

1. Kullmann: What is "neoanalysis"? In what way is neoanalysis consistent with the theory of oral composition whereas traditional analytic approaches are not?

Kullmann, Wolfgang. "Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis" *GRBS* 25 (1984) 307-323.

Neoanalysis is concerned with the history of motifs as taken from earlier poetry, including the persons and plot from the epic cycle of the Trojan War. Neoanalysts consider the greater part of the Cycle to have been delivered orally before the *Iliad* was composed. They believe that the unity of the composition of the *Iliad* argues for the original composition of the *Iliad* as a whole. Taking the recurrent motifs as the function of a poet reflecting the common experience of his epoch, and focusing on the "more specific motifs or specific nuances in general motifs," the neoanalyst outdoes the oralist in respect for the continuity of epic tradition. In short the individual shaping by a single poet, the "semi-rigid" dependence on motifs taken from earlier epics, the similarity of these motifs to fixed formulae, and liberation from the model of Serbian epic poetry help oralists transcend the strictures of the Parry model while allowing the fundamental assertions of the traditional analyst. The neoanalysts argument is weakest where it perceives the need for a model for written epic, deferring the necessity for original impetus and ignoring the possibility of some sort of punctuated equilibrium in the evolution of poetic invention.

2. Kopf and Kullmann: What is the relationship between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopsis*, and how does our answer to this question affect our appreciation of the *Iliad* as we have it?

Kopf, E. Christian. "The Structure of the Amazonia (*Aetheopsis*)" in R. Häggied. *The Greek Renaissance in the 8th Century*. Stockholm: Publisher Not Given, 1983.

According to Kullman, the *Aetheopsis* was orally delivered before the *Iliad* was formed and, after a period of oral transmission, was transcribed and subtly changed—perhaps on the model of a written *Iliad*. While motifs from the earlier oral version of *Aetheopsis* are incorporated into the *Iliad*, they are not slavishly mimicked but are artistically refined and transformed to show greater delicacy of narrative art, intellectual expression, and religious meaning. Kopf, on the other hand, sees Iliadic sensitivity springing from an earlier version of the *Aethiopsis* or *Amazonia*; I am not sure which or if they are one in the same. While Kullman sees the *Iliad* as a virtuosic perfection of motifs found in *Aethiopsis*, Kopf conjectures that *Aethiopsis* provides the inspiring pathos for scenes later merely imitated by the *Iliad*. I am incredulous of Kullman's and Kopf's claims that either *Iliad* 8, 16, and 18 or *Aetheopsis* find their nexus in such themes. The scenes in the *Iliad* seem sufficiently brilliant to have provided a model for a later *Aethiopsis*—relative dating being yet a debatable matter—and perhaps the apparent parallelism is purely coincidental. Both views argue, albeit more transparently than before, for greater appreciation of *Iliadic* genius.