

# The resilience of orality in cuneiform and the alphabet: Greek and Babylonian epic

Bernardo Ballesteros Petrella

Despite profound semiotic differences in how they conveyed meaning, both Mesopotamian cuneiform and early Greek alphabetic writtenness(es) were anchored in highly oral cultural milieux. Oral modes of learning and communication were essential to the development and propagation of written culture. That interaction is most visible in educational practices: the teaching of cuneiform word-lists and lexical texts that were exported across the Near East, and the Old Babylonian ‘scribal curriculum’, relied on memorisation and oral recitation, though this did not exhaust their intellectual function (Veldhuis 2010, Delnero 2012, Van de Mieroop 2015). So did late-archaic and Classical Greek elite education, where Homeric and lyric written poetry was learnt as a function of performance (Spelman 2019). This is all well understood, if hardly ever compared. But how precisely the writing and composition of those culturally-central texts were anchored in, and influenced by oral composition and performance remains a scholarly crux in both fields.

One obstacle is the difficulty in conceptualising the coexistence of orality, performance and writing, and the prevalence of dichotomic frameworks. In Homeric studies, the idea that writing has a fundamentally transformative power leads scholars to be sceptical that oral poetic expression may be compatible with literate composition (Nagy 2009, Ready 2019). It also underpins ‘scripsist’ views, which downplay oral composition in view of Homeric artistry (recently Friedrich 2019, Lucarini 2019, cf. West 2011). In cuneiform studies, on the other hand, the materiality of the written artifacts that constitute our sources has long hindered the study of oral or oral-derived features (Ballesteros forthcoming, but see Vogelzang and Vanstiphout 1992, Delnero 2015). Comparison between the two fields (recently Lardinois 2018, Waal 2018: 113–19, Ballesteros 2021, Kelly and Metcalf 2021) is likely to be a game-changer, opening up new avenues for conceptualising writing and orality beyond unidirectional and evolutionary frameworks.

In the cuneiform context, epic was most likely composed in writing, as suggested by contextual factors including metapoetic statements (Metcalf 2015: 143–5) and heavy reliance on scribal wordplay. When cuneiform literary texts appear, writing had been in existence for centuries. As for Homer, Milman Parry’s case for the traditionality and oral background of Homeric diction has not been invalidated (Parry 1971, Edwards 1986-1988, Friedrich 2019). The Homeric poems are likely to have emerged as the alphabetic scripts took hold in the Aegean. The contexts of Babylonian and early Greek poetry were thoroughly different, as were the scripts that recorded them. But comparison shows that their performance-directed features are entirely commensurate. In this paper, I offer quantitative and qualitative evidence regarding noun-epithet and other traditional naming expressions in Homer’s *Iliad* and Old Babylonian poetry (*Atra-hasīs*, *Agušaya*). The comparison demonstrates that the oral dimension of ancient epic was eminently resilient to the impact of literacy. Cuneiform and alphabetic texts were indeed anchored in an oral dimension. But the latter was not necessarily earlier than writtenness, or incompatible with its emergence.

## Select Bibliography

- Ballesteros, B. (2021) ‘On *Gilgamesh* and Homer: Ishtar, Aphrodite and the meaning of a parallel’, *The Classical Quarterly* 71: 1–21.
- Delnero, P. (2012) *The Textual Criticism of Sumerian Literature*. Boston: Journal of Cuneiform Studies Supplemental Series.
- Delnero, P. (2015) ‘The materiality and function of the Sumerian liturgical corpus’ in P. Delnero and J. Lauinger (eds.) *Texts and Contexts: The Circulation and Transmission of Cuneiform Texts in Social Space*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Edwards, M. W. (1986-1988) ‘Homer and oral tradition: the formula. Part I’, and ‘Homer and oral tradition: the formula. Part II’, *Oral tradition* 1: 171–230, 2: 11–60.
- Friedrich, R. (2019) *Post-oral Homer: Orality and Literacy in the Homeric Epic*. Stuttgart: Franz-Steiner Verlag.
- Kelly, A. and Metcalf, C. eds. (2021) *Gods and mortals in early Greek and Near Eastern mythology*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Lardinois, A. (2018) 'Eastern myths for western lies: allusion to Near Eastern mythology in Homer's *Iliad*', *Mnemosyne* 71: 895–919.
- Lucarini, C. M. (2019) *La genesi dei poemi omerici*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Metcalf, C. (2015) *The Gods Rich in Praise. Early Greek and Mesopotamian Religious Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nagy, G. (2009) *Homer the Classic*. Washington, DC: Center for Hellenic Studies.
- Parry, M. (1971) *The Making of the Homeric Verse. The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (ed. A. Parry). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ready, J. (2019) *Orality, Textuality, and the Homeric Epics: An Interdisciplinary Study of Oral Texts, Dictated Texts, and Wild Texts*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Spelman, H. (2019) 'Schools, reading and poetry in the early Greek world', *Cambridge Classical Journal* 65, 150–72.
- Van De Mieroop, M. (2015) *Philosophy before the Greeks: The Pursuit of Truth in Ancient Babylonia*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Veldhuis, N. (2010) 'Guardians of tradition: Early Dynastic lexical texts in Old Babylonian copies', in H. D. Baker, E. Robson and G. Zólyomi (eds.) *Your Praise is Sweet. A Memorial Volume for Jeremy Black from Students, Colleagues and Friends*. London: British Institute for the Study of Iraq: 379–400.
- Vogelzang, M. E. and Vanstiphout, H. L. J. eds. (1992) *Mesopotamian Epic Literature: Oral or Aural?* Lampeter: Mellen Press.
- Waal, W. J. I. (2018), 'On the 'Phoenician Letters': the case for an early transmission of the Greek alphabet from an archaeological, epigraphic, and linguistic perspective', *Aegean Studies* 1: 83–125.
- West, M. L. (2011) *The Making of the Iliad. Disquisition and Analytical Commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.