (c) οὖλομένην, | the accursed [wrath] |
| (d) ἣ μυρὶ Ἀχαιοῖς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε, | <u>that</u> caused numerous woes to the Achaians, |
| (e) πολλὰς δ' ἰφθίμους ψυχὰς | <u>and</u> many brave souls, |
| (f) Ἄϊδι προΐαψεν | [it] sent [them] forth to Hades, |
| (g) ἡρώων, | of heroes, |
| (h) αὐτοὺς δ' ἐλώρια τεῦχε | <u>and</u> made them a feast, |
| (i) κύνεσσιν | for the dogs |
| (j) οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι, | and all the birds, |
| (k) Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή, | <u>and</u> Zeus' will was being fulfilled, |
| (l) ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα | from the moment when –see– for the first time |
| (m) διαστήτην | they stood in division |
| (n) ἐρίσαντε | after they had quarreled |
| (o) Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν | both [the] son of Atreus, the lord of men |
| (p) καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς. | and godlike Achilles. |

Let us now proceed by applying the same speech-segment analysis to the Odyssean poem:

- | | |
|---|--|
| (a) Ἄνδρά μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, | Tell me, Muse, about the man, |
| (b) πολύτροπον, | the resourceful one, |
| (c) ὅς μ' ἄλλα πολλὰ / πλάγχθη, | <u>who</u> has suffered a great deal, |
| (d) ἐπεὶ Τροίης ἱερὸν πτολίεθρον ἔπερσε | since he sacked the holy citadel of Troy; |
| (e) πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα | <u>and</u> [he] saw the cities of many men |

10. Chafe (1980) 9-50, (1994).

11. Bakker (1997a) 292.

- (f) καὶ νόον ἔγνω, and became aware of their mentality,
- (g) πολλὰ δ' ὃ γ' ἐν πόντῳ πάθεν ἄλγεα and [he] suffered much at sea
- (h) ὃν κατὰ θυμόν, in his own heart,
- (i) ἀρνύμενος ἥν τε ψυχὴν trying to save his own soul
- (j) καὶ νόστον ἐταίρων. and [make possible] the return of his comrades.
- (k) ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὧς ἐτάρους ἐρρύσατο, But still he did not save [his] comrades,
- (l) ἰέμενός περ despite his will;
- (m) αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν for out of their own wrongdoings [they] perished,
- (n) νήπιοι, fools,
- (o) οἳ κατὰ βοῦς Ὑπερίονος who devoured the cattle of Hyperion's son, Helios;
- (p) αὐτὰρ ὁ τοῖσιν ἀφείλετο νόστιμον ἡμᾶρ. but he deprived them from their day of return.
- (q) τῶν ἀμόθεν γε, θεά, From some place or other, goddess,
- (r) θύγατερ Διός, daughter of Zeus,
- (s) εἰπέ καὶ ἡμῖν. tell us too.

The above speech-segment analysis should be read with a rather mandatory *caveat* in mind: the translation offered is deliberately idiosyncratic as it tries to bring out as clearly as possible the peculiarities of the Homeric text. Using this analysis as our guide we can now tackle each and every one of the similarities of the two proems, not from the viewpoint of a mimetic process according to which the Odyssean proem has been composed upon the pattern offered by its famous Iliadic predecessor, but as exemplifying a mental process of *orientation*, *framing* and *information organization*.

1. Similarities 1-2 concerning the epic theme (μῆνιν-ἄνδρα) and the divine invocation (ἔειδε, θεά – ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα) belong to the same intonational unit, which coincides with a metrical slot, the central third-foot caesura (penthemimeral in *Il.* 1, trochaic in *Od.* 1). In the process of retrieving information that will be used in the proem, the speaking voice begins with the first *focus of consciousness* that surfaces the mind: *the principal theme*. But, this theme can be triggered only through appeal to divine assistance (ἔειδε, θεά – ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα). Therefore, the grammatical particularities observed by traditional critics (such as the initial accusative, the vocative used for divine invocation)

have not so much to do with the mimetic tendency of the Odyssean proem in respect to the Iliadic one, but rather with information-processing organized by the human mind.

2. The description of the main epic theme first by a single adjective in apposition (οὐλομένην - πολύτροπον), second by relative clauses (ἥ μιν Ἰὼν Ἀχαιοὺς ἄλγε' ἔθηκε - ὅς μάλα πολλὰ / πλάγχθη), and third by δέ-clauses (πολλὰς δ' ... / ἡρώων, αὐτοὺς δ' ἐλώριε ... / οἰωνοῖσι τε πᾶσι, Διὸς δ' ἐτελείετο βουλή), (πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ... ἔγνω, πολλὰ δ' ὃ γ' ἐν πόντῳ ... θυμόν) is typical of the so-called *expansion aesthetic*, one of the expressive highlights of Homeric discourse.¹² The thematic nucleus is expanded by appositional devices, in the manner of either one-word adjectival forms or relative clauses or strung-on paratactic δέ-clauses. Items 3-5 in the above list virtually fall into the category of additional material supplemented within the same *framing*. These *Item-pluses* are true landmarks of epic verse-making,¹³ since they exemplify a specific mental strategy in the deployment of information around an initial thematic kernel. Moreover, they play a key-role in the listener's *orientation*. The detailed, albeit laconic, description of the central theme, directs the audience to the *kind of song* they should be expecting to hear. These *orientation* devices look at the same time backwards and forwards. They are anaphoric (in the sense that they are related to left-located, or at times dislocated, terms) and deictic (since they acclimatize the listener to the exigencies of the plot and align him to the epic's perspective). This orientation process aims at limiting the wide scope of the basic theme, thus enabling the listener to situate himself/herself within the coordinates of the plot. Items 12-13 (general familiarity with the epic tradition and speed in situating the listener at the beginning of the plot) also stem from the nature of the aforementioned *orientation* technique. Homeric discourse aims at placing the audience within a specific version of a well-known myth with remarkable speed. Any delay may highlight other rival stories belonging to the same mythical pool, which the epic voice deliberately and systematically downplays. Homeric speech¹⁴ speedily moves to the beginning of its own cherished version of events in the same way human discourse hastens to promote its own undisputed authority.

3. Items 6-7 refer to the vastness of human losses. Our analysis into speech-segments shows that each mention of a loss is presented by a single intonation

12. These word-groups also form *intonation units* representing the dictional verbalization of specific *foci of consciousness*.

13. Russo (1994) 374; Bakker (1997a) 90.

14. Cf. Hor. *de arte poetica*, 148: semper ad eventum festinat.

unit.¹⁵ At first glance, one may get the impression that the Odyssean proem is miming the Iliadic, in fact this has been interpreted as a form of *auxesis*. The correspondence between intonation units and completion of syntactical clusters shows that we may be dealing here with another authority-conferring technique. The story to be told is of great importance and status among other stories of the same kind because it may deal with a single theme (the wrath of Achilles and Odysseus, the Man), but the implications of this theme are indeed of outstanding proportions. It is not the version of the theme that is vast, but what results from this version. We are dealing with a mental process of emphasizing the momentousness of the story to be told; speech advertises itself and promotes its special power and supremacy. The cornucopia of $\pi\omicron\lambda(\lambda)\upsilon/-\alpha$ compounds in both proems is not based on rhetorical effect but rather manifests a conferring-authority process typical of Homeric and everyday discourse.

4. Ring-composition has been felicitly coined "an index of the ways in which this [archaic] style, as special speech, draws on the resources of ordinary speech".¹⁶ The repetition of some form of the basic idea expressed in the beginning of the ring-composition structure should not be seen as a return to or recapitulation of previous meaning but as a statement made by the speech itself, a statement acknowledging the new reality which has been produced after the previewed initial reference. Homeric discourse as a form of special speech should be considered as a flow of speech through time, and it is in that respect that what lies between the two statements, initial and catalectic, of any ring-composition device displays the narrative movement from point A to point B and, what is more important, *the realisation of this movement by speech itself* through phraseology repetition.¹⁷

Viewed in this light, the reiterated phraseology occurring towards the end of the two Homeric proemia (item 8) is a feature pertaining to human discourse at large, and can be paralleled with *topic boundary markers* which represent topic-shifts in written discourse. These *topic boundary markers* are, in the case of spoken discourse, called *paratones*;¹⁸ they are a sort of *speech paragraphs* employed by speakers to mark a topic-shift. Thus, ring-composition may be seen as a feature of spoken discourse, a device of special speech (such as Homeric speech) indicating the flow of speech, the realisation of this flow

15. See the analysis above.

16. Bakker (1997a) 120.

17. On ring-composition and the grammar of discourse, see Bakker (1997a) 115-121.

18. The term *paratones* has been coined by Brown (1977) 86.

and the preparation of speaker and audience for making one narrative step forward.

5. General familiarity with the epic tradition as a whole (item 10) on the part of the audience must be taken for granted. What has escaped notice, however, is that such *givens* are typical of mental structures employed for organizing information in an economical way and, moreover, for interpreting reality upon a *given-new* pattern.¹⁹ Homeric speech, as a form of *special speech*, cognitively involves the audience in the "processes that create both language and story".²⁰ Psycholinguists have long debated on determining the importance of one or multiple factors (sentential form, focal stress, speaker-dependent intonation) in the process of signaling information status. In the case of Homeric speech, "strong syntactic and rhythmic expectations established by the formulaic style, together with the metrical and specifically colometric constraints demanded by the hexameter, provide ideal frames for carrying out the more stylized or 'ritually expected' features of the language".²¹ Therefore, the audience's familiarity with the topic which is taken for granted in both the Iliadic and the Odyssean proems is manifested by the elliptical and condensed nature of the informational data processed (brevity, lack of a summary of the plot), but most of all by the *inferred* and *evoked* entities (*situational* and *current-textual*)²² triggered in the audience's consciousness after the initial *theme*, the left-most constituent element in the linear organisation of our printed text. Typographical considerations tend to iconize the *theme* by locating it at a spot readily seen by the human-eye, thus making it easily discernible by the modern reader. In an oral performance, emphasis is given by the placement of the epic theme in the first foot of the hexameter (one of the most emphatic positions), where thematical *staging* is best effected.²³ Thus, among the *inferred entities*, which the audience would associate with the themes $\mu\tilde{\eta}\nu\iota\varsigma/\lambda\nu\acute{\eta}\rho$, are the par excellence 'wrath',

19. See Hornby (1972) 632-642; Clark & Clark (1977) 93; Brown & Yule (1983) 176-189.

20. Russo (1999) 169.

21. Russo (1999) 163. Russo points to "the tendency for relative and other subordinate clauses to begin most regularly in the fifth or fourth colon ($\delta\varsigma\ \mu\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\ \pi\omicron\lambda\lambda\acute{\alpha}$, *Od.* 1.1), and secondarily in the second colon ($\omicron\upsilon\lambda\omicron\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu\eta\gamma\eta$, *Il.* 1.2), or with a conjunction linking the first to the second colon ($\pi\lambda\acute{\alpha}\gamma\chi\theta\eta$, $\acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\iota$ *T\rho\omicron\iota\eta\varsigma*, *Od.* 1.2)" (163).

22. Brown & Yule (1983) 184-187.

23. On 'staging', see Brown & Yule (1983) 134-138. Another 'strong' position for effectuating 'staging' within the particular metrical constraints of the hexameter is the end of the verse. See Bakker (1997a) 162-183.

i.e. that of Achilles, and the par excellence 'man', i.e. Odysseus²⁴; likewise, the most prominent *evoked situational entities* by the Iliadic proem would be the tenth year of the war and by the Odyssean proem the post-war wanderings of Odysseus. *Current-textual evoked entities* are, as Chafe has neatly put it, "lexically attenuated", and are expressed with substitutive devices such as pronouns.²⁵ The *anaphoric* pronouns ἀντοῦς in *Il.* 1.4 and αὐτῶν in *Od.* 1.7 express *endophoric* relations, tying cohesively the previous references to heroes (in *Il.* 1.3) and to the comrades (in *Od.* 1.5-6) to what follows. The heroes and the comrades are thus entities well known to the audience and, therefore, the speaker feels free to cut several corners in the presentation of his material and point to them with minimalistic pronominal forms.

6. The search for a temporal point to begin the narration (item 12) finds its rest towards the end of the proems, and displays a specific mental strategy used in human discourse in respect of material-organizing. It is only after the explicit reference to the most important element surfacing human thought that the mind is able to retrieve the causal *incipit*. This is done towards the end of the initial frame set by the proem and only when the description has been regarded as complete.

The above observation will no doubt strike a familiar note to discourse analysts and linguists at large, since it is this scientific discipline which has determined that in representing background knowledge the human mind uses *scenarios*, "extended domains of reference" employed as interpretative devices behind a text. One particular element of the scenario-based comprehension (corroborated by relevant experiments with real subjects) is that understanding and effectiveness speeds up (item 11) when a *specific* scenario is mentally activated.²⁶ It is noteworthy that in both proems, just before the temporal localization of the plot-departure point, there is a *specific* mention to the role of a god (item 9), Zeus in the Iliadic proem, Helios in the Odyssean. It seems that the speaking voice in both proems tries to find a rest, a pause in his mapping the scope of his theme, and that this stop is found at the moment when *specific* divine action is stated. The reference to concrete action (note the opposition between the anonymous losses of heroes or comrades and the action of eponymous gods) creates a juncture in the speaker's consciousness, as if a red light has been suddenly turned on. When the mind moves from the

24. The systematic suppression of Odysseus' name in the beginning of the *Odyssey* shows that the audience could easily recognise Odysseus through the reference to a 'man' and that no confusion could be created.

25. I owe this reference to Brown & Yule (1983) 185.

26. Brown & Yule (1983) 245-247.

general to the individual, the introduction can be regarded as complete: it is now time for the poem to begin.

Bibliography

- Bakker, E. J. 1997a. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca & London.
- Bakker, E. J. 1997b. "The Study of Homeric Discourse." In I. Morris & B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*. Leiden-New York-Köln. 284-304.
- Bassett, S. E. 1923. "The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*," *AJPh* 44: 339-348.
- Brown, G. 1977. *Listening to Spoken English*. London.
- Brown, G. & Yule G. 1983. *Discourse Analysis*. Cambridge.
- Chafe, W. 1980. "The Deployment of Consciousness in the Production of a Narrative." In W. Chafe (ed.), *The Pear Stories: Cognitive, Cultural, and Linguistic Aspects of Narrative Production*. Norwood, N. J. 9-50.
- Chafe, W. 1994. *Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: The Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speech and Writing*. Chicago.
- Clark, H. H. & Clark, E. V. 1977. *Psychology and Language*. New York.
- Clay, J. S. 1976. "The Beginning of the *Odyssey*," *AJPh* 97: 313-326.
- Clay, J. S. 1983. *The Wrath of Athena. Gods and Men in the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Dimock, G. E. 1989. *The Unity of the Odyssey*. Princeton.
- Edwards, M. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 5, Books 17-20. Cambridge.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer. The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca-London.
- Gaissner, J. H. 1969. "A Structural Analysis of the Digressions in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*," *HSCPh* 73: 1-43.
- Griffin, J. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford.
- Hornby, P. A. 1972. "The psychological subject and predicate," *Cognitive Psychology* 3: 632-642.
- de Jong, I. J. F. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge.
- Kirk, G. S. 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 1, Books 1-4. Cambridge.
- Latacz, J. 1997³ [1985]. *Homer. Der erste Dichter des Abendlands*. Düsseldorf [München-Zürich].
- Latacz, J. 2000. *Homers Ilias. Gesamtkommentar*. Band I, 1. Gesang, Faszikel 2: Kommentar. München-Leipzig.
- Lenz, A. 1980. *Das Proem des frühgriechischen Epos: ein Beitrag zum poetischen Selbstverständnis*. Bonn.
- Lohmann, D. 1970. *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin.
- Μαρωνίτης, Δ. Ν. 1971. 'Αναζήτηση καὶ Νόστος τοῦ Ὀδυσσεύα. Ἡ διαλεκτικὴ τῆς Ὀδύσσειας. Ἀθήνα.
- Pedrick, V. 1992. "The Muse Corrects: The Opening of the *Odyssey*," *YCIS* 29: 39-62.
- Pucci, P. 1998. *The Song of the Sirens. Essays on Homer*. Lanham-Boulder-New York-Oxford.
- Race, W. R. 1992. "How Greek Poems Begin," *YCIS* 29: 13-38.
- Romeo, A. 1985. *Il proemio epico antico*. Roma.

- Russo, J. 1994. "Homer's Style: Nonformulaic Features of an Oral Aesthetic," *Oral Tradition* 9: 371-389.
- Russo, J. 1999. "Sicilian Folktales, Cognitive Psychology, and Oral Theory." In Th. M. Falkner, N. Felson, and D. Konstan (eds.), *Contextualizing Classics: Ideology, Performance, Dialogue*. Lanham-Boulder-New York-Oxford. 151-171.
- Rüter, K. 1969. *Odysseeinterpretationen. Untersuchungen zum 1. Buch und zur Phaia-kis*. Göttingen.
- Thalmann, W. G. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Baltimore.
- van Groningen, A. 1946. "The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*," *Meded. Ned. Akad. van Wetensch. Afd. Letterkunde* 9, 8: 279-294.
- van Otterlo, W. A. A. 1944. *Untersuchungen über Begriff, Anwendung und Entstehung der griechischen Ringkomposition*. Amsterdam.
- Walsh, T. R. 1995. "Odyssey 1.6-9: a Little more than Kine," *Mnemosyne* 48: 385-410.
- West, S. 1988. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*. Oxford.