

Tradition or Innovation ? :
An Explanation of Some Formulas
in *The Destruction of Troy*

Yukio KAMATA

(1995年10月31日受付)

SUMMARY

Ritzke-Rutherford (1981a) proposes a framework of the compositional elements of Middle English (abbreviated as ME) alliterative poetry and calls the formularity of language and style as the *formulaic microstructure* (*formula*, *system*, and *cluster*) and that of content and narrative structure as the *formulaic macrostructure* (*motif*, *type-scene* and *theme*).

It may be maintained that the elements of the *formulaic microstructure* include, in addition to the above three by Ritzke-Rutherford, also the concept of *mold*. This concept was proposed by Waldron (1957) and modified by Suzuki (1984). Furthermore, the definitions of a *formula* and a *system* by Ritzke-Rutherford should be modified by applying the definition of a *formula* by Fry (1967) and that of a *system* by Suzuki (1969), respectively.

Based on the definitions of a *formula*, a *system*, and a *mold*, examined are the groups of words with such a syntactic structure as “ADJ. + *men* + PREP. + NOUN” in *The Destruction of Troy* (abbreviated as DT). The comparison of the examples in DT with those having the same syntactic structure in other ME alliterative poems reveals a peculiarity in the formulas of the DT-poet. Such a peculiarity is regarded as an innovative aspect of the DT-poet in the traditional style of ME alliterative poetry.

1. Introduction

Ritzke-Rutherford (1981a) proposes a framework of the compositional elements of Middle English (hereafter abbreviated as ME) alliterative poetry in order to explain the formulaic structures in a systematic way. She calls the formularity of language and style as the *formulaic microstructure* and that of content and narrative structure as the *formulaic macrostructure*. According to her framework, the former consists of three abstract concepts: *formula*, *system*, and *cluster*, and the latter also of three abstract concepts: *motif*, *type-scene* and *theme*¹⁾.

As for a *formula*, she adopts Parry's classic definition, ‘a group of words which is regularly

employed under the same metrical conditions to express a given essential idea'. This definition is the one proposed by Parry in his examination of the traditional expressions of Homeric verse²⁾. The definition of a *system* she adopts is Fry's one, which he proposed in order to explain the formulaic expressions of Old English (hereafter abbreviated as OE) poetry. The definition runs as follows :

a group of half-lines, usually loosely related metrically and semantically, which is related in form by the identical relative placement of two elements, one a variable word or element of a compound usually supplying the alliteration, and the other a constant word or element of a compound with approximately the same distribution of non-stressed elements³⁾.

Although her proposal of the concept of *cluster* as one of the compositional elements of ME alliterative poetry could be regarded as convincing, her application of Parry's definition of a *formula* and Fry's definition of a *system* directly to ME alliterative poetry without any modification would cause some problems. Firstly, a part of Parry's definition of a formula, 'under the same metrical conditions', does not coincide with Lawrence's observation. Namely, in ME alliterative poetry, especially in *The Wars of Alexander*, Lawrence discovers the rhythmical variation of formulas implying a system from which they probably originated⁴⁾. Secondly, from these definitions she adopts, it is not clear whether *verbatim repetition* is the necessary condition or not in regarding a group of words as a formula. It may be maintained that with regard to a formula, she should have adopted Fry's definition, in which the problem of *verbatim repetition* is resolved by thinking that all formulas originate from systems and 'to prove that a group of words is a formula, we need only find another group implying a system from which both probably originated'⁵⁾. Thirdly, considering the linguistic and stylistic differences between OE and ME alliterative poetry, it may be not sufficient enough to apply Fry's definition of a formulaic system for OE poetry to ME alliterative poetry without any modification.

In order to apply the concept of system to ME alliterative poetry, Suzuki (1969) modifies Fry's definition of a *system* as follows :

a group of half-lines, usually loosely related metrically and semantically, which are related in form by the identical relative placement of two words, one variable, and the other constant, both of which bear the alliteration in the a-verse with a lack of alliteration in one word in the b-verse, with approximately the same distribution of non-stressed elements⁶⁾.

Furthermore, Suzuki (1984), by imposing semantic restriction on the concept of *mold*, the idea which was first proposed by Waldron (1957) as a set of rhythmical-syntactical patterns, modifies it more usefully in order to explain the analogical creations deeper than the level of the *system*

in the poems of ME alliterative poets. He defines a *mold* as follows :

a phrase pattern abstracted from a group of half-lines that are not only similar in syntax and meter, but also interrelated by means of the presence of semantic resemblance among them⁷.

It may be worthy of note that Suzuki's definition of a *mold* would have the intention to connect it with the other two 'principles of organizing formulaic language' : a *formula* and a *system*. He mentions as follows :

Of the three principles of organizing formulaic language, obviously a *formula* is verbally most specific, while a *system* requires one constant word. A *mold*, however, requires no constant word ; it is a formulaic archetype from which a certain number of semantically related systems are derived, their relation characterized by the replacement of one key word by another belonging to the same class of an equivalent idea, for example, that of person, place, time, or weapon⁸.

Although Ritzke-Rutherford does not include the concept of mold in the formulaic microstructure, it may be safe to say that there is a good reason to regard the concept of mold as one of the compositional elements in the formulaic microstructure in ME alliterative poetry. Therefore, the formulaic microstructure consists of the four abstract concepts : *formula*, *system*, *mold* and *cluster*. From the discussion above, the most relevant definitions of the four concepts may be thought as follows :

A FORMULA is a group of words, one half-line in length, which shows evidence of being the direct product of a formulaic system. Fry (1967 : 204)

A SYSTEM is a group of half-lines, usually loosely related metrically and semantically, which are related in form by the identical relative placement of two words, one variable, and the other constant, both of which bear the alliteration in the a-verse with a lack of alliteration in one word in the b-verse, with approximately the same distribution of non-stressed elements. Suzuki (1969 : 77)

A MOLD is a phrase pattern abstracted from a group of half-lines that are not only similar in syntax and meter, but also interrelated by means of the presence of semantic resemblance among them. Suzuki (1984 : 30)

A CLUSTER is a group of words, usually loosely related metrically and semantically, which is regularly employed to express a given essential idea without being restricted to a certain form or sequence, or to a certain number of lines.

Ritzke-Rutherford (1981a : 73)

2. An analysis of the examples from *The Wars of Alexander*

Let us examine some groups of words seen in *The Wars of Alexander* by applying the concepts of *formula*, *system* and *mold* discussed above. Each group of words in the second half-line (b-verse) below could be described as a formula derived from the system “ADJ.+ *men*+PREP.+ *armes*” in which the word “*armes*” is the constant. The position of “ADJ.”, the variable, is filled with a word fulfilling metrical, semantic, and alliterative requirements.

(1) a system : ADJ.+ *men*+PREP.+ *armes*

b-verse constant : *armes*
(X)/XX/X variable : ADJ. (*bald*, *big*, *fele*, *kene*, *thra*)

& *bald men of armes*, 1717b (1x) *kene men of armes*, 90b (1x)
with *big men of armes*, 1418b (1x) of *thra men of armes*, 1369b (2x)
of *fele men of armes*. 803b (1X)

If we postulate the mold “(DET.)+ADJ.-*est*+PREP.+(DET.)+NOUN of place”, these groups of words occurring in the second half-line (b-verse) below could be described as formulas originated from the same mold. That is to say, from the mold are the four systems derived, in which the words filled the space of the constant, in this case, the position of “NOUN of place”, are chosen as *erth*, *heuen*, *land* or *werd* respectively. From these four systems the formulas realized in the second half-lines are derived, after the space of the variable, in this case, the position of “ADJ.-*est*”, is filled with a word fulfilling metrical, semantic, and alliterative requirements respectively.

(2) a mold : (DET.)+ADJ.-*est*+PREP.+(DET.)+NOUN of place

b-verse constant : NOUN of place (*erth*, *heuen*, *land*, *werd*)
(X)/XX(X)(X)/(X) variable : ADJ.-*est*

1	<i>pe biggest in erth</i> , 2285b (1x)	2	<i>pe best vndire heuen</i> , 1925b (2x)
	<i>pe grettest on erde</i> . 271b (1x)		<i>pe biggist [vndire heuen]</i> , 3851b (1x)
	<i>pe hareest on erthe</i> , 1186b (1x)		<i>pe gaiest vndire heuen</i> . 5270b (1x)
	<i>pe miztist in erthe</i> , 3850b (1x)		<i>pe oddest vndire heuyn</i> , 2134b (2x)
	& <i>proudest in erth</i> , 5018b (1x)		<i>pe sotelest vndire heuen</i> . 3049b (1x)
	<i>pe soueraynest in erth</i> , 3224b (1x)	3	<i>pe proudis of pat land</i> . 5592b (1x)
	<i>pe tethiest on erth</i> , 2325b (1x)	4	<i>pe clenness of pe werd</i> , 3903b (2x)
	<i>pe tidiest on erth</i> 2492b (1x)		<i>pe fairest of pe werde</i> . 4893b (1x)
	& <i>worhist on erthe</i> 1731b (1x)		<i>pe grettest in pe worde</i> , 5257b (1x)

<i>pe kideſt of pe werd.</i> 2011b (1x)	<i>pe ſtithēſt of pe werd,</i> 5391b (1x)
<i>pe maſt of pe werd ;</i> 3797b (2x)	<i>pe ſtrangeſt of pe werde ;</i> 3725b (1x)
<i>riccheſt of pe werd,</i> 4949b (1x)	<i>pe trieſt of pe werd,</i> 5097b (1x)

a-verse XX(X)/XX(X)(X)/(X) constant : *god, heuyn, werd, ſon*

- 1 Now pou, *pe gretteſt vndir god*, 2030a (1x)
- 2 Sayd, 'Lo, *vnhappeiſte vndire heuyn* 713a (1x)
- 3 And he, *pe waeſt of pe werd*, 2130a (1x)
- 4 And *pe ſotelleſt vndere ſon* 34a (1x)

In the examples occurring in the first half-line (a-verse) above, in which the constant and the variable should alliterate each other, it may be thought, in the same way, that the four systems with a "NOUN of place" as constant are derived from the same mold mentioned above. And from these systems each group of words in italics is derived after each variable word is determined respectively. Then each group of words is realized as a formula in the first half-line. In this case, as each formula derived from the four systems occurs only once in the work, it may seem difficult even to postulate each system, since we cannot postulate a system unless there are, at least, two formulas, which probably originated from it, in the work examined. It should be emphasized, however, that we cannot regard these groups of words as the formulas of the same origin until we postulate the concept of mold deeper than that of system. It may be thought that a mold is the abstract concept which has both a certain "grammetrical" structure⁹ and meaning but is not yet determined either variable or constant. These four groups of words above, it is assumed, may have been derived in the first half-line through the analogical process at the level of mold. It should be added that the concept of mold would give us a clue to explain the formulas especially realized in a-verse, in which the stressed words should alliterate each other, in a more systematic way than Ritzke-Rutherford's framework which does not include the concept of mold.

If the poets of ME alliterative poetry shared the tradition in which they composed their works through the analogical process of the abstract concepts termed above as *system* and *mold*, *formulas* realized in the lines may be regarded as the most specific unit of the three concepts, in which the verbal characteristics of each poet are expected to be revealed. In other words, if we carefully examine the formulas realized in the lines of each poem, it may be expected that the similarities and differences between the formulas of each poem would show that some formulas are shared by many poets and others are peculiar to an individual poet. That is to say, from the careful examinations of formulas in each poem, we may expect to reveal both the traditional and the innovative aspects of each poet.

3. Possible examples of the formulas peculiar to *The Destruction of Troy*

Based on the assumption of the foregoing discussion, we have examined the groups of words with such a syntactic structure as “ADJ.+ *men* + PREP.+ NOUN” in *The Destruction of Troy*. As the result of the investigation, these groups of words can be classified into *formulas* belonging to the three types of *molds* (1-3), the four types of *systems* (4-7), and others (8) as follows¹⁰⁾:

1. ADJ.+ *men* + PREP.+ NOUN for ‘fight’
2. ADJ.+ *men* + PREP.+ NOUN for ‘deeds’
3. ADJ.+ *men* + PREP.+ NOUN of place
4. ADJ.+ *men* + PREP.+ *will*
5. ADJ.+ *men* + PREP.+ *wit*
6. ADJ.+ *men* + PREP.+ *shape*
7. ADJ.+ *men* + PREP.+ *stature* CONSTANT : NOUN
8. ADJ.+ *men* + PREP.+ something VARIABLE : ADJECTIVE

In order to compare the examples of *The Destruction of Troy* with those of other poems, the examples with the same syntactic structure in other alliterative poems need to be investigated. The following tables show the result of the investigation of mainly the “classical corpus” of the Middle English alliterative poetry¹¹⁾. The table I shows whether or not the same types of the formulas seen in *The Destruction of Troy* occur in the other alliterative poems¹²⁾. The table II is the list of frequencies of the table I. The four signs in the table I mean as follows:

The double circle mark means that a *mold* can be postulated from the examples in the work in question.

The single circle mark means that a *system* can be postulated from the examples in the work in question.

The triangle mark means that one example occurs in the work in question.

In this case, one example means one ‘type’, not one ‘token’.

The X mark means that no example occurs in the work in question.

From the tables, the formulas that may be thought peculiar to *The Destruction of Troy* can be pointed out. In the following discussions, these formulas will be treated as a part of the creative aspects of the DT-poet.

TABLE I.
THE FORMULAS WITH THE GRAMMETIRICAL STRUCTURE OF
“ADJ.+men+PREP.+NOUN” IN THE CLASSICAL CORPUS OF
MIDDLE ENGLISH ALLITERATIVE POETRY

(1) b-verse									(2) a-verse								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
DT	⊙	⊙	⊙	○	○	○	△	△	DT	⊙	⊙	⊙	×	×	×	○	△
AA	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	AA	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
AB	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	AB	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
CA	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	CA	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
CL	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	CL	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	△
EK	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	EK	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
JA	○	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	JA	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
MA	○	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	MA	△	×	⊙	×	×	×	×	×
PA	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	PA	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
P 3 A	○	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	P 3 A	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
SGGK	×	×	×	△	×	×	×	×	SGGK	×	×	○	×	×	×	×	△
SJ	○	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	SJ	×	×	△	×	×	×	×	△
WA	○	○	△	×	×	×	×	×	WA	△	×	×	×	×	×	×	×
WP	○	×	⊙	×	×	×	×	△	WP	△	△	△	×	×	×	×	×
WW	△	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	WW	×	×	×	×	×	×	×	×

⊙=mold ○=system △=an example ×=no example

TABLE II.
THE LIST OF THE FREQUENCIES OF TABLE I

(1) b-verse									(2) a-verse								
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
DT	53	18	8	4	10	2	1	10	DT	35	5	5	—	—	—	2	12
AA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	AA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
AB	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	AB	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	CA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
CL	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	CL	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	1
EK	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	EK	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
JA	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	JA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
MA	29	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	MA	1	—	3	—	—	—	—	—
PA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	PA	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
P 3 A	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	P 3 A	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
SGGK	—	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	SGGK	—	—	2	—	—	—	—	1
SJ	2	—	—	—	—	—	—	—	SJ	—	—	1	—	—	—	—	4
WA	6	2	1	—	—	—	—	—	WA	1	—	—	—	—	—	—	—
WP	6	—	2	—	—	—	—	1	WP	1	1	1	—	—	—	—	—

The group of words, “ADJ. + *men* + PREP. + *armes*”, which Oakden regards as one of “tags” of the second half-lines in ME alliterative poetry¹³⁾, occurs in eight alliterative poems: DT, JA, MA, P3A, SJ, WA, WP, and WW. Except WW in which there is one example of it, all the poems have the examples from which the system, “ADJ. + *men* + PREP. + *armes*”, can be postulated as follows¹⁴⁾:

of <i>clene men of Armes</i> , JA.408b	full <i>ferse men of armes</i> , P3A.349b
<i>hondred men of Armes</i> . JA.476b	a <i>gude man of armes</i> , P3A.351b
and <i>wyse men of armes</i> , MA.19b	a <i>siker man of armes</i> , SJ.434b
with <i>clene men of armez</i> , MA.1603b	with <i>ten men of armes</i> , SJ.456b
with <i>ferse men of armez</i> ; MA.1897b	of <i>gode men of armes</i> , WP.1348b
with <i>fresche men of armes</i> , MA.364b	were <i>kene men of armes</i> , WP.2288b
with <i>gude men of armes</i> , MA.563b	with <i>clene men of armes</i> WP.4693b
as <i>pryce men of armes</i> . MA.2754b	are <i>sadde men of armes</i> , WW.193b

In DT, not only *armes* but also *wer*, a synonym of *armes*, is used as constant in the second half-lines. In this case, the mold “ADJ. + *men* + PREP. + NOUN for ‘fight’” can be postulated.

1 of <i>byg men of armys</i> , 6311b (1x)	& <i>proude men of Armys</i> , 1693b (3x)
& <i>bold men of armys</i> , 6866b (1x)	& <i>sad men of armys</i> , 7108b (1x)
<i>derfe men in Armys</i> . 2570b (1x)	with <i>sharp men of armys</i> , 4055b (2x)
with <i>fele men of armys</i> , 5467b (1x)	with <i>shene men of Armys</i> ; 2805b (1x)
<i>furse men of Armys</i> ; 1132b (6x)	<i>strong men of armys</i> , 1193b (1x)
<i>goode men of Armys</i> , 1506b (1x)	with <i>sure men of Armys</i> , 2327b (1x)
& <i>kant men of armes</i> ! 8999b (2x)	<i>wale men of armys</i> , 4716b (1x)
with <i>kene men of armys</i> , 6460b (3x)	& <i>wight men in Armys</i> , 2215b (1x)
& <i>kyd men of Armys</i> , 1741b (9x)	2 <i>fell men of wer</i> , 6348b (1x)
with <i>light men of armys</i> , 6208b (1x)	& <i>kide men of were</i> . 13144b (1x)
<i>od men of armys</i> , 6194b (1x)	<i>nait men of werr</i> . 10020b (1x)
with <i>prise men of Armes</i> . 3685b (2x)	as <i>prise men of wer</i> . 5159b (1x)

Furthermore, in the first half-lines, in addition to *armes* and *wer*, other three synonyms of *armes* are used as constant: *batell*, *fight*, and *stoure*.

1 With <i>abill men of armys</i> , 4065a (1x)	4 Of <i>stithe men in stoure</i> 7a (3x)
So <i>od men in armys</i> , 4165a (1x)	<i>Strong men in stoure</i> , 6091a (1x)
2 With <i>mony bold men in batell</i> 1032a (4x)	5 All <i>wight men in wer</i> , 7713a (1x)
3 And <i>felle men in fight</i> , 1507a (4x)	<i>ffull wise men of wer</i> , 2269a (5x)
And <i>fuerse men in fight</i> 5194a (6x)	

In three poems other than DT, there is one example of this kind of group of words in the first half-line respectively, from which we cannot postulate a system in each poem¹⁵.

All *pe kene men of kampe*, MA. 3701a of *bold burnes in batailes* WP. 3565a
Azt & tuenti men of armes WA. 4058a

Considering that from the examples in works other than DT, we can only postulate the *armes*-system, it may be likely that, on the basis of the *armes*-system, the DT-poet analogically creates other systems in which synonyms of *armes* are used as constant.

From the examples in DT below, the mold “ADJ. + *men* + PREP. + NOUN for ‘deeds’” can be postulated, in which three words are used as constant : *dedes*, *hond*, and *strenght*¹⁶.

b-verse

(pl.)	(sg.)
1 <i>bold men of hond</i> . 6621b (2x)	1 <i>a prise mon of dedes</i> , 5449b (1x)
<i>felle men of hondes</i> . 9867 (1x)	2 <i>a bold mon of hond</i> , 7835b (1x)
<i>kyde men of hond</i> . 13201b (1x)	<i>a sad mon of hond</i> , 10614b (1x)
<i>prise men of honde</i> . 2743b (1x)	3 <i>a kid man of strenght</i> , 6543b (1x)
2 & <i>kydmen of strenght</i> : 11386b (1x)	<i>a sad mon of strenght</i> , 5448b (2x)
<i>nait men of strenght</i> . 8212b (1x)	<i>a tor man of strenght</i> ; 5437b (2x)
<i>od men of strenght</i> , 6172b (1x)	
<i>tore men of strenght</i> . 1035b (2x)	

a-verse

1 <i>A derffe man in dede</i> , 3799a (1x)	2 <i>Hardy men of hond</i> , 10272a (1x)
<i>A discrete man of dedis</i> , 5523a (1x)	3 <i>A storre man of strenght</i> 538a (2x)

Two examples of this type of formula occur in WA, from which the *strenth*-system can be postulated. In WP, one example occurs in the first half-line.

ane odd man of strenth, WA. 2756b as *dou3ti men of dedes*, WP. 3266a
a huge man of strenthe, WA. 3002b

The rarity of the occurrence of this type of formulas in works other than DT suggests that this mold is developed by the DT-poet on the analogy with other formulas which have the same grammatical structure, for example, those originated from the *armes*-system.

The four systems below, in which *will*, *wit*, *shape*, and *statute* are used as constant respectively, can also be regarded as the developments by the DT-poet, who probably creates them on the analogy of the other formulas with the same grammatical structure, since in other works, except in SGGK 1.57¹⁷), there is no example of the formulas belonging to these four systems.

b-verse

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | & <i>cant men of wille</i> , 2267b (1x) | <i>qwaint men of wit</i> ; 1531b (1x) |
| | <i>fell men of will</i> , 8984b (1x) | <i>an abill mon of wit</i> , 5522b (2x) |
| | <i>nayt men of will</i> ; 13600b (1x) | <i>a sad man of wit</i> , 8444b (1x) |
| | & <i>pro men of wille</i> . 5498b (1x) | 3 <i>a coynt mon of shappe</i> , 7715b (1x) |
| 2 | with <i>clene men of wit</i> , 790b (4x) | <i>was a fuerse man of shape</i> , 5502b (1x) |
| | <i>prise men of wit</i> , 8858b (2x) | 4 <i>a hegh mon of stature</i> , 6153b (1x) |

a-verse

- | | | |
|---|--|---|
| 4 | <i>A store man of stature</i> , 3819a (1x) | <i>A stythe man of his stature</i> , 3833a (1x) |
|---|--|---|

The examples below clearly show that the DT-poet composes the half-lines of his poem through the analogical process not only at the level of the system and the mold but also at the level of the 'grammetrical unit' in which 'semantic restriction is absent'¹⁸⁾.

b-verse

- | | |
|--|---|
| (pl.) | (sg.) |
| <i>fele men of Crafte</i> ; 1593b (1x) | <i>an old man of age</i> . 12554b (1x) |
| with <i>sere men of elde</i> , 11881b (1x) | <i>a roghe man of hors</i> , 3888b (1x) |
| and <i>ser men of hest</i> , 12091b (1x) | <i>a fyne man of lore</i> , 1484b (1x) |
| and <i>pure men of lyffe</i> , 8821b (1x) | <i>a sure mon of olde</i> , 13479b (1x) |
| with <i>od men to wale</i> . 6356b (1x) | |
| & <i>kyde men of worship</i> , 9708b (1x) | |

a-verse

- | | |
|--|---|
| (pl.) | (sg.) |
| <i>Abill men of archery</i> , 8193a (1x) | <i>A clene man of counsell</i> , 3939a (1x) |
| The <i>bold men on bake</i> 9411a (1x) | <i>A faire man in feturs</i> 3865a (1x) |
| "A! <i>nobyll men of nome</i> , 2526a (2x) | <i>A faire man of fourme</i> , 3964a (1x) |
| ffor <i>proud men in price</i> 4840a (1x) | <i>A large man of lenght</i> 3762a (2x) |
| pat were <i>pro men in threpe</i> , 5246a (1x) | <i>A Riche mon of Renttes</i> , 11391a (1x) |
| | <i>A sad man of siens</i> , 4493a (2x) |
| | <i>A wilde man to wale</i> , 3902a (1x) |

The following examples in poems other than DT suggest that the analogical process at the level of the grammetrical unit also works among them.

- | | |
|--|--|
| <i>a konyng man of lore</i> , WP. 2917b | <i>Lered men of pe lawe</i> , SJ. 473a cf 705a |
| <i>Clene men in companynye</i> CL.119a | <i>Stipe men in stiropys</i> SJ. 523a |
| pat oper <i>stif mon in study</i> SGGK 2369a | <i>Armed men in pe ayer</i> SJ. 1221a |

It may be thought that each poet realises these groups of words above on the analogy with the

traditionally established phrase patterns, in this case, with the system “ADJ. + *men* + PREP. + *armes*”, since the system can be thought, from the investigation in the classical corpus of ME alliterative poetry, to be the most established phrase pattern among those with the syntactical structure “ADJ. + *men* + PREP. + NOUN”.

4. Conclusion

We have been comparing some formulas occurring in *The Destruction of Troy* with those in other works of alliterative poetry in Middle English in order to point out the formulas peculiar to *The Destruction of Troy* on the basis of the concepts of system and mold.

We should be cautious in interpreting the absence of a phrase pattern since it can be thought that the poet may have avoided using the phrase pattern though he knew it. And it may be natural to think that each poet could have used more formulas than those occurring in his work. What we can do, however, is to examine the works extant to us. Although there is a good reason to think that behind the extant works, there must have been more works of alliterative poetry than those we have in the history of alliterative tradition¹⁹), it can be thought valuable and necessary to examine the extant works carefully and exhaustively and, if possible, to make a clear distinction between the similarities and the differences among them. The discussion above is one of the possible explanations of some formulas occurring in those works, and an effort to seek the peculiarity and the creative aspects of the poet of *The Destruction of Troy*, from the viewpoint of the concepts of *system* and *mold*.

NOTES

- 1) Although it may be thought that her framework of the formulaic macrostructure has some problems, they are not treated in this article.
- 2) Parry (1930) p. 80.
- 3) Fry (1967) p. 203.
- 4) See Lawrence (1970).
- 5) Fry (1967) p.204.
- 6) Suzuki (1969) p. 77.
- 7) Suzuki (1984) p. 30.
- 8) Suzuki (1984) p. 37. The italics are mine.
- 9) For the term “grammetrical”, see Lawrence (1966).
- 10) In this case, the space of “NOUN” can be considered as the position of the constant word and that of “ADJ.” as the variable word.
- 11) For the “classical corpus” of Middle English alliterative poetry, see Pearsall (1981) p. 6 and Lawton (1983) p. 72. See also Pearsall (1977) p. 153.
- 12) For the abbreviations of the works, see the selected bibliography at the end of this article.
- 13) See Oakden (1935) pp. 383-4.
- 14) The examples of WA have been shown in the section 2 (1) above.
- 15) Hamel (1984) glosses *kampe* in MA I.3701a as ‘war, battle’ in her edition. Two adjectives are used as

- modifier of *men* in WA 1.4058a, in which the first adjective *Azt* alliterates with *armes*. In WP 1.3565a, the word *burnes*, one of the alliterative synonyms for 'men', is used instead of the word *men*.
- 16) See *Middle English Dictionary* s.v. *dede* n. 1b., *hond(e)* n. 4.(a), *strength(e)* n. 1.(e),
- 17) *Kyng hyppest mon of wyllle*, SGGK 1.57. This example may be excluded from the formulas in question, since the phrase occurs in 'wheel' in which alliterative requirement is absent but the word in the end of the line should rhyme; in this case, *wyllle*.
- 18) Suzuki (1984) p. 36.
- 19) See Turville-Petre (1977) and Wilson (1970).

Selected Bibliography

A. Editions

- AA *Alisaunder of Macedoine* (or *Alexander A*), ed. W.W. Skeat, E.E.T.S. e.s. 1 (London, 1867).
- AB *Alexander and Dindimus* (or *Alexander B*), ed. W.W. Skeat, E.E.T.S. e.s. 31 (London, 1878).
- CA *Cheuelere Assigne*, ed. H.H. Gibbs, E.E.T.S. e.s. 6 (London, 1868).
- CL *Cleanness*, ed. J.J. Anderson (Manchester, 1977).
- DT *The Destruction of Troy*, ed. George A. Panton and David Donaldson, E.E.T.S. o.s. 39 and 56 (London, 1869, 1874; repr. in 1 vol., 1968).
- EK *Saint Erkenwald*, ed. Clifford Perterson (Philadelphia, 1977).
- JA *Joseph of Arimathie*, ed. W.W. Skeat, E.E.T.S. o.s. 44 (London, 1871).
- MA *Morte Arthure*, ed. Mary Hamel (New York, 1984).
- PA *Patience*, ed. J.J. Anderson (Manchester, 1969).
- P3A *The Parlement of the Thre Ages*, ed. M.Y. Offord, E.E.T.S. o.s. 246 (London, 1959).
- SGGK *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, ed. J.R.R. Tolkien and E.V. Gordon, 2nd edn. revised by Norman Davis (Oxford, 1967).
- SJ *The Siege of Jerusalem*, ed. E. Kölbing and Mabel Day, E.E.T.S. e.s. 47 (London, 1932).
- WA *The Wars of Alexander*, ed. Hoyt N. Duggan and Thorlac Turville-Petre, E.E.T.S. s.s. 10 (Oxford, 1989).
- WP *William of Palerne*, ed. G.H.V. Bunt (Groningen, 1985).
- WW *Wynnere and Wastoure*, ed. Stephanie Trigg, E.E.T.S. o.s. 297 (Oxford, 1990)

B. Studies

- Amodio, Mark C. ed. (1994) *Oral Poetics in Middle English Poetry*, New York: Garland.
- Benson, C. David (1980) *The History of Troy in Middle English Literature*, Woodbridge: Boydell & Brewer.
- Benson, Larry D. (1965) *Art and Tradition in Sir Gawain and the Green Knight*, New Brunswick, N.J.: Rutgers University Press.
- Borroff, Marie (1962) *Sir Gawain and the Green Knight: A Stylistic and Metrical Study*, New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Duggan, Hoyt N. (1976) "The Role of Formulas in the Dissemination of a Middle English Alliterative Romance," *Studies in Bibliography* 29: 265-88
- (1986) "The Shape of the B-Verse in Middle English Alliterative Poetry," *Speculum* 61: 564-92
- (1988) "Final-*e* and the Rhythmic Structure of the B-Verse in Middle English Alliterative Poetry," *Modern Philology* 86: 119-45.
- (1990) "Stress Assignment in Middle English Alliterative Poetry," *JEGP* 89:309-29.
- Finlayson, John (1963) "Formulaic Technique in *Morte Arthure*," *Anglia* 81: 372-93.

- (1988) "Alliterative Narrative Poetry: The Control of the Medium," *Traditio* 44: 419-51.
- Foley, John Miles (1985) *Oral-Formulaic Theory and Research: An Introduction and Annotated Bibliography*, New York: Garland.
- Fry, Donald K. (1967) "Old English Formulas and Systems," *English Studies* 48: 193-204.
- Göller, Karl Heinz ed. (1981) *The Alliterative Morte Arthure: A Reassessment of the Poem*, Cambridge: D. S. Brewer.
- Johnson, James J. (1969) "Formulaic Diction and Thematic Composition in the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*," (Unpublished dissertation, University of Illinois).
- (1978) "Formulaic Thrift in the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*," *Medium Ævum* 47: 255-61.
- Kottler, Barnet and Alan M. Markman eds. (1966) *A Concordance to Five Middle English Poems*, Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press.
- Krishna, Valerie (1982) "Parataxis, Formulaic Density and Thrift in the Alliterative *Morte Arthure*," *Speculum* 57: 63-83.
- Lawrence, R.F. (1966) "The Formulaic Theory and its Application to English Alliterative Poetry," in Roger Fowler ed. *Essays on Style and Language*, pp. 166-83, London.
- (1970) "Formula and Rhythm in *The Wars of Alexander*," *English Studies* 51: 97-112.
- Lawton, David A. (1980) "*The Destruction of Troy* as Translation from Latin Prose: Aspects of Form and Style," *Studia Neophilologica* 52: 259-70.
- (1981) "The Middle English Alliterative *Alexander A and C*: Form and Style in Translation from Latin Prose," *Studia Neophilologica* 53: 259-68.
- (1983) "The Unity of Middle English Alliterative Poetry," *Speculum* 58: 72-94.
- ed. (1982) *Middle English Alliterative Poetry and its Literary Background*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Lord, Albert B. (1960) *The Singer of Tales*, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Oakden, J.P. (1935) *Alliterative Poetry in Middle English, Vol. II: A Survey of the Traditions*, Manchester: Manchester Univ. Press.
- Ong, Walter J. (1984) "Orality, Literacy, and Medieval Textualization," *New Literary History* 16: 1-12.
- Parks, Ward (1986) "The Oral-Formulaic Theory in Middle English Studies," *Oral Tradition* 1/3: 636-94.
- Parry, Milman (1930) "Studies in the Epic Technique of Oral Verse-Making, I: Homer and Homeric Style," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* XLI: 73-147; rpt. in Adam Parry ed. *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1971) pp. 266-324.
- Pearsall, Derek (1977) *Old English and Middle English Poetry*, London: Routledge & Kegan Paul.
- (1981) "The Origins of the Alliterative Revival," in Bernard S. Levy and Paul E. Szarmach eds. *The Alliterative Tradition in the Fourteenth Century*, (Kent, Ohio: The Kent University Press). pp. 1-24.
- (1982) "The Alliterative Revival: Origins and Social Backgrounds," in Lawton ed. (1982) pp. 34-53, 132-6.
- Ritzke-Rutherford, Jean (1981a) "Formulaic Microstructure: The Cluster," in Göller ed. (1981) pp. 70-82, 167-69.
- (1981b) "Formulaic Macrostructure: The Theme of Battle," in Göller ed. (1981) pp. 83-95, 169-71.
- Salter, Elizabeth (1983) *Fourteenth-Century English Poetry: Context and Readings*, Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Suzuki, Eiichi (1969) "Middle English *Molde*," *Studies in English Literature* (English Number) 1969: 75-87.
- (1984) "*Mold* in Middle English Alliterative Poetry: A Reconsideration," *Poetica* 19: 27-38.
- Turville-Petre, Thorlac (1977) *The Alliterative Revival*, Cambridge: D.S. Brewer.
- Waldron, Ronald A. (1957) "Oral-Formulaic Technique and Middle English Alliterative Poetry," *Speculum* 32: 792-804
- Wilson, R.M. (1970) *The Lost Literature of Medieval England*, 2nd ed. London.