To Sing the Deeds of Men: Epithet and Identity in Homeric Epic

by

Daniel O. Walden

Doctoral Committee:

      Professor Benjamin W. Fortson IV, Chair
      Professor David M. Halperin
      Professor Richard Janko
      Professor *Emerita* Ruth Scodel

Daniel O. Walden

daoliver@umich.edu

ORCID iD: 0000-0001-5850-0540

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to the entire membership—οἵ τ᾽ ἐόντες οἵ τ᾽ ἐσσόμενοι πρό

τ᾽ εόντες—of the University of Michigan Men's Glee club, for making me wish that eight and a

half years of graduate school could have gone on forever.

O the singing!
There was so much singing, then.
We all sang, and this was my pleasure too.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Though there are no immediate benefactors to thank for this project, I would not have been able to complete it without considerable support from a number of people, some of whom I can thank here.

I am grateful first and foremost to my parents, John and Margaret Walden, for their unconditional love, their infinite patience, and their total faith in my ability to pursue scholarship and in the value of my work.

I thank my younger siblings—Tim, Charlie, Jack, and Lukey—for their determination to admire their oldest brother even when he has been less than admirable. I return their admiration fourfold, for being the most caring, intelligent, and loving siblings anyone could ask for.

I thank my dissertation committee—Ben Fortson, David Halperin, Richard Janko, and Ruth Scodel—for their constant support, for their endlessly helpful criticism, and for never hesitating to tell me when I was talking nonsense.

I thank my cohort—Jan, Tyler, Mara, Allie, and John—for being exactly the right people to fall back on when it's 1:00 am and grades are due by 9, and for always being willing to wind down at Ashley's.

Finally, I thank the University of Michigan Men's Glee Club and the two directors, Eugene Rogers and Mark Stover, under whom I've sung these past eight and a half years. The men of the Glee Club and the music we made together have been both my rock and my joy, and this dissertation is dedicated to them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

The most distinctive feature of Greek epic poetry, especially of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* attributed to Homer, is its highly developed system of epithets that mark out heroic characters and allowed for improvised oral performance. The question of how the epithet system conveys the identities of particular heroes, and of what "identity" means in the context of oral poetry, has generated a great deal of discussion, but some problems have yet to be dealt with. In particular, the leading proposed theories of signification and characterization grapple insufficiently with the need for narrative character development. This dissertation attempts to offer a correction, and to demonstrate how oral-formulaic characterization through repeated tellings of traditional stories is not only compatible with narrative but enriches it.

This dissertation also attempts to demonstrate the Homeric tradition's awareness and deliberate manipulation of the possibilities and limits of oral-formulaic characterization, as well as the afterlife of Homeric characterization and identity in one of the lyric poets, Pindar.

Although chapter 3 contains a brief discussion, by way of example, of some treatments of identity in modern social psychology, the primary method throughout is philological, both internal and comparative. Examples from other poetic traditions in the greater Indo-European language family are used where appropriate.

CHAPTER I

What's in a Name?

§1. Introduction

The relationship between heroic epithet and heroic identity in Homeric epic is already heavily theorized, the paradoxical subject of both broad agreement and deep conflict. It is necessary to begin here, because the disputes about the function of heroic epithet are the ground on which an argument about the historical development of its function(s) must be built. This chapter will begin by outlining the problem before moving on to the broad agreements about the function of noun-epithet formulae, beginning from Milman Parry's contribution. After exploring some of the problems with contemporary theories of signification, it will propose a different framework based on catalogic signification, to be developed in the following chapters.

Since the noun-epithet phrase is the primary means by which heroes and gods are identified to listeners of epic, two major questions present themselves. The first question is, "What is identity in epic?" and the second is, "How does epic poetry indicate or convey that identity?" The first question is what drives the present study, but the two questions are basically inseparable from one another: to ask what epic identity is demands an account of how we know it, and the ways in which the poems impart this information to their audience strongly determine the sorts of things that we can say about them. But this

is no chicken-and-egg problem, because there is a clear order in which these questions must be addressed.

When Diomedes is introduced for the first time in the *Iliad*, the poem assigns him the epithet phrase perhaps most closely associated with him: τῶν αὖθ᾽ ἡγεμόνευε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης (*Il.* 2.563).[1] Its position is rigid in each of its 21 attestations, and therefore especially memorable; only his patronymic is better attested among his characteristic epithets.[2] This is telling the audience something about him and about who he is and, though not a fully unique epithet,[3] it says something particularly about Diomedes in contrast to others. But poetry is tricky stuff, and there are a number of reasons to suspect that the lexical information given by βοὴν ἀγαθὸς does not map neatly or straightforwardly onto Διομήδης. The question that first demands answering, then, is how the noun-epithet phrase does its signifying work. What devices or operations does it employ? Are those devices unique to this mode of signification, or are they used elsewhere in epic poetry?

Once we have sketched out a loose account of *how* the noun-epithet phrase signifies identity, it will be much easier to talk cogently about *what* it signifies and to begin to give an account of what, precisely, Homeric identity is, and to use this conception to refine our understanding of the mechanisms through which the Homeric poems signify it. This is not an infinite exercise in Hegelian dialectic or mystical theology: the identities of literary heroes are textual and cultural constructions whose

---

[1] Homeric quotations depend on West's editions for both the *Iliad* (1998-2000) and the *Odyssey* (2017) when deciding between variations, though I have retained iota subscript for the sake of familiarity.
[2] The patronymic Τυδεΐδης is attested 29 times in the *Iliad* and once in the *Odyssey*. It tends to appear in initial position but can move as far back as the initial syllable of the third foot.
[3] Diomedes shares this epithet phrase with Menelaus, except for a single attestation at *Il.* 24.250: βοὴν ἀγαθόν τε Πολίτην.

structures and parameters are fully amenable to philological excavation and scientific analysis. But the two questions of *how* epic identity is signified and *what* epic identity is are sufficiently intertwined with one another that a responsible exploration demands a certain amount of dialectical back and forth, as refinements to understanding one part of the issue enable further refinements to understanding the other.

In outlining the broad consensus about the noun-epithet formula, it is necessary to begin with Parry not because he is the basis for *all* other contemporary theoretical accounts of epithet and identity, but for two other important reasons. Firstly, any work on the semantic or deictic functions of the noun-epithet formula with respect to heroic identity must respond to Parry's argument that it signifies bare identity in the same way as mere use of the proper name. Secondly, Parry's work has so thoroughly permeated the study of formula and epithet that, though there are still many useful insights to be found in his predecessors and in those scholars who were not persuaded by his work, it is necessary to work past their premises in order to do so. Parry defines a formula as "an expression regularly used, under the same metrical conditions, to express an essential idea" (1928a/1971, p. 13). His definition of "essential idea" is worth scrutinizing: as he later makes clear, what is "essential" for Parry is only the hero's identity conceived as bare differentiation, so that πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς signifies nothing more or less than the unadorned Ἀχιλλεύς would. As later chapters of the present study will show, simple differentiation is a starting point for the discussion of identity in Homer, but it is only a precondition for identity, not its substance.

Parry is not, strictly speaking, wrong in asserting the lack of distinction between the noun-epithet formula and the bare name, but he sought to establish the oral-formulaic

character of Homeric language, and did not delve deeply into the particular modes of signification used in oral poetry. Thus, at first glance, his statement about formulaic signification seems to oppose a view such as that articulated contemporaneously by Maurice Bowra,[4] who views the Homeric poems as products of a single poet and the epithets as chosen by the poet such that they are appropriate to the immediate narrative context. Indeed, Parry does argue against this conception, but he does so by arguing for an alternative definition of "narrative context" wherein the narrative determinant is action rather than manner: the poet must speak of a character doing a particular thing, and there is a finite selection of words that allow him to do so; this effectively redefines "narrative context" as metrical context. What is lost here is the notion of manner: that the use of "swift-footed" connotes particular swiftness on the part of Achilles at the moment of its use. A noun-epithet formula signifies the "essential idea" in that it distinguishes between identities by designating one person and not another, but does not differentiate a character at one moment of the poem from the same character at another.

The Unitarian school, despite its strong disagreements with the determinism to which Parry's conclusions lead, also has a great deal to contribute to a theory of the formula. Continuing to take the early Bowra as paradigmatic of late pre-Parry Unitarianism, he maintains a focus on modes of connotation and foreshadowing typically associated with literate poetry. The poet's use of enjambed οὐλομένην at *Il.* 1.2 is characterized as an act of foreshadowing, but Bowra also notes that the word "is used by Homer of anything disastrous, but particularly of anything wrong" (Bowra 1930, p. 14); this is in fact the primary use of the word in the enjambed position that accounts for 9 of

---

[4] Bowra 1930 is representative of this phase of his thinking, although he later embraced Parry's work and became a defender of oral-traditional rather than singular composition. See Bowra 1952, especially ch. XII.

its 14 attestations. This acknowledgement of the formulaic word's semantic network is crucial for establishing a theory of epithet that goes beyond Parry's "essential idea," since it allows us to argue that the signification of epithet goes beyond lexical definition and may even point away from it entirely. Bowra's argument about moral connotation illustrates this, for indeed the moral repercussions of Achilles's rage end up dominating the poem to a far greater degree than the loss of life alluded to by the lexical sense of οὐλομένην.

The incompleteness of the Unitarian account of formulaic signification lies, then, not in some failure to grasp how the noun-epithet phrase acquires meaning and connotation, but rather in its attributing to an individual poet too great a determinative authority over a semantic complex that is always external to any particular poet, in which meaning must be created in a framework established by poetic tradition. This is not the same thing as the nexus of *linguistic* signification, which is found in the language community at large. In contrast to that, we locate the specifically *poetic* signification of formulae in the subset of the language community that employs and hears these formulae in the context of poetry. This is precisely the account given in the opening chapter of Watkins 1995, wherein he distinguishes between language A in its entirety and A′, the subset of A encompassing only poetic language, arguing that this subset can and should be treated as a language in its own right, susceptible as such to grammatical and lexical analysis and open to comparison with other poetic languages via the Comparative Method.

More recent scholars working in a primarily oral-traditional framework have, for the most part, integrated this view of formulaic signification into their work. Most

notably, this is the basis for John Miles Foley's articulation of "traditional referentiality," a term which encapsulates the ability of traditional formulae to signify beyond the popular lexical meanings of their component words by drawing on the specifically poetic usages of the same formula.[5] Foley's account also incorporates the role of the audience in constructing and recalling traditional meaning, since part of the function of traditional diction is to prime the audience such that they will engage with the performance in a specifically traditional and poetic mode rather than as everyday discourse. In Foley's account, poetic diction is not merely appropriate to the occasion of performance but actually creates the occasion by signaling the manner in which the audience is to receive the work: the rhythms of epic meter and the use of the language particular to epic are signal enough that this language is to be heard as poetry rather than as conversation.

The attempt to study formulaic signification under Homeric language's own terms, insofar as this is possible, does, however force us to confront one of the major methodological hurdles in the study of epithet: that what constitutes a formula is defined by the poetic grammar of the Homeric *Kunstsprache*, and that the literary transmission of the poems and the dearth of material severely limit our ability to reconstruct this grammar and its lexicon of expressions as we would for a living language. In this light, the best working definition of a formula remains that put forward by Hainsworth (1968, p. 19), who makes "mutual expectancy" the litmus test for determining whether an expression is a formulaic or merely coincidental arrangement of words: in particular metrical circumstances, we expect to see a set of words together if we see them at all. This definition has the advantage of not making any particular formulaic element

---

[5] This is outlined most fully in Foley 1999. Ch.1 and ch. 7 are particularly crucial.

determinative: the poet's use of particular combinations of words in particular metrical slots creates the expectation that they will appear together in those slots, preserving the emphasis on the formula as a complete unit. On the other hand, this definition seems to constrain our analysis rather sharply, as it forces us to rely on formulaic echoes within the Homeric corpus to determine whether such "mutual expectancy" can be said to apply: we are left with fundamentally the same mode of ascribing significance that was employed by pre-Parry Unitarians. Although we theorize the nexus of meaning as located in poetic tradition, the determination of which formulae merit analysis *qua* formulae is still made on the basis of surveying a written corpus for multiple attestations. The present study confines the "formula" to Homer—that is, to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, although formulaic language is retained and used in Hesiod and in the Homeric Hymns.

This has not been fatal to the project of formulaics, and nor should it be. The advantage of the concordance approach is its surety: repeated use within the corpus is sure evidence of a phrase's formulaic status. We do not, however, need to limit our analysis to formulae that are absolutely certain, for the oral-formulaic framework affords us other ways of recognizing formulae, albeit with somewhat reduced certainty. Nagy (1974) notes the tendency for metrical irregularities to occur at formulaic boundaries and within fossilized expressions; for him this is the bedrock of an argument that formulaic diction drives metrical development. But even if one finds Nagy's argument unpersuasive, it has long been accepted that phrases exhibiting metrical irregularities merit attention as potentially formulaic even if a lack of repetition does not allow us to establish mutual expectation among their component words. This is easy to see in, for example, Helen's reply to Priam at *Il.* 3.172, which contains two major metrical

irregularities: αἰδοῖός τέ μοί ἐσσι φίλε ἑκυρέ δεινός τε. Here the -ε of φίλε must scan long

owing to the following aspiration making position,[6] and -ε of ἑκυρέ likewise scans long;

historically, these anomalies can be traced to ἑκυρέ being a reflex of earlier *swekure*[7]

and to loss of digamma in δεινός < *dweinos*. There is no other attestation of φίλε ἑκυρέ

in the Homeric corpus—indeed, ἑκυρός appears only three times in any form, and

thereafter is unattested until the third century. Despite this lack of multiple attestation, it

seems clear that at least the second part of the line is very old—since δεινός does not

always make position for the preceding vowel—and was considered worth preserving

intact by the poets in the tradition. When taken together with the narrative contest, this

makes the line a strong candidate for analysis as a full-line formula of address.

     Archaic lyric poetry also affords us a way to hypothesize formulae in the absence

of repetition within the Homeric corpus. West (1973a, p. 191) has convincingly argued

for the presence of an Aeolic tradition of heroic poetry based on the presence of Πέραμος

(Sappho 44.16) and Πέρραμος (Alc. 42.2) in the Lesbian poets when referring to Priam.

The latter of the two is the expected Aeolic equivalent to Πρίαμος,[8] and the former is

plausible as a metrically convenient variant. This is, according to West, evidence that

poetry about the Trojan War was in circulation at least prior to the dialect split between

Aeolic and Ionic. West is not alone in thinking this: Nagy has argued extensively that

---

[6] Initial aspiration, most often a reflex of initial *s-*, can make position if *s-* was part of an initial consonant cluster: definitively attested are reflexes of *sw-*, *sr-*, *sm-*, and *sn-*, the first two of which result in an initial aspiration, either on the vowel or on initial rho. West 1997 provides an extended summary of Homeric metrics and its various anomalies, including examples from each of these clusters. The more extensive discussion of Homeric metrics is found in West 1984.
[7] This development continued, eventually resulting in full loss of aspiration. Teodorsson 1974 (pp. 229–231) describes the "mixed" phonetic situation in the Classical period, during which initial aspiration had begun to disappear from everyday speech but was retained in literary and upper-class speech. Teodorsson 1978 (p. 82) covers the retention of this mixed situation by Hellenistic Koine and the gradual final disappearance of initial /h/.
[8] Attic C-ρι-V : Aeolic C-ερρ-V is the relevant correspondence. See Buck 1928, p. 61.

some formulae in Homeric poetry became fixed before the dactylic hexameter had taken its final form.[9] In his original statement of this argument,[10] Nagy begins from the uncontroversial hypothesis that there exist poetic formulae in Homeric Greek that took shape prior to the separation of Greek from other Indo-European languages, citing the reconstruction of *$\acute{k}lewos\ \d{n}d^hg^{wh}itom$ from Gk. κλέος ἄφθιτον[11] and Ved. *śráva(s) ákṣitaṃ*.[12] On this basis, and on the firmly established basis that the Aeolic meters predate the dactylic hexameter, he argues that some formulae in Greek poetry took place before the firm establishment of the hexameter, and were adapted into parallel formulae by divergent lyric and epic traditions; he produces a parallel list of formulae from epic and lyric, where the lyric formulae seem at first glance to be epic formulae reduced by the length of a short and the final long with *brevis in longo*. Nagy's argument, however, is that this list shows line-final formulae in parallel development rather than outright borrowings.

Whether Nagy's list represents actual instances of such development or whether some of its items were conscious or unconscious borrowings is of secondary importance. Its primary contribution is that it lends a great deal of plausibility to West's hypothesis of a parallel tradition of Aeolic heroic verse. In this light, it is possible to expand the list of possible formulae by parallel examination of archaic epic and lyric poetry and noting formulaic parallels on both lexical and semantic levels. Of course, given the later dates of

---

[9] See, among others, Nagy 1990a (ch. 1), 1990b (ch. 2), and 1998. The centrality of the spoken formula also underlies much of Nagy's other work, e.g. the argument in Nagy 1996 (p.131) about melodically preserved accentuation patterns.

[10] Nagy 1974. The bulk of the argument is contained in ch. 5.

[11] This is widely regarded as formulaic because of the reconstruction, but see Finkelberg 1986 *contra*.

[12] This is a representation of convenience for comparative purposes. The phrase itself will appear quite differently in context due to Sanskrit's extensive morphophonological rules ("sandhi"): for example, the nominative would be *śrávo 'kṣitam*. See Jamison 2008, pp. 10–13 for a complete description of Sanskrit sandhi rules.

the lyric poets and the panhellenic character of the Homeric poems, a certain portion of these will be borrowings from epic into lyric. Borrowing, however, is less likely than it might appear at first glance. Sappho fr. 44 is, as Nagy shows, filled with line-final nominal forms and prepositional phrases that seem to be truncated versions of line-final hexameter formulae: compare κλέος ἄρθιτον (Sapph. 44.4) and κλέος ἄρθιτον ἔσται (*Il.* 9.413), or ἅλμυρον (Sapph. 44.7) and ἁλμυρὸν ὕδωρ (*Od.* 4.511). But it is clear that Sappho did not merely truncate epic forms here: many of her line endings in 44 have the shape $|\breve{} - \breve{}\breve{}|$, and extending these into hexameter endings by adding $|- x|$ would violate Hermann's bridge. This strongly supports a parallel formulaic development, such that significant overlap of the kind documented by Nagy can be evidence in favor of a phrase's formulaic character, even if the phrase is a Homeric *hapax legomenon* without metrical irregularities.

We are not, then, stuck with purely literary-based methods for determining which phrases might merit investigation as formulae. Specifically, the oral-formulaic hypothesis allows us to recognize that there is a life for the formula outside of Homeric poetry and to adjust the scope of our investigation accordingly. It also demands that theorizing about oral-formulaic language account not only for its functions in epic but also for the ways in which it underlies or structures the later poetic genres that descend closely from oral poetry but have become partly literary traditions.

This is not a demand that oral poetics be theorized only through a general theory of poetics as such, but rather an observation that theorizing oral poetics in a literate society necessarily entails a historicizing approach. Historicizing is precisely where contemporary Homeric scholarship has not pursued all of the lines of inquiry open to it,

since scholarship on epithet in a post-Parry world has largely concerned itself with the ways in which formula in general and epithet in particular signify in the context of the poems *as we have them*. As evident from the preceding discussion, this has been an enormously fruitful line of inquiry that has done much to increase our understanding of the Homeric poems both as they were understood by contemporary audiences and as they were received by classical and Hellenistic successors. Nonetheless, treatments of the formulaic system from a fully diachronic perspective are noticeably lacking. Much of this lack stems, to be sure, from the difficulty of the enterprise, and much else from the desire to reckon with the cataclysm wrought by Parry and Lord on theories of signification that assumed a literate basis for Greek epic. Nonetheless, we deny ourselves a full understanding of how epic signifies if we do not also ask how it *comes* to signify, and that is the gap that the present study wishes to help fill.

This is not to say, however, that scholarship that takes a diachronic approach to formulaics has been entirely lacking. Hoekstra (1965) offered an early study of the diachronic development of formulaic language. Watkins's "contribution to the theory of formula," as he characterizes it (Watkins 1995, p. 293), brought the use of comparative linguistics in studying poetry to the attention of a much wider audience of classical scholars, and both Nagy and West have, as noted in the preceding discussion, advanced theories concerning the development of formulaic systems in lyric genres as well as epic. In addition, scholars working on the history and development of the dactylic hexameter have contributed a good deal to diachronic treatment of the formula: the contribution of Nils Berg (1978) is especially notable.

One of the problems in historical metrics that continues to raise some of the most interesting issues of formulaic development and signification is the question of the scansion of ἀνδροτῆτα, which famously scans with an initial short syllable, since applying standard scansion rules would produce | – ⏑ – ⏑ |, which is strictly prohibited in any part of the hexameter line. The standard historical solution to this problem remains the most widely accepted one, though its detractors are numerous and significant enough that it should not be characterized as the *communis opinio*. Briefly, it traces ἀνδροτῆτα back to a Proto-Greek *anṛtāta*, with *ṛ* acting as a vocalic resonant allowing the initial *a* to be read as a light syllable; the sound changes involved are all well established.[13] The major objection to this solution is that it would require that the formula ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην[14] have been established at its line-final place in the poem during the Proto-Greek phase of the language or very nearly after it: as noted above, vowel epenthesis beside syllabic resonants had already taken place even at the time of the earliest Mycenaean texts. The solution also requires that the meter have reached something resembling its current form at a similarly early point, which is incompatible with the evidence from Mycenaean, as Myc. Gk. *-kʷe* (transcribed *-qe*) is the only attested form of the connecting particle in the inscription evidence. Finally, the derivational morphology hypothesized by this solution is extremely unusual in Greek: *-tāt-* is a highly productive suffix that makes abstract nouns out of adjectives, but this solution requires that it be added directly onto a root noun, which would make ἄνδροτῆτα a unique formation. This is theoretically possible, but it seems very unlikely.

---

[13] *-ṛ-* > *-ro-* is regular in both Mycenaean and Aeolic, and both dialects, along with Ionic, developed a stop between nasals and *ṛ*, with the stop's placement determined by the nature of the nasal. See Sihler 1995, pp. 92–94 for the relevant historical grammatical data and a full explanation of the sound changes.
[14] Twice attested: *Il.* 16.857 and *Il.* 22.363.

12

Eva Tichy (1981) shares these objections, and she offers her solution in the course of supporting Nils Berg's (1978) proposed hypothesis about the origin of the dactylic hexameter. Tichy does not contest the reconstruction of *anṛtāta* as the original form of ἀνδροτῆτα nor that its original scansion would fit, but suggests rather that the ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην formula fits perfectly into the Pherecratean meter proposed by Berg as the original second segment of a two-part combination that evolved into the modern dactylic hexameter. This answers the objection about time, allowing for and indeed relying on the fact that the Aeolic meters predate the dactylic hexameter and are likely to have played a role in its formation.[15] The most serious objection is that this still does not account for the apparent derivational uniqueness of the form. In addition, it requires that the ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην formula be fully preserved as a unique stem formation in a section of the poem whose "age" is a complicated question, as it seems to have been imported and rewritten from unattested portions of the Epic Cycle.[16] The assumed antiquity of a unique formula without any evidence of further variation or analogy still seems to vitiate her proposal.

A third solution is suggested by Timothy Barnes (2011) along comparative lines. Observing the weaknesses in both the traditional account and Tichy's, he proposes that ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην is actually modeled on an older and unattested *ἀμ(β)ροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην. The argument is somewhat involved, but he locates a parallel in the Avestan dvandva compound *hauruuātā amərətātā* "wholeness (and) not-dying," as well as several semantic cognates in traditional prayers throughout the Indo-European world, including

---

[15] This is one of the relatively few topics in the study of epic on which West (1973a, 1973b, 1984) and Nagy (1974, 1998) have never seriously disagreed, though they do disagree sharply on which lyric meters form the basis for the hexameter and by what process this occurred.

[16] Mühlstein 1972 further complicates the question by arguing that Euphorbus is a doublet for Paris; Janko 1992 (p. 412) agrees. But see Nickel 2002 for a critical view of Mühlstein's proposal.

Sanskrit, Luwian, Latin, and Umbrian. He renders *ἀμ(β)ροτῆτα and its cognates as "not-dying" rather than "immortality" because the imprecatory contexts present both elements of the posited formula as requests made of divinities that the speaker be healthy and preserved from death, in much the same way that a Christian praying the Lord's Prayer asks for "daily bread." He hypothesizes that ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην was introduced as a variation on this sort of imprecatory formula. This neatly solves the problems of the line's necessary age and historical scansion, since it does not need to contend with the problem of pre-Mycenaean sound changes, and also solves the problem of derivational morphology, since the hypothesized original is a perfectly regular *-tāt- formation with an adjective. The account is, however, weak in its reliance on an unattested formula, since the proposed formula has only semantic and not direct cognates anywhere.

These three proposed solutions are not the only options available, and each has both merits and flaws. All three, however, help to demonstrate and confirm one of the most fundamental assumptions of formulaics, which is the tendency of a formula to remain fixed even when further developments in its poetic environment render it unsuitable: the metrical irregularities created by the loss of digamma are perhaps the most prevalent examples of this phenomenon. This tendency toward fixity is what led to Adalbert Kuhn's ability to discover the famous cognate relationship between κλέος ἄφθιτον and *śráva(s) ákṣitam*, and also leads scholars like Foley and Nagy to contend that the unit of poetic composition for Greek epic is the formula rather than the word. Indeed, Foley goes so far as to argue that ἔπος, like Serbian *reč*, denotes units of meaning rather than units of speech, and can thus refer to units of highly variable length, ranging from a single word to several lines of a type-scene, especially if those lines are never

found apart from one another. In confirming the principle of fixity, each of these proposed solutions to the ἀνδροτῆτα problem also illuminates the ways in which a formula's developmental history is essential for discussing its modes and manners of signification.

This diachronic study of formulaics also offers the potential for filling in another notable gap, which is that between the hypothesized early form(s) of Greek epic and the formulaic system of the Homeric poems, with its high degree of flexibility and highly economical and rich forms of signification. How, in other words, does the network of associations that forms the nexus of formulaic meaning come to be constructed, and in the case of heroic and godly identity, what precisely does that meaning point toward? These questions concern such abstractions as a "nexus of meaning" and a "network of associations," but these associations are accumulated through a historical process, and if we are to understand the important formulae, particularly those having to do with the identities of major characters, then we must, as far as we are able, investigate the history of those formulae and uncover the processes through which their meaning was accumulated.

§2. Epithet and Identity

The formation of epithet is intimately tied up with the formation of heroic identity, because heroic identity is itself a textually-constituted phenomenon in the Homeric poems. It must, however, be stressed that this claim is restricted to heroes *as poetic characters* and says nothing about hero cult, nor about the other religious aspects of heroic identity available to us through archaeological and later textual sources. This restriction also entails the expansion of "heroic identity" to encompass divine identity, as

the forms used to denote these identities overlap quite heavily, though certain forms of address (e.g. the prayer and hymnic forms, discussed below) are confined to divine characters. Having made this qualification, religious language offers the most visible example of epithet constituting a central building block of heroic and divine identity. The discourse of prayer, encompassing both hymnic and rogative modes, is characterized most strongly by its initial lines, which identify the recipient of the prayer through their characteristic epithets and their notable actions or deeds. The prayer of Chryses at the beginning of the *Iliad* is an excellent starting point for this analysis:

> κλῦθί μευ ἀργυρότοξ᾽, ὃς Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας
> Κίλλάν τε ζαθέην Τενέδοιό τε ἶφι ἀνάσσεις,
> Σμινθεῦ· εἴ ποτέ τοι χαρίεντ᾽ ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεψα,
> ἢ εἰ δή ποτέ τοι κατὰ πίονα μηρί᾽ ἔκηα
> ταύρων ἠδ᾽ αἰγῶν, τὸ δέ μοι κρήηνον ἐέλδωρ·
> τείσειαν Δαναοὶ ἐμὰ δάκρυα σοῖσι βέλεσσιν. (*Il.* 1.37–42)
>
> Hear me, Silver-Bow, who holds Chryse
> and sacred Killa and rules in might over Tenedos,
> Sminthean, if ever I set a roof over your gracious temple,
> or if ever I burned for you the fat thighs
> of bulls and goats, fulfill my desire:
> make the Danaäns pay for my tears with your arrows![17]

The identifying material is clustered together in the opening of the prayer: the vocative ἀργυρότοξε immediately designates a single deity, since it is one of the most widely recognized epithets of Apollo, but the line moves immediately into a relative clause designating the god's dominions or cult centers. Importantly, however, this designation is couched in active terms on the part of the god: the poet speaks of where the god *dwells* in terms of what the god *does*. The god is the subject of an active verb in the present tense,

---

[17] All translations outside of direct quotations are my own unless otherwise specified.

but the verb can just as easily be an imperfect or aorist: it depicts action, whether ongoing or completed.

The Homeric Hymns exhibit this pattern as well. In the Hymn to Apollo, the god's signature epithet ἕκατος closes the first line and is followed immediately by a relative clause: "at whom the gods tremble as he goes through the halls of Zeus." Once again the god's attribute is couched in an active verb, this time with the god himself as the object, although the relative pronoun that opens the clause suggests his centrality, and the participle that closes the line and clause cements it. The Hymn to Demeter varies slightly in its opening:

> Δήμητρ᾽ ἠΰκομον, σεμνὴν θεὰν, ἄρχομ᾽ ἀείδειν,
> αὐτὴν ἠδὲ θύγατρα τανύσφυρον, ἣν Ἀιδωνεὺς
> ἥρπαξεν, δῶκεν δὲ βαρύκτυπος εὐρύοπα Ζεύς" (1–3).

> Lovely-haired Demeter, an august goddess, do I begin to sing,
> and her slender-ankled daughter, whom the dweller in Hades
> took, and whom loud-thundering wide-seeing Zeus gave.

Here both Demeter and Persephone receive epithets, but the latter is the object of a following relative clause. The Hymn to Demeter also demonstrates the ability of the relative clause to accept a past-tense verb, in this case an aorist. The second clause also appears to be a relative clause with a suppressed object in parallel construction, although the conventions of hexameter poetry render it unclear: a personal or demonstrative pronoun is equally plausible. Both the Hymn to Apollo and the Hymn to Demeter necessitate a slight revision to the definition of "action" elaborated above: the god can be an object of action as well, but the positioning of pronouns will always center the action on the god. Things done and things undergone seem to be interchangeable, a pattern which holds for the identities of heroes as well, as will be discussed below.

One contention must be addressed at this point: that some post-epithet relative clauses, particularly those in the present tense, are characteristics rather than deeds, and that in this sense they serve the same function as epithets themselves. On the one hand, the ultimate functional identity between epithet and statement of deed is one of the things that this project seeks to prove, but this objection seeks rather to distinguish the post-epithet identifying relative clause as a separate category from the epithet itself, and in doing so, also seeks to distinguish between statements of characteristic and statements of identity. This seems on its face to be a distinction that may be worth making; it is at least one that cannot be immediately written off. Ultimately, however, identity is constructed in Greek heroic poetry, as indeed in Indo-European poetry in general, as a compilation of potential characteristics or attributes, and so the distinction between characteristic and attribute is ultimately meaningless.

§3. Identity and Construction

This constructive basis for identity is not immediately obvious, but it becomes clear through an overview of the scholarship and some textual examples. The work of Calvert Watkins has always taken an interest in the constructive functions of lists, and Watkins observes on multiple occasions[18] that construction—the poetic-rhetorical act of sequentially enumerating component items of an implied or explicit whole—is in fact a primary function of a list in oral poetics. On the most basic level, the enumeration of members combines with temporal-sequential extension to construct a figurative body or unit, whether that unit is an actual integral whole, as in the individual body healed and

[18] See Watkins 1978 on grain terms as merisms, Watkins 1979 on apotropaic kingly utterances and the enumeration of disasters, and Watkins 1995 on, *inter alia*, construction of the body in medical spells (ch. 58), construction and affirmation of kingship in praise poetry (ch. 5, ch. 6), and the construction of post-Archaic Greek heroism in epinician verse (ch. 55).

made whole by an incantation,[19] or an understood collective mass, as in the Catalogue of

Ships. This basic constructive function can, however, be augmented through the use of

various poetic devices, allowing a finite list to point toward a much larger, though

unenumerated, body of members. One of the most common such devices is the merism,

whereby a list of two members constructs those members as opposite poles encompassing

an infinite spectrum of all unstated members that lie between them, as with the English

expression "young and old," or when Cato's farmer implores Mars to keep safe the

pastores pecuaque ("shepherds and cattle") (*De Ag.* 141), which represent the totality of

his slaves, animals, and other so-called movable wealth,[20] or when Zeus's kingship is

expressed by πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, which includes all mortal and immortal beings.

The merism builds upon the constructive function of the list and directs this function

along a spectrum bounded by a pair of traditional opposites in order to construct a full

ecosystem or cosmos by, so to speak, offloading the work of enumeration onto the

imaginations of the audience. This is possible only within an established framework of

traditional referentiality:[21] it is one of the methods whereby the attention of the audience

is drawn past the bare semantics of the formula and directed toward a particular segment

of the body of traditional poetic knowledge and made to perform a particular

poetic/cognitive operation on that body (in this case, assembling a constructive list).

    The merism is, however, only one among many poetic devices capable of

directing such operations, and it is a relatively basic one, as the scope of its referents,

---

[19] The Second Merseburg Charm is a paradigmatic example, and the *Atharvaveda* is rife with healing charms exhibiting this constructive paradigm.

[20] The distinction between movable and immovable wealth is central to most Indo-European oral-poetic traditions and is likely inherited from Proto-Indo-European. See Benveniste 1969, ch. 4.

[21] The account of traditional referentiality here draws most heavily on Foley (1988, 1990, 1999), though its conceptualization as operational instructions carried out on a body of tradition within defined parameters is independently conceived.

while numerically infinite, is a category bounded and defined by both the commonality and the opposition of the two enumerated members. Because of this, its audience requires comparatively little common knowledge in order to make the merism rhetorically effective: while it does point toward a body of traditional knowledge, it is not strictly necessary that the audience be deeply acquainted with or immersed in that body, since the audience does not actually enumerate an infinite set of members, but rather understands them to have been *already* enumerated within the body of tradition, even if the audience members themselves have only a dim view of the specific contents of that body. In the case of πατήρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, one need not have detailed knowledge of the various spirits and minor divinities that populate the Greek imaginative world; the merism is understood to cover both the things the audience knows and the things they don't. More culturally dependent operations, however, can be accomplished without the same rigid constraints of polarity necessitated by the merism, but they require a correspondingly better acquaintance with the body of traditional knowledge. That the epithet system operates in this way, allowing the poet to index the audience's understanding of unstated items in a given hero's characterization in order to create dynamic characterization, is one of the principal arguments of the present study.

It is worth pausing briefly to consider the senses of "tradition" and to be specific about what "poetic tradition" means when talking about Homeric poetry. We can speak somewhat cogently of a broad "Greek poetic tradition" that extends from points unknown in the Archaic period all the way into the Imperial period and even beyond. We can also speak of a tradition of "hexameter poetry" that begins with Homer and extends through Apollonius even, one must concede, across the language barrier into the Latin poets—a

critic who would not put the *Georgics* in the same tradition as the *Works and Days* would need ample justification for separating them. But when talking about the epithet system, "tradition" and "traditional" refer specifically to heroic poetry, a tradition that can be reliably traced back at least to the Mycenaean period.[22] This tradition was expressed to the Homeric audience through highly developed hexameter poetry and, as discussed earlier, perhaps also through some forms of lyric poetry. Poetic tradition for the Homeric audience was primarily the stories they remembered, which they probably heard both informally and formally from a young age, told in the traditional way—that is, in dactylic hexameter with the diction features of heroic poetry, including formulaic language and heroic epithets that mark the subjects of Homeric verse as heroes with deeds worth remembering.

This, then, is the "tradition" that is of primary concern in the present study: the tradition that was experienced by the audience of Homeric poetry, whose knowledge could be primed and indexed in various ways by various poetic devices. The way in which this can happen, however, requires a bit more explication. Returning to the form of the prayer or hymn, it seems clear that Greek precatory forms such as the prayer of Chryses (*Il.* 1.37–42) and Sappho 1, both discussed below, are this sort of more sophisticated traditional-heuristic operation. A deity's epithets and actions are used to construct the deity's identity, but they are understood to be a small portion of the titles and actions that characterize that deity, and implicitly point toward them, though

---

[22] The line-final formula ξίφος ἀργυρόηλον is attested 11 times in the Homeric corpus. Archaeological evidence from Knossos confirms the presence of studded swords in the late bronze age/early Mycenaean period (all of type Di), but such swords had fallen out of use by the time the Pylos tablets were written and deposited (Sandars 1963, p. 127), and Driessen and Macdonald 1984 discuss what these artifacts tell us about the military aspects of late Bronze Age Aegean societies. All of this strongly suggests that "silver-studded" swords were spoken of in heroic verse prior to the composition of the tablets.

arguably with a somewhat looser set of parameters that do not necessitate the same

indexing into a constructive list that the merism demands. This, however, requires the

audience to be positively aware of the existence of other epithets and actions for the

deictic function of the enumerated items to assert itself. But the most interesting

operation is that carried out by the next section of a prayer, wherein the petitioner

reminds the deity of their past relationship, using either past examples of the deity's aid

or past sacrifices or dedications made by the petitioner on the deity's behalf. This section

functions essentially as a single-item list, since its manifest function is to remind the deity

that their relationship with the petitioner (or the petitioner's family, or community, or

other collective on whose behalf the petitioner speaks) is ongoing and reciprocal: even

recalling past incidents of the deity's assistance, with no apparent reason, makes sense in

this context, for the notion of reciprocity is embedded in both sides of the relationship. As

with the merism, the indexing of reciprocity does not actually draw the audience into a

list of concrete reciprocal acts, but rather shows that they are done and already listed: the

actual work of listing has already been accomplished in the body of traditional

knowledge, and the poet need not speak what has already been spoken.

  These various indexing functions are more apparent in demonstration, so it is

useful to return to the prayers studied previously, beginning with the prayer of Chryses.[23]

The deictic function of the initial epithets is augmented by the presence of Ἀπόλλωνι

ἄνακτι in the previous line, and indeed the focalization around the priest points toward

the consciousness of the formula in his own mind as well as those of the poet and

---

[23] See p. 16 *supra*.

audience:[24] his awareness of tradition primes the awareness of his audience. The specificity of the places which Apollo holds also points toward other actions and in particular other cult sites, since Apollo holds the most famous panhellenic sanctuary of all. But this demonstrates the increased cultural knowledge required for these poetic operations: both a modern classicist and an ancient listener would be aware of the importance of Delphi, but one would not necessarily expect this prayer to resonate in the same way for a first-year undergraduate or an ancient envoy from Phoenicia. The prayer goes on to remind the deity of Chryses's having built beautiful temples and offered worthy sacrifices, and in doing so indexes a life spent in the service of the god. The repeated εἰ ποτέ τοι of lines 39 and 40 further confirms the indexing function of the prayer by confirming that this is not direct tit-for-tat: Chryses is asking for help not based on particular incidents, but based on a long-established relationship whose actions he prompts both the god and the audience to recall.

Sappho 1 is slightly more complex owing to its status as a literate poem, but nonetheless exhibits the same basic operational features, since these function on a listening audience responding to traditional language, regardless of whether the language is employed by a poet with the aid of writing. The initial ποικιλόθρονος ("with adorned throne") in particular must necessarily call to mind the existence of other epithets for the goddess, since the word is a *hapax legomenon* and likely would have been used infrequently or not at all. The other major epithet, δολόπλοκε ("weaver of deception"), is also *hapax* until the Imperial era, but it notably has the shape of a hexameter epithet, so

---

[24] De Jong 1987 is the standard work on focalization in the *Iliad* and its implications for character, and De Jong 2014 is a general overview of focalization and other narratological tools and their applicability to classical texts.

we cannot discount a possible, though unattested, epic origin for the word. Indeed, Sappho's familiarity with oral epic is further demonstrated in the highly elaborate invocation of reciprocity that takes up most of the remaining lines, reaching its apex in the penultimate stanza:

> καὶ γὰρ αἰ φεύγει, ταχέως διώξει,
> αἰ δὲ δῶρα μὴ δέκετ᾽ ἀλλὰ δώσει,
> αἰ δὲ μὴ φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει
>   κωὐκ ἐθέλοισα. (Fr. 1, 21–24)

> For if she flees, soon she will pursue,
> and if she refuses gifts, she will offer them,
> and if she does not love, she will love,
>   however unwilling she be.

Sappho has already constructed the relationship between herself and Aphrodite, but here the reciprocity of the petitioner/deity relationship is echoed in the reciprocity that Aphrodite will impose on the object of Sappho's affections. The reciprocating goddess makes Sappho into her miniature: it is Sappho who will now be pursued and petitioned for favors and given gifts, which lends Sappho's request the legitimacy of a natural order, since reciprocity between worshipper and deity is a foundational assumption shared by the poet's audience.[25]

As noted earlier, the poem's lyric and literate origins complicate any discussion of its use of oral-poetic formulaic operations. Scholarship in the 20th and 21st centuries is, however, broadly in agreement about the poet's acquaintance with the oral-formulaic tradition and her deliberate play on the tropes and language of archaic epic.[26] Some go even further, arguing that Sappho, at least in some poems, makes use of a parallel

---

[25] See Burkert 1985 (p. 73) and Price 1999 (pp. 34–39) on reciprocity.
[26] Even the somewhat conservative Denys Page (1955) notes her use of epic trope and adaptations of formula, even noting "a very small residue of pieces which admit features characteristic of the Epic dialect" (p. 65).

repertoire of oral formulae specifically suited to the Aeolic lyric meters.[27] Whether Sappho's poetry makes direct use of an Aeolic formulaic repertoire, and to what extent, remains up for debate. The existence of such a repertoire, however, is strongly supported by the philological evidence, as noted earlier, and therefore support for Sappho's knowledge of that tradition and repertoire is almost equally strong. What we have in Sappho, then, is a literate poet with deep knowledge of the manipulation of oral poetic techniques and formulaics. Her metrical allusion to the shape of hexametric epithet allows her to borrow the indexing technique of the epic precatory form, constructing the god's identity partly on the basis of her pre-existing relationship with the deity. But she goes further, turning the precatory form back on itself so that she becomes Aphrodite in miniature. That Sappho is able to do this bespeaks a poetic self-consciousness about the operations of oral tradition and opens up the possibility that this self-consciousness may not be individual but inherent, or at least latent, within the tradition. Lyric poetry's conscious appropriation of epic modes of identity construction will be explored through the example of Pindar in chapter 4.

But it is not only Greek poets who use constructive lists as the basis for establishing the identity of deities. Perhaps the most canonical hymn to Indra uses precisely this principle for the first part of the poem, when addressing the god:

> 1   *índrasya nú vīryā̀ṇi prá vocaṃ yā́ni cakā́ra prathamā́ni vajrī́*
>   *áhann áhim ánv apás tatarda prá vakṣáṇā abhinat párvatānām*
> 2   *áhann áhim párvate śiśriyāṇáṃ tváṣṭāsmai vájraṃ svaryàṃ tatakṣa*
>   *vāśrā́ iva dhenávaḥ syándamānā áñjaḥ samudrám áva jagmur ā́paḥ*
> 3   *vṛṣāyámāṇo 'vṛṇīta sómaṃ tríkadrukeṣv apibat sutásya*
>   *ā́ sā́yakam maghávādatta vájram áhann enam prathamajā́m áhīnām*
> 4   *yád indráhan prathamajā́m áhīnām ā́n māyínām ámināḥ prótá māyā́ḥ*
>   *ā́t sū́ryaṃ janáyan dyā́m uṣásam tādī́tnā śátruṃ ná kílā vivitse (RV 1.32.1–4)*

---

[27] Nagy (1974) is the primary proponent of this view, and it has been influential through both him and his students, though it is not widely shared outside the United States.

I will proclaim the manly deeds of Indra, foremost which the thunderer did:
He smashed the serpent; he bored through to the waters; he split the stomach of the
    mountains.
He smashed the serpent resting in the mountains: Tvaṣṭar made for him the
    resounding *vajra*.
Like bellowing cows, flowing out, the waters went down to the sea.
As a bull he chose the soma and drank of it among the Trikadrukas.
The generous one took up the *vajra* as a missile and smashed him, firstborn of
    serpents.
When you, Indra, smashed the firstborn of serpents and tricked the tricks of the
    tricksters,
then, birthing the sun and the sky and the dawn, since then surely you have not found
    a rival.

The form is quite straightforward: the hymn names its subject, summarizes his deeds, and

then elaborates on the myth in question, in this case the slaying of the serpent Vṛtra and

releasing the dawn-cattle and the waters of the rivers. Indra's name is in the highly

emphatic initial position of the first half-verse, and the subject matter is precisely his

vīryā̀ṇi: the "manly deeds" through which the audience will learn who and what Indra is.

The hymn indexes these deeds in the first line and goes on to list a representative sample

of them; it is clear that Indra's identity as a heroic deity is constructed on the basis of this

list of deeds; they are in a very real sense its substance. As we will see, for Greek heroes

such a list is presumed: not only is identity in Greek epic constructed of multiple parts by

default, but it is the list of deeds, accomplishments, and poetically-defined characteristics

that forms the substance of the heroic portion of their identities—the portion that makes

them worth talking about in formulaic epithet-laden language in the first place.

Both the prayer of Chryses and the precatory lyric of Sappho demonstrate he

constructive principle at work in constructing the identities of deities, and the Vedic

example suggests that this principle is at work in multiple Indo-European traditions, but it

remains to demonstrate that principle in the identities of mortal heroes. Thankfully,

Odyssey book 8 provides a nearly ideal example of this principle in action, when

Alcinous questions Odysseus about his identity in list form:

> εἴπ᾽ ὄνομ᾽ ὅττι σε κεῖθι κάλεον μήτηρ τε πατήρ τε
> ἄλλοι θ᾽ οἵ κατὰ ἄστυ καὶ οἳ περιναιετάουσιν.
> οὐ μὲν γάρ τις πάμπαν ἀνώνυμός ἐστ᾽ ἀνθρώπων,
> οὐ κακὸς οὐδὲ μὲν ἐσθλός, ἐπὴν τὰ πρῶτα γένηται,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἐπὶ πᾶσι τίθενται, ἐπεί κε τέκωσι, τοκῆες.
> εἰπὲ δέ μοι γαῖάν τε τεὴν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε (*Od.* 8.550–555)

> Tell me what name they called you there, your mother and your father
> and the others in town and those living around it.
> For no one among men is entirely nameless,
> not the base and not the noble, once they are born,
> but parents, once they have birthed them, give names to all.
> And tell me your land, and your people, and your city…

Alcinous continues for a further 36 lines, but the question very clearly expects an answer,

and the principles of parallel composition would seem to demand that the king's speech

be answered in the order and manner in which it was given.[28] The multipart question

confirms that Homeric identity is itself multipart: a minimally complete account of

someone's identity is already a list encompassing name, parentage, and homeland.

Odysseus follows through on answering the question, and he answers in clear list format,

but adds something extra by introducing the heroic dimension of his identity, the deeds

and sufferings and stories that make him more than an ordinary person. His statement of

his identity opens with two fascinating lines: εἰμ᾽ Ὀδυσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν

/ ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει (*Od.* IX 19–20).[29] He is Odysseus, and he

is known to all men for his acts of deception: the poem points directly and

unambiguously to an unspoken list of the deeds of Odysseus that is known to both his

audience and the poet's, and it is *on the basis of the items in this list* that Odysseus is

---

[28] Lohmann 1970 is the definitive account of the social etiquette of questions and answers in the *Iliad*.
[29] I am Odysseus the son of Laertes, known to all men for my wiles, and my fame reaches heaven.

known to all people and, presumably, to his Phaeacian listeners. There is precious little room for equivocation on this point: he is not known on the basis of any single thing he did, but precisely on the basis of the totality of the list, and the unstated but unmistakably present listing of those accomplishments confirms his identity via construction. This is further supported by the rest of the question and answer: Alcinous's question format suggests construction as the basis for Odysseus's identity, and Odysseus's answer supplies the requested elements as part of the confirmation.

As it happens, the question of how the noun-epithet formula signifies is also a multi-part question, and specifically a bipartite one: it encompasses both "How does the internal structure and performance context of the poems enable the noun-epithet formula to signify beyond their lexical-semantic content?" and "Are there internal poetic features that suggest how this hyper-signification was able to develop?" The first of these questions has a well-developed answer, worked out most fully in the scholarship of John Miles Foley. The process through which epic language hyper-signifies is one that Foley and subsequent scholars have called "traditional referentiality." It functions not only because of the formal features of the poems, but also because repeat performances of both the Homeric poems and other poetry in the epic cycle ensure that the audience hears formulaic phrases, lines, and scenes in a variety of poetic contexts.

But Odysseus's confirmation of his own identity on the basis of *unstated* deeds that are nonetheless made present by the indexing function of his language demands some revision to Foley's theory, as well as the related theories of heroic epithet signification such as "epithet as epiphany" as elaborated by Bakker (1997). Specifically, both Foley and Bakker, as well as other similar theories of identity and signification,

fundamentally agree with Parry's contention that a noun-epithet formula for the name of a hero signifies an "essential idea," which both read as the totality of the hero's identity. For Foley this is achieved via traditional referentiality: the noun-epithet formula refers to the entire body of traditional associations with that hero. Bakker prefers to discuss the noun-epithet formula as an epiphany, wherein a hero is presented not as a character with a distinctive chronology but as a mythic whole. "Instead of ascribing a property to an absent referent, noun-epithet formulas make this absent referent present, in its most characteristic form, to the here and now of the performance, as an essential piece of the universe of discourse shared between the performer and his audience" (1997, p. 161). This would be pretty as a metaphor; it is nonsense as poetics. An epic hero's mode of presence to the audience is narrative, but Bakker's account totally avoids confronting the Homeric poems as narrative works and all but vacates the semantic content of the epithet, both of which problems it shares with Foley's account.

To confront the poems as narrative means that, at the most basic level, one must begin from the assumption that the poems are narrative works that tell a self-contained story. They are many other things as well, but they concern events with an established temporal succession and characters who end the poem much changed from how they began it. This is the dimension for which Foley and Bakker do not fully account. In positing a universalized hero made present by characteristic epic discourse, Bakker's account leaves listeners with heroes who remain unchanging throughout the succession of narrative events. If "uttering the [noun-epithet] phrase is a summoning to the present of the Odysseus or Athene of all moments" (*Ibid.*), then what are we to make of the narrative progression of the *Odyssey*? Despite the narrative complexities presented by

Odysseus's assuming the role of poet, the *Odyssey* remains a narrative whole through which the character of Odysseus moves, altering his relationships with various gods and mortals along the way and moving from a liminal, precarious position back into a place at the center of his household and society. A gestalt myth-figure laden with all his various characterizations is fundamentally non-narrative, and is in this sense self-obliterating: the "he" who has done the things that give the myth-figure his referentiality must be a narrative figure who underwent change, but this person cannot be the same as the hero "of all moments" whom Bakker's account would conjure out of the realm of poetic noumena by the incantatory power of the formula: this myth-figure has already done and already been changed and will not suffer the events of the narrative. In this sense, Bakker's account ruptures the connection between myth-figure and character and destroys the coherence of the referentiality that it claims to rely on.

Foley's account fares no better than Bakker's, for Bakker makes explicit the necessary consequences of Foley's conception of traditional referentiality. If traditional referentiality is without constraints and links together all versions of the hero "in all their complexity, not merely in one given situation or even poem but against an enormously larger traditional backdrop" (Foley 1999, p. 18), then the polyvalent signaling attributed to the formula by Foley is fatally undermined, for by indexing an "entire" hero on every occasion, the formula becomes, ironically, strictly monovalent, depicting always the same "entire" hero and drawing its meaning not from its immediate context, but from all contexts. If, as Foley states early on, "oral tradition works like language, only more so" (*Ibid.,* p. xii), then it hardly makes sense to utterly abandon context as a determinant for semantics. Less glibly, the scholarly approach which treats poetics as a subset of

language has been outlined quite clearly in the first section of Watkins 1995, and Watkins's numerous readings make quite clear that context is *not* to be abandoned if we are to treat poetic language as a subset of language.

In the end, the collapse of polyvalence engendered by an unrestricted view of referentiality amounts to vacating the semantic value of the formula in narrative. There *must* be restrictions on referentiality if it is to be a coherent mode of signification, and an account in which signification functions as a bridge between text and agglomerated heroic archetype must be characterized as an unrestricted referentiality. In addition to dramatically reducing the role of context to the point of near elimination, it also empties the semantics of the epithet itself. This is, of course, difficult territory: we must not ascribe an unnecessary level of purpose to a class of words whose primary reason for appearing where they do is their metrical value. But a lack of poetic choice does not necessarily amount to semantic identity: the fact that a hero is signified by multiple epithets does not mean that each signifies in the same way. Neither Foley nor Bakker, however, allows for such variations, because a referentiality in which the referent is the hero *in se* cannot admit a restriction that would isolate the hero's mythic "future" from their "past," and indeed we should not assume that those two are rigorously distinguished by an audience who has heard the stories before:[30] the audience must be assumed to be a knowing one in order for referentiality to function at all. But reconceptualizing the object of referentiality may yield a more useful framework for analysis which retains the

---

[30] Indeed, the *Iliad* itself is aware of the futures and pasts of its heroes, as its structure famously telescopes both the beginning and end of the war, particularly in the Teichoskopia and in the outcomes of the funeral games for Patroclus. See, *inter alia*, Jamison 1994 on the Teichoskopia and the commentary in Richardson 1993 on book 23.

benefits of Foley's observations about the location of the nexus of meaning while allowing for closer attention to character as located within and formed by narrative.

§4. The List as Referential Object

In reconceiving traditional referentiality as pointing toward a list rather than an identity, it is important to note what remains of Foley's framework, which is to say, a great deal. The location of the referenced object in tradition rather than in an intratextual space remains, and even the unconstrained nature of the referential operation *in se* is preserved, even as this change allows for a much more harmonious integration of identity with narrative. The key to this lies in Odysseus's reply to the query of Alcinous discussed above. The deliberate indexing of an unspoken list of his deceptions means that a number of the elements which constitute his identity are left undetermined: the process of construction is completed among the audience members at the moment of reception. There are no direct constraints on the ways in which Odysseus's Phaeacian audience will fill out the remainder of the list that constitutes his identity, but there are a number of circumstantial factors that may affect which elements are incorporated. The most relevant in this context is the narrative moment, for Odysseus has just accomplished a characteristically Odyssean act of deception and brought his audience to a point of anagnorisis. Part and parcel of this context is their knowledge of his history, since Demodocus has just sung the *nostoi* of the Achaeans. The moment is quintessentially metapoetic, and has been read as such by many generations of scholars. Here it fulfills that function again, for it explicates within the poem's narrative the process by which the poem, through traditional referentiality, directs its audience toward the tools needed to construct and re-construct heroic identity over the course of listening to a narrative poem.

The first element of Odysseus's answer is his name, and the presence of the name (or a suitable substitute such as a patronymic) in the noun-epithet formula is vital to the traditional-referential function. This is not readily apparent in Foley's account or in those accounts which draw on his, such as Nagy 1999 and, as already noted, Bakker 1997: indeed, much of Foley's argument centers on the need to view the entire phrase (ἔπος) as a single compositional unit. There is, however, no necessary reason given beyond "tradition" why, at least for characters, the heroic name alone does not suffice for traditional referentiality. Here the name functions as the determinative that governs what list of characteristics will be indexed by the formula: these are the characteristics connected to that name both textually, through widespread use, and semantically, through association in both verbal and non-verbal media. It is crucial to understand, as noted earlier, that the indexing function encompasses any item that falls within definite parameters, but that those items themselves may be definite or determined to varying degrees, depending on the audience: some items may be definite epithets, while others may be defined only by semantic value, and still others may be traditional visual iconography that is not readily susceptible to verbalization.

The second element of Odysseus's answer is his patronymic epithet, and this points directly to the question of whether or not the heroic name is sufficient for traditional referentiality. If the function of traditional referentiality is to index characteristics rather than a unified identity, then the answer must be no: the presence of epithets is necessarily constitutive of the indexing process, since epithets which would appear as definite indexed items would only be so indexed because of their appearance with the name elsewhere in the oral-poetic corpus. It is epithets, and in particular those

which Parry classifies as unique or distinctive epithets, which form the core of the entire

traditional referentiality system. That said, the presence of unique epithets allows generic

epithets to carry the indexing function as well, provided that they are paired with an

appropriate constraining noun: it is the phrase as a full unit that prompts the indexing of

characteristics, not necessarily any individual element in it. This is most evident in the

final line of the proem to the *Iliad*, which names the two contenders for honor: Ἀτρεΐδης

τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (*Il.* 1.7). In this case, we find a patronymic epithet for

Agamemnon in line-initial position, but its meaning is unclear because it is one of the few

epithets that are distinct but not unique.[31] It is not, in this case, sufficient to fully define

the parameters of the traditional-referential indexing function: the remaining definition is

supplied by ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, which is entirely unique to Agamemnon and thus completes

the nominal function of the patronymic, allowing the indexing only of those

characteristics associated with Agamemnon. By contrast, the formula for Achilles that

completes the line consists of a generic epithet paired with a name. The two names are,

however, clearly in parallel construction: the deferral of the dual subject to the end of the

sentence and the use of formulaic constructions that take up the entire line necessitate that

the names be read either as a unit or in exact parallel with one another.[32] Given this,

---

[31] It is, however, far more characteristic of Agamemnon than of Menelaus. It is used of Menelaus 29 times in the entire corpus, always with his name, but it forms an irreducible part of Menelaus's full-line address formula: Ἀτρεΐδη Μενέλαε διοτρεφές, ὄρχαμε λαῶν—the formula rests on the first foot, while the bucolic diaresis marks a point where the formula can be truncated, as at *Od.* 4.235: Ἀτρεΐδη Μενέλαε διοτρεφές, ἠδὲ καὶ οἴδε.

[32] This is not an attempt to take a definite position on the question of Homeric authorship, as the necessity for reading the two in parallel and the manifest intentionality of the construction are evident whether one posits a single poet (cf. Janko 1992; Čolaković 2007; West 2011), a collective poetic tradition without distinguished individual contributors (cf. Foley 1990; Nagy 1996), or anything in between. An author composing with the aid of writing, as in West's account, would be able to place the clause carefully with the benefit of review, and a primarily oral author, whether dictating or performing, still has the ability to choose formulae that fit various line spaces: it is the choice to fill the line here that dictates the particular formulae employed; this holds even more true for a "post-traditional" Homer of the sort advocated by Čolaković. One cannot make an argument about choice if one's framework necessitates anonymous

whatever theory of epithet signification we propose, we must posit the noun-epithet formula for Achilles as signifying in the same way as the more distinctive formula for Agamemnon, demonstrating not only the potential for formulae built from generic epithets to signify in the same way as those built from unique epithets, but the necessity of their doing so for the formulaic system to function, since a disparity in signification would obviate the plain sense of the parallel construction that the poem displays here and elsewhere.

If a generic epithet and a unique epithet cannot signify in the same way, then a poet is bound only to certain modes of signification at certain points in the line thanks to the system's strong tendency toward economy: when the only choice available is a formula built on a generic epithet, the modes proper to the unique epithets are foreclosed. This is nonsensical from both a Unitarian and strict Oralist perspective: the Unitarians' single author is a poet of sufficient skill, they have repeatedly emphasized, that he employs the oral-poetic system to say exactly what he wishes, when he wishes it. The Oralists, by contrast, emphasize the richness of the system itself and its ability to furnish tools for composing on any traditional theme, and such a disparity would transform Homeric economy into a serious deficiency in the entire system. At the stage of development in which the oral-poetic system comes down to us, it appears nearly certain that, though the existence of unique epithets is integral to the functioning of the traditional-referential system, there is no necessity that they be used in a particular instance.

---

tradition as the primary "author." In such a case, the point about parallel construction as a dual subject suffices to show that the two formulae signify together and/or in parallel.

So far, Odysseus's reply has furnished instances of the general components of a noun-epithet formula in its primary mode of signification (i.e. heroic identity), but the material which follows demonstrates in detail how that signification functions: the πᾶσι δόλοισιν occasions an enjambment, which gives additional weight to the completion of the reply with ἀνθρώποισι μέλω, and καί μευ κλέος οὐρανὸν ἵκει fills out the remainder of the line by elaborating on what has just been said. It is not at all necessary for Odysseus to say this, but the moment of anagnorisis provides occasion for a detailed and extended elaboration of his identity: in this case, he explicates the indexing of his deeds and reasserts his heroic status by noting their fame. As discussed above, this is a kind of composite mode of identity construction: he has given his name and included definite elements like his patronymic, but the remainder of his identity is indexed as the δόλοι that his Phaeacian audience will fill in. This renders a portion of his identity fluid and open to being shaped by the context in which he finds himself: in this case, one might surmise that the anagnorisis combined with the recent exposition of the *nostoi* of the Achaeans would emphasize his craft and tenacity in the minds of his audience, but this is ultimately, at this narrative moment, an identity construction that takes place in each member of his audience. Should they continue to tell this story, the narrative context in which they place the anagnorisis will contribute to a collectively held and relatively stable identity for the hero.

This stability is not, however, the same sort of stability that the heroic identity enjoys under Foley's and Bakker's readings. In this case, Odysseus's stable identity will be the result of its tending to be constructed in similar ways at similar moments: the incidents leading up to his revelation will settle into a relatively stable order and be

conveyed in language already familiar from other feast scenes in other poems, and the audience's individual pictures of him will begin to overlap heavily, as each will have heard the same stories. This does not, however, amount to a unified static identity, but rather an identity that is continually reconstructed along lines dictated by patterns of narrative that become traditional: the portion of his own identity that he leaves deliberately open will be filled anew again and again with similar characteristics every time he opens it up. This is a mode of constructing identity that easily settles into familiar patterns, but also remains forever open to innovations in the tradition, which is a necessary precondition if "tradition" is to have any meaning at all.

This fundamental mutability is perhaps the most important fruit of re-orienting traditional referentiality as an indexing function rather than a straightforwardly deictic one, particularly in light of the ongoing controversy over the meaning of Homeric "tradition" and the extent to which Homer, if the Unitarian camp is to be believed, can be considered a "traditional" poet at all. In some cases it is difficult to know the extent to which characterizations in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are fully "traditional," and this does not even begin to account for the necessary polyvalence of the notion of "tradition" itself. The character of Diomedes is a particularly good case study here: his Homeric reputation as both an extremely capable fighter and an honorable man is already well known. The *Iliad* itself, however, also features a sharp break in his characterization in book 10, wherein he murders a prisoner of war and kills Rhesus and his soldiers in their sleep in order to steal their horses. Though book 10 is widely agreed to be a later interpolation into the tradition, the fact remains that ancient compilers considered its language and characterizations to be authentic, and any notion of "tradition" which cannot

accommodate it runs a severe risk of being reduced to the arbitrary judgment of modern critics, divorced from the experience of ancient readers and audiences. Additionally, what we can reconstruct of other poems in the Epic Cycle seems to offer similar alternative characterizations of Diomedes: the *Cypria* (fr. 27) has him conspiring with Odysseus to murder Palamedes, the fellow Greek king who did the army a great service by seeing through Odysseus's feigned insanity and forcing him to follow through on the oath of Helen's suitors. It seems clear from both of these episodes that the mode of characterization at work among ancient audiences allowed for Diomedes to be *both* a courageous and honorable warrior who kept his family obligations *and* a ruthless soldier who will kill an already-defeated enemy or assassinate a fellow king. The static identity necessitated by Foley's articulation of tradition would be very ill at ease holding together such a stark contradiction, and it makes little sense for ancient critics and audiences to consider all of these episodes as authentic unless their own sense of the hero's identity allowed for a great deal of mutability.

The groundwork for this mutability is the intersection of the unbounded indexing function of the noun-epithet formula with the narrative context in which that function is carried out in the minds of the audience. The indexing function allows the audience to construct a hero's identity in the moment and as appropriate to the moment, and to reconstruct that identity as the narrative demands. The Achilles who kills Lycaon and dishonors the body of Hector and the Achilles who adjudicates the funeral games and receives the suppliant Priam are very different iterations of the same character, but they were recognized as versions of the same by readers and audiences in antiquity. Indeed, as far as we can tell, changes in character over the course of the plot were an expected part

of the drama, if Aristotle's account of anagnorisis is to be believed. He notes:

ἀναγνώρισις, ὥσπερ καὶ τοὔνομα σημαίνει, ἐξ ἀγνοίας εἰς γνῶσιν μεταβολή, ἢ εἰς φιλίαν

ἢ εἰς ἔχθραν, τῶν πρὸς εὐτυχίαν ἢ δυστυχίαν ὡρισμένων (*Poet.* 1452a, 29–32).[33]

Anagnorisis moves a character from ignorance to knowledge, and in doing so can change

their relationship to others, to their environment, and/or to their own self,[34] which is

precisely the sort of change accommodated by a list-referential account of formulaic

signification.

The appearance of a noun-epithet formula provides, then, an occasion for

reassessing, reconstructing, and rearticulating heroic identity, precisely by marking an

identity as heroic. Being talked about with epithets—particularly with unique epithets—

marks the presence of a "heroic remainder" like what Odysseus signaled to the

Phaeacians: a body of deeds, experiences, traits, and stories that make this character

worthy of epic commemoration. This is not to say that identity is always and everywhere

constructed and reconstructed, but rather that it is always *subject* to reconstruction on the

occasion of rearticulation. A given instance of articulation in the form of a noun-epithet

formula both provides occasion for reconstruction of identity as appropriate to the

narrative moment and integrates that moment into the index of tradition. In this way, the

unbounded indexing function of the formula is constrained and limited by the narrative

occasion, but the fundamental underpinnings of traditional referentiality *secundum* Foley,

and in particular its unconstrained collocation of incidents and attributes under a single

name, are preserved and become essential to the functioning of epic narrative. The texts

---

[33] "Anagnorisis, as the name indicates, is the movement from ignorance to knowledge, either into
friendship or enmity, of those destined [by the poet] for good or bad fortune."
[34] Else 1957 contains the most influential discussion of the meaning of anagnorisis (pp. 349–358), but see
also MacFarlane 2000, which seeks both to supplement and to revise Else.

of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as we have them depend on the network of associations accessible via referentiality for much of their poignancy and dramatic effect. The reconciliation between Achilles and Priam is rife with such formulaic signals. Achilles's speech after Priam attempts to refuse to stay the night is prefaced with τὸν δ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ὑπόδρα ἰδὼν προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς (24.559), allowing the contrast between the recent weeping shared by the two men and the ὑπόδρα ἰδών, which always signals anger,[35] to inform the articulation of Achilles's identity and its occasion for indexing in the line-final position. In this moment he can be both pitying and pitiless, for his past is rife with incidents of casual murder, both intra- and inter-textual, that his formula can evoke. The audience can thus construct an Achilles who, despite his appetite for killing, has been moved to pity and tears, but who nonetheless remains extraordinarily dangerous, for his anger is made present both through its traditional formulaic evocation as well as through the indexing of his past killings occasioned by the juxtaposition of formulaic anger with the noun-epithet formula. In this way, he changes for his audience, even as he remains Achilles.

Given the serious flaws with the scheme of identity outlined by Foley's articulation of traditional referentiality, it seems clear that the study of identity in epic requires a different articulation—one that preserves Foley's valuable work on the hyper-signification of epic language while allowing for the flexibility that narrative action demands. The present study will attempt to outline one such articulation, rooting its flexibility in the type of semantic indexing displayed most fully in Homeric catalogues.

---

[35] In 11 out of its 20 attestations in the Homeric corpus, it is followed shortly by an overt threat of violence, suggesting that the anger denoted by the formula should be read as carrying an implicit threat. See Hesk 2017 for a close study of how such an occasion plays out among the Phaeacians in *Odyssey* 8.

This signification through indexing ultimately shows identity in Homeric poetry to be a highly flexible and malleable thing, a locus of possibilities for characterization rather than an accumulated *Gestalt* fully instantiated by the hyper-signification that traditional referentiality makes possible. Rather, the object of traditional referentiality is the locus of possibility, and characterization is best viewed as an event that takes place between poet and audience in particular moments and scenes. Identity in Homer thus emerges as a highly adaptable narrative tool, encompassing not only a character's actions and trials as narrated in the poem, but also unrealized actions and trials that, by the tradition's own logic, might have happened but didn't. This self-awareness within the tradition of how flexible and adaptable identity can be is taken up in a variety of ways by later poets, but perhaps most explicitly by Pindar. The final chapter explores Pindar's highly flexible approach to the identities of both contemporary and traditional subjects, and in particular his variegated use of patronymic characterization in augmenting or diminishing a subject's reputation. It reveals Pindar not as a revisionist who used or discarded epic modes of characterization as he saw fit, but as a poet whose approach to characterization is fundamentally an extension of the epic tradition and is always in dialogue with it. This revision to the common understanding of Homeric identity has the potential to similarly revise our understanding of many other subsequent authors, many of whose engagements with Homer are, I suspect, even more interesting and exciting than current scholarship imagines.

CHAPTER II

Catalogue, Identity, and Epithet

The study of catalogues can yield significant returns for an understanding of the substance and structure of identity in epic, because the catalogue's extent makes it a test case for which elements are considered essential in distinguishing one character from another. The need to enumerate a large number of persons arises out of various considerations, of which the most basic is "preserving large amounts of mythological data without the aid of writing."[36] This consideration extends beyond mythological data; indeed, if myth is built around a historical kernel, as has been so often suggested of the myth of the Trojan War, then there would be multiple reasons to preserve large quantities of historical data in such a form as well.[37] The central question is: what piece of information about individuals were worth preserving? More to the point, which pieces of information are *consistently* preserved across catalogue entries? In asking these questions I have adopted Benjamin Sammons's relatively narrow formal definition of the catalogue:

> A catalogue is a list of *items* which are specified in discrete *entries;* its entries are formally distinct and arranged in sequence by anaphora or by a simple connective, but are not subordinated to one another, and no explicit relation is made between the items except for their shared suitability to the catalogue's specified *rubric.* (Sammons 2010, p. 9).

---

[36] Sammons 2010, p. 6. The suggestion that this was in fact the origin of the catalogue form was put forward in Webster 1958.

[37] Burr 1944 suggests that the Catalogue of Ships took shape first as a war roster.

This formal restriction is appropriate because answering these questions demands a certain internal uniformity in the objects of study. A speech may have strongly catalogic elements: perhaps the most famous such speech is the enumeration of the rewards that Agamemnon will give to Achilles in *Iliad* book 9 if he should decide to return, enumerated first by Agamemnon himself (121–156) and then relayed by Odysseus (264–298). But that list lacks uniformity in its entries, and though its stated rubric is clear, the wide variation in the structure of entries makes such a speech and other catalogic passages much less suitable for an exploration of the catalogue as a conservational form for a body of data.

§1. The Catalogue of Ships

The ideal place to start is, of course, the longest catalogue of persons in the epic corpus, the Catalogue of Ships. Its entries encompass a great variety of names, largely because of the exacting but highly flexible structure that undergirds its entries.[38] These entries vary a great deal in size, but each includes three major pieces of information: the homeland of a people, the name of their leader, and the number of ships that they brought to Troy. Within this basic framework, a number of expansions are possible. The most common is a list of the territories that each people holds; the second most common is a description or short mythological story of the people or their leaders. One sees both of these elements at work in the entry on the Locrians:

> Λοκρῶν δ᾽ ἡγεμόνευεν Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας
> μείων, οὔ τι τόσος γε ὅσος Τελαμώνιος Αἴας
> ἀλλὰ πολὺ μείων· ὀλίγος μὲν ἔην λινοθώρηξ,
> ἐγχείῃ δ᾽ ἐκέκαστο Πανέλληνας καὶ Ἀχαιούς·   530
> οἳ Κῦνόν τ᾽ ἐνέμοντ᾽ Ὀπόεντά τε Καλλίαρόν τε
> Βῆσσάν τε Σκάρφην τε καὶ Αὐγειὰς ἐρατεινὰς

---

[38] The present study is concerned with the internal structure of entries rather than with their order. On the arrangement of entries and their geographic taxis, see Danek 2004.

Τάρφην τε Θρόνιόν τε Βοαγρίου ἀμφὶ ῥέεθρα·
τῷ δ᾽ ἅμα τεσσαράκοντα μέλαιναι νῆες ἕποντο
Λοκρῶν, οἳ ναίουσι πέρην ἱερῆς Εὐβοίης. (*Il.* 2.527–535)

The Locrians were led by the son of Oileus, swift Ajax
the lesser, not at all as great as Telamonian Ajax,
but much lesser: he was small and wore a linen cuirass,
but with the spear he excelled all the Hellenes and the Achaeans.
These dwelt in Cynus and Opus and and Calliarus
and Bessa and Scarphe and lovely Augeiae
and Taphe and Thronium and around the streams of Boagrius.
And upon him followed forty black ships
Of the Locrians, who dwell on the other side of sacred Euboea.

The Locrians themselves occupy first position, but they are quickly superseded for the moment by Ajax the Lesser, whose brief description seems clearly to be an appended piece of poetic artistry. Enjambment of the epithet allows him to be introduced in an appropriately heroic manor as the one who leads the Locrians, but this is qualified by his comparison to the other Ajax, whose name is paired at the end of the following line. The use of τόσος γε ὅσος as a comparison seems to be unique to this catalog entry: there are no further attestations of this highly compact formulation until the grammarians' commentaries on Homer. The use of λινοθώρηξ also suggests that this is an artistic embellishment; the word's only other appearance until the grammarians is in the muster of the Trojans later in book 2. But this Ajax, despite his inferiority, is not without his skill, and the poet makes this clear in the final line of his description. The line-initial position of ἐγχείη may safely be read as emphatic, as its metrical shape gives it considerable flexibility and it appears in various line positions:[39] although three of its five attestations are line-initial, the sample size makes it difficult to draw a conclusion, particularly in light of the much more common attestation of the plural dative form

---

[39] At *Il.* 5.279 it fills out the entire second and half of the third foot. At *Od.* 9.10 it fills out the entire fourth and half of the fifth foot.

ἐγχείηισι(ν) and its strong bias toward line-final position. In any case, the poet has here

elected to tell his audience in highly nonstandard diction that Ajax, despite being lesser,

is preeminent with the spear among all the Greeks.

The second part of the entry is highly formulaic, and displays two of the six major

structures that underlie the entries in the Catalogue, as documented by Eva Tichy.[40] This

is part of an effort to support Berg's (1978) hypothesis about the origin of the

hexameter.[41] Tichy's scheme classifies these six verse types alphabetically. Verses of

type (a) are sentence-initial and entry-initial verses that contain a place name in the

accusative. Type (b) verses are likewise initial and contain both an initial-position

ethnonym in the genitive plural and a leader's name in the nominative; type (c) verses are

initial verses that fill the initial position with the name of a leader in the nominative.

Types (d) and (e) verses are so-called "continuing" verses that must occupy a medial

position between two other verses: those of type (d) consist of place names in the

accusative, while those of type (e) contain an initial τῶν and a leader's name in the

nominative in final position. Type (f) verses conclude a catalogue entry and contain the

number of ships that the people named in the entry brought to Troy. Note that types (a)

and (d) contain similar material and are differentiated on the basis of being initial or

continuing verses; the same is true of types (b) and (e).[42]

Lines 531–535 are examples of types (d), and (f), and the opening verse of the

entry is a clear example of type (b). The typology accounts, in fact, for all of the lines that

---

[40] Her full treatment appears in Tichy 2010.
[41] See the discussion in ch. 1, pp. 12–13 of the present study.
[42] This is far from the only available scheme for classifying verses. Kirk 1985 lays out his own scheme covering all the major verse-types in the catalogue (pp. 170–177), and Visser 1997 lays out a tripartite classification of only those verses containing geographic designations (pp. 53–77).

are not part of the descriptive/mythological portions of the entry. This holds for other entries as well: see, for example, the entry on the Abantes that follows that of the Locrians:

> οἳ δ᾽ Εὔβοιαν ἔχον μένεα πνείοντες Ἄβαντες
> Χαλκίδα τ᾽ Εἰρέτριάν τε πολυστάφυλόν θ᾽ Ἱστίαιαν
> Κήρινθόν τ᾽ ἔφαλον Δίου τ᾽ αἰπὺ πτολίεθρον,
> οἵ τε Κάρυστον ἔχον ἠδ᾽ οἳ Στύρα ναιετάασκον,
> τῶν αὖθ᾽ ἡγεμόνευ᾽ Ἐλεφήνωρ ὄζος Ἄρηος   540
> Χαλκωδοντιάδης μεγαθύμων ἀρχὸς Ἀβάντων.
> τῷ δ᾽ ἅμ᾽ Ἄβαντες ἕποντο θοοὶ ὄπιθεν κομόωντες
> αἰχμηταὶ μεμαῶτες ὀρεκτῇσιν μελίῃσι
> θώρηκας ῥήξειν δηΐων ἀμφὶ στήθεσσι·
> τῷ δ᾽ ἅμα τεσσαράκοντα μέλαιναι νῆες ἕποντο. (*Il.* 2.536–545)

> And the Abantes, breathing might, who held Euboea
> and Chalkis and Eiretria and vine-rich Histaea
> and Cerinthus by the sea and the high citadel of Dios,
> who held Carystus and lived in Styra,
> of these the commander was Elephenor the offspring of Ares,
> son of Chalcodon and leader of the great-souled Abantes.
> And with him the swift Abantes followed, with their hair long in back,
> spearmen yearning with ashen spears outstretched
> to shatter the armor around their enemies' breasts,
> and with him there followed forty black ships.

Here the entry begins with an initial verse that opens with a toponymic specification (a), followed by three verses of type (d) and a verse of type (e), which gives way to three lines of description before closing the entry with a standard verse of type (f). The flexibility of verse type (d) is relatively obvious: whichever combination of pronouns and conjunctions helps the accusative forms to make their metrical positions is the one that gets used, and the poet's repertoire is rich with variants that serve these functions. But the underlying structure of lines like type (a) are harder to spot, and so I have reproduced two lines of type (a) below. The first is line 536 above, and the second is line 695 later in the same book. Both are marked according to Tichy's system.

οἳ δ᾽^{INV} Εὔβοιαν^D ἔχον^{VAR1} μένεα^{VAR2} πνείοντες^{VAR3} Ἄβαντες^D

οἳ δ᾽^{INV} εἶχον^{VAR1} Φυλάκην^D καὶ^{VAR2} Πύρασον^D ἀνθεμόεντα^{VAR3}

Each sentence-initial toponymic line begins with an invariant οἵ δ᾽, followed by two determinant elements and up to three variable elements. Note that a toponym is mandatory as the first determinant, but an ethnonym is possible as the second determinant. The metrical shape of the determinant elements dictates their placement in the line, and the first determinant will appear as soon as its metrical shape allows it to. The three variable elements represent a maximum; in practice, as Tichy documents, there may be fewer than three realized variables; Tichy accounts for this by positing a null option as a possibility for variable elements, but an "up to 3 variants" constraint seems both neater and more accurate. This structure, as the two lines above indicate, can give rise to a number of poetic configurations. Line 536 exhibits a bookended or chiastic structure with the determinant elements taking first and final position after the invariant, whereas line 695 alternates between variable and determinant elements. Note here that both epithets and conjunctions are variable elements subordinated to the statement of the determinant: there is no necessary relationship between a particular variable slot and either determinant element.

Further comparison demonstrates the singular name(s) as determinant elements of the lines. Below are several lines of type (e), the continuing lines with the leader's name(s) in final position, including line 540 from the passage discussed above:

τῶν ἦρχ᾽ Ἀσκάλαφος καὶ Ἰάλμενος υἷες Ἄρηος (2.512)
τῶν αὖθ᾽ ἡγεμόνευ᾽ Ἐλεφήνωρ ὄζος Ἄρηος (2.540)
τῶν αὖθ᾽ ἡγεμόνευ᾽ υἱὸς Πετεῶο Μενεσθεύς. (2.552)
τῶν αὖθ᾽ ἡγεμόνευε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης (2.563)

τῶν αὖθ᾽ ἡγεμόνευε Γερήνιος ἱππότα Νέστωρ· (2.601)

τῶν ἦρχ᾽ Ἀγκαίοιο πάϊς κρείων Ἀγαπήνωρ (2.609)

τῶν μὲν ἄρ᾽ Ἀμφίμαχος καὶ Θάλπιος ἡγησάσθην (2.620)

τῶν αὖθ᾽ ἡγεμόνευε Μέγης ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ (2.627)

The initial τῶν is the sole invariant element here; though one of three verbs of ruling—

ἄρχω or ἡγέομαι[43] or ἡγεμονεύω—is at some point mandatory, the verbal form and its

placement are sufficiently flexible that, because of this mutability of form and placement,

the verb of ruling may be classed as a variable, as indeed Tichy does. Though the

typology of these lines strongly favors a final position for the leader's name, this is not a

hard and fast rule: the name's determinant character mandates that it be stated in its

nominative form, wherever that form might fit. Granted, that "wherever" seems to tend

strongly toward the back of the line based on the above examples, but even that evidence

is not absolutely airtight: it is, for example, difficult to imagine that a poet would have a

hard time putting Ἐλεφήνωρ in final position if he wished.

What is clear from these entries is that the name(s) are the sole determinative

elements, and that any accompanying epithets serve only to fill out the line: this is a

catalogue of heroes, and the context does the work of signaling the "heroic remainder" of

their identities. This is best illustrated by line 620, in which the shapes of the two names

prevent either from occupying final position, and so the verb of ruling shifts to both an

unusual position and an unusual form to make room: as the other examples indicate, both

ἄρχω and ἡγεμονεύω exhibit strong tendencies to fall as far back as possible in the line

---

[43] Note, however, that ἡγέομαι appears in the *Schiffskatalog* only with genitive personal objects instead of the dative objects much more common to that verb even elsewhere in the Homeric corpus. Although dative objects would be metrically identical to genitive ones, it seems clear that the line-initial genitive objects structure the catalogue to such an extent that more "standard" use gives way. It may even be that the few other uses of ἡγέομαι + gen. in the Homeric corpus are modeled on the *Schiffskatalog*.

and to appear in the imperfect rather than the aorist, but both of these tendencies are subordinate to the metrical needs of the determinant elements. Similarly, although there is a strong tendency to use patronymic epithets for more minor heroes and recognized unique epithets for the major players, this tendency is also not inviolable, as when Meges is called ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ in line 627.[44]

What, then, of Oilean Ajax in line 527? This is a line of type (b), and it should be compared to other lines of this type, reproduced below.

> Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον (494)
> αὐτὰρ Φωκήων Σχεδίος καὶ Ἐπίστροφος ἦρχον (517)
> Λοκρῶν δ᾽ ἡγεμόνευεν Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας (527)
> αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς ἦγε Κεφαλλῆνας μεγαθύμους (631)
> Αἰτωλῶν δ᾽ ἡγεῖτο Θόας Ἀνδραίμονος υἱός (638)
> Κρητῶν δ᾽ Ἰδομενεὺς δουρικλυτὸς ἡγεμόνευεν (645)
> Μαγνήτων δ᾽ ἦρχε Πρόθοος Τενθρηδόνος υἱός (756)

These lines have no fixed elements and two fundamental determinants; a second commander acts as a secondary determinant in its alteration of the verb of ruling, but the second name is clearly a type of variable rather than a variation in line type. The first determinant is, of course, the ethnonym, which tends strongly toward initial position and toward the genitive case. Even in the case of line 519 with its doubling of commanders, the αὐτὰρ that helps to fill out the line merely pushes Φωκήων to second position; line 494 features similar doubling but perfectly ordinary word order. The major exception among this collection is line 631, in which Odysseus is named. The line likewise begins with an initial αὐτὰρ, but instead of an initial ethnonym, we see Odysseus take the earliest possible position, with the Cephallenians pushed to the end of the line. This is to

---

[44] Meges's patronymic appears twice elsewhere in the *Iliad* (13.692; 19.239).

a certain extent metrically necessary, as the single initial short syllable makes Κεφαλλῆνας somewhat tricky to fit into a line. More remarkable, however, is the poet's choice to render the ethnonym in the accusative plural rather than the genitive plural. In this case metrical necessity can be eliminated: the shape of ἦγε Κεφαλλῆνας μεγαθύμους could be perfectly duplicated with ἦρχε Κεφαλλήνων μεγαθύμων. It is not out of the question for the poet to use special variations when announcing well-known heroes: Achilles is announced in line 685 with τῶν αὖ πεντήκοντα νεῶν ἦν ἀρχὸς Ἀχιλλεύς, which seems to be a hybrid of types (e) and (f). Line 645 is also slightly unusual, but only in its ordering of elements: Idomeneus takes first position, but the line is filled out by standard elements, with δουρικλυτός making Hermann's Bridge and inaugurating a bucolic dieresis as it does in each of its attestations—indeed, δουρικλυτὸς ἡγεμόνευε(ν) ends three different lines in book 2 alone. But aside from the lines with double names and the lines announcing Odysseus and Idomeneus, each hero in the type (b) lines is given either a patronym or a patronymic epithet phrase.

In the case of Ajax, the patronym is essential in that it distinguishes him from the other Ajax. It is, nonetheless, a variable element as far as the structure of the *Schiffskatalog* is concerned: it might easily be replaced with other material if the poet wished to deemphasize his distinction. But it is precisely this distinction that the entry seems to emphasize:

> Λοκρῶν δ᾽ ἡγεμόνευεν Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας
> μείων, οὔ τι τόσος γε ὅσος Τελαμώνιος Αἴας
> ἀλλὰ πολὺ μείων· ὀλίγος μὲν ἔην, λινοθώρηξ,
> ἐγχείῃ δ᾽ ἐκέκαστο Πανέλληνας καὶ Ἀχαιούς· (*Il.* 2.527–530)

The very mechanisms of emphasis, however, reveal that there is something structurally secondary about the lesser Ajax's inferiority in stature, appearing as it does as an

embellishment enjambed after a syntactically complete line. The central element here is the name, cited with the accompanying epithets that specify which Ajax we see. The catalogic form makes this distinction visible, because the fundamental structure of the entries conveys the most essential information in the least poetically viable amount of space. In the case of the *Schiffskatalog*, the essential information is the name(s) of a people's commander(s), which territories the people controls, and how many ships they brought to Troy.[45] On a finer level, the most important thing about the commanders themselves is the names that distinguish them from one another. While Οϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας is comprised of one determinative element and two variable ones, this particular determinative necessitates at least the patronym, because the enumerative function of the catalogue necessarily entails a distinctive function: the enumeration of entries is itself an act of drawing distinctions and stating their difference from one another even as they fall under the catalogue's common rubric. But this structure suggests that the name itself as a tool of distinction is what matters most: *nomina nuda tenemus*, if we set aside the embellishments that seem to be clear superadditions to the underlying catalogic structure.

§2. Simple Catalogic Structure and Catalogic Flexibility

Although the *Schiffskatalog*, because of its highly systematic structure, is perhaps the easiest catalogue in which to see the "essential idea" revealed as bare distinction, other catalogues demonstrate this as well. A brief but fascinating example is Dione's catalogue of the sufferings of the gods in *Iliad* 5, which she speaks to Aphrodite following her daughter's wounding at the hands of Diomedes thanks to Athena's divine assistance. The catalogue contains only three entries with varying levels of elaboration,

---

[45] Kirk 1985 outlines these three elements in the introductory remarks on the Catalogue (see n. 42 of the current chapter), and Sammons 2010 concurs (p. 136).

but the formulaic *incipit* of each entry both marks its commonality with the others and

distinguishes it as a separate item.

> τλῆ μὲν Ἄρης ὅτε μιν Ὦτος κρατερός τ᾽ Ἐφιάλτης   385
> παῖδες Ἀλωῆος, δῆσαν κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ·
> χαλκέῳ δ᾽ ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας·
> καί νύ κεν ἔνθ᾽ ἀπόλοιτο Ἄρης ἆτος πολέμοιο,
> εἰ μὴ μητρυιὴ περικαλλὴς Ἠερίβοια
> Ἑρμέᾳ ἐξήγγειλεν· ὃ δ᾽ ἐξέκλεψεν Ἄρηα   390
> ἤδη τειρόμενον, χαλεπὸς δέ ἑ δεσμὸς ἐδάμνα.
> τλῆ δ᾽ Ἥρη, ὅτε μιν κρατερὸς πάϊς Ἀμφιτρύωνος
> δεξιτερὸν κατὰ μαζὸν ὀϊστῷ τριγλώχινι
> βεβλήκει· τότε καί μιν ἀνήκεστον λάβεν ἄλγος.
> τλῆ δ᾽ Ἀΐδης ἐν τοῖσι πελώριος ὠκὺν ὀϊστόν,   395
> εὖτέ μιν ωὑτὸς ἀνὴρ υἱὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
> ἐν Πύλῳ ἐν νεκύεσσι βαλὼν ὀδύνῃσιν ἔδωκεν·
> αὐτὰρ ὃ βῆ πρὸς δῶμα Διὸς καὶ μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον
> κῆρ ἀχέων ὀδύνῃσι πεπαρμένος· αὐτὰρ ὀϊστὸς
> ὤμῳ ἔνι στιβαρῷ ἠλήλατο, κῆδε δὲ θυμόν.   400
> τῷ δ᾽ ἐπὶ Παιήων ὀδυνήφατα φάρμακα πάσσων
> ἠκέσατ᾽· οὐ μὲν γάρ τι καταθνητός γε τέτυκτο.
> σχέτλιος αἰσυλοεργός ὅ τ᾽ οὐκ ὄθετ᾽ αἴσυλα ῥέζων,
> ὃς τόξοισιν ἔκηδε θεοὺς οἳ Ὄλυμπον ἔχουσιν. (*Il.* 5.385–404)

Ares suffered when Otus and mighty Ephialtes,
the sons of Aloeus, bound him with a strong chain;
they placed him in a bronze jar for thirteen months,
and Ares, insatiate of war, would have died then
had not their stepmother, beautiful Eriboea,
told Hermes. He stole Ares away,
by then distressed, since his painful chain overcame him.
Hera suffered, when the mighty son of Amphitryon
pierced her right breast with a three-barbed arrow:
then pain without relief seized her.
And Hades suffered a bitter arrow like the rest of these
when the same man, the son of Zeus who bears the aegis,
struck him among the dead in Pylos and gave him over to pains.
But he went to the house of Zeus and to blessed Olympus,
grieving in his heart and pierced by pains, for the shaft
had been driven into his mighty shoulder, and he was distressed of spirit.
But Paeëon, spreading pain-relieving drugs on him,
healed him, for he was not at all mortal.
Wretched man of shameful deeds, who took no heed in accomplishing reckless
      things,
who with his arrows distressed the gods who hold Olympus.

The three entries are each marked by a sentence- and line-initial τλῆ followed by an appropriate conjunction and name; each name ends with the initial long syllable of the second foot. The remainder of each initial line names the person or thing that has caused the suffering of the god in question—for the first two it is a person, and for Hades it is an arrow that wounds him. The first two, lines 385 and 392, are enjambed despite accomplishing their function: naming a personal cause of their suffering seems to demand a subordinate temporal clause, whereas the cause of Hades's suffering can be stated as a simple accusative object of τλῆ, which forms a syntactically complete sentence despite its subsequent expansion that names Heracles as the agent. But remarkably, each line is taken up entirely or almost entirely by its formulaic beginning and the stated cause: the ἐν τοῖσι πελώριος in the middle of 395 seems to be entirely metrical filler material, as both could be removed without in any way altering the grammatical sense of the line.

The opening lines of each entry, then, give all the basic information that fits the rubric of the catalogue: which deity suffered, and at the hands of what or whom. Indeed, Sammons concedes that "it is arguable that the name of the wounded god with anaphoric τλῆ could constitute a sufficient entry, i.e. with the god alone as an item and the name of the wounding mortal as a point of elaboration" (Sammons 2010, p. 27). This seems to misread the basic shape of the catalogue entry: the wounding mortal is not necessarily the central item, because the poet has chosen in the case of Hades's entry to privilege the instrument, the ὠκὺν ὀϊστόν, rather than the person, κρατερὸς πάϊς Ἀμφιτρύωνος, in the entry's opening line. This is certainly a distinct choice of subject matter for the line because, as noted above, each deity's name ends with a long syllable on the second foot, making the opening statements of each entry metrically interchangeable. Had the poet so

chosen, the line *τλῆ δ᾽ Ἀΐδης ὅτε μιν κρατερὸς πάϊς Ἀμφιτρύωνος would have been perfectly admissible. Heracles, however, has another patronymic epithet phrase available for use, and the relatively loose structure of the catalogic entries makes it easy for a skilled poet to insert it. This is far less true of the *Schiffskatalog*, whose tight linear structure leaves far fewer options and ensures that some heroes' epithets will be repeated, as with Idomeneus:

> Κρητῶν δ᾽ Ἰδομενεὺς δουρικλυτὸς ἡγεμόνευεν (245)
> τῶν μὲν ἄρ᾽ Ἰδομενεὺς δουρικλυτὸς ἡγεμόνευεν (250)

The entry lines for Hera and Hades in Dione's catalogue have two intervening lines rather than four, but this seems to be an arbitrary threshold in any case. By metrical count, the Idomeneus lines and the Hera and hypothetical Hades lines would vary by precisely the same amount of material: a full foot's worth of varied material in each case, with all the rest repeated. It seems much more likely, therefore, that the lines differ because there is a substantive difference in what the poet wishes to convey with them: the poet chose to mark out the arrow rather than Heracles as the proximate agent of Hades's wounding. Paradoxically, this makes Sammons's contention that the catalogue entries could be reduced to their initial lines more credible rather than less, as the poet's inclusion of Heracles in the succeeding lines now appears as choice rather than necessity: the initial lines of each entry convey precisely what the poet wished to use to fulfill the catalogue's rubric.

The sufficiency of the first line of each entry is further underscored by the narratives that make up the rest of each entry. The substance of the narratives paradoxically illuminates why the central kernel of each account is contained in the first line, as well as why the entries for Ares and Hera name persons, whereas that for Hades

54

names an object. The victory of Otus and Ephialtes over Ares is a rank humiliation: he is bound with a chain (δῆσαν κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ) and imprisoned in a jar for thirteen months (χαλκέῳ δ' ἐν κεράμῳ δέδετο τρισκαίδεκα μῆνας) before being rescued by the stepmother of his captors; the poet's contrafactual even admits the possibility of Ares having died in that jar if he had not been rescued. The naming of his captors in the opening line makes perfect sense in light of the highly personal affront to Ares. The suffering of Hera is much briefer but also far more transparent: she suffered an arrow wound at the hands of Heracles, whose apotropaic name bespeaks Hera's well-known hatred for him. What unites these two accounts is the personal enmity and humiliation involved in the deity's wounding: the humiliation of Ares at the hands of the Aloeadae and the humiliation of Hera at the very existence of Heracles are both sources of personal enmity, and it therefore makes sense to state a personal cause for harm. Hades, on the other hand, has no history of personal enmity with any mortal at all, and the account in Dione's catalogue focuses on his suffering an arrow wound and being subsequently taken care of by Paeëon; there is neither a personal history nor an extended account of humiliation here. Hades's wounding may well be an act of hubris, but it seems not to have the personal dimension of the other two incidents, and so it makes far more sense for the poet to focus on the arrow as the source of his suffering when he summarizes it in the first line of the catalogue.

The third relevant catalogue for our purposes is the catalogue of mortals and goddesses enumerated by Calypso in order to justify her continued captivity of Odysseus. This is a similarly brief catalogue to that of Dione, likewise containing only three entries, although the third entry is deliberately varied for rhetorical effect; the third entry is also

the longest, giving the catalogue a clear ascending tricolonic structure. She addresses

Hermes as follows:

> σχέτλιοί ἐστε, θεοί, ζηλήμονες ἔξοχον ἄλλων,
> οἵ τε θεαῖς ἀγάασθε παρ᾽ ἀνδράσιν εὐνάζεσθαι
> ἀμφαδίην, ἤν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσετ᾽ ἀκοίτην.   120
> ὣς μὲν ὅτ᾽ Ὠρίων᾽ ἕλετο ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς,
> τόφρα οἱ ἠγάασθε θεοὶ ῥεῖα ζώοντες,
> ἕως μιν ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ χρυσόθρονος Ἄρτεμις ἁγνὴ
> οἷς ἀγανοῖσι βέλεσσιν ἐποιχομένη κατέπεφνεν.
> ὣς δ᾽ ὁπότ᾽ Ἰασίωνι ἐϋπλόκαμος Δημήτηρ,   125
> ᾧ θυμῷ εἴξασα, μίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ
> νειῷ ἔνι τριπόλῳ· οὐδὲ δὴν ἦεν ἄπυστος
> Ζεύς, ὅς μιν κατέπεφνε βαλὼν ἀργῆτι κεραυνῷ.
> ὥς δ᾽ αὖ νῦν μοι ἄγασθε, θεοί, βροτὸν ἄνδρα παρεῖναι.
> τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν ἐσάωσα περὶ τρόπιος βεβαῶτα   130
> οἶον, ἐπεί οἱ νῆα θοὴν ἀργῆτι κεραυνῷ
> Ζεὺς ἔλσας ἐκέασσε μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ.
> ἔνθ᾽ ἄλλοι μὲν πάντες ἀπέφθιθεν ἐσθλοὶ ἑταῖροι,
> τὸν δ᾽ ἄρα δεῦρ᾽ ἄνεμός τε φέρων καὶ κῦμα πέλασσεν.
> τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ φίλεόν τε καὶ ἔτρεφον, ἠδὲ ἔφασκον   135
> θήσειν ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήραον ἤματα πάντα. (*Od.* 5.118–136)

> You are wicked, o gods, and jealous beyond all men,
> since you resent that goddesses lie with men
> in the open, if one of them will make a man her beloved husband.
> So when rose-fingered Dawn took Orion,
> you living gods resented but tolerated it,
> until in Ortygia golden-throned and holy Artemis
> with her gentle arrows came upon him and killed him.
> So when with Iasion lovely-haired Demeter,
> having yielded in her heart, mixed with him in bed and love
> in a thrice-plowed fallow field. Nor long ignorant of this
> was Zeus, who slew him, striking him with a bright thunderbolt.
> So now, o gods, do you begrudge that a mortal man should be with me.
> I saved him when he had mounted the ship's keel
> all alone, since with a shining thunderbolt his swift ship
> Zeus, having hindered it, shattered in the middle of the wine-dark sea.
> There all his other companions perished,
> but the wind bore him and the wave brought him here.
> Him I treaded kindly and fed, and I told him
> that I would make him immortal and ageless for all time.

56

The catalogue's rubric is clear: she enumerates mortals whom goddesses have taken as lovers. The structure of the entries is likewise clear: each is introduced with sentence- and line-initial ὥς followed by a contrastive particle and a temporal particle, though the specific items vary both with the demands of the meter and the necessary syntax of the entry. After the introductory material in the first part of the line, the poet states the name of the mortal and the name of the goddess. The two formulaic entries both give the name of the mortal first, but this can presumably give way to the demand that both names be stated, as with the entries in the *Schiffskatalog*. A verbal element seems to be unnecessary, since the first entry includes a final ἕλετο but the second defers εἴξασα until the following line. The opening line of the second entry is somewhat metrically unusual both in the striking hiatus between Ἰασίωνι and εὐπλόκαμος and in its split of the diphthong that one expects at the start of the latter.[46] While this does not necessarily mean anything about the age of the line, it does suggest, along with the catalogue's relative simplicity, that the catalogue of goddesses and men has not undergone the same lengthy process of development that the more extensive *Schiffskatalog* has clearly undergone.[47]

---

[46] It is possible to gloss this split as the preservation of an extremely archaic syllabic split, since ἐυ- < PIE *h₁su-. Although this particular diphthong is always orthographically split (Janko 1992, p. 14, n. 19), there are numerous attestations in the *Odyssey* in which the epithet appears at the beginning of the second foot after a long vowel (e.g. ναίει ἐυπλόκαμος, *Od.* 7.246), obviating the metrical need for correption or a diphthong split. This, however, may simply be evidence of the relative novelty of these lines in the *Odyssey* compared with their *Iliad* counterparts, since a newly composed line would tend to collapse a metrically preserved dieresis. See Hoekstra 1965 (p. 113) on the replacement of archaic formulaic constituents with more familiar ones.

[47] That the *Schiffskatalog* has a long history is virtually uncontested, and so it may seem trivial to note that another part of the poem has not been as extensively developed, but an extensive development would tend to smooth out or eliminate such difficult lines by replacing them with something more poetically sound, since catalogic elasticity (enumerated below) dictates that no particular entry is essential.

If this is the case, then this, along with the evidence from the *Schiffskatalog* and the catalogue of Dione, leads to a two-tiered schema for the Homeric catalogue, or at least for those catalogues whose primary subjects are people. In the combined evidence from the three catalogues explored so far, several unifying tendencies emerge. The first is *catalogic economy*, the tendency for the catalogue to convey its essential information in as small a space as is poetically feasible. The second principle, derived from the first, might be termed *hierarchical ordering*; this is the tendency for catalogues to list their most essential information in the opening line(s) of the entries. This tendency is most visible in simple catalogues like the two most recently discussed, since the defining information of their entries fits in a single line; more complicated examples like the *Schiffskatalog* contain too much information for a single line, as well as containing information whose importance can vary considerably depending on the ethnic self-identification(s) of the audience. Nonetheless, the structure of the *Schiffskatalog* allows any piece of possibly essential information to take first position in the entry. The length of the entries in turn also gives rise to an emphatic final position, which is usually taken by a type (f) verse designating the number of ships that a particular people brought but may also incorporate other information as well. This hierarchical ordering leads us to the third principle of *catalogic elasticity*, by which the non-essential information in the catalogue may be expanded, contracted, or overwritten entirely at the discretion of the poet without affecting the catalogue's integrity. It is this principle of catalogic elasticity, I contend, that Sammons is really articulating when he says that the anaphoric τλῆ and the

name of the deity "could constitute a sufficient entry," and that "[i]n this sense Dione's

catalogue is reducible to the form of a list."[48]

These principles are more readily visible in the catalogue of Zeus's lovers that

Zeus himself narrates during Hera's seduction of him in *Iliad* 14. Ensnared by the power

of Aphrodite's girdle and enraptured with his wife, he speaks the following:

> τὴν δ᾽ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς·
> Ἥρη κεῖσε μὲν ἔστι καὶ ὕστερον ὁρμηθῆναι,
> νῶϊ δ᾽ ἄγ᾽ ἐν φιλότητι τραπείομεν εὐνηθέντε.
> οὐ γάρ πώ ποτέ μ᾽ ὧδε θεᾶς ἔρος οὐδὲ γυναικὸς   315
> θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσι περιπροχυθεὶς ἐδάμασσεν,
> οὐδ᾽ ὁπότ᾽ ἠρασάμην Ἰξιονίης ἀλόχοιο,
> ἣ τέκε Πειρίθοον θεόφιν μήστωρ᾽ ἀτάλαντον·
> οὐδ᾽ ὅτε περ Δανάης καλλισφύρου Ἀκρισιώνης,
> ἣ τέκε Περσῆα, πάντων ἀριδείκετον ἀνδρῶν·   320
> οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Φοίνικος κούρης τηλεκλειτοῖο,
> ἣ τέκε μοι Μίνων τε καὶ ἀντίθεον Ῥαδάμανθυν·
> οὐδ᾽ ὅτε περ Σεμέλης οὐδ᾽ Ἀλκμήνης ἐνὶ Θήβῃ,
> ἥ ῥ᾽ Ἡρακλῆα κρατερόφρονα γείνατο παῖδα·
> ἣ δὲ Διώνυσον Σεμέλη τέκε χάρμα βροτοῖσιν·   325
> οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Δήμητρος καλλιπλοκάμοιο ἀνάσσης,
> οὐδ᾽ ὁπότε Λητοῦς ἐρικυδέος, οὐδὲ σεῦ αὐτῆς,
> ὡς σέο νῦν ἔραμαι καί με γλυκὺς ἵμερος αἱρεῖ. (*Il.* 14.312–328)

> To her in answer spoke the cloud-gatherer Zeus:
> Hera, you may go there afterward,
> but for us, let us enjoy ourselves lying together in love.
> For never yet so did desire for a goddess or woman,
> poured out upon me, overpower the heart in my breast,
> not when I desired the wife of Ixion,
> who bore Perithous, peer of the gods in council,
> nor when I loved Danae of the lovely ankles, daughter of Acrisius,
> who bore Persius, glorious among all men,
> nor when [I loved] the daughter of far-famed Phoenix,
> who bore me Minos and godlike Rhadamanthus,
> nor when [I loved] Semele or Alkmene in Thebes,
> which latter bore Heracles, a strong-hearted child,
> and Semele bore Dionysus as a delight to mortals,
> nor when [I loved] Demeter the lovely-haired queen,
> nor when [I loved] glorious Leto, nor even you yourself,
> so much as I now love you and sweet desire seizes me.

---

[48] Sammons 2010, p. 27.

The rhetorical force of the catalogue is clear: through an accumulation of negations, the final positive assertion is magnified. The entries, introduced by οὐδ᾽ ὅτε or οὐδ᾽ ὅποτε depending on metrical need, also contain at least one mandatory second line, making this a catalogue not only of Zeus's lovers but of Zeus's children. The second line of the entry is introduced with the feminine relative pronoun, and there is a strong tendency for the line to begin with ἣ τέκε before naming the child of that particular union. This tendency, in fact, is only broken in the entry of lines 323–325, in which the initial line of the entry names two goddesses and thus seems to mandate two following lines naming their children, and in the antepenultimate and penultimate lines of the catalogue. The structure of the first break is chiastic: Semele, Alcmene, Heracles the son of Alcmene, Dionysus the son of Semele. As for the second, break, the only women or goddesses whose children are not named are Demeter and Leto, and the line beginning with Leto also addresses Hera herself. The absence of Persephone's name allows the line naming Demeter to form a descending tricolon with Leto and Hera, culminating in the sudden shift into the second person and the negation even of that love in the face of Zeus's present desire for Hera.

But the two-part structure of the entries does not mean that this catalogue could not be collapsed. Indeed, the final descending tricolon demonstrates that the lines naming Zeus's progeny could be omitted from the catalogue entirely, as they are both grammatically and conceptually subordinate to the catalogue's main subject. What matters here are the formulaic names, and only the names, of the women, stated with maximum poetic economy. Indeed, the first is not even a name, but merely a formulaic

reference: Ἰξιονίης ἀλόχοιο. The formulaic reference is also used in the case of the

Φοίνικος κούρης τηλεκλειτοῖο. This particular formulaic construction is notable for its

flexibility: the placement of κούρης in the center of the formula is a matter of free poetic

choice, because the entire formula consists of long syllables except for the final anceps;

the line would be identical if the poet were to sing *οὐδ᾽ ὅτε κούρης Φοίνικος

τηλεκλειτοῖο.[49] This could theoretically involve a deliberate ambiguity between Φοίνικος

and κούρης as the nominal complements of τηλεκλειτοῖο, since there are no attestations

of τηλεκλειτός in unambiguously feminine forms until Apollonius Rhodius writes

τηλεκλειτὴν τ᾽ Ἀριάδνην (*Arg.* 3.1097) in the third century. It seems, however, that this is

another case of a split epithet formula: *Od.* 19.546 yields Ἰκαρίου κούρη τηλεκλειτοῖο,

and the *Shield of Heracles* contains Λυγκῆος γενεὴ τηλεκλειτοῖο (*Scut.* 327). Since both

of the Homeric attestations use a form of κούρη, it is unclear whether the word is

mandatory in this formula or whether it forms a variable element, although speaking of a

"formula" *sensu stricto* seems to demand a second relatively fixed element; the pseudo-

Hesiodic usage might better be termed a "formulaic pattern." In this case, this formula

consists of a variable masculine name in the genitive covering the second food-and-a-half

of the line, followed by a form of κούρη and τηλεκλειτοῖο. A concise representation

might resemble the following:

$$— \smile\smile — \qquad\qquad — — \qquad\qquad — — — — \text{x}$$
[Name]MASC GEN [κούρη]ANY   τηλεκλειτοῖο

At first glance, then, this seems to invoke the daughter through the name of her father in

standard patronymic fashion, but the structure of the formula subverts this reading: the

---

[49] The line is extremely unlikely to the point of near impossibility, as it lacks a caesura within or after the third foot, but it does break in the fourth foot: see West 1984, p. 36.

father, rather, is given a kind of false epithet that belongs grammatically to him but is formulaically proper to the κούρη. At the same time that it names the daughter through the father, the formula allows the father to be named as "far-famed" only in terms of his relationship to his daughter.

Zeus's catalogue of lovers readily displays the principle of economy: the names of the women are confined to a single self-contained line. The principle of hierarchy is also evident: the following lines of each entry depend on the first for their pronominal referents, but the first lines do not require the other lines for completeness. The use of the genitive case does prompt the question of whether the first line of the first entry (317) supplies a necessary verb, ἠρασάμην, for the first lines of each subsequent entry. Certainly its use in the first entry links it to the initial genitives in each subsequent entry, but the presence of nominative ἔρος with objective genitives θεᾶς and γυναικός in line 315, which outlines the catalogue's rubric, renders the verb grammatically unnecessary: the catalogue could just as easily hold together as a list of objective genitives all traceable to the ἔρος of 315 that precedes all entries. While Sammons's criterion of connective or anaphoric arrangement would not be disrupted if each entry depended fully on ἠρασάμην, overdetermination of the genitive cases ensures that the initial entry can be omitted as long as the opening lines laying out the rubric are cited. This makes the entries interchangeable: even the final entry can be omitted so long as the catalogue concludes with ὡς σέο νῦν ἔραμαι καί με γλυκὺς ἵμερος αἱρεῖ.

It is plain, then, how this catalogue might be abbreviated or collapsed. Since the succeeding lines of each entry are fully subordinate to the first, they can be omitted without doing grammatical violence to the catalogue. Indeed, because of the

overdetermination of the genitive cases in each entry, any particular entry, including the first, might be omitted or replaced with another. The integrity of the catalogue depends upon no particular entry or arrangement of entries: their selection and arrangement is entirely at the discretion of the poet, and an extremely brief catalogue is just as feasible as an extremely lengthy one; nothing prevents either choice except, perhaps, the boredom of the poet's audience or the lateness of the hour. Indeed, the entries themselves are far from immutable: Δανάης and Σεμέλης are metrically identical, and οὐδ' ὅτε περ Δανάης is almost perfectly interchangeable line-initially with οὐδ' ὅτε Δήμητρος, so long as an initial consonant follows the latter. Each, then, can also be made into a double entry in order to compress the catalogue still further, although it is quite unlikely that the poet would compress a mortal into the same line as Demeter; in this telling of the catalogue he saves the goddesses for last, and it is reasonable to assume at least that gods would not be included in the same lines as mortals. Indeed, even the mortals who bore gods are not included in the same lines as other mortal women. But even these structural caveats do not alter the main point: the catalogue depends upon no particular entry for its integrity.

§3. Catalogic Indexing

The framework outlined thus far provides ample room for a poet to collapse a catalogue of names into a few bare entries, or even into just one. But the catalogic framework allows for still further compression, although this compression carries the resulting text outside anything that might reasonably be called a catalogue. Nonetheless, this compression is a permutation of the catalogic framework rather than a break with it. It relies specifically on the lines that open a catalogue in which the catalogue's rubric is spelled out. It has been established already that these lines make it possible to define a

catalogue as a concatenation of entries in no particular order; each is independent and no

particular entry is determinative, so entries can be omitted or added with no effect on the

other entries or on the basic structure of the catalogue.

This is possible, however, only because of the function of the rubric lines that

precede the catalogue proper. Consider the lines that open Dione's catalogue of wounded

deities:

> τέτλαθι, τέκνον ἐμόν, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ.
> πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλῆμεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ᾽ ἔχοντες
> ἐξ ἀνδρῶν, χαλέπ᾽ ἄλγε᾽ ἐπ᾽ ἀλλήλοισι τιθέντες. (*Il.* 5.382–384)

> Be patient, my child, and persevere though you suffer,
> for many of us who have homes on Olympus have suffered
> at the hands of mortals as we set difficult pains upon one another.

The relevant lines for the catalogue's rubric are lines 383–4: they assure Aphrodite that

she is not unique in her humiliation, and in fact that many deities have suffered wounds

from mortals during conflicts that involved both mortals and gods. Implicit in this is that

the gods wreak suffering upon one another through mortals, whom the Homeric poems

do not depict wounding gods unless the mortals receive divine assistance of their own.[50]

The thought, however, is complete as it stands: Dione has already given Aphrodite reason

for consolation, and the opening lines of the catalogue index the many different occasions

on which mortals have wounded gods. Seen in this light, the catalogue is a limited

instantiation of the many occasions that could possibly be cited, but it is essentially

nothing more than an elaboration or intensification of the rhetorical gesture already

expressed by its opening lines: in this case, it intensifies Dione's consolation of

---

[50] Both the Aloadae (*Od.* 11.305–308) and Heracles are demigods, suggesting that this harm is not always deliberate, but may be an inevitable result of the chaos that arises when gods become too involved with mortals.

Aphrodite. But if the catalogue merely intensifies the rhetorical gesture of the opening

lines and instantiates a portion of the indexed material, it would be perfectly possible to

omit the catalogue entries entirely while remaining within the framework that allows for

the catalogue's flexibility. The catalogue can, in other words, be collapsed entirely into

its introductory lines and a null entry: the entries themselves become fundamentally

unnecessary for achieving the indexing aims of the catalogue.[51]

This indexing is less overt in the opening of Calypso's catalogue, but the lines

still ultimately fulfill an indexing function:

> σχέτλιοί ἐστε, θεοί, ζηλήμονες ἔξοχον ἄλλων,
> οἵ τε θεαῖς ἀγάασθε παρ᾽ ἀνδράσιν εὐνάζεσθαι
> ἀμφαδίην, ἤν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσετ᾽ ἀκοίτην. (*Od.* 5.118–120)

> You are wicked, o gods, and jealous beyond all men,
> since you resent that goddesses lie with men
> in the open, if one of them will make a man her beloved husband.

Once again the *rhetorical* function of the catalogue is clear even from its rubric lines, and

the enjambed ἀμφαδίην emphasizes its relatively restricted character: Calypso's primary

complaint is about the public scandal that gods give whenever a goddess sleeps openly

with a mortal. The homoioteleuton of the initial and final words in the line drives the

point home. What conceals the indexing function is the absence of a variation of πᾶς or

πολύς: one of the two makes an appearance in the rubric lines of each of the other

catalogues discussed so far. In this case, the function is carried out more covertly by ἤν

τίς τε φίλον ποιήσετ᾽ ἀκοίτην.[52] The initial ἤν replicates the homoioteleuton of the first

---

[51] In this respect they function similarly to the foil elements of a summary priamel, as discussed in the first chapter of Bundy 1962. More recently, see Race 1982 for a full literary-historical treatment of the priamel. Note, however, that the catalogic elements are not strictly *foils* as the elements of a priamel, as they do not exist in order to be negated. Zeus's catalogue of lovers, however, is a perfect priamel in catalogic form.
[52] Calypso's use of ἀκοίτην has been taken to imply an intent to wed rather than merely to take him as a lover, but see Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, p. 266: the prohibition on mortal liaisons of any kind seems to be absolute with goddesses, but not with nymphs like Calypso.

part of the line, allowing the phrase to stand as a nested unit within the larger sense unit of the line. The indexing function itself hinges on the indicative future verb, which underscores the inevitability of goddesses sleeping with mortals: because it has happened before, it is bound to happen again. This is augmented by the present tense of the prothetic apodosis: the envy of the gods is habitual, returning each time this happens. Though the ordinary words that mark such an indexing are absent, the poet's intensification of the strictly poetic[53] dimensions of the line allows the line to be marked and, for an audience knowledgeable about myth, to index the many mythological instances of goddesses and mortals. Here as elsewhere, the catalogue entries underscore the rhetorical point and indeed constitute much of its force, but their role is still auxiliary. Indeed, the entries themselves are curious for not being more widely attested examples, which would be more familiar to the audience and hence more credible as persuasive precedents for Calypso's case: most striking of all is the omission of Aphrodite's liaison with Anchises,[54] given the notable role of Aeneas in the Trojan War and the severe consequences for Anchises as a result of their coupling.

These relatively obscure entries are, as noted above, auxiliary to but not constitutive of the main rhetorical thrust of the catalogue: what constitutes the catalogue's rhetorical force is the indexing function that allows the accumulation of exempla beyond the limits of bare citation. It points toward the uncited body of traditional material that *could* be instantiated but has not been, and aims to bring that material onto the same level of reality as explicitly instantiated material. This aim accounts for the relative obscurity

---

[53] "Poetic" here in Jakobson's sense of drawing explicit attention to language as language; see Jakobson 1960.

[54] Though Aphrodite may not be entirely absent from the catalogue; see the discussion of Eos below.

of Calypso's two exempla in her catalogue, which seem not only to choose more obscure

myths but to deliberately emphasize them over and above more canonical versions. This

is quite visible in her citation of the myth of Orion:

> ὣς μὲν ὅτ᾽ Ὠρίων᾽ ἕλετο ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἠώς,
> τόφρα οἱ ἠγάασθε θεοὶ ῥεῖα ζώοντες,
> ἕως μιν ἐν Ὀρτυγίῃ χρυσόθρονος Ἄρτεμις ἁγνὴ
> οἷς ἀγανοῖς βελέεσσιν ἐποιχομένη κατέπεφνεν. (*Od.* 5.121–124)

In this version, the goddess who takes Orion is Eos, and it is the vengeance of Artemis

that leads to the hunter's death. The *Odyssey* is the only early antique attestation of this

version of the story whatsoever;[55] even later scholiasts and mythographers, with one

exception, ignore Eos in favor of his liaison with or attempted rape of Artemis, in which

he dies by scorpion sting.[56] It is possible that the poet at the time that these lines were

fixed was unaware of that particular story, but it also seems strange for a Homeric

account to go relatively unattested in later mythography, unless the Homeric account was

considered non-standard. Artemis's slaying of Orion would become, in this case, a

deliberate demonstration of the poet's choice to elevate this story over the other.

The effect of this elevation of the non-standard story over and against the more

common one is to augment and underscore the central operation of indexing. In this light,

the more obscure exempla are *better* for making Calypso's case, because they are able to

imply more well-known stories by conspicuous omission, thus adding the rhetorical force

of unstated exempla to those stated. In the case of Anchises and Aphrodite, for example,

---

[55] Ps.-Eratosthenes's *Catasterismi* 1.32–34 summarizes a myth of Orion and Artemis supposedly taken from a lost work of Hesiod. Ps.-Apollodorus's *Bibliotheke* 1.4.3–5 does discuss the vengeance of Artemis, but this is generally dated to the first or second century CE, and places Orion's death at Delos instead of Ortygia.

[56] Eos may have been cursed by Aphrodite, per Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, (p. 266). For Aphrodite's relationship to her and possible erotic aspects of the dawn goddess, see Boedeker 1974 (pp. 1–18).

its absence amid the decision to enumerate specific exempla is what draws attention to it and calls it to mind.[57] By allowing for this effect of conspicuous absence, the poet has increased the number of precedents brought to bear by Calypso's speech without needing to cite them. This is more effective than a more general indexing operation without specific exempla; the mere perception of the possibility of many exempla does not carry the same weight as exempla that have been concretized. This concretization, rather than full instantiation, is what renders the exempla persuasive, and this is what brings Aphrodite and Anchises to bear: since what draws attention is the particular absence of a particular story, that story is able to come fully to mind even without being told. The audience knows precisely what could be present, rather than perceiving the general possibility of filling the catalogue with a greater number of interchangeable entries.

Ironically, the most paradigmatic catalogue in the entire corpus is also a conspicuous exception to this analysis. But the *Schiffskatalog* seems to be aware of this, and to account for its own exception to the more common catalogic scheme:

> ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ᾽ ἔχουσαι·
> ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστέ τε, ἴστέ τε πάντα,   485
> ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν·
> οἵ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν·
> πληθὺν δ᾽ οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ᾽ ὀνομήνω,
> οὐδ᾽ εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ᾽ εἶεν,
> φωνὴ δ᾽ ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,   490
> εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
> θυγατέρες μνησαίαθ᾽ ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον.
> ἀρχοὺς αὖ νηῶν ἐρέω, νῆάς τε προπάσας. (*Il.* 2.484–493)

Tell me now, you Muses who have homes on Olympus,

---

[57] The absence is conspicuous because the account given even in the later *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* still shares major structural elements with those elaborated on in the catalogue. The divine φθόνος born of erotic envy that characterizes each entry is here displaced to the beginning of the story, as it is clear that Aphrodite's boasting is what arouses this jealousy (Bergren 1989, p. 2; Schein 2013, p. 298), but this φθόνος remains constitutive of the episode, and thus the episode remains a typological fit for recall via catalogic indexing.

(for you are goddesses, and you are present to all things and see them,
but we hear only of the fame [of things] and know nothing),
who the leaders and kings of Danaans were.
I could not tell their thronging nor their names,
not even if I had ten tongues and ten mouths
and an unyielding voice and a heart of bronze within me,
unless you Olympian Muses, aegis-bearing Zeus's
daughters, remember who came to Ilium.
But I shall tell the leaders of the ships and all the ships in their order.

It is readily apparent that this catalogue cannot be curtailed even in the slightest, both because the rubric lines have foreclosed that possibility and because this is a catalogue of historical items rather than a set of rhetorical exempla. The invocation of the Muses cites first their superabundant knowledge (ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστέ τε ἴστέ τε πάντα) and contrasts it with the imperfect knowledge of a mortal singer, gained by rumor rather than by firsthand witness (ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν). His inability to recount or name them is couched as an unreal conditional with a negated analeptic apodosis, once more exhibiting the rhetorical negation of inability or lack as an expression of plenitude. The final line is the actual rubric: the ἀρχοὺς νηῶν and the νῆας προπάσας are the basic items of the catalogue.

Both the invocation of the Muses and the final rubric line explicitly disavow the abbreviation of this catalogue, and in doing so they set it apart from other catalogues that carefully navigate instantiated and potential material. The plenitude of the *Schiffskatalog* in fact renders basic catalogic indexing obsolete and unnecessary: there need be no indexing if there are no unenumerated members. This, I contend, is a conscious contrast on the poet's part: the poet is aware of the conventions of catalogic verse and, in a feat of superlative poetic memory, elects both to break them deliberately and to announce his departure from convention in the most flagrant possible way. The verse-final προπάσας is

especially daring and emphatic, suggesting not only plenitude but perfectly controlled and orderly plenitude: each will be named with their ships at the appropriate time. That the poet feels the need to announce his mnemonic and declamatory endeavor speaks to the need to contrast it with typical catalogic practice: it suggests an audience well aware of the typical incomplete structure of catalogues, and renders the poet's intention to give a full accounting all the more exciting.

§4. Indexing and the Epithet Formula

The indexing function, then, is sufficiently basic to the catalogue that the exceptionalism in the rubric to the *Schiffskatalog*, though rhetorically and poetically exciting, seems also to be a necessary disclaimer against the audience's expectations of a catalogue of persons. And indeed, the present discussion began by considering the entries themselves as miniature exercises in indexing, since only a comparatively small amount of information, often only a single line's worth, is actually necessary to satisfy the rubric of the catalogue, and the entries are structured so as to frontload this information and allow the poet to exercise discretion about whether to provide supplementary information as an artistic exercise or a mnemonic aid for the audience. This is the embedded indexing that the *Schiffskatalog* retains even as the basic indexing of the rubric is obviated through completeness.

This is easily illustrated through two contrasting leader citations in the catalogue. First is the entry of Menestheus, which contains a short descriptive appendix:

> τῶν αὖθ᾿ ἡγεμόνευ᾿ υἱὸς Πετεῶο Μενεσθεύς.
> τῷ δ᾿ οὔ πώ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπιχθόνιος γένετ᾿ ἀνὴρ
> κοσμῆσαι ἵππους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἀσπιδιώτας·
> Νέστωρ οἶος ἔριζεν· ὃ γὰρ προγενέστερος ἦεν· (2.552–555)

> Of these the leader was Menestheus the son of Peteos.

> To him was no other man upon the earth an equal
> at marshalling horses and shield-bearing men:
> only Nestor contended with him, for he was the elder.

Here Menestheus receives a fairly standard citation with a patronymic epithet. The poet

follows this with a description of his battle prowess similar to that received by Oilean

Ajax, though in this case the emphasis is on Menestheus's superiority at marshalling over

nearly everyone; the qualifier about Nestor is itself appended, and could easily be omitted

without any syntactic violence to the rest of the text. But although the line is formally

dispensable, Nestor *does* display his great skill at marshalling troops and at commanding

chariot fighters, quite memorably,[58] whereas Menestheus does not. This is dramatically

effective supplementation, in an entry has a relatively high amount of supplementary

material: three supplementary lines to the single nominal one. Contrast this with the first

lines of the first entry in the catalogue:

> Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον
> Ἀρκεσίλαός τε Προθοήνωρ τε Κλονίος τε (2.494–495)

As remarked earlier, the first line is notable because of its double name, a comparative

rarity in the *Schiffskatalog*, though perfectly cogent both under Tichy's analysis and

under the catalogic framework outlined in the present chapter. The second line is taken

up entirely by three more names linked by a simple connective particle; none of the

names, either in the first or second line, has an epithet of any kind. Giving *only* bare

names places severe inhibitions on the indexing function enabled by traditional

referentiality: the lines maximize the amount of basic rubrical information that they carry

at the expense of the extra-lexical information that might be available if more

recognizable formulae or formulaic patterns were used. Names, of course, are not devoid

---

[58] See ch. 3, §4 of the present study for further discussion of these displays.

of information and context; it is hard to hear the name Heracles without thinking of his labors, and prolonged thought brings to mind other parts of his life and story for the informed listener. But bare names lack the network effect of traditional referentiality, in which a singer employs "sanctioned designations…each of which is used in myriad other songs and situations throughout the networked epic tradition." This concatenation of references "indexes a large inventory of background information" and enables characterization in shorthand (Foley 199, p. 102). In this way, formulaic names in familiar metrical slots function similarly to rhyme in orally-performed English lyric:[59] they tell the ear what it has heard and allow the audience to process a steady flow of poetry more easily, allowing the indexing function to operate more easily than it might if the audience must concentrate on making sense of an unusually-structured line.

But the contrast between bare and formulaic name is less visible with comparatively minor figures, as in the lines discussed above. Indeed, the poet may very well choose to fill out this portion of his catalogue with bare names precisely because these figures lack the robust attestation required for traditional referential characterization to function: Klonios and Arkesilaos, for example, are mentioned only in this catalogue entry and in book 15, where they are killed by Hector (*Il.* 15.329–342),[60] and Prothoenor perishes in book 14 (*Il.* 14.450). Peneleos and Leïtos are somewhat more common, though by no means ubiquitous; they are concentrated in books 13 and 14, and they seem to be paired to some degree (*Il.* 13.91–92). With a major figure like Telamonian Ajax, the

---

[59] Perhaps the best discussion of rhyme in contemporary English oral lyrics is Stephen Sondheim's brief technical introduction, found in Sondheim 2010, pp. xxv–xxviii.
[60] This is the last in a series of deaths in 3 books that kills off the entire familial group introduced in the catalogue entry. See the commentary in Janko 1992.

contrast is much more obvious. His first attestation in the *Schiffskatalog* is in the entry

naming Ajax the Lesser discussed earlier:

> Λοκρῶν δ᾽ ἡγεμόνευεν Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας
> μείων, οὔ τι τόσος γε ὅσος Τελαμώνιος Αἴας
> ἀλλὰ πολὺ μείων: ὀλίγος μὲν ἔην λινοθώρηξ,
> ἐγχείῃ δ᾽ ἐκέκαστο Πανέλληνας καὶ Ἀχαιούς· (2.527–530)

Compare this with Ajax's own entry in the catalogue:

> Αἴας δ᾽ ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας,
> στῆσε δ᾽ ἄγων ἵν᾽ Ἀθηναίων ἵσταντο φάλαγγες. (2.557–558)

The first citation of Ajax's name is accompanied by his characteristic patronymic epithet,

attested sufficiently widely that a full study would be a monograph by itself. Less than 30

lines later, his entire entry comprises two lines and seems to be something of an appendix

to the entry on the Athenians, which directly precedes it.[61] The bare line-initial Αἴας is

striking given the severe paucity of such references as compared with attestations

involving an epithet.[62] It is all the more striking given that the first entry specifically

distinguishes between the two Aiantes. Kirk's suggestion that the lineage of Ajax was

under dispute at the time that this line was composed seems not to adequately account for

the decision. Parsimony suggests the possibility that the two Aiantes had already been

distinguished from one another, and so there was no need to mark the second and greater

of the two, though this is not terribly satisfying either. More plausibly, the toponym that

follows his name distinguishes him without any standard formula, although the line

---

[61] See the discussion in Finkelberg 1988b. The brevity of this entry was noted by ancient commentators, and it was athetized by Aristarchus as insupportable in light of its detailed placement of the Salamis ships relative to those of the Athenians. For a comprehensive treatment of Aristarchean criteria for athetesis, see Schironi 2018, pp. 444–496.

[62] Kirk 1985 suggests that the lineage of Ajax may have been under dispute at the time of composition (p. 209), noting that Αἰακίδης is a unique epithet for Achilles.

remains structurally difficult to classify. A third possibility is that the poet is holding

back in preparation for the catalogic "endnote" about him and Achilles:

> ἀνδρῶν αὖ μέγ᾽ ἄριστος ἔην Τελαμώνιος Αἴας
> ὄφρ᾽ Ἀχιλεὺς μήνιεν· ὃ γὰρ πολὺ φέρτατος ἦεν,
> ἵπποι θ᾽ οἳ φορέεσκον ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα. (*Il.* 2.768–770)

> And of men the best was Telamonian Ajax
> while Achilles raged: for he was much the best,
> And the horses that carried the blameless son of Peleus.

Perhaps the best comparandum for Ajax's catalogic citation is the line giving the name

of Achilles at 685: τῶν αὖ πεντήκοντα νεῶν ἦν ἀρχὸς Ἀχιλλεύς. As discussed earlier, this

seems to be a combination of line types particular to Achilles, and the line announcing

Ajax exhibits the same combination, plus the internal toponym. Given the stature of both

heroes, the break in the typical line patterns of the *Schiffskatalog* is somewhat more

understandable.

But most important for the present discussion is the way in which this break

interrupts the indexing function of the catalogue entry. At least the name of Achilles

appears after four standard catalogic lines; though the entry continues, it seems as if lines

686–694 are superadditions to the entry, since they uncharacteristically refer to the events

of the poem—the entry for Protesilaus that follows does the same thing through

enjambment of ζωὸς ἐών in line 699. Though without an epithet, Achilles also occupies

the line-final position that he has occupied on many other occasions. Ajax has, in effect, a

single-line entry giving his name as commander, his city of origin, and the (unusually

small) number of ships that he brought; the second line of the entry is a syntactically

superfluous addition. The unusual positioning of his name, in combination with the major

breaks in catalogic form, takes the audience into *terra incognita* and in doing so disrupts

the ability of traditional referentiality to index Ajax's character. This is not to say that no indexing is possible, but the absence of familiar modes of reference hinders the process: the name appears in a rare and unusual context not easily connected with its other attestations.

The previous chapter discussed in detail the indexing function of poetry and the ways in which this function is signaled and invoked in oral poetry particularly. Since this is one of the central operations of Homeric characterization, it is signaled in a variety of ways, but all of these ways may be, in the end, subsumed under the Jakobsonian poetic: they call attention to language *qua* language, and in doing so mark it as working "like languages, only more so" (Foley 1999, p. 12).[63] Fundamentally, the Jakobsonian poetic marks poetic language as performing a linguistic function more intensely or more effectively: in this case it is the function of reference, whose ordinary mono- or polyvalence overflows into the superabundance of index; index is the ecstasy of reference. The poetic takes many forms, some more accessible than others. Among the most universal and accessible is alliteration, as in *índraś ca yád yuyudhā́te áhiś c[a]* (*RV* 1.32.13) in which even a reader with no Sanskrit can see the alliterative phrase linking the parallel *índraś* and *áhiś*, and a reader who glosses the line "when Indra and the serpent fought with one another" can observe immediately that this alliteration heightens the struggle between the two rival combatants; the short sentence encapsulates a long and vicious battle, and is able to convey the parity of the two combatants by placing their names in initial and final positions joined by an alliterative link. One observes a similar phenomenon in ἐξ οὗ δὴ τὰ πρῶτα διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε / Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ

---

[63] This is also the import of Watkins's discussion of genetic relationships between the poetic registers of genetically related languages. See Watkins 1995, pp. 3–11.

75

δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς (*Il.* 1.6–7), although in this case the consonance that signals parity in strife begins in the first line and the parallel names, both in well-attested epithet phrases, are deferred until the following line. In the Vedic example, the alliterative joining accomplishes what bare names alone cannot, and enables "Indra and the serpent" to connote not merely a pair but a rival pair in pitched and equal battle: the statement of their having fought indexes the full length of the battle, whose length is indeterminate but which certainly lasted beyond one or two passes.[64] In the Homeric example, the highly consonant first line alternating between sibilant and dental consonants entangles the two rivals, and their deferral until the next line finally resolves the sentence with a full formulaic statement that manages to preemptively index the entire *Iliad*. This is in some respects, of course, the normal and expected work of a proem, but these functions would not be possible, or at least would be far, far more difficult, without the alliterative devices that heighten the indexing power of these concluding lines.

But it is not only alliteration or other devices of sound-play that highlight this poetic dimension, or rather, it is not only *pure* devices of sound-play that do this. It seems necessary to classify the formulaic repetition and rearticulation that forms the bulwark of traditional referentiality as belonging to the same family of devices as alliteration: it does, after all, create its effect through the patterned repetition of particular sounds—it merely does this on a larger scale than intralinear alliteration or homoioteleuton. This repetition of both sound and meter certainly highlights language *qua* language: it cannot help but do so in its project of distinguishing the language of epic from ordinary speech. It is this linguistic intensification that allows concurrent intensification of the referential function.

---

[64] The canonical account is *RV* 1.32, though this is actually two accounts with notable difference, somewhat similar to the creation accounts of Genesis 1 and 2.

Where a catalogue rubric must specify a particular category of things or persons eligible for inclusion, indexing them in proportion to the listener's knowledge, the noun-epithet formula is able to invoke this function poetically: the development of an elaborate system of metrical epithet phrases is historically inseparable from the epithet's Jakobsonian poetic function and its indexing ability, to the point that this indexing function has become inseparable from Homeric characterization as such.

This inseparability is most clearly visible in the introductory and laudatory elements of the Teichoskopia. It seems difficult to deny, based on the internal evidence, that this episode is indeed genuinely introductory and probably took shape as an earlier episode in the war before being transposed into the *Iliad*.[65] But this introductory character is distorted and obscured both by its temporal placement in the final year of the war and by its relatively brief introductions of some of the major players.[66] This does not, however, inhibit its characterization, because the relatively brief introductions given by Helen begin with statements that suggest some kind of genetic relationship with catalogue literature. This results in a kind of bipartite characterization, beginning with questions from Priam that physically describe particular men and ask Helen to identify them; her answers then fill out these descriptions, uniting the specificity of particular perception with the indexing capacity of poetic tradition. Her speech in reply to Priam's initial question illustrates this perfectly:

> αἰδοῖός τέ μοί ἐσσι, φίλε ἑκυρέ, δεινός τε·
> ὡς ὄφελεν θάνατός μοι ἁδεῖν κακὸς ὁππότε δεῦρο
> υἱέϊ σῷ ἑπόμην θάλαμον γνωτούς τε λιποῦσα

---

[65] This was the *communis opinio* even according to Kirk 1985 (p. 286), and subsequent scholarship has not substantially altered this judgment.

[66] Jamison 1994 contends that these formal elements are explicable as the residue of a ritualized answer to an incorrectly performed abduction. This does not seem to weaken the case for the episode's transposition, as a failed duel remains far more characteristic of the early stage of a war than of its final year.

παῖδά τε τηλυγέτην καὶ ὁμηλικίην ἐρατεινήν.   175
ἀλλὰ τά γ᾽ οὐκ ἐγένοντο· τὸ καὶ κλαίουσα τέτηκα.
τοῦτο δέ τοι ἐρέω ὅ μ᾽ ἀνείρεαι ἠδὲ μεταλλᾷς·
οὗτός γ᾽ Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων,
ἀμφότερον βασιλεύς τ᾽ ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ᾽ αἰχμητής·
δαὴρ αὖτ᾽ ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνώπιδος, εἴ ποτ᾽ ἔην γε. (*Il.* 3.172–180)

You are revered to me, dear father-in-law, and august.
Would that evil death had delighted me on that day when
I followed your son after leaving behind my room and my kinsmen
and my darling daughter and my lovely lady companion.
But these things did not come to pass, for which I pine away in weeping.
But I will tell you this thing which you ask and inquire of me:
That one is the son of Atreus, wide-ruling Agamemnon,
both a noble king and a mighty spear-fighter,
and he is brother-in-law to dog-faced me, if ever there was one.

The first part of Helen's answer is personal narrative material that is not necessarily part of the core of the scene. Her answer begins in earnest when she marks it at line 187 with a known formula of reply.[67] Immediately following it is a three-line introduction whose first line consists of initial οὗτος followed by a formulaic citation of Agamemnon's name. The other two lines give his accomplishments as king and warrior and his relationship to Helen herself.

Following Priam's visual description of Odysseus and his second query, Helen once again replies to him with three lines of description:

οὗτος δ᾽ αὖ Λαερτιάδης πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς,
ὃς τράφη ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης κραναῆς περ ἐούσης
εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μήδεα πυκνά. (*Il.* 3.200–202)

That one is Atreus's son, the much-devising Odysseus,
who was reared in the land of Ithaca, though it is rugged,
and who knows all kinds of tricks and intricate devices.

The pattern of the replies starts to become clear here. Each reply begins with a line stating the name of the hero being considered. Each line in turn is composed of an

---

[67] This form of reply is not attested again in the *Iliad* but is attested at *Od.* 7.243 and 15.402.

78

invariant initial οὗτος followed by a formulaic statement of the hero's name. In this case, the formula is nearly identical in metrical shape to the full-line formula used to address Odysseus, διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη πολυμήχαν᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ, minus the first word; the variation arises because there is no way to fit nominative πολυμήχανος into the line, and so the nominative version of this formula must substitute πολύμητις, which is both semantically similar and, like its vocative counterpart, unique to Odysseus. This entry likewise acknowledges its subject's rulership and prowess, although it appropriately emphasizes his intelligence over his martial strength. Since he has no family relationship to Helen, this is not cited. Kirk (1985, p. 286) notes the catalogue's eccentric inclusion criteria, and Jamison (1994, p. 14) observes that all of the heroes named in this entry are close kinsmen or supporters of Menelaus. All are in fact signatories of the Oath of Tyndareus, and in Jamison's account this is sufficient for their inclusion, as the Oath specifically renders them aggrieved parties if the marriage is endangered, creating a legal kinship sufficient to override the normal settlement of the right of action only upon Helen's or Menelaus's blood kinsmen.

At this point a strongly catalogic structure seems readily apparent in these entries: they have a highly formulaic beginning and a distinctive structure. Although this three-line structure is broken in the final entry, which names Ajax, Idomeneus, and Helen's brothers the Dioscuri, its initial line retains the structure of an initial line in a catalogue entry: οὗτος Αἴας ἐστὶ πελώριος ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* 3.229). In addition to the formal parallels, it also partakes of the declarative quality that unites catalogic entries. It shares this declarative character not only with catalogues or catalogue-like portions of the Greek

corpus, but also with heroic poetry across the Indo-European tradition. Some of the most

apparent examples are hymnic poems, such as the following example from the *Ṛgveda*:

> *yó jātá evá prathamó mánasvān*
> *devó devā́n krátunā paryábhūṣat*
> *yásya śúṣmād ródasī ábhyasetāṃ*
> *nṛmṇásya mahnā́ sá janāsa índraḥ* (RV 2.12.1)

> He who, just born, became wisest,
> the god who of his own will tended to the gods,
> before whose breath the world-halves trembled
> from the greatness of his manliness: he, O people, is Indra!

The verse-final *sá janāsa índraḥ* ("he, O people, is Indra!") concludes the first fourteen

verses of this fifteen-verse hymn. This is the normal place for such declarations: the

names of the suitors of Draupadī also appear in the final portion of her announcement of

each (Jamison 1994, pp. 11–12). The announcement is clearly formulaic, giving cohesion

and direction to an otherwise loosely correlated list and transforming it into a miniature

act of divine construction.[68] The initial relative pronoun that begins each of the first

fourteen verses confirms the structure of the poem not only as a list, but as

straightforwardly catalogic. This is not to say that the poem is structurally identical to a

Homeric catalogue, as it lacks the kind of definite rubric whose indexing function enables

much of the rhetorical punch of the catalogue. Part of the rubric function, however, is

filled by the verse-final acclamation of Indra: the repeated acclamation incorporates each

relative clause into the identity of Indra, giving retrospective definition and direction to

each line even for a listener unfamiliar with the particular mythic narratives that a given

line invokes or alludes to.[69] By repeating the name of Indra in a poetically marked

---

[68] See the discussion of list hymns in Jamison and Brereton 2014, p. 65.
[69] Incorporation is one of the major functions of acclamation more generally. Regal acclamations in post-Roman and Byzantine kingship served to incorporate the earthly actions of the monarch into the eternal kingship of Christ with the tricolonic acclamation *Christus vicit, Christus regnat, Christus imperat,*

fashion, the poet not only indexes the potential instantiations of his identity, but explicitly invites the incorporation of new elements into the listeners' picture of the god. The linchpin of this incorporation is the Jakobsonian poetic emphasis brought out by repetition, operating here in a more readily visible way than through the noun-epithet formula in each of Helen's catalogue-style entries, but accomplishing the same effect; compare the precatory invocation of divinity by Chryses in *Il.* 1.37–42, which is similarly constructive but not marked by the accumulating declarative refrain.

This effect is also readily visible in the early lines of *Beowulf*, in which the great hero is introduced.

> Ðǽm eafera wæs   æfter cenned
> geong in geardum   þone god sende
> folce tó frófre·   fyrenðearfe ongeat·
> þæt híe ǽr drugon   aldorléase
> lange hwíle·   him þæs líffréä
> wuldres wealdend   woroldáre forgeaf:
> Béowulf wæs bréme   —blǽd wíde sprang—
> Scyldes eafera   Scedelandum in. (12–19)

> To him an heir was then born,
> young in the yards, whom god sent
> to comfort the people; great distress had he seen
> that they suffered before, leaderless
> for a long while; to him therefore the Life-Lord,
> glory-ruling, gave worldly honor;
> Beowulf was famed (his glory spread wide),
> the heir of Scyld in the northern lands.

The structure here bears somewhat closer resemblance to the standard Indic form than to its Greek counterpart in that it delays the announcement of its subject's name until the final portion (line 18). Most lines are either end-stopped or exhibit resumptive rather than syntactically necessary enjambment—that is, the enjambment uses explanatory relative

---

originally the bipartite Χριστὸς νικᾷ, Χριστὸς βασιλεύει. See Kantorowicz 1946, especially pp. 7–14, for a discussion.

clauses, epexegetical infinitives, or appositional predicate nominatives, all of which add

information to a sentence in ways that subordinate that information to the central clause,

either through grammatical subordination or through zero copula predication following

the completion of the syntactic unit. The effect here is identical to that of the syntactically

unnecessary expansions in the *Schiffskatalog* or the Teichoskopia: it incorporates this

information into the identity of a hero whose name is stated in a generically appropriate

emphatic position. Because Old English poetry lacks the rigid metrics that give rise to

productive formulaic systems and *Beowulf* does not favor strophic forms in its narrative

verse, it achieves the requisite Jakobsonian poetic emphasis primarily through its

alliterative metrical structure. The central alliterative pattern links *Béowulf*, *bréme*

("famous"), and *blæd* ("glory, splendor"); these also make up three of the four maximally

stressed syllables around which the line is built.[70] This ties the three words together

specifically by joining these attributes to the character of Beowulf, and secondarily

allows the attributes that build up to the nominal line to be incorporated into his character

as well by placing the nominal line in a near-final position; the syntactic dependence of

the final line seems to cede the emphatic position to the penultimate, as with the

"extraneous" information that follows the emphatic initial line of a Greek catalogue.

    All this is to say that the catalogic function as a mode of delineating heroic

identity is widely attested across Indo-European languages, and each example

incorporates an expression of the Jakobsonian poetic function that specifically marks the

---

[70] OE *bréme* < PGerm *brōmiz* "famous" < PIE *b^hrem-* "to make noise." The semantic complementarity of *b^hrem-* "to make noise" and *$\acute{k}lew$-* "to hear" is worth noting, and this etymology puts the Germanic vocabulary into line with Italic in privileging speaking over hearing in the semantic complex of speaking and hearing that seems to define Indo-European fame or reputation, though there is dispute over Lat. *gloria,* which seems to be a fungible commodity along the same lines as κλέος and may be related. Some major entries in the lengthy debate surrounding the meter of *Beowulf* are Sievers 1893, Bliss 1958, Russom 1987, and Cable 1991.

name of a hero. It is this marking that allows indexing to take place, and the use of noun-epithet formulae which differentiates poetic from ordinary language is the means by which Greek epic effects this marking. For the indexing function itself, the catalogue, with its ability to incorporate both stated and potential entries, is the indexing form *par excellence*, and indexes persons whose identities are themselves indexing functions that interact with the narrative via the formulaic system. For this reason, the noun-epithet formula must be treated as capable of a full range of catalogic indexing. Just as a formal catalogue can be collapsed into its rubric, the virtual catalogue of potential heroic attributes expresses itself in fully collapsed form as the noun-epithet formula.

CHAPTER III

Realizing Character, Enacting Identity

The previous chapters have dealt with the operation of referentiality on the level of the formula, and have emphasized the ways in which formula can collapse a rich variety of characterization, including stories no longer extant in texts, into a few short words. This forms the backbone of a characterization process in which the formulaic, lexical, and poetic elements of the text are able to make present elements of character not directly present on the semantic level. Such elements are nonetheless "realized" textually through referential and poetic processes, and the basic medium of this realization is lexical. Realization, however, is not uniform for all elements of character: some are more directly and transparently present than others.

§1. A Schema for Realization

The schema that I propose is one of "tight" and "loose" lexical realization for elements of epic character, corresponding to the transparency of an element's semantic presence in the text. Tight lexical realization is epitomized by direct expression in a formulaic epithet: Agamemnon's kingship and claim to a certain kind of high social status are directly expressed by ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν, and the supremacy of Zeus is similarly expressed by πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε. Defining physical traits are often realized in this way: γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη and πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς are straightforward examples of this, but it can easily be extended to signature pieces of equipment as well. This is most

obvious with gods, as in Chryses's addressing Apollo as ἀργυρότοξος (*Il.* 1.37), but extends to signature equipment of mortal heroes as well: no one is associated with the λόφος ἱππιοχαίτης, the horse-haired crest, more strongly than Hector, an association strengthened by the epithet κορυθαίολος, "shining-helmed."

Because the epithet system is, along with full-line formulae and type scenes, one of the basic building blocks of Homeric verse, it is tempting to view tightly-realized character traits, and particularly those realized through epithet formulae, as more central to characterization than more loosely-realized traits. There is a sense in which this is true, but I wish to contend that this sense is trivial for the process of characterization in performance: it has no necessary bearing on what becomes central to someone's characterization. This is one of Foley's most valuable insights: that the development of the oral tradition and the wide deployment of the epithet system allows dimensions of character to be invoked by a formulaic epithet even on occasions when those dimensions are not actively represented by the bare lexical elements of the verse.[71] This is the far horizon of loose realization. Somewhat easier to speak about are the ways in which character traits are communicated in extended scenes or in ways not tied to identity-bearing formulae. This realization remains demonstrably lexical in that the trait in question is communicated via the immediate semantics of the words in the verse, but it is "loose" in that it cannot be gleaned from an epithet, relative clause, or other mode of direct characterization. "Tight" and "loose" realization, then, should be construed as relative terms on a spectrum that is bounded at the "tight" end by straightforward noun-

---

[71] Foley 1999 is the fullest and most mature statement of this position, but see also Foley 1988 and Foley 1990 for its development.

epithet formula and at the "loose" end by traits not present at a particular moment in the text but which are brought to bear through the process of traditional referentiality.

Two paradigmatic examples of loose realization are the verbal prowess of Odysseus and the age of Nestor, both of which are fundamental elements of their characterization that rely on loose construction for elaboration, but that are nonetheless absolutely fundamental to how these two characters are perceived in all of their social interactions. This chapter will explore these examples in detail, elaborating both on their unmistakable presence and on their ethical polyvalence. Prior to a discussion of this ethical polyvalence, however, it is necessary to lay the foundations for this discussion in a short digression on the social-scientific phenomenon called "priming."

§2. Priming and Personality in Social Science

In sociology, psychology, and both socio- and psycholinguistics, *priming* refers to the phenomenon whereby exposure to a stimulus affects a subject's response to a subsequent stimulus without conscious guidance or intention. In linguistic research, it refers specifically to verbal priming, wherein the original stimulus is verbal. Verbal priming operates in a variety of ways, and the present study does not aim at providing a comprehensive psycholinguistic account of oral poetics; rather, it seeks to illuminate how modern social scientific work on verbal indications of identity support a "loose" construction of identity that is subject to constant rearticulation and fluctuation, rather than a "tight" construction marked by stability and persistence. The phrasing parallel to the scheme of character realization discussed earlier is deliberate. A loose construction of identity is predicated on the regular presence and use of loose realization, whereas a tight construction ultimately obviates the notion of loose realization: if "identity" encompasses

the same set of traits indicated at every instance of formulaic reference, even if this is a *gestalt* construction from many sources rather than a set garnered from a single literary source, that indicated set must become the semantic content of those formulaic expressions, and every trait in the set must therefore become tightly realized in every instance. An exploration of priming will illustrate the ways in which verbal communication of identity is far more flexible than this, and that even discrete and identifiable traits that serve as building blocks of identity are subject to a variety of articulations and re-articulations that affect how that identity is constructed and reconstructed from moment to moment.

The literature on priming is vast, and some of it is disputed as part of the ongoing replication crisis in psychological literature.[72] One of the better-established areas of research, however, is research on stereotype threat, in which subjects become less able to perform due to circumstances that remind them of stereotypes which might be applied to them or to people like them. The foundational research on this was put forward by Claude Steele (Steele and Aronson 1995), whose paper investigated disparate performance on the GRE test by African-American men who were told that the test was diagnostic of verbal ability or who were told that it was not diagnostic. Steele and Aronson theorize that the activity primes the subjects' knowledge of stereotypes about their group—in this case, a stereotype about verbal infelicity—and this specter of conforming to a stereotype induces anxiety and diverts the subjects' attention toward the specter of stereotype and away from the task at hand, causing them to underperform. What is primed, then, is not only the

---

[72] On the failure to replicate a priming experiment, see Yong 2012. On the replication crisis in general, see Fiedler and Schwarz 2016 and Simmons, Nelson and Simonsohn 2011.

existence of a stereotype, but also the subject's relationship to it and the extent to which it determines the subject's own self-conception and personal identity.

Stereotype threat functions only to inhibit performance, but there is also significant research on alternative effects, which are termed "stereotype lift" and "stereotype boost." Both are relevant to identity formation and the malleability of personal identity. Stereotype lift occurs when an evaluative task primes subjects not with negative stereotypes of their own group, but with negative stereotypes of another group perceived to be inferior in some way relevant to the evaluation: this boosts the performance of the subjects.[73] This boost is eliminated when stereotypes about the denigrated group are explicitly confronted as false or misleading. The studies in stereotype lift seem to show subjects defining their own identities not through the lurking specter of stereotype about themselves, but rather through dissociating from out-groups already defined as both "other" through marked difference and "worse" through existing stereotypes.

Lastly, stereotype boost is the true inverse of stereotype threat, wherein subjects are primed by a diagnostic setting to be conscious of positive stereotypes about groups to which they belong, resulting in a performance boost over those who do not perceive a task as diagnostic.[74] In this case, the subjects define themselves positively as members of a specially able group, implicitly against others not in that group who are *ipso facto* not as able in the area under diagnosis.

---

[73] Walton and Cohen 2003 is a meta-analysis of a number of studies relating to stereotyping, and finds sufficiently strong correlation in the results to be able to establish the conditions of stereotype lift outlined above.

[74] See Shih, Petinsky, and Ho 2012 on stereotype boost in general. This builds on the work initially advanced in Shih, Petinsky, and Trahan 2006.

In all three of these primed phenomena, subjects construct their own identities in the moment in response to circumstantial reminders of how that identity might affect their performance. This construction is not conscious, but it does contribute to the subjects' actual performance in a perceived diagnostic test. In no case is the scope of this self-construction unlimited: subjects worked with pre-existing stereotypes about racial or gendered groups to which they belonged, but were able to turn those stereotypes into positive or negative performance depending on the circumstances and the nature of the task at hand. But despite being restricted to certain domains, the subjects did vary their self-construction depending on the perceived stakes of the task, and those conceiving of themselves as better or worse actually performed better or worse. For the present study, however, the variation in performance is useful only insofar as it strongly indicates the variations in self-construction that gave rise to it. Even though the bases of these varying self-constructions were comparatively stable and unchanging categories of identity like race and gender, categories which tend to persist as part of a person's self-conception, these stable categories could nonetheless be positively or negatively inflected. Race and gender are generally considered to be foundational to a person's identity, as evidenced by their treatment in nondiscrimination laws, so it makes little sense to say that any person's identity might be affected by them more or less than another's: rather, it is these building blocks themselves, and therefore the selves built on them, that are more malleable than their persistence and seeming stability would suggest.

The positive or negative inflection of some part of a person's identity seems to arise primarily from the circumstances in which they feel evaluated: "the meaning that people assign to [identity-based] cues ultimately affects whether they will become

vulnerable to—or protected against—stereotype threat" (Murphy and Taylor 2012, p. 17).

It is this situational inflection of identity that is useful to the student of oral poetry.

Earlier chapters have dealt with the enumerative list as a default mode of constructing

identity in Homeric epic and in other oral poetries in Indo-European traditions: if this is

not a common inheritance of the shared poetic tradition, it is likely to be fundamental to

oral poetries around the world.[75] Those chapters have also advanced the thesis that the

"essential idea" advanced by Parry as the object of reference in noun-epithet formulae is,

in fact, an unstated enumeration of attributes present in dispersed form throughout the

poetic tradition and in unfinished, imperfect form in the minds of listeners, according to

their degree of familiarity with the Homeric oral tradition. These attributes are used as

needed in the listeners' construction of the identities of the gods and heroes of epic, and

like the identities of those facing stereotype threat, these identities can fluctuate quite

widely while also remaining distinct and identifiable.

I do not wish to argue that oral poetry operates via precisely the same mechanisms

as stereotype threat: the subjects under consideration and their relationship to the stimulus

or situation are starkly different. A person reflecting on their own identity and its

relationship to an evaluative task is almost certainly not undergoing the same cognitive

processes as an audience member listening to a well-known poem being recited by a

bard. The evaluative element, for one, is lacking: no one is measuring an audience

member's ability to respond to poetry. Instead, the relevant parallel must be sought in the

act of identity construction common to both the experimental subjects in the stereotyping

experiments and the listening subjects of the poetic audience. In each instance, the

---

[75] This was the position of Walter Ong, who described oral literature as characteristically "additive rather than subordinative." See Ong 2002, particularly chapter 3.

subjects in question are prompted by context to maintain an identity in their heads: the evaluative context primes the experimental subjects to think on their own identity, while the context of poetic performance demands that listening subjects consider the identities of the characters involved in epic narrative. These constructed identities vary with the circumstances: an experimental subject primed with a stereotype will experience increased or decreased performance depending on how that stereotype relates to their personal identity, while a listening subject must vary the construction of an epic character's identity depending on what context the poetic narrative has supplied. Both of these are acts of continuing construction, assessment, and reconstruction depending on the context, and in this way both show personal identities as subject to strong fluctuation and variation at the level of particular traits or characteristics, even as the identities remain fixed and recognizable on a more general level. Even when characteristics appear to stay the same, their contribution to identity formation varies with circumstance.

Some of the most visible demonstrations of this inflection in the Homeric poems are full-line nominative formulae, used to enjamb a subject. These are fully unique to their subjects but appear in a wide variety of contexts, and so the aspects of characterization realized in them very considerably in their connotations. Agamemnon's formula, for example, appears three times in the corpus. It appears first in book 1:

> ἤτοι ὅ γ᾽ ὣς εἰπὼν κατ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἕζετο· τοῖσι δ᾽ ἀνέστη
> ἥρως Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
> ἀχνύμενος· μένεος δὲ μέγα φρένες ἀμφὶ μέλαιναι
> πίμπλαντ᾽, ὄσσε δέ οἱ πυρὶ λαμπετόωντι ἐΐκτην. (*Il.* 1.101–104).

> So speaking, he then sat down, and among them stood up
> the warrior son of Atreus, wide-ruling Agamemnon,
> grieving, and with rage his blackened heart was
> greatly filled, and his eyes were like shining fire.

The passage opens with the standard formula used when changing speakers in a public assembly, and it introduces the next speaker with a full-line nominative formula in every case. In other cases, however, only the speaker is enjambed and the clause ends with the formula.[76] Here and only here, the poet enjambs a second time, deferring the end of the clause until initial ἀχνύμενος in the following line. The remaining line and three quarters elaborate on Agamemnon's anger with Calchas, inflecting his prestige and kingship with the overconfidence and foolishness that characterize him during the first part of the poem.

The second appearance of the epithet phrase is found in book 7, in a feasting scene:

> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ παύσαντο πόνου τετύκοντό τε δαῖτα,
> δαίνυντ᾽, οὐδέ τι θυμὸς ἐδεύετο δαιτὸς ἐΐσης·
> νώτοισιν δ᾽ Αἴαντα διηνεκέεσσι γέραιρεν
> ἥρως Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων. (*Il.* 7.319–322).

> But when they ceased from fighting and prepared the food,
> they feasted, and their spirit did not lack any portion of the equal feast.
> And with the unbroken chine he honored Ajax,
> the warrior son of Atreus, wide-ruling Agamemnon.

This context is perhaps even more bound by formulaic diction than the first: it opens with one of the traditional beginnings of a feast, followed by the full-line formula for feasting. But after that, we find a *dis legomenon* formula for giving honor at a feast: it appears only here and at *Odyssey* 14.437, when Eumaeus honors Odysseus with the chine from a sacrificed boar. Here, however, Agamemnon honors Ajax, and his role is unmistakably that of the one entitled to dispense honors, and his full-line epithet phrase here connotes his proper execution of this kingly action. In giving honor to one who deserves it, this

---

[76] See *Il.* 1.68; 2.75; 7.354; 7.365.

important building block of Agamemnon's identity is given unmistakably positive inflection.

The final attestation of Agamemnon's full-line nominative epithet phrase is perhaps the most difficult to evaluate. It arises in book 11 as the Trojans descend upon the Achaean ships, and Poseidon in the guise of Calchas attempts to stir the Greek army to action with a speech. During this speech, he offers a somewhat strange *apologia* for the war when he comes to the topic of Agamemnon:

> ἀλλ᾽ εἰ δὴ καὶ πάμπαν ἐτήτυμον αἴτιός ἐστιν
> ἥρως Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
> οὕνεκ᾽ ἀπητίμησε ποδώκεα Πηλεΐωνα,
> ἡμέας γ᾽ οὔ πως ἔστι μεθιέμεναι πολέμοιο. (*Il.* 13.111–114)

> But even if in truth the cause is entirely
> the warrior son of Atreus, wide-ruling Agamemnon,
> since he dishonored the swift-footed son of Peleus,
> we may in no way slacken from battle.

To speak of positive or negative inflection here would be to flatten the argument, but it seems clear enough that Agamemnon's full-line epithet phrase connotes in this passage the responsibility that comes with kingship: as king, his quarrel with Achilles has consequences for the entire army, and they would be right to blame him for it, Nonetheless, however, his failure to act for the good of the army rather than solely for himself does not justify the soldiers' failing in their duty to defend the ships.

The parallel between the inflection of the facets of identity in epic and in priming situations is further demonstrated in another series of experiments involving the alleviation of stereotype threat without changing the aspect of identity under consideration. One series of experiments demonstrates the alleviation of stereotype threat faced by women in mathematical assessments through priming them with general

93

knowledge of women's achievements (MacIntyre, Paulson, and Lord 2003). The achievements were not specifically related to mathematics: the priming in the first experiment spoke only of women's general capabilities, and the priming in the second experiment involved specific biographical examples of high-achieving women in architecture, law, medicine, and scientific invention. In both cases, the women primed with positive women's achievement scored higher than the control group on the mathematics assessment.

One of the ways, then, in which the negative inflection of women's identity as women mathematicians could be combated was through positive inflection of their identities as women in general: it seems from the experiment that conceiving of oneself as capable in a general sense can offset the detrimental effects of conceiving of oneself as incapable or insufficiently capable in a particular task. The experiment also demonstrates, implicitly, the limits of such priming. The women in the experiment had the effects of their stereotype threat alleviated, but this threat was not converted into stereotype boost of any kind: the material out of which the women formed their self-conceptions was constrained by what actually existed. There is no widespread stereotype about women's proficiency in mathematics, and so the effects of stereotype boost were not available given the social conditions in which the experiment took place. But by positively inflecting the women's general identities as women, experimenters were able to prime the imagined possibility of high achievement despite the very real perception of a negative stereotype about women and mathematics.

§3. Odysseus

But how does this apply more broadly to the literary identities in epic poetry?
This can be explored by looking at contrasting inflections of a hero's identity, particularly
when the aspect being inflected is "fundamental," which is to say, persistent and
frequently identified in a variety of sources. Perhaps the textbook example of this is
Odysseus's skill at speaking and arguing. It contrasts with Nestor's skill at speaking
because Nestor's derives in part from his age and from his authority, which he has
possessed since he was young:[77] the Achaeans listen to his words because he has earned
the right to have them taken seriously.[78] Odysseus, by contrast, is not the most
accomplished fighter nor the highest ranking: his skill at speaking is just that, a skill in
which he excels. Since his speech is either an ἐμπειρία or a τέχνη depending on whom
one asks,[79] it has no moral virtues in itself and can rightly be suspected of doing bad

---

[77] Austin 1966 examines Nestor's digressive speeches, in which he narrates his earning the right to speak by his deeds. It is precisely that authority that remains with him, though he can no longer do the deeds that earned it.

[78] Nestor's introduction in *Il.* 1.247 emphasizes both his age and his persuasiveness:

> Ἀτρεΐδης δ᾿ ἑτέρωθεν ἐμήνιε: τοῖσι δὲ Νέστωρ
> ἡδυεπὴς ἀνόρουσε λιγὺς Πυλίων ἀγορητής,
> τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή·
> τῷ δ᾿ ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
> ἐφθίαθ᾿, οἵ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ᾿ ἐγένοντο
> ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέῃ, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσεν (247–252).

> The son of Atreus raged from side to side: then among them Nestor,
> sweet of speech, the clear speaker of Pylos, stood up,
> from whose tongue flowed a voice sweeter than honey:
> in his lifetime two generations of mortal men
> had passed, who together with him before had been born and reared
> in holy Pylos, and he ruled over the third.

[79] See Plato, *Gorgias* 461a–c.

things as well as good, as indeed it will be in tragic and later treatments.[80] Odysseus is

selected as part of the embassy to Achilles in part because of his skill at persuasion:

> τοῖσι δὲ πόλλ᾽ ἐπέτελλε Γερήνιος ἱππότα Νέστωρ
> δενδίλλων ἐς ἕκαστον, Ὀδυσσῆϊ δὲ μάλιστα,
> πειρᾶν ὡς πεπίθοιεν ἀμύμονα Πηλεΐωνα. (9.179–181)

> Then Nestor the Gerenian horseman, looking to each,
> instructed them, and most of all Odysseus,
> to try and persuade the blameless son of Peleus.

Admittedly, Ὀδυσσῆϊ δὲ μάλιστα does a great deal of the lifting here, but its line-final

position followed immediately by πειρᾶν ὡς πεπίθοιεν signals that, at least in Nestor's

opinion, Odysseus is especially suited to this work, even above the others. The function

of μάλιστα here is to pick out and emphasize a single member of the collective τοῖσι, as

well as the collective subject of πεπίθοιεν, as demonstrated by its being preceded by

Ὀδυσσῆϊ, whose case necessitates construction parallel to the demonstrative pronoun.

The syntactic parallelism in turn suggests parallelism of the emphatic force, such that the

emphasis follows the collective subject through the shift, mediated by πειρᾶν ὡς, from

addressees to verbal subjects.

The treatment of this passage in Homeric scholarship varies considerably

depending on the authors' views on such matters as the unity or multiplicity of the *Iliad*'s

author(s), the nature of Homeric identity, the detail of the audience's knowledge, and the

relative age of this portion of the poem in relation to others. Hainsworth (1993, p. 81)

notes that Odysseus is the one who conducts all diplomatic business in the *Iliad*, either

alone or with others; it is one of his major narrative functions. Hainsworth also, however,

---

[80] Sophocles's *Ajax* and *Philoctetes* both feature a deceptive and somewhat malicious Odysseus (though he becomes more sympathetic at the end of the *Ajax*), and this deceptive cleverness is one of his primary attributes in Ovid's retelling of the Judgment of Arms (*Met.* 13.1–398).

appears to draw a firm distinction between narrative function and identity: he regards Odysseus's inclusion among Achilles's φίλοι ἄνδρες (9.197) as decisive for his inclusion in the negotiating party.[81] Hainsworth's commentary assumes a singular poet, but his point remains salient even for the committed multi-singer Oralist: if Odysseus's relationship to Achilles is sufficiently fundamental to the audience's conception of him, then his inclusion among the diplomatic party makes sense as a matter of character.

The question of whether that relationship is sufficiently "fundamental" is in many respects an ideal question for Homeric philology: it treats a relationship between major players and must be addressed with careful reading throughout the Homeric corpus; it is also unlikely ever to be settled, and so will provide ample fodder for papers and replies over several generations of scholarship. Indeed, even posing the question smuggles assumptions about the permanence and stability of Homeric identity back into the discussion. Those assumptions might prove to be warranted, but even the audience's background knowledge of Odysseus's relationships or his character requires prompting, and this is what the narrative accomplishes with Ὀδυσσῆϊ δὲ μάλιστα: it allows *whatever* makes Odysseus especially suitable for this diplomatic mission to be brought to the foreground, and inflects those characteristics positively. For many and perhaps most listeners, those characteristics would include his rhetorical facility and general cunning, but there is no reason that other characteristics might not resonate more with particular audience members.

This account of Nestor's charge to the embassy implicates a long-standing problem in the study of *Iliad* 9, and this problem bridges the charge and the confrontation

---

[81] This inclusion is not without detractors; *vide infra* the discussion of Nagy's (1999) objection.

with Achilles: how are we to read Nestor's charge in light of the repeated use of the dual

in the narration of embassy's arrival and reception by Achilles?

> τὼ δὲ βάτην παρὰ θῖνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης
> πολλὰ μάλ᾽ εὐχομένω γαιηόχῳ ἐννοσιγαίῳ
> ῥηϊδίως πεπιθεῖν μεγάλας φρένας Αἰακίδαο. (9.182–184)

> And the two walked by the loud-roaring sea,
> praying fervently to the Earth-holder, the Earth-shaker,
> that they might easily persuade the great-hearted descendant of Aeacus.

> τὼ δὲ βάτην προτέρω, ἡγεῖτο δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς,
> στὰν δὲ πρόσθ᾽ αὐτοῖο· ταφὼν δ᾽ ἀνόρουσεν Ἀχιλλεὺς (9.192–193)

> The two then came forward, and great Odysseus led,
> and they stood before him, and Achilles stood up astonished…

> τὼ καὶ δεικνύμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς·
> χαίρετον· ἦ φίλοι ἄνδρες ἱκάνετον ἦ τι μάλα χρεώ,
> οἵ μοι σκυζομένῳ περ Ἀχαιῶν φίλτατοι ἐστον. (9.196–198)

> Then, acknowledging the two, swift-footed Achilles spoke:
> "Hail: you come as friends, and with some great need,
> who even in my anger are dearest to me of the Achaeans."

The problem of the duals is a small scholarly industry in its own right and provided a

major battleground for Analyst and Unitarian scholarship for much of the 20th century;

the present study does not seek to conclusively resolve that problem.[82] But the use of

duals beginning in 9.182 calls into question the true emphatic force of μάλιστα in 9.180:

its semantic use in emphasizing the best of either 3 or an undefined plural clashes with

the use of the dual, and affects how much weight we afford it as an articulation of

Odysseus's character. Resolving this question demands facing directly the problem of the

---

[82] Lesky's (1967) supplement to Pauly gives an overview of the controversy surrounding this set of duals (pp. 103–105), although his description highlights Analyst and Unitarian views: Oralism gets little say. Segal 1968, though staunchly Unitarian in its attempted solution to the problem, contains a comparative study of the miniature embassy in book 1 (320–348) with book 9 that is useful to scholars of any persuasion. Those of an Oralist bent seeking to account for the duals as part of a type scene involving a pair of heralds may even find his solution somewhat persuasive after some adjustments.

duals in both a historic and semantic sense, as an attentive reading of Achilles's

responses will show.

Returning momentarily to the question of the text's inflection of Odysseus's

cleverness, Achilles famously thinks poorly of someone so able to persuade others, as he

seems to regard it as a form of lying. His rebuke is often glossed as a particular rebuke to

Odysseus:

> τὸν δ᾽ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς·
> διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη πολυμήχαν᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ
> χρὴ μὲν δὴ τὸν μῦθον ἀπηλεγέως ἀποειπεῖν,
> ᾗ περ δὴ φρονέω τε καὶ ὡς τετελεσμένον ἔσται,　　　　　　　310
> ὡς μή μοι τρύζητε παρήμενοι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος.
> ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος ὁμῶς Ἀΐδαο πύλῃσιν
> ὅς χ᾽ ἕτερον μὲν κεύθῃ ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἄλλο δὲ εἴπῃ.
> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐρέω ὥς μοι δοκεῖ εἶναι ἄριστα. (9.307–314)

> Then in answer to him spoke swift-footed Achilles:
> God-born son of Laertes, Odysseus of many wiles,
> I must speak this account bluntly,
> both as I am inclined, and as must happen,
> so that you do not murmur on at me, sitting on this side and that.
> For he is hateful to me as the gates of Hades
> who hides one thing in his mind, but says another.
> But I will speak as seems best to me.

The juxtaposition between πολυμήχανος and ἐχθρὸς γάρ μοι κεῖνος is extremely difficult

to ignore. The use of διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη πολυμήχαν᾽ Ὀδυσσεῦ establishes a high

register for Achilles's reply,[83] and ἐχθρὸς…κεῖνος is a complete syntactic unit on which

both the remainder of its line and the entire following line are completely dependent. But

there are two targets of Achilles's ire, and his rebuke verbally echoes the conclusion of

Agamemnon's offer, though he has not heard it: δμηθήτω· Ἀΐδης τοι ἀμείλιχος ἠδ᾽

---

[83] Hainsworth 1993: "διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη…is the regular whole-verse formula for Odysseus in the vocative case" which "has no special connotations for the speaker, beyond a certain formality" (p. 102).

ἀδάμαστος, / τοὔνεκα καί τε βροτοῖσι θεῶν ἔχθιστος ἁπάντων (9.158–159).[84] The verbal

echo between ἔχθιστος and ἐχθρός and between ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος and ἄλλο δὲ εἶπε must,

however, also be set against the contrast of φίλος and φίλτατος in his greeting with

ἐχθρός in his rebuke.

Here the problem of the duals now reasserts itself: is the use of the dual in

Achilles's greeting an actual restriction of his hospitality that does not include Odysseus?

Nagy (1999, ch. 3, §15–§20) poses this question and answers affirmatively, arguing that

the duals do not represent an older textual layer in which the embassy consisted only of

Odysseus and Ajax, as traditional Analytic scholarship holds.[85] Rather, by Nagy's

account, the scene integrates one primary traditional theme—an embassy to Achilles by

Ajax and Phoenix—with an allegedly traditional enmity between Odysseus and

Achilles:[86] this is achieved through Odysseus's insertion into the text and through his

"self-assertion" in making the speech that recapitulates Agamemnon's offer. By this

reasoning, the first set of duals in 182–184 is a remnant of the supposedly original

Ajax/Phoenix embassy, and the second (192–193) is a remnant with Odysseus tacked on

through the use of ἡγεῖτο δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς in the second half of the line. The third, by

Nagy's reading, becomes Achilles's deliberate rhetorical exclusion of Odysseus as an

expression of their supposedly traditional enmity. Nagy's hypothesis is not entirely

without appeal: most notably, it leaves intact the final persuasive power of Ajax's speech

while making ample room for the moving narrative told by Phoenix. Certainly there are

---

[84] Let him yield! Hades, remember, cannot be soothed or bent,
for which he is the most hateful to mortals of all the gods.
[85] Page 1959 is exemplary, noting the absence of reference to Phoenix in most of the scene (p. 300).
[86] Segal 1968 does not go so far as to posit traditional enmity, but does note both that Odysseus is most representative of Agamemnon, since he relays the offer word for word, and that Achilles and Odysseus are "antithetical personalities" to one another (p. 110).

good reasons for positing an enmity of Odysseus and Achilles as a common traditional theme: the hiding of Achilles on Skyros, which was discovered by Odysseus, is attested as a visual artistic theme as early as the 5th century,[87] as well as in the lost *Skyrioi* of Euripides.[88] Odysseus is in many ways the reason why Achilles is far from home in the first place, and the reason that he is going to die. This plausibility, however, is not enough to support Nagy's hypothesis, particularly in light of Odysseus's public beating of Thersites for his hostility to Agamemnon and open admiration for Achilles (*Il.* 2.246– 264); the embassy is not the first time Odysseus has been a proxy for Agamemnon, and so no special hypothesis is necessary to establish a plausible context for Achilles's hostile reference to Odysseus.

But the ancient evidence for such an enmity is hardly beyond suspicion. 5th century vase paintings and classical tragedy may be evidence for the existence of such a theme in the tradition of Homeric reading during the 5th century itself, but three hundred years is a long time: such a theme could very easily be founded on classical reading and performance practices rather than on characterizations present in the Homeric tradition. The romance of Achilles and Patroclus is one such tradition, clearly rooted in aristocratic Athenian practices of pederasty rather than in details of Homer's text, though no less influential for its lack of specific textual support.[89] Its existence should remind us that

---

[87] Pausanias 1.22.6 attests a painting by Polygnotus: εὖ δέ μοι φαίνεται ποιῆσαι Σκῦρον ὑπὸ Ἀχιλλέως ἁλοῦσαν, οὐδὲν ὁμοίως καὶ ὅσοι λέγουσιν ὁμοῦ ταῖς παρθένοις Ἀχιλλέα ἔχειν ἐν Σκύρῳ δίαιταν, ἃ δὴ καὶ Πολύγνωτος ἔγραψεν.

[88] Wright 2018 is a comprehensive treatment of the lost and fragmentary plays of the major tragedians.

[89] Halperin's entry on "Homosexuality" in the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* (2012) sums up the matter adequately: "Homer, to be sure, did not portray Achilles and Patroclus as sexual partners (although some Classical Athenians thought he implied as much (Aesch. frs. 135, 136 Radt; Pl. *Symp.* 179e–180b; Aeschin. *In Tim.* 133, 141–50)), but he also did little to rule out such an interpretation, and he was perhaps less ignorant of pederasty than is sometimes alleged: he remarks that Ganymedes was carried off to be the gods' cupbearer because of his beauty (*Il.* 20. 232–5) and he singles out for special mention the man who

101

classical audiences were perfectly capable of creative thematizing on archaic material,

and caution a reader against positing an archaic "theme" based primarily on post-archaic

evidence. This is the primary weakness in Nagy's proposed solution, though the solution

is also compromised by its reliance on the further abstraction of type scenes into

"themes" whose flexibility makes it quite difficult to establish definitive proof of their

existence.

A far more cogent solution to the problem of the duals was posed by Charles

Segal (1968), building on the work of Franz Boll.[90] Boll notes a number of parallel lines

between the short embassy to Achilles in book 1 and the larger embassy in book 9. Boll's

pairs are reprinted below:

> 1.322: ἔρχεσθον κλισίην Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
> 9.166: ἔλθωσ᾿ ἐς κλισίην Πηληϊάδεω Ἀχιλῆος
>
> 1.327: τὼ δ᾿ ἀέκοντε βάτην παρὰ θῖν᾿ ἁλὸς ἀτρυγέτοιο
> 9.182: τὼ δὲ βάτην παρὰ θῖνα πολυφλοίσβοιο θαλάσσης
>
> 1.328 = 9.185: Μυρμιδόνων δ᾿ ἐπί τε κλισίας καὶ νῆας ἱκέσθην
>
> 1.329: τὸν δ᾿ εὗρον παρά τε κλισίῃ καὶ νηῒ μελαίνῃ
> 9.186: τὸν δ᾿ εὗρον φρένα τερπόμενον φόρμιγγι λιγείῃ
>
> 1.334: χαίρετε κήρυκες Διὸς ἄγγελοι ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν
> 9.197: χαίρετον· ἦ φίλοι ἄνδρες ἱκάνετον ἦ τι μάλα χρεώ

The first pair is plainly a variant depending on the mood of the verb; the second pair is

contrastive only in that the earlier embassy highlights the fear of the heralds; it continues

to highlight this in their approach to their task, since the pair of heralds in the earlier

embassy stands afraid before Achilles (1.331–2). Then we have a near-matching pair of

---

was—with the exception of Achilles—the most beautiful man in the Greek host (*Il.* 2. 673–4)." For a more
thorough treatment, see Percy 1998.
[90] Originally proposed in Boll 1917/1918, and refined in Boll 1919/1920.

lines, with a metrically unconstrained variation describing the first sight of Achilles, and finally the greeting. The use of the plural at 1.334 is clearly metrically constrained, since it is followed immediately by a fixed formula for heralds;[91] the dual greeting is *not* constrained, and Achilles's continued use of the dual in the rest of his greeting eliminates this possibility. In summary, for Segal all uses of the dual prior to Achilles's greeting refer to the heralds, who stand in for the entire embassy, but his use of the dual in greeting the party negotiates the tension between the need to greet the heralds, as official ambassadors of Agamemnon, and the need to greet his friends. Odysseus remains excluded here, but not because of a thematic enmity between the two, but rather because of his proximity to Agamemnon; Segal holds that Odysseus's leading the heralds (designated by the dual)[92] cements this proximity and renders him part of the embassy, excluding him from the φίλοι addressed by Achilles. What stands out here is Segal's concession that there is a structure to the formal embassy that necessitates a pair of heralds, and I think this concession opens up the possibility that these duals would not go away even with further additions to the embassy party. Though Phoenix and Ajax appear to have taken over some of the functions of heralds in this scene, the paired ambassadors may very well be a relatively rigid element of a type scene for which no other examples remain, despite the embassy in book 9's also showcasing the flexibility of this form.

   This flexibility and the ensuing difficulty does, however, bear heavily on the project of identity, because this scene deals both with a portion of Odysseus's identity that exhibits loose lexical realization locally but tight realization elsewhere—that is, his cunning—and, at least under Nagy's account, a portion of his identity that is loosely

---

[91] See *Il.* 7.274–5: εἰ μὴ κήρυκες Διὸς ἄγγελοι ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν / ἦλθον…
[92] 9.192: τὼ δὲ βάτην προτέρω, ἡγεῖτο δὲ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς.

realized at best throughout the extant corpus—his enmity with Achilles. The basis of this posited aspect of Achilles's identity in a theme or story is not necessarily any kind of disqualification: as noted above, loose textual realization does not imply marginality or unimportance. What makes Nagy's proposition finally untenable is that it is nowhere textually embedded: its instantiation within the referential network is purely hypothetical. This is not necessarily the case with other characters whose traits are loosely realized as narrative items, and in fact a study of one such realization demonstrates how tightly realized formulaic elements allow the more loosely realized elements to become elements of characterization accessible through traditional referentiality.

§4. Nestor

Earlier, this chapter contrasted the speaking ability of Nestor with that of Odysseus. Nestor's skill with speech and his skill with horses are his two most tightly realized character traits, with ἱππότα appearing 26 times in the *Iliad* and ten in the *Odyssey* and λιγὺς Πυλίων ἀγορητής appearing twice in the *Iliad*, once in the nominative and once in the genitive.[93] The low numbers for the epithets that directly signals his rhetorical skill—one more, ἡδυεπής, is *hapax legomenon* at 1.248 alongside λιγὺς Πυλίων ἀγορητής—are surprising, but the centrality of this trait to Nestor's characterization is assured by the number of times that he acts it out. Even more loosely realized is Nestor's age, which does not have an epithet attached to it but is always characterized either narratively, when it is directly referred to, or by Nestor's long-

---

[93] This epithet is also part of an alliterative pair, the other member of which is λιγὺς περ ἐὼν ἀγορητής, first deployed against Thersites by Odysseus (2.245). It is not immediately clear which of the two is chronologically prior, but narratively the characterization of Nestor appears first, and its plainly sarcastic deployment against Thersites highlights and mocks the gap between his status and rhetorical skill and those of Nestor.

winded speechmaking, which reaches near-comic proportions as the *Iliad* goes on. As noted earlier, Nestor's age is noted immediately upon his introduction into the narrative:

> Ἀτρεΐδης δ᾽ ἑτέρωθεν ἐμήνιε· τοῖσι δὲ Νέστωρ
> ἡδυεπὴς ἀνόρουσε, λιγὺς Πυλίων ἀγορητής,
> τοῦ καὶ ἀπὸ γλώσσης μέλιτος γλυκίων ῥέεν αὐδή·
> τῷ δ᾽ ἤδη δύο μὲν γενεαὶ μερόπων ἀνθρώπων
> ἐφθίαθ᾽, οἵ οἱ πρόσθεν ἅμα τράφεν ἠδ᾽ ἐγένοντο
> ἐν Πύλῳ ἠγαθέῃ, μετὰ δὲ τριτάτοισιν ἄνασσεν (*Il.* 1.247–252).
>
> The son of Atreus raged from side to side: then among them Nestor,
> sweet of speech, the clear speaker of Pylos, stood up,
> from whose tongue flowed a voice sweeter than honey:
> in his lifetime two generations of mortal men
> had passed, who together with him before had been born and reared
> in holy Pylos, and he ruled over the third.

Nestor's introduction is enjambed with a string of epithets, culminating in the traditional line-final λιγὺς Πυλίων ἀγορητής. Interestingly, his rhetorical skill is referred to twice in this introduction, both with the traditional epithet and with the *hapax* ἡδυεπής, which would be less noteworthy if it did not have strongly related expressions in parallel traditions.[94] After the elaboration on his sweet speech,[95] three lines are devoted to his age. He is unique both among the Argives and among his countrymen for his long life: he alone survives from the generations that were born and reared with him. This sole survivorship is realized again and again in Nestor's tales: he is the only remaining witness to the exploits of his old comrades. This pointed and even poignant elaboration on his age establishes its centrality, and its appearance directly after an extended formulaic sequence assumes it into the referential network that characterizes Nestor. This close entwinement of characterization via epithet and tight realization with

---

[94] Compare Avestan *hudəmə̄m vaxəδhrahiiā* (*Yasna* 29.8) and Sanskrit *svādmā́naṃ vācáḥ* (*RV* 2.21.6), both abstract nominal forms ("sweetness of speech").
[95] Kirk 1985 notes that this elaboration is not unusual: anything that is ἡδύς can be described as "sweeter than honey" with no special superlative force (p. 79).

characterization via loose narrative realization is what allows this more loosely realized

element to remain present and accessible within the referential system even in scenes that

do not mention it at all, as is the case with most of his public oratory.

One important case for judging Nestor's public oratory is his exhortation of the

Achaean troops in book 4. The poem shows this during Agamemnon's survey of the

battlefield, during which he comes upon Nestor instructing the Achaean horsemen on

how to properly fight opponents in chariots. One of the continual sources of strife among

commentators has been the question of whether Nestor's advice is good or not. This

would be a minor question if not for Agamemnon's salutation to Nestor after he has

finished his motivational speech:

> ὦ γέρον εἴθ᾽ ὡς θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσι φίλοισιν
> ὥς τοι γούναθ᾽ ἕποιτο, βίη δέ τοι ἔμπεδος εἴη·
> ἀλλά σε γῆρας τείρει ὁμοίϊον· ὡς ὄφελέν τις
> ἀνδρῶν ἄλλος ἔχειν, σὺ δὲ κουροτέροισι μετεῖναι. (*Il.* 4.313–316)

> Sir, if only, as the spirit in your dear breast,
> your limbs followed and your strength were firm,
> but afflicting old age presses on you: would that
> some other of the men had that, and you were among the youths.

The question, then, is whether Agamemnon, having overheard Nestor's speech, is making

an ironic joke at his expense, or whether both the narrative and the character accept his

advice as fundamentally sound.[96] Such is his speech:

> μηδέ τις ἱπποσύνῃ τε καὶ ἠνορέηφι πεποιθὼς
> οἶος πρόσθ᾽ ἄλλων μεμάτω Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι,
> μηδ᾽ ἀναχωρείτω· ἀλαπαδνότεροι γὰρ ἔσεσθε.
> ὃς δέ κ᾽ ἀνὴρ ἀπὸ ὧν ὀχέων ἕτερ᾽ ἅρμαθ᾽ ἵκηται
> ἔγχει ὀρεξάσθω, ἐπεὶ ἦ πολὺ φέρτερον οὕτω.

---

[96] The soundness of Nestor's advice dominates modern scholarship, as in Edwards 1987 (pp. 4–5, 18, 21), Martin 1989 (pp. 52, 59–60, 80–81, 101–102), and Stanley 1993 (pp. 47, 51); though these same accounts do not hesitate to acknowledge the poem's moments of irony or ridicule at his expense, all maintain that this does not detract from his performance as a counselor.

ὧδε καὶ οἱ πρότεροι πόλεας καὶ τείχε᾽ ἐπόρθεον
τόνδε νόον καὶ θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν ἔχοντες. (*Il.* 4.303–309)

Let no one, having put trust in his horsemanship and manhood,
be eager alone and in front of the rest to fight with the Trojans,
nor let him go back, for you will be more easily exhausted.
But when someone can come out of his own chariot toward another's,
let him thrust with a spear, since that way is much better.
Thus those in former times ravaged walls and cities,
having such a mind and spirit in their breasts.

 The case against Nestor rests on the real-world tactical soundness of a chariot fighter using a spear to stab at a fighter protected by a chariot. But this is in fact perfectly in keeping with the genuine tactics of chariot fighting: the passage is "one of the very few references to massed chariots in action," as well as "one of the very few references to any sort of fighting from the chariot" at all (Greenhalgh 1973, p. 8). Here Nestor accounts fully for the protective use of the chariot, which Greenhalgh contends is not only the only sensible use of the vehicle, but may be one of the few surviving poetic memories of genuine battle chariots.[97] But the real-world soundness of Nestor's advice is secondary to its assumed soundness in the poem, and this is a crucial distinction. We do not, for instance, question the sincerity of Hesiod's farming advice, even though its actual use as farming advice is questionable at best: there are generic reasons for taking it as sincere while maintaining that its real-world effectiveness is ultimately ancillary to its literary purpose.[98] This seems to be the case with Nestor: if it can be established that his battle

---

[97] The argument in Greenhalgh 1973 is somewhat involved, but it posits that the use of chariots in Homer mainly as a grand conveyance to and from battle is a literary invention, and that the Geometric-era depictions of chariots are 1) based more on epic than on genuine warfare and 2) depict racing chariots rather than war chariots. Littauer and Crouwel disagree strongly in a review (1977), contending that spear-fighting in a chariot at all is impractical, and state their case in more detail in Littauer and Crouwel 1983.

[98] Nelson 1996 discusses the dubious effectiveness of Hesiod's advice, and West 1978 pp. 53–55 provides a short catalogue of some of the oddities in Hesiod's presentation. The poem also has very strange ideas about its audience as it "assumes a pupil initially unequipped for anything…On the other hand, he assumes a general understanding of the purpose and method of ploughing, reaping, threshing, and so forth." (p. 52).

advice is generally effective, and if, given this general competence, there is no reason to

believe that he is poorly equipped to advise on this particular occasion, it stands to reason

that the poem regards his advice as sound, irrespective of its use for drilling charioteers.

The lengthy battle in book 6 provides just such an example of Nestor's speech in

battle. His brief speech urges the Argive fighters onward to such an extent that it

demands an answering act of speech from Hector, lest the Trojans be overwhelmed:

> ὦ φίλοι ἥρωες Δαναοί θεράποντες Ἄρηος
> μή τις νῦν ἐνάρων ἐπιβαλλόμενος μετόπισθε
> μιμνέτω ὥς κεν πλεῖστα φέρων ἐπὶ νῆας ἵκηται,
> ἀλλ᾽ ἄνδρας κτείνωμεν· ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τὰ ἔκηλοι   70
> νεκροὺς ἂμ πεδίον συλήσετε τεθνηῶτας.
> ὣς εἰπὼν ὄτρυνε μένος καὶ θυμὸν ἑκάστου.
> ἔνθά κεν αὖτε Τρῶες ἀρηϊφίλων ὑπ᾽ Ἀχαιῶν
> Ἴλιον εἰσανέβησαν ἀναλκείῃσι δαμέντες,
> εἰ μὴ ἄρ᾽ Αἰνείᾳ τε καὶ Ἕκτορι εἶπε παραστὰς   75
> Πριαμίδης Ἕλενος οἰωνοπόλων ὄχ᾽ ἄριστος (*Il.* 6.67–76)

> Friends, warriors of the Danaans, comrades of Ares,
> let no one, anticipating the spoils, stay back
> behind, so that he might come bearing the greater portion back to the ships,
> but let us slay the men, and afterward at ease
> you will strip the corpses lying dead upon the plain.
> Having thus spoken, he roused the strength and spirit of each.
> Just then the Trojans, at the hands of the Achaeans dear to Ares,
> would have been driven back to Ilium, conquered in their weakness,
> if, coming up to Aeneas and Hector,
> Helenus the son of Priam, best of the augurs, had not said…

The narrative contrafactual is explicit: if Helenus had not roused Hector and Aeneas, then

the Argives would have overcome the Trojans and forced them to retreat immediately.

The spirits of the Trojans must be revived by an equivalent speech from Hector:

> Ἕκτωρ δὲ Τρώεσσιν ἐκέκλετο μακρὸν ἀΰσας·
> ‘Τρῶες ὑπέρθυμοι τηλεκλειτοί τ᾽ ἐπίκουροι
> ἀνέρες ἔστε φίλοι καὶ ἀμύνετε ἄστεϊ λώβην,
> ὄφρ᾽ ἂν ἐγὼ βείω προτὶ Ἴλιον, ἠδὲ γέρουσιν
> εἴπω βουλευτῇσι καὶ ἡμετέρῃς ἀλόχοισι
> δαίμοσιν ἀρήσασθαι, ὑποσχέσθαι δ᾽ ἑκατόμβας. (*Il.* 6.110–115)

And Hector, shouting loudly, called to the Trojans:
High-hearted Trojans and far-famed allies,
be men, friends, and ward off disgrace from your city,
so that I may go to Ilium and speak in counsel
with the elders and with our wives
and pray to the gods and offer them hecatombs.

The two speeches are themselves combat maneuvers, the latter answering the former with precise equivalence. Both begin with full-line vocative formulae followed by four lines of exhortation. The contrasting language of invasion and defense heightens this complementarity: Nestor's speech spurs the Achaeans on with the promise of plunder, and Hector's promises support from the city in the form of hecatombs offered on the soldiers' behalf. The import of this is clear: Nestor's speech was not only sound but efficacious, and only a speech precisely in kind from Hector prevented the Trojans from being overrun.

This seems sufficient to answer the question of whether Nestor's knowledge of warfare is up to par: indeed, it goes beyond showing his adequate knowledge, for Nestor's speech in book 6 is itself an act of battle-craft, deployed strategically in order to rout the enemy in the same way that a tactical maneuver would be. This does not necessarily obviate the difference between rhetorical skill and skill in battle, but it does further illustrate the way in which the two are linked: μύθων τε ῥητήρ᾽ ἔμεναι πρηκτῆρά τε ἔργων is, for Achilles and for every hero, a complete formulaic unit, the entirety of heroism, with two distinct but ultimately inseparable elements.[99] This supplements and confirms the evidence from Nestor's most frequent epithet: it would be nonsensical if

---

[99] Indeed, the two may not ultimately be distinct, as Martin 1989 argues: "That is the essence of the dictum Peleus entrusts to Phoinix, who in turn reminds Achilles to be a speaker of words and a doer of deeds. Between the two concepts no distinction is drawn. Both are performances." (p. 146)

ἱππότα Νέστωρ were an object of comic ridicule for a speech about chariot warfare. Even the loosest and most flexible mode of oral-referential characterization has limits.

This is not to gainsay the long-established comic element to Nestor's reminiscences, but rather to note that this comic element must coexist with the poem's fundamental respect for the knowledge and rhetorical prowess that Nestor's age has bestowed on him. In this light, Agamemnon's remarks on Nestor's age following his muster of the horsemen in book 4 must be read not as an ironic mockery of an out-of-touch old man, but rather as a comment on the way in which age has transformed his battle prowess: if he still had the strength of body to match the strength of his oratory, he would be among the best of the Achaeans. This scene is a positive inflection of Nestor's age, made present explicitly through Agamemnon's greeting, and this positive inflection undergirds the exhortation in book 6. In light of this well-established positive inflection, we can read Nestor's extended reminiscence in book 11 as doubly inflected, or perhaps simultaneously inflected: the comic element depends fundamentally on the poem's basic respect for Nestor's age.

Nestor's narrative to Patroclus in book 11 is the story most fundamental to the listener's view of who Nestor is. It is his longest narrative, and comes in two major parts. In telling the story he enacts his role as orator and elder giving the story of the deed that earned him fame.[100] If, however, we take seriously the notion of Nestor's genuine expertise and skill as a counselor and fighter, it is also a moment of profound tragic irony, as he stirs Patroclus to do something that will absolutely result in the latter's death.

---

[100] Hainsworth 1993 notes the comic element to the sheer length of Nestor's speech, but also that epic exhibits a tendency to lengthen the speeches prior to the most urgent events (p. 295). Austin 1966 takes Nestor's stories somewhat more seriously, emphasizing that they "are not senile meandering" (p. 201) and stressing their consistent rhetorical use as hortatory *paradeigmata* for the younger fighters to live up to.

Indeed, the irony would be far less sharp if Nestor were merely incompetent, but if he really does give the soundest and best advice that he is able, the best that could be expected, then the irony of his ignorance is far deeper and more effective.

The opening of the speech laments the absence of Achilles, who, he thinks, cares nothing for the sufferings of the Argives:

> ἦ μένει εἰς ὅ κε δὴ νῆες θοαὶ ἄγχι θαλάσσης
> Ἀργείων ἀέκητι πυρὸς δηΐοιο θέρωνται,
> αὐτοί τε κτεινώμεθ᾽ ἐπισχερώ; οὐ γὰρ ἐμὴ ἴς
> ἔσθ᾽ οἵη πάρος ἔσκεν ἐνὶ γναμπτοῖσι μέλεσσιν.
> εἴθ᾽ ὣς ἡβώοιμι βίη δέ μοι ἔμπεδος εἴη   670
> ὡς ὁπότ᾽ Ἠλείοισι καὶ ἡμῖν νεῖκος ἐτύχθη
> ἀμφὶ βοηλασίῃ, ὅτ᾽ ἐγὼ κτάνον Ἰτυμονῆα
> ἐσθλὸν Ὑπειροχίδην, ὃς ἐν Ἤλιδι ναιετάασκεν (*Il.* 11.666–674).

> Will he wait until the swift ships by the sea
> are burned, against the Achaeans' will, by destructive fire,
> and we ourselves are killed one after another? For there is not strength
> as once there was in my twisted limbs.
> Would that I were young and the strength still steady within me,
> as when there was strife between us and the Eleians
> over a cattle-driving, when I killed Itymoneus,
> brave son of Hypeirochus, who lived in Elis.

Nestor foresees a crisis, in which the Argives are powerless to stop the advance of the Trojans toward the ships, while Achilles waits for a restitution that can never be made. It is only at this crisis point that Nestor finds himself properly powerless: even his skill in oratory and battle-speech cannot stop the coming catastrophe, and he laments his age and bodily weakness over nearly six full lines, the greatest amount of space ever given directly to his age in the corpus. His epitome would be sufficient, but the speech itself has been cited as evidence for a far older and stranger background to Nestor as a twinned horseman, of the same type as the Dioscuri.[101] This seems highly unlikely, though

---

[101] This is argued at tremendous length in Frame 2009, but this is not a mainstream view, and Frame's attribution of knowledge of Vedic poetry to Homeric bards makes this theory difficult to take seriously.

certainly the centrality of the cattle raid in both the epitome and the longer narrative

suggests a story of some antiquity. Dramatically, however, Nestor's speech does far more

than elaborate an obscure and difficult-to-parse background story. The beginning of the

quarrel with the Epeians lays the central background for Nestor's character:

> ἐλθὼν γάρ ῥ᾽ ἐκάκωσε βίη Ἡρακληείη
> τῶν προτέρων ἐτέων, κατὰ δ᾽ ἔκταθεν ὅσσοι ἄριστοι·
> δώδεκα γὰρ Νηλῆος ἀμύμονος υἱέες ἦμεν·
> τῶν οἶος λιπόμην, οἳ δ᾽ ἄλλοι πάντες ὄλοντο.
> ταῦθ᾽ ὑπερ ηφανέοντες Ἐπειοὶ χαλκοχίτωνες
> ἡμέας ὑβρίζοντες ἀτάσθαλα μηχανόωντο (*Il.* 11.690–695).

> For Herakles had come and thrashed us with his strength
> in earlier years, and the best of us had been killed,
> for we were twelve sons of lordly Neleus,
> of whom only I remained, and the others perished,
> and having grown arrogant over this, the bronze-armored Epeians
> looked down on us and plotted against us.

Nestor here collapses the narrative of how he came to be alone among his generation into

background for the story of the cattle-raid, but this does not make it any less central to his

characterization. Indeed, it lends continuity between Nestor's past self in the story and

the present self who narrates it: the already-enacted death of his brothers figures him as a

last remnant, even though in practical terms many of his generation remain alive during

the events that he narrates. This sole survivorship is given fairly tight lexical realization

in the contrasting formulaic phrases that make up the line,[102] separated by a strong

caesura: τῶν οἶος λιπόμην, οἳ δ᾽ ἄλλοι πάντες ὄλοντο, set against the dozen sons of

Neleus in the previous line, emphasizes this as characteristic of Nestor rather than

incidental to him, and sets up the remainder of his story as a mixed narrative rather than

---

[102] The combination of οἶος and a middle form of λείπω to convey sole survivorship is attested three times in the Homeric corpus: λιποίμην / οἶος (*Il.* 9.437–8); οἶος λιπόμην (*Il.* 11.692); οἶοι λείπονται (*Od.* 22.249). Likewise, πάντες ὄλοντο for a conflict with no default survivors is thrice attested: οἳ δ᾽ ἄλλοι πάντες ὄλοντο (*Il.* 11.693); πάντες κ᾽ αὐτόθ᾽ ὄλοντο (*Il.* 16.847); οἱ μὲν πάντες ὄλοντο (*Od.* 19.276).

one of straightforward heroism. The rest of his story bears this out: instead of even a

miniature *aristeia*, we are treated to a narrative marked by initial success, but whose

central element is his failure to kill the twin Moliones, although this failure is excused by

the intervention of their father Poseidon (whose fatherhood is, however, somewhat

undercut by the patronymic Ἀκτορίωνε).[103] The Pylians, successful in repelling the raid,

are nonetheless cut off in their pursuit of the Epeians:

> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπόρουσα κελαινῇ λαίλαπι ἶσος,
> πεντήκοντα δ᾽ ἕλον δίφρους, δύο δ᾽ ἀμφὶς ἕκαστον
> φῶτες ὀδὰξ ἕλον οὖδας ἐμῷ ὑπὸ δουρὶ δαμέντες.
> καί νύ κεν Ἀκτορίωνε Μολίονε παῖδ᾽ ἀλάπαξα,   750
> εἰ μή σφωε πατὴρ εὐρὺ κρείων ἐνοσίχθων
> ἐκ πολέμου ἐσάωσε καλύψας ἠέρι πολλῇ.
> ἔνθα Ζεὺς Πυλίοισι μέγα κράτος ἐγγυάλιξεν·
> τόφρα γὰρ οὖν ἑπόμεσθα διὰ σπιδέος πεδίοιο
> κτείνοντές τ᾽ αὐτοὺς ἀνά τ᾽ ἔντεα καλὰ λέγοντες,   755
> ὄφρ᾽ ἐπὶ Βουπρασίου πολυπύρου βήσαμεν ἵππους
> πέτρης τ᾽ Ὠλενίης, καὶ Ἀλησίου ἔνθα κολώνη
> κέκληται· ὅθεν αὖτις ἀπέτραπε λαὸν Ἀθήνη.
> ἔνθ᾽ ἄνδρα κτείνας πύματον λίπον· αὐτὰρ Ἀχαιοὶ
> ἂψ ἀπὸ Βουπρασίοιο Πύλονδ᾽ ἔχον ὠκέας ἵππους,   760
> πάντες δ᾽ εὐχετόωντο θεῶν Διὶ Νέστορί τ᾽ ἀνδρῶν (*Il.* 11.747–761).

> Then I rushed upon them like a black whirlwind,
> and I caught fifty chariots, and in each two men
> bit the earth with their teeth, overpowered by my spear.
> And I would have killed Aktor's sons, the Moliones,
> had not their father, the earthshaker of wide strength,
> saved them from the battle, hiding them in a thick cloud.
> Then Zeus bestowed great strength on the Pylians:
> for we chased them over the hollow plain,
> killing them and taking their splendid armor,
> until we brought our horses to Bouprasion the grain-rich
> and the Olenian rock, and the hill there is called the hill
> of Alesios. Athena turned our people away from there.
> There I killed and left my last man, but the Achaeans

---

[103] This ambiguity of parentage is present even in other archaic sources: the Hesiodic tradition describes their mother Molione as Ἄκτορι κυσαμένη καὶ ἐπικτύπῳ ἐννοσιγαίῳ (*Cat.* fr. 17a), and a scholiast on *Il.* 11.750 glosses Ἀκτορίωνε Μολίονε as follows: ὅτι ἐντεῦθεν Ἡσίοδος Ἄκτορος κατ᾽ ἐπίκλησιν καὶ Μολιόνης αὐτοὺς γεγενεαλόγηκεν, γόνῳ δὲ Ποσειδῶνος (Schol. A Hom. Λ 750 (ii. 272. 40 Erbse), "Ἀκτορίωνε Μολίονε").

> steered their swift horses from Bouprasion to Pylos,
> and all praised Zeus among the gods and Nestor among men.

Nextor's success in killing other men receives exactly equivalent treatment as his failure to kill the Moliones: the two events are clear mirrors of one another. Set in similar contrast are the initial success of the Pylians and their eventual turning back. In both cases, a god is involved in the failure: their divine parent rescues the Moliones, and Athena turns the Pylians back from their enemies. This is a traditional epic mode of turning failure either into success or at least into a reputaitonally neutral event:[104] a god's intervention is cause even for the greatest hero to back down, and the *Iliad* itself deploys this to excellent effect in the *aristeiai* of Diomedes and Achilles, as well as in the duel between Paris and Menelaus. In Nestor's hands, however, it cannot be read without a strong ironic element: is this a straightforward epic trope, or does he deploy it in order to bolster a relatively mediocre victory? In any case, even the repulsion of the Achaeans resounds in the end to Nestor's own credit, presumably because they took sufficient plunder, and he wins a warrior's acclaim among the Pylians.

This is where the speech takes a productive turn in its contrast with the situation of Achilles. Nestor's loneliness, his sole survivorship, is a tragic backdrop to the story, but he ends as a lauded and fully integrated part of his community. The central contrasting element is Nestor's public laudation against the fate of Achilles, who sits alone and will be alone forever unless he comes to the aid of the Achaeans: αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς / οἶος τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπονήσεται· ἦ τέ μιν οἴω / πολλὰ μετακλαύσεσθαι ἐπεί κ' ἀπὸ λαὸς ὄληται (11.762–764). Here the speech suppresses a hypothetical: it implicitly posits

---

[104] Indeed, the *aristeia* is just such an intervention, particularly in the *Normalform* outlined in Krischer 1971 (pp. 13–36): the intervention of a deity is part of this paradigmatic scheme, though this scheme is nowhere fully realized.

the possibility that Achilles may defeat even the entire Trojan army by himself, but it forecloses the conditions of *kleos* by depriving him of a public. The initial οἶος may be emphatic, but the closure with ἀπονήσεται at a bucolic dieresis is shocking: this clause juxtaposes two things that should not be put together, and does so in a meter that virtually demands enjambment into the following line in order to re-establish conventional poetic rhythms.

The second part of the speech is no less strange than the first: Nestor recalls his and Odysseus's being present at Phthia when Peleus and Menoetius sent their respective children off to Aulis. His recollection to Patroclus seems to be both advice to the younger man and a vindication of his own role in the Achaean army:

> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ τάρπημεν ἐδητύος ἠδὲ ποτῆτος,
> ἦρχον ἐγὼ μύθοιο κελεύων ὔμμ᾽ ἅμ᾽ ἕπεσθαι·
> σφὼ δὲ μάλ᾽ ἠθέλετον, τὼ δ᾽ ἄμφω πόλλ᾽ ἐπέτελλον.
> Πηλεὺς μὲν ᾧ παιδὶ γέρων ἐπέτελλ᾽ Ἀχιλῆϊ
> αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων·
> σοὶ δ᾽ αὖθ᾽ ὧδ᾽ ἐπέτελλε Μενοίτιος Ἄκτορος υἱός·   785
> ‘τέκνον ἐμὸν γενεῇ μὲν ὑπέρτερός ἐστιν Ἀχιλλεύς,
> πρεσβύτερος δὲ σύ ἐσσι· βίῃ δ᾽ ὅ γε πολλὸν ἀμείνων.
> ἀλλ᾽ εὖ οἱ φάσθαι πυκινὸν ἔπος ἠδ᾽ ὑποθέσθαι
> καί οἱ σημαίνειν· ὃ δὲ πείσεται εἰς ἀγαθόν περ.’ (*Il*. 11.780–789)

> But when we had delighted in food and drink,
> I began a tale, and invited you both to follow us:
> the two of you were quite willing, and they enjoined you.
> Peleus the old man told his son Achilles
> always to excel, and to be preeminent over others.
> But Menoetius the son of Aktor spoke thus to you:
> "My son, Achilles is superior to you by birth,
> but you are the elder: he is much greater in strength,
> but you must speak solid words to him and advise him
> and show him the way. He will trust you to his own good."

Several points stand out here. The first is Nestor's imputing some of the fault for Achilles's stubbornness to Peleus, since αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων is

found elsewhere only in Achilles's speech in book 9. The second is the way in which he invites Patroclus to assume the role that he himself has played for the Argives, precisely in order to fill the gap that he himself is unable to fill due to Achilles's isolation. He achieves this not, however, though an explicit invitation to step into a counselor's role, but rather through the mnemonic and prosopopoetic invocation of Menoetius, such that "the advice attributed to Menoetius is really Nestor's advice to Patroclus" (Alden 2000, p. 96). He couches his invitation not as a new course of action, but as something already accomplished and done: Patroclus is to be a counselor to Achilles because he always-already was one: the invitation is an invitation to be what he was, in which teleology assumes the form of history.

Nestor's discourse, then, positions him as someone who failed where Achilles might feasibly succeed (i.e. in killing all of his enemies), but whose failure was nonetheless greater than Achilles's success would be. Indeed, he is also someone who has been through the fate that awaits Achilles in being deprived of his contemporaries, figured by his brothers, and whose participation in battle and reintegration into the society of warriors was a watershed. His fundamental contention is that he was a kind of Achilles, and that as such he can speak authoritatively about the fate that awaits Achilles if he continues to isolate himself. Patroclus is the immediate audience for this portion of his speech, but it seems clear that the *paradeigma* of the first section of the speech is intended for Achilles. In his address directly to Patroclus, however, he reverses this pattern, and rather than positioning himself as Patroclus, he positions Patroclus as himself, or at least as this particular facet of himself. Age is certainly relevant here: just

as Nestor advises because he is the oldest, so Patroclus will advise Achilles due to being the elder.

In this moment, the poem most explicitly discloses the conception of identity that undergirds its action. Nestor's clear analogy between his own role and Patroclus's does not point only toward the analogy between the two, but indicates both the really-existing potential for Patroclus to realize this role and the disjunction between this potential and the current reality of Patroclus's position. Nestor's rhetorical gesture establishes the parallel between the two men and the ways in which their identities are able to overlap with one another: they bear not only similar "traits" but also similar relationships to similarly-situated others, who are their superiors by birth but who require advice. This parallel, however, is only rhetorically effective if there can be genuine overlap between Nestor's actually-existing, already-realized role and Patroclus's potentially-extant, yet-to-be-realized one: there must be an ontological level at which the actual and the potential can be spoken of as equally real.

It is at this point beyond question whether Nestor's speech is rhetorically effective: nowhere does the poem seriously question Nestor's facility with words, and the narrative weight of his speech-acts both before and during battle demands that we assume their effectiveness within the narrative regardless of our external evaluation of them. His act of parallelism, then, must point to a kind of equivalence between his realized traits and relationships and those same traits and relationships as "merely" potential elements of Patroclus's character: each can be spoken of as proper to someone and as part of who they are with equal sense. This univocity of character seems to indicate decisively that a

117

character trait's potential realization is itself constitutive of character and identity, prior to or even separate from whether it is ever realized.

The major objection to this reading is that Nestor establishes this potential realization through a citation of past events: since it was Menoetius who told Patroclus that this was who he was to be, he has to some extent played the roles of elder and counselor to Achilles in the past, and his stepping into it is therefore better articulated as a return to a set of roles that were already part of his character. In this account, his roles as elder and counselor have already become part of his character through assignment, enactment, or a combination of the two, and don't exist as "potential" traits but rather as already-present ones that are not being acted upon.

§5. Characterizing the Actual and Potential

A full treatment of this argument would mire the present study in an ontologico-epistemic thicket from which neither writer nor reader would emerge alive and sane. The major flaw in this objection is its failure to account for the operation of oral-formulaic characterization that renders all the events and elements of characterization not only equally proper to particular characters, but also equivalent in articulating that characterization, whether those elements are "past" or "future" with respect to the current work. This is the basis for the strong articulation of traditional-referential characterization made by Bakker,[105] in which an identical gestalt identity is made present in all particular instances. It represents an absolute equivocity of characterization: all elements are present at all times and in the same respect. Such absolute equivocity, as the present study has contended already,[106] seems to be too strong an articulation, as it creates irresolvable

---

[105] Bakker 1997 throughout, but especially ch. 1.
[106] See chapter 1, pp. 28–32 for a detailed discussion of the difficulties with this "strong" articulation.

narrative difficulties. Nonetheless, traditional referentiality demands equivocity on some level: the utterance of ποδὰς ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς *must* say not merely its lexical-semantic value, but also something else. Indeed, even Parry's basic contention demands this formulaic equivocity: the formula conveys the "essential idea," which is said in a variety of lexical configurations. But Parry's articulation seems in this light to present a univocity: many things are uttered but only one is said. Traditional referentiality inverts this, and presents a semantics in which many utterances all "say" one another and a great deal else besides. Foley notes explicitly that referentiality operates on the entire body of oral tradition, without regard for temporal ordering of its elements.[107] This objection, then, defeats itself in part, since the distinction that it makes between the reality of past and potential attributes seems to demand a mode of referentiality that oral traditions do not exhibit. It is certainly possible that a radically different articulation of oral referentiality might be developed, in which those distinctions could be made amid a large body of oral literature experienced by its audience in no particular chronological order, but such an articulation is, for now, only hypothetical.

That said, the question of how this equivocity between potential and past is possible remains to be answered. The present study does not pretend to offer anything like a complete answer, but there are several ways in which such equivocity might be cogently thought and spoken of. The first involves a relentless centering of the narrative present and a relegation of both past and potential to the same realm of narrative

---

[107] "[The noun-epithet formula] indexes the given character through the use of assigned *sêmata*. That is, by deploying one of the sanctioned designations for Halil, each of which is used in myriad other songs and situations throughout the networked epic tradition, these *reči* summon the figure they name to narrative present. What is more, this slotting procedure amounts to an extremely economical kind of characterization. Because the singer uses a 'word' familiar from other occurrences, it indexes a large inventory of background information, representing not just the boiled-down 'essential idea' of Halil but the living mythic figure complete with his epic biography." (Foley 1999, p. 102)

possibility: absent from present narrative, but present within tradition and referentially accessible. In this reading, Nestor's speech confronts Patroclus with Nestor's own presence as elder and counselor, one who speaks the πυκινὸν ἔπος, and concretizes the absence of those traits in Patroclus, attempting the negation of that concretized absence and the realization of a role that Nestor himself is incapable of filling. Nestor's prosopopoeia sets Patroclus up first as Nestor's own negation, but also potentially as his fulfillment in a way exceeds what Nestor himself can do, since the stakes are paradoxically higher than those of Nestor's youthful adventures.[108]

Another reading views this speech as exposing and using both the link and the gap between word and deed. The admonition of Menoetius to εὖ οἱ φάσθαι πυκινὸν ἔπος ἠδ᾽ ὑποθέσθαι / καὶ οἱ σημαίνειν binds Patroclus, and its lexical presence necessarily entails its pragmatic absence: such an admonition would be unnecessary for someone who was already fulfilling its terms. This reading makes the gap itself constitutive in part of Patroclus's character: what is realized in this scene is precisely the absence or incompleteness of his role with respect to Achilles. "Realized" here does double duty: at the same time that this gap is defined and concretized, Patroclus himself becomes conscious of his own absence and abstention. His presence at Achilles's side is refigured as an absence from his father's command, and his presence before Nestor becomes absence under another guise. His proximity to the wounded compounds this realization of

---

[108] This reading owes a great deal, perhaps too much, to Hegelian notions of development through negation. But the structure of Nestor's appeal can also be articulated more straightforwardly. "Nestor was the salvation of the Pylians: Patroclus could be the salvation of the Greeks. Nestor is presenting his own example for Patroclus to imitate, and there is nothing indirect about it. Nestor fought against his father's wishes and won the day: if Patroclus cannot persuade Achilles either to fight in person or to allow him, Patroclus, to fight wearing Achilles' armor, Patroclus may have to fight anyway, against Achilles' wishes. The example of Nestor's success in spite of opposition from his father encourages Patroclus to believe that even if he has to fight against Achilles' wishes, he will win the day, like Nestor." (Alden 2000, pp. 98–99)

120

absence, as he comes to see his presence with Achilles as another mode of abstention that is not mitigated by spatial proximity to the results of battle.

This series of absences attendant upon lexical presence makes for excellent drama, but the series of analogical absences whose unfolding constitutes the drama depends on the gap registered by Nestor's citation of Menoetius. This gap between word and deed through which the word's presence highlights the deed's absence may be best articulated as the *trace* of deconstructionist criticism. "The *trace* is not the present but rather the simulacrum of a presence that dislocates, displaces, and refers beyond itself" (Derrida 1977, p. 156). Both what has been abandoned and what lurks as potential are equally thinkable as *trace*: to say something is to *not* say something else, as when expectation prepares a listener to hear, e.g., a certain element in a catalogue, but leaves it unsaid. For Nestor to flesh out possibility in this instance would be to render absence into presence, to construct identity explicitly rather than referentially. This is a common strategy in Homeric poetry, but ultimately inappropriate both for the genre of hortatory speech, which attempts to bridge the gap between what is and what might be, and for the character of Patroclus, who is defined in large part by what is unrealized in him, both in his proximity to the towering figure of Achilles and in the early demise which prefigures and sets in motion, but is ultimately overshadowed by, the demise of Achilles.

Patroclus's being marked by undeveloped or unrealized potential is perhaps the strongest argument in favor of a diffuse construction of Homeric identity. It would make little sense to talk simply of undifferentiated "potential" as tragic in itself: the tragic pathos lies precisely in the specificity of what was lost, in the preservation by poetic memory of both the forward-looking dynamic humanity of the warrior and the moment

when those possibilities are extinguished. Just as conspicuous omission can be a form of inclusion in and of itself, as with Calypso's catalogue of goddesses discussed previously in this study,[109] the poem points at Patroclus's unfulfilled potential, the things he *didn't* do, and folds it into his character. The fact of what he specifically might have been but wasn't becomes as much a part of his character as the facts of what he was and did.

This seems at first glance to be contrary to the conventions of epic and to the conception of identity elaborated on thus far in various strains of Indo-European epic. It is certainly not at all foreign to Greek epic: indeed, one of the central elements in the characterization of Achilles is his account of the two futures open to him:

> εἰ μέν κ᾽ αὖθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
> ὤλετο μέν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται·
> εἰ δέ κεν οἴκαδ᾽ ἵκωμι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,
> ὤλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ μοι αἰὼν
> ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κέ μ᾽ ὦκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχείη. (9.412–416)

> If I stay and fight around the city of the Trojans,
> my homecoming will perish, though my fame will be deathless.
> But if I go homeward to the dear land of my fathers,
> my splendid fame will perish, but a long life will be left
> to me, and my end in death will not come quickly.

The poem, and indeed Achilles himself, is clear that this choice lies at the heart of his actions in the poem, and that he defines himself, not only at this point but at others as well, by his choice to do one thing and not the other. Both the specificity of this choice and the certainty of his death are fundamental to the tragic pathos of the poem, and the conditional spells this out; indeed, it ends by speaking of death in the most hypothetical mode possible, underscoring the dramatic irony of its certainty.

---

[109] Ch. 2, §3, pp. 65–68.

These turns to the hypothetical are not merely features of characterization, but are in fact a common dramatic device that Homeric poetry employs. By introducing a hypothetical alternative that violates the established narrative continuity of the poem, a poet is able to introduce heightened drama through a challenge to what the audience knows must occur: it spells potential disaster both for the story and for the poet's own abilities, as the audience anticipates a resolution that will bring the narrative back on track.[110] For example, the poet imagines defeat for the Achaeans as early as book 2: ἔνθά κεν Ἀργείουσιν ὑπέρμορα νόστος ἐτύχθη / εἰ μὴ Ἀθηναίην Ἥρη πρὸς μῦθον ἔειπεν (2.155–6). This always takes the form of an unreal conditional with a prothetic apodosis: the alternative is posited and given a kind of narrative consideration until the intervention described in the apodosis prunes it away from the narrative line. Morrison (1992, p. 67) describes these "reversal passages" as a way for the poet "to respond to the epic tradition by posing an alternative to it" as a sort of commentary: "Homer shows us how the traditional story might have been changed." Such passages also imagine the deaths of major characters, as when the poet addresses Menelaus directly:

> ἔνθά κέ τοι Μενέλαε φάνη βιότοιο τελευτὴ
> Ἕκτορος ἐν παλάμῃσιν, ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτερος ἦεν,
> εἰ μὴ ἀναΐξαντες ἕλον βασιλῆες Ἀχαιῶν,
> αὐτός τ᾽ Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
> δεξιτερῆς ἕλε χειρὸς ἔπος τ᾽ ἔφατ᾽ ἔκ τ᾽ ὀνόμαζεν. (7.104–8)

> And there, Menelaus, would have appeared the end of your life
> at the hands of Hector, since he was far stronger than you,
> had not the kings of the Achaeans, leaping up, caught you,
> and Atreus's son himself, wide-ruling Agamemnon,
> grabbed your right hand and spoken to you and called you by name.

---

[110] Morrison 1992 gives an overview of this phenomenon in the *Iliad*. Louden 1993 explores how certain pivotal contrafactuals highlight narrative similarities between different incidents in the poem.

Morrison (1992, p. 66) views these reversal passages in light of a strongly Unitarian approach to Homeric authorship: "Although the *Iliad*'s poet most likely has not invented such a formulation, he has introduced it into this epic with great frequency: approximately once every 450 lines." Yet he also acknowledges both their formulaic quality and their presence throughout the oral epic tradition, appearing in both Homeric epics, the hymns, and Hesiod. It seems strange, then, to view the reversal passage as a signature stylistic device of a singular *Iliad* poet. It may very well be that the particular reversals in our text are the interventions of a particular poet; indeed, that seems at least as likely for these passages as it does for the Homeric similes, long thought to be sites of individual poetic exhibition.[111] But this is not, *pace* Morrison, a necessary indicator of a particular poet or redactor's ability to enrich and comment on an otherwise straightforward tradition. It rather demonstrates the tradition's own capacity for self-reflection on its standard plots, as well as a capaciousness that can assume alternatives into itself precisely through this process of reversal or negation.

This assumption of negated alternatives into tradition reveals a tension in tradition that is always being negotiated and manipulated by poets well after the Homeric period. Nowhere is this tension better illustrated than in the account of Stesichorus's palinode given in the *Phaedrus*:

> ἔστιν δὲ τοῖς ἁμαρτάνουσι περὶ μυθολογίαν καθαρμὸς ἀρχαῖος, ὃν Ὅμηρος μὲν οὐκ ᾔσθετο, Στησίχορος δέ· τῶν γὰρ ὀμμάτων στερηθεὶς διὰ τὴν Ἑλένης κακηγορίαν οὐκ ἠγνόησεν ὥσπερ Ὅμηρος, ἀλλ᾽ ἅτε μουσικὸς ὢν ἔγνω τὴν αἰτίαν καὶ ποιεῖ εὐθύς·

---

[111] This does not preclude understanding the simile as a developed element of oral tradition whose acceptable boundaries are set by that tradition rather than by an individual poet; indeed, this view is put forth in Scott 1974 and developed along firmly Unitarian lines in Scott 2009. The simile is "not required by [Homeric] tradition or by the demands of metrical form for the completion of any scene" (Scott 2009, p. 174), and thus a particular use is a matter of poetic choice even for the strictest Oralist. Nonetheless, Homeric simile is "characterized by linguistic lateness" (Shipp 1972, p. 208), with an abundance of late forms and a paucity of archaisms, which strongly points toward spontaneous inclusion by later poets.

οὐκ ἔστ᾽ ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος,
οὐδ᾽ ἔβας ἐν νηυσὶν ἐϋσσέλμοις
οὐδ᾽ ἵκεο πέργαμα Τροίας,

καὶ ποιήσας δὴ πᾶσαν τὴν καλουμένην Παλινῳδίαν παραχρῆμα ἀνέβλεψεν. (243a–b)

For those who err about mythology there is an ancient purification, which Homer did not know but Stesichorus did: for when he was blinded on account of his slander of Helen, he was not ignorant as Homer was, but because he was devoted to the Muses, he understood the cause and straightaway wrote:

This is not a true account,
And you did not board well-beached ships,
And you did not go to the citadel of Troy.

And after he composed the whole thing, which is called the Palinode, he at once saw again.

Leaving aside its role in the Platonic *agon* against poetry, this passage envisions the poet as one who errs and recants concerning the subjects of his poetry. Negation here functions not only to correct an error previously made by the poet, but also to push against the boundary between negated alternatives and expressed traditional material, confronting the authoritative account with a flatly contradictory one in an attempt to bring a posited negative into fully expressed realization. At the same time, this is not a free-for-all: the figure of Helen is the arbiter of mythological truth concerning herself, and the underlying assumption of Socrates's speech is that truth and falsehood are relevant categories in the discussion of such myths. But since the falsehood has already been uttered and the poet punished, he cannot resort to the same device as the Homeric tradition, flirting with possibility before negating it with reality: he must instead make a καθαρμός by going back on what was said. Plato's account reverses some of the standard terms of Homeric poetic discourse: the poet's blindness becomes punitive rather than prophetic, and the Homeric account an error to be corrected rather than a reliable source. But the categories of ἔτυμος

125

λόγος and ἁμαρτία still govern what can or should be said, even as the "erroneous" account of Homer remains inseparable from the poetic tradition. Plato is, of course, perfectly aware of this: there is no evidence of his actually seeking to emend Homer on factual grounds. Rather, his ironic attack on the poet's credibility undercuts the notion of a monolithic tradition: "emendation" is a rhetorical device through which the mythological-poetic tradition can be opened up and added to without effacing the "error" to which the newer material is responding. It allows the realization of alternatives precisely *as* alternatives, retaining their negative character in relation to the body of tradition whose events have been foreclosed and existing in the shadow of that body: it cannot posit itself independently, but must retain a relationship to the established traditional plot precisely in its refusal to realize it.

Epic tradition, then, remains a polymorphous thing even in a form as developed as the Homeric poems. A tradition in which even pivotal plot points are realized in the shadow of potential alternatives and in which narration happens in the explicit refusal of alternatives requires a mode of characterization that functions in the same way. Indeed, this is entirely consonant with a tradition in which deed and identity are so tightly bound up with one another: the κλέα ἀνδρῶν appear not only as the deeds that the poem narrates but as the ones that it negates, and a foreclosed or negated deed nonetheless remains part of characterization in the same way that negated events remain part of the epic tradition as a whole. The moral flexibility of discrete elements of identity explored in the first part of this chapter has given way to a deeper flexibility in which the expression or realization of character traits is itself open to negotiation and criticism from within the tradition. These modes of negotiation remain, however, radically dependent on the audience's familiarity

with the body of tradition as a whole: their effectiveness demands a knowing audience whose response is conditioned by the familiarity of the material.

The linchpin of the audience's familiarity remains the epithet system. It is the scattered presence of formulaic epithet throughout the body of poetry that allows loosely realized characterization to be assumed into the body of tradition. One can tell a story in which Achilles gives a speech, but this is not necessarily "traditional" if the account of it lacks the traditional cues for the delivery of significant speech. If, however, the speech is introduced with τὸν δ᾽ ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη πόδας ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς and given in hexameters, then this becomes an account to be taken seriously as part of the Homeric tradition, even if it should contradict another traditional account: the line between ἔτυμος λόγος and ἁμαρτία must still be negotiated by the poet, but the material is eligible for inclusion provided that such a negotiation can be made, because an audience recognizes the lexical, metrical, and stylistic markers of "traditional" accounts. But given this dependence on the more rigid elements of the formulaic system, does this not set up a "tiered" structure to tradition and characterization? This would be the case if the noun-epithet formulae retained their lexical-semantic specificity, but this does not seem to be the case: in this sense, Parry's "essential idea" remains the universal object of signification for such formulae. It is the relative immutability of the formula and its association with a particular name that allows it to function as a stable linchpin for the more loosely realized elements of traditional characterization. This near-immutability is, however, also what makes possible the formula's simultaneous semantic vacuity and plenitude: the emptying-out of lexical-semantic meaning and the signification of an "essential idea" are ultimately the same process. In this way, the character traits that would be tightly realized in a noun-epithet

127

formula are not "more traditional" than a more loosely realized trait would be: the traits themselves are all equally open to realization or negation, because the mere use of a formula does not automatically realize the characterization expressed therein.

Importantly, this network of associations held together with fixed formulaic items operates to some degree as long as poetry is *orally performed* and retains a relationship to the oral-formulaic tradition through the use of lexically and metrically similar formulae. The Stesichorus palinode can be written and glossed as an intervention only in a context where such a relationship is still presumed through its establishment in other lyric poetry. The following chapter will explore the ways in which the epic configuration of identity as clustered potential available for realization is further disclosed and developed in lyric poetry leading out of the archaic and into the classical period.

CHAPTER IV

The Pindaric Refashioning of Epic Identity

§1. Methodological Overview

The study of oral characterization in lyric poetry poses essentially the same problems as its study in *Beowulf*: the material is composed in writing, but the primary experience of the audience is oral; the poets are well-acquainted with an oral bardic tradition and some may even have been trained in it, but their use of that tradition is slippery and allusive, and the history that connects this literate but semi-oral poetry to the more fully oral tradition remains unclear and contested, to say nothing of the Nonetheless, much of the extant Greek lyric poetry, especially epinician, clearly borrows, imitates, and reworks forms of praise found originally in Homeric epic. These ties to the epic tradition allow lyric to make use of the established body of epic characterization through essentially epic modes of indication. This is not omnipresent, as lyric has no need to make exclusive use of traditional epic referentiality; rather, it can choose selectively how and when to tie itself more closely to the epic tradition and when to underscore its distance from the same.

The most pertinent question that bears answering first is whether it is feasible or even coherent to speak of a "formula" in lyric tradition. Certainly there is no "formula" in the epic sense, for lyric has no need to fill out a line on the fly. Is there, however, a body of distinct terms attested in the lyric corpus, or in the corpora of metrically related poems,

that see consistent use as markers for particular mythological or epic figures? This is a somewhat more complicated question to answer: the early work of Nagy on this question seems not only to point to such a body of phrases but indeed links that posited formulaic repertoire specifically to epic as part of an argument about the origin of the dactylic hexameter. Whatever one's opinion of Nagy's overall argument, his table of correspondences between Sapphic and Homeric verse points either to the flexibility of the formula or to a separate lineage of formulae in Pherecratean lines,[112] a hypothesis with which West concurs.[113] But even this is distinct from Pindaric verse: at most it points to another strand of formulaic poetry with which Pindar might engage; it is not strong enough to posit an distinct inherited formulaic repertoire in Pindar.

In addition to the question of a "lyric formula," or at least a lyric mode of engagement with epic formula, a study that aims to contribute to the discussion of formula and identity in lyric must contend with the specific genre conventions of epinician poetry and its translation of certain portions of the epic tradition. Even "conventions" here may raise hackles, invoking as it does one of the major rifts in Pindaric scholarship between schools of interpretation in the historicizing or biographical mode and those emphasizing schematics and a "grammar" of style.[114] The present study,

---

[112] See Nagy 1974. His table on pp. 121–2 deals with lines in which Sappho's poetry seems to clip the last two syllables from the Homeric line. The table on pp. 126–7, detailing line-initial correspondences, is less persuasive owing to its reduction of "correspondence" to single words that are often not metrically identical.

[113] West (1973a, 1973b, 1984) concurs with Nagy that the Aeolic meters predate the hexameter and are likely to have played a role in its development with respect to both its metrical structure and its repertoire of formulaic diction.

[114] This division can be traced back to the earliest modern Pindaric scholarship. The edition of Boeckh (1811–1821) is the first major attempt at formal criticism of Pindar, particularly in the metrical treatise in the first volume; nonetheless, even Boeckh treats the poems as biographic allegories for their subjects. Schadewaldt 1928 continues Boeckh's biographic strain a century later. Schmidt 1862 elects instead to focus on biographic clues to Pindar's own life. Croiset 1880 is far more concerned with form, though it builds on Boeckh's interpretive ideas. Metzger 1880 makes a formal study of word repetitions within particular odes. Bury (1890; 1892) employs Metzger's theory but remains fixated on the biographic

however, refuses to see a distinction between historical and structural criticism, since structures of meaning and their historical development are very much the object of interest. Nonetheless, it is the history of structure rather than of the poet that draws the most commentary here. To argue that epinician makes use of originally epic constructions of identity is to invite a charge of tautology: the subjects of victory odes undergo a process of heroization that renders them, within the ode's scope, fitting subjects for hypothetical contemporary epic.[115] The *kleos* promised by this memorial verse positions itself as the reward of an epic hero, and indeed sometimes goes further into outright divinization.[116] This mode of variation suggests already that this is not a tautological characterization, and the case for the specific demarcation of epinician's borrowing from and variation on epic modes of characterization is bolstered by Pindar's own mixed relationship with the Homeric corpus.[117] This is, in short, a distinctive body of poetry, some of whose conventions are drawn from but do not precisely replicate those of epic. Examining both what these conventions and modes of characterization share with the epic tradition and how they vary from it is therefore essential for further specifying

particulars of the poems' subjects. For further discussion and the latter history of Pindaric scholarship, see Young's excellent essay reprinted in Calder and Stern 1970 (pp. 1–96). But see also the re-evaluation offered by Heath 1986. Contemporary Pindaric scholarship happily enjoys a great diversity of approaches, including recent close studies of the poems' rhetorical devices (Patten 2009), political dimensions (Morgan 2015), and performance contexts (Spelman 2018), in addition to now-standard studies of social economy (Kurke 1991) and Pindaric connection to hero cult (Currie 2005).

[115] Currie 2005 treats extensively the process of heroization in Pindar both as a rhetorical-poetic process and as a religious-historical one related to archaic and classical cult and Hellenistic ruler cult. See especially ch. 8 (pp. 120–157) on the heroization of athletes.

[116] Sigelman 2016 distinguishes between the "long-lasting" immortality of epic *kleos* and the ever-fresh permanence of the epinician moment of victory, characterizing the latter as "immortal" in the sense of divinity (p. 2).

[117] For Pindar's understanding of what the Homeric corpus includes, see Fitch 1924, which argues for Pindar's broad understanding of which poems were "Homeric." Bowra 1964 disagrees, claiming that Pindar owes "almost nothing" to Homer as a source of material (p. 283)4. Mann 1994 concurs broadly, though he sees an agonistic relationship to the Homeric account in *Nem.* 7 (pp. 327–332).

our picture of what, exactly, "identity" means in epic and how it is signaled and delineated.

§2. The Craftsmanship of Identity

Perhaps the most significant gap between epic and epinician is the former's distinctive paucity of metaphor. This is itself somewhat misleading: Homeric epic does not lack instances of metaphorical language,[118] and these metaphors can be as striking or as vivid as any simile: Achilles's abuse of Agamemnon as a δημοβόρος βασιλεύς (*Il.* 1.231) is both brief and shocking. Homeric metaphor, however, is extremely brief and is not developed to the same degree of detail as an extended simile. This is not to be taken as a deficiency in Homeric poetics; indeed, the use of simile alone proves that a Homeric poet was perfectly capable of extended and developed imagery. But it was the extended simile that became characteristic of epic, and its presence a way of marking the text in question as epic literature.[119] Pindaric lyric certainly makes use of extended simile, but stands apart in its metaphoric richness and density. The proem of Olympian 6 furnishes an excellent example:

> χρυσέας ὑποστάσαντες εὐτειχεῖ προθύρῳ θαλάμου
> κίονας, ὡς ὅτε θαητὸν μέγαρον
> πάξομεν· ἀρχομένου δ᾽ ἔργου πρόσωπον
> χρὴ θέμεν τηλαυγές. (*Ol.* 6.1–4)[120]

> Raising golden pillars for the fine-walled entrance of our house,
> a wondrous hall, so to speak,
> shall we build: at the beginning of our work a front
> far-shining must we place.

---

[118] Parry 1933 deals with the "traditional" (that is, repeated) metaphor in Homer. Moulton 1979 surveys a number of metaphorical phrases in the Homeric corpus, including the repeated metaphors and the small number of extended metaphors.

[119] Ready 2018 treats the simile as one of the poet's devices for negotiating a spectrum between "shared" and "idiolectal" poetic elements, both marking the poet's individual skill and displaying his credentials as a member of a mature poetic tradition (pp. 70–127).

[120] Pindaric quotations depend on the edition of Snell (1953).

Figuring his poem as a building, Pindar realizes this poetic edifice even as he speaks of its present necessity. Within this metaphor, πρόσωπον has a double figuration, standing both for the façade of the figured building and for the front matter of the poem. In building this metaphorical edifice, he also implicitly figures his own poetic work as the work of craftsmanship and himself as a τέκτων.

This use of metaphor also affects the poet's conception of identity, in that identity itself is made the object of figuration. Olympian 6 does precisely this in the lines following the proem:

> εἰ δ᾽ εἴη μὲν Ὀλυμπιονίκας,
> βωμῷ τε μαντείῳ ταμίας Διὸς ἐν Πίσᾳ,
> συνοικιστήρ τε τᾶν κλεινᾶν Συρακοσσᾶν· τίνα κεν φύγοι ὕμνον
> κεῖνος ἀνήρ, ἐπικύρσαις ἀφθόνων ἀστῶν ἐν ἱμερταῖς ἀοιδαῖς;
> ἴστω γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ πεδίλῳ δαιμόνιον πόδ᾽ ἔχων
> Σωστράτου υἱός. (*Ol.* 6.4–9)

> But if someone were an Olympic victor,
> a steward of the mantic altar of Zeus at Pisa,
> a co-founder of famous Syracuse, then what hymn
> would that man escape after coming upon unenvious citizens in joyful songs?
> Let him know that he has a divine foot in this sandal,
> the son of Sostratus.

This seems to be a stark departure from the epic conception of identity explored in previous chapters. Here identity becomes a conjunction, a joining figured in bodily terms between the bare or naked self and the stuff of his reputation. This stuff—his Olympic victory, his stewardship of the mantic altar, and his part in the foundation of Syracuse—is what merits the hymnic praise from a joyful citizenry, but its figuration as a πέδιλον, something fitted that can nonetheless be put on and removed, disjoins it from Hagesias's bare personhood. Indeed, as if this simple disjunction were not enough, the poem places the subject and his reputation at further remove from one another through its isolation of

the sandal's fit around the foot: Hagesias's relationship to his glory-winning reputation is mediated through his possession not of the πέδιλον of fame itself, but of the foot that it surrounds; his living body becomes, in this sense, a genuine barrier between himself and his fame, since a dead hero has nothing but their *kleos* and is identical with it, whereas the fame of the living is not yet fixed, their deeds written on unbaked clay. This leaves the enjambed paternal epithet phrase, with which the poet finally names his subject, in a state of interpretive limbo: is it to be reckoned with the bare self figured by the metaphor of the sandal, or should it be read as another mode of poetic distance that defers and fragments the victor's identity as it will appear in the completed poetic θάλαμος? The particulars of patronymics and paternal epithet phrases will be explored later in this chapter.

Returning to the metaphor of the πέδιλον, its separation of deed from doer calls specific attention to the role of the poet in crafting the subject's reputation. The poet's figuration as a skilled craftsman is carried over from the previous architectural metaphor and expressed at this point through the poet's work in arranging and fitting the elements of reputation into an object that conforms to the body of the ode's subject: it "fits" him not merely because of the strength of his accomplishments, but because of the poet's ability to render them into a form that appears already appropriate. What marks this metaphor most strongly is the self-insertion and self-consciousness of the poet as craftsman. The Homeric bard sings as moved by the Muse:

> αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἕντο,
> μοῦσ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν,
> οἴμης τῆς τότ᾽ ἄρα κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἵκανεν (*Od.* 8.72–4)

> But when they put away the desire for food and drink,
> the Muse moved the singer to sing the deeds of men,

and the fame of this song reached the broad sky.

But even here, the poet is plainly conscious of his own role: the κλέα ἀνδρῶν that make up heroic reputation have been explicitly spread around by the particular song that Demodocus is performing; τῆς here unmistakably indicates *this* song. It is not the poet who is missing from the Homeric account, but the craft: the mnemonic gift of the Muse bestows upon the poet knowledge of the substance of the song—the κλέα—and it is these deeds that reach the ears of the audience. The same role is played by ἔργ᾽ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε in book 1 (338) during the song of Phemius. We see the overlap of the two in the proem to the story told by Phoenix during the embassy in the *Iliad*:

> οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν
> ἡρώων, ὅτε κέν τιν᾽ ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἵκοι·
> δωρητοί τε πέλοντο παράρρητοί τ᾽ ἐπέεσσι.
> μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ πάλαι, οὔ τι νέον γε,
> ὡς ἦν· ἐν δ᾽ ὑμῖν ἐρέω πάντεσσι φίλοισι. (9.524–8)

> Thus have we heard of the deeds of men of old,
> heroes, when violent anger came upon any of them:
> they were open to gifts and amenable to words.
> I myself remember this deed of old, not something recent,
> how it was: and I will tell it among all of you who are my friends.

We find κλέα here with an enjambed ἡρώων, but this seems merely emphatic: the phrase clearly has the same semantic force as the unaugmented κλέα ἀνδῶν discussed above. The mnemonic core of the poetic function is explicit here: this is a memory of Phoenix himself and so has no need of the Muse, but the objectified deed itself is what he relates, a κλέος whose significance he now reveals πάντεσσι φίλοισι.

Comparative evidence provides a further basis for reading κλέα ἀνδρῶν in this way. The expression is attested in a Vedic hymn to Agni:

> *yé me pañcāśátaṃ dadúr*
> *áśvānāṃ sadhástuti*

dyumád agne máhi śrávo
bṛhát kṛdhi maghónāṃ
nṛvád amṛta nṛṇám (*RV* 5.18.5)

For those who gave me fifty
horses for the joint praise,
o Agni, make bright and great fame,
lofty for the generous ones,
filled with men, o Immortal One.

Even this attestation is contestable: instead of presenting a straightforward *śrávo nṛṇām*

"fame of men" as a direct cognate for κλέα ἀνδρῶν, the hymn allows the final *nṛṇām* to

rest in an ambiguous position between construction with *śrávo* as a possessive genitive

and construction with *nṛvád* as an objective genitive. Though scholars have disagreed

about which reading should be given precedence,[121] the purposeful ambiguity seems

clear, and the hymn clearly begs Agni to reward the generous patrons of the sacrifice with

the fame that comes from song. Nagy (1990a, p. 201) does not entirely agree, and wishes

to draw a distinction "between singular *śrávas-* in Indic and plural *klea* in Greek: the

singular conveys the notion of a single given composition, while the plural seems to

emphasize a given tradition of composition." His primary supporting authority is

Schmitt,[122] who seems to concur about a distinction between the singular and plural, but

disagrees on what that distinction entails. Schmitt distinguishes between the singular

śrávas- of the Rigveda and the plural κλέα on the basis of an abstract/concrete

distinction, with the singular representing an abstract reward and the plural denoting

---

[121] Schmitt 1967 (p. 96) elects to construe it as a possessive, which is unsurprising given that the hymn is discussed amid a larger discussion of the function of praise. Jamison and Brereton 2014 prioritize the objective genitive, and my translation above has followed their choice.

[122] „Auffallend gegenüber der festen griechischen Pluralverbindung κλέα ἀνδρῶν ‚Rühme der Männer' ist an der ṚS.-Stelle der Singular: *śrávo / ... / ... nṛṇām* ‚Ruhm der Männer'. Doch ist dies vom Inhalt der Wendungen her durchaus berechtigt: Während es sich bei dem *śrávas-*, das der vedische *kávi-* für seine großzügigen Gönner erfleht, um etwas Abstraktes, um eine Wertung handelt, meinen ja die homerischen κλέα ἀνδρῶν ‚berühmtgewordene Taten von einzelnen Helden', also wirklich ‚Rühme der Männer'." (Schmitt 1967, p. 96).

136

particular songs performed by singers. Nagy's contention that singular *śravas-* signifies a singular concrete composition appears not to have any basis either in Schmitt's argument or in the text. Indeed, Schmitt's actual argument seems to be much closer to the truth: its other cognate formulaic attestation as *śravo…ákṣitam* (*RV* 1.9.7) "imperishable fame" is clearly abstract, and even when figured geographically as *urugāyam…śravo* (*RV* 6.65.6) "wide fame" it refers to a reputation spread by song or other means, not to the song which spreads reputations; in this respect it parallels the use of singular κλέος in both epic and lyric, as in Olympian 10: τρέφοντι δ᾽ εὐρὺ κλέος / κόραι Πιερίδες Διός (95–6).[123] Here the fame being nurtured by the Muses is clearly not a particular song, but reputation in general. And as far as epic is concerned, we should refer first to the value of εὐρὺ κλέος in a nominal compound, as in Εὐρύκλεια, whose force is clearly abstract. In addition, as discussed earlier, the *Odyssey* is quite conscious of the distinction between the songs which spread κλέος and the singular κλέος itself. I refer back to *Od.* 8.74: οἴμης τῆς τότ᾽ ἄρα κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἵκανεν. The poem is clear about separating fame from song, and its explicit reference to fame being spread by this song of Demodocus does not diminish the clear separation between the two. The κλέος that the song spreads is an abstract thing carried by the song but not identical with it.

§3. Pindaric Use of Homeric Epithet

But Pindar's engagement with Homeric characterization is not limited to roundabout reworkings of epic κλέος: the most direct way of engaging with epic modes of characterization is through the straightforward duplication of epithet, preferably in

---

[123] The Pierides, daughters of Zeus, nurture wide fame.

forms that would themselves be metrically admissible into hexameter poetry. The proem

of Olympian 8 provides just such a duplication:

> μᾶτερ ὦ χρυσοστεφάνων ἀέθλων, Οὐλυμπία,
> δέσποιν᾽ ἀλαθείας· ἵνα μάντιες ἄνδρες
> ἐμπύροις τεκμαιρόμενοι παραπειρῶνται Διὸς ἀργικεραύνου,
> εἴ τιν᾽ ἔχει λόγον ἀνθρώπων πέρι
> μαιομένων μεγάλαν
> ἀρετὰν θυμῷ λαβεῖν,
> τῶν δὲ μόχθων ἀμπνοάν. (*Ol.* 8.1–6)

> O mother of the golden-crowned contests, Olympia,
> mistress of truth: where men of prophecy,
> judging from burnt offerings, ask Zeus of the flashing thunderbolt
> if he has any message about men
> seeking to attain great
> excellence in their hearts,
> and a relief from toils.

Here the epithet in question, ἀργικεραύνου, signals its participation in epic

characterization in both overt and subtle ways. Most obviously, it is one of the unique

epithets of Zeus, attested three times in the *Iliad*,[124] and its metrical shape is

characteristically epic. Indeed, its placement at the end of the third line further

underscores the comparison, recalling as it does the final two feet of the hexameter line.

The original attestations, however, are exclusively vocative addresses to Zeus by other

deities. Though it would not be beyond Pindar's ambition to appropriate the diction of

gods for his verse, the vocative function seems to be most prominent here. Its placement

in the indirect question posed by the μάντιες ἄνδρες allows its vocative function to be

preserved under the guise of an objective genitive: the genitive's placement directly after

the verb of asking marks an address on the part of the seers to Zeus Argikeraunos, and the

---

[124] 19.21: Ζεῦ πάτερ ἀργικέραυνε ἔπος τί τοι ἐν φρεσὶ θήσω·
20.26: τίπτ᾽ αὖτ᾽ ἀργικέραυνε θεοὺς ἀγορήνδε κάλεσσας;
22.178: ὦ πάτερ ἀργικέραυνε κελαινεφὲς οἷον ἔειπες·

question posed to the god follows.[125] This mantic discourse is possible because of the vocative invocation in the poem's first lines of the goddess Olympia, whose location makes such prophecy possible.[126] The particular vocative form normally reserved for deities thus becomes more appropriate, because its use is overseen by the personified Olympia who, at least in the conceit of Pindar's poem, is able to address Zeus on somewhat more egalitarian terms.

§4. Pindar and Patronymic in Pythian 1

One Pindaric mode of characterization that deserves special attention is the patronymic epithet, of which he makes extensive use. Indeed, Pindar's focus on the familial descent of his subjects is one of the devices with which he seems most Homeric: it also speaks to the monumentality of a Pindaric ode, which is written with a clear future audience in mind that includes the subject's family.[127] It is this monumentality and its family ties, as well as the transactional element of the poet-patron connection, that leads to the consideration of Pindar as embodying the characteristically Indo-European poetic role of a craftsman in the business of crafting immortality professionally.[128] Certainly this monumental function is one of the strongest points of overlap between epinician and epic: the *Iliad* itself is, *pace* Simone Weil (1945), an act of memorializing and

---

[125] "First are the seers (μάντιες ἄνδρες, 2), who, by inspecting burnt offerings, try to determine before the event what the outcome will be for the contestants" (Race 1990, p. 142). Race notes, however, that these activities are "a foil for the real subject of interest" (p. 143) and that this device conceals the pious hopes of the athletes.

[126] *Ibid.*, p. 144: "As mother of the crown games, Olympia is the 'queen of truth' not just because oracles in her precinct may come true, but because she decides the greatest athletic events in accordance with the will of Zeus (Διὸς ἀργικεραύνου, 3)."

[127] Again, see Currie 2005: the processes analogous to cult formation involve likewise analogous processes linking a hero's descendants to their heroic past.

[128] Watkins 1995 is a major source for this view; he is alleged to have characterized Pindar as "in many ways the most Indo-European of Greek poets," and this seems to be a reasonable characterization of his views, but this remark is attested only secondhand in West 2007, p. 15.

monumentalizing for the war dead of Troy, whose names and lineages are recorded in order to bridge the gap between the lost age of heroes and the present day. This monumentality is, however, inflected very differently by the two corpora. The Homeric hero's patrilineal descent is part of the core of his identity:[129] whether it is conveyed through a patronymic epithet or through a noun phrase with a genitive of origin, this fact of descent serves to differentiate him from others—indeed, in the case of the two Ajaxes, their patronymic epithets have become the primary means of differentiating them. The consequences of this descent are well known, exemplified most fully in the friendship of Glaucus and Diomedes. The care taken by the *Iliad* in giving each named man a patrilineal phrase or epithet speaks to their central importance: such information is very nearly part of a name.

The patronymic in Pindar is rather more opaque, deployed as one element in a poetic strategy that relies both on familial positioning and on mythic and historical analogizing. The reading of Olympian 6 at the beginning of this chapter deferred the consideration of patronymic epithets in epinician constructions of identity, noting only that Σωστράτου υἱός in line 9 is ambiguous with respect to how it fits into Pindar's sandal metaphor. Both its syntax and enjambment suggest, if not the same sort of centrality enjoyed by Homeric patronymic, at least greater centrality relative to the metaphorical foot: ἴστω γὰρ ἐν τούτῳ πεδίλῳ δαιμόνιον πόδ᾽ ἔχων / Σωστράτου υἱός. This seems to present two alternatives: either the patronymic is contiguous with its Homeric counterpart in being a tightly realized core element that demands articulation along with a personal

---

[129] Indeed, in some cases it is far *more* important than the given name. Brown 2006 notes that Agamemnon is addressed by his patronymic 36 times, by Ἀτρέος υἱέ 3 times, and with vocative Ἀγάμεμνον *sans* patrilineal attribution only twice (p. 29).

140

name or as a metonymic substitute, or the deferral of the personal name with a

patronymic allows the identity of the subject, at least in the poetic context, to be

constructed entirely by the poet; the foot, as it were, is beside the point.

Pythian 1 offers somewhat more nuance to this picture. After the lengthy proem

detailing the mythic background of Hieron's native Aetna, the poem announces and

enacts his city's glorification through the proclamation of his name:

> εἴη, Ζεῦ, τὶν εἴη ἁνδάνειν,
> ὃς τοῦτ᾽ ἐφέπεις ὄρος, εὐκάρποιο γαίας μέτωπον, τοῦ μὲν ἐπωνυμίαν
> κλεινὸς οἰκιστὴρ ἐκύδανεν πόλιν
> γείτονα, Πυθιάδος δ᾽ ἐν δρόμῳ κάρυξ ἀνέειπέ νιν ἀγγέλλων Ἱέρωνος ὑπὲρ
>   καλλινίκου
> ἅρμασι. (*Pyth.* 1.29–33)

> Let us, Zeus, please you,
> who administers this mountain, this brow of the fruitful earth, whose eponymous
> neighboring city its famous founder glorified,
> when the herald in the race course of Pythia proclaimed it, announcing Hieron as
>   glorious victor
> with the chariot.

The personal name comes first, after a quick series of poetic moves that link Hieron to

the mythic past as founder *of* the namesake city *of* this mountain. But before any

patronymic identification, the poet analogizes him both to Apollo and to Philoctetes,

petitioning the gods for his preservation "in the same manner" as the hero:

> οὕτω δ᾽ Ἱέρωνι θεὸς ὀρθωτὴρ πέλοι
> τὸν προσέρποντα χρόνον, ὧν ἔραται καιρὸν διδούς.
> Μοῖσα, καὶ πὰρ Δεινομένει κελαδῆσαι
> πίθεό μοι ποινὰν τεθρίππων. χάρμα δ᾽ οὐκ ἀλλότριον νικαφορία πατέρος. (*Pyth.*
> 1.56–59)

> So let a god be a preserver for Hieron
> into the coming time, giving him the opportunity for what he desires.
> Muse, heed me, and with Denomenes
> sing the reward for the chariot-victory. No alien joy is his father's victory.

Line 58 names Hieron's son, who has the same name as Hieron's father (Gildersleeve 1885), enlisting him for the praise-song along with the Muse. Notably, Pindar's rhetorical strategy does *not* enlist Deinomenes as a way to tie Hieron to his country, since Deinomenes rules Aetna as regent through Hieron's tyranny, so the poet must find other means than authochthonous ancestry to forge this tie. Nor does the invocation of his son and father connect Hieron to any past lineage of athletic victory: here he assumes the role of heroic progenitor, and it is his victory that colors his line, so that his victory is not alien to his son. Instead of positioning Hieron in a lineage of victory, the effect rather is to graft Hieron's ancestry onto his victory and to glorify his family by means of its latest descendant. In a reversal of the Homeric mode, Hieron's achievement figuratively tells his father who he is, rather than being informed by the identity of Deinomenes. This is, of course, a rhetorical fiction: Deinomenes is descended from the founders of Gela, and this informs the poet's focus on Hieron's founding the city of Aetna, which positions him as the latest in a line of founders.

The next succession of patronymics does *not* refer to Hieron, but makes use of famous family lines in order to glorify Hieron and his family by comparison:

> ἐθέλοντι δὲ Παμφύλου
> καὶ μὰν Ἡρακλειδᾶν ἔκγονοι
> ὄχθαις ὕπο Ταϋγέτου ναίοντες αἰεὶ μένειν τεθμοῖσιν ἐν Αἰγιμιοῦ
> Δωριεῖς. ἔσχον δ᾽ Ἀμύκλας ὄλβιοι,
> Πινδόθεν ὀρνύμενοι, λευκοπώλων Τυνδαριδᾶν βαθύδοξοι γείτονες, ὧν κλέος
> ἄνθησεν αἰχμᾶς. (*Pyth.* 1.62–66)

> Willingly do Pamphylus's
> and the Heraclidae's descendants
> dwelling beneath Taÿgetus abide forever under the laws of Aegimius
> as Dorians. Prosperous did they take Amyklae
> after setting out from Pindus, well-reputed neighbors of the white-horsed
> Tyndaridae, and the fame of their spear bloomed.

Hieron's conquests here are both peaceful and violent, and his bloodless exercise of power over the descendants of Pamphylus and the Heraclidae augments the legitimacy of his rule: the use of patronyms-turned-ethnonyms suggests conquest, although there is nothing to suggest that his rule of those peoples is anything but peaceful. Furthermore, the use of these ancient patronymics links the novel and questionable tyranny of Hieron to the Dorian inhabitants—and according to the myth of the Heraclids, the original inhabitants—of the Peloponnesian peninsula through their descendants' acquiescence to Hieron's rule: their bloodlines augment the worth and reputation of Hieron himself, who then advances the reputation of his relatively undistinguished family. After the conquest of Amyklai,[130] they are established as γείτονες to the Tyndaridae, and it is difficult not to read this as an elevation of Hieron's family to the same legendary status. Referring to these subjects and neighbors *solely* through patronymics thus constitutes a *reduction* of the scope and complexity of their identities, which is underscored by the use of the plural. In a post-heroic age, a bare patronymic is an insufficient marker of personal status: patronymics are broad rather than strict kinship terms that extend to entire peoples, and thus the uniqueness and centrality of a famous patronymic have both been severely undermined. Hieron retains his specificity as the son of a particular person whose achievements are solely his own. The effacement of the Pamphylids and the Heraclids, on the other hand, reduces these groups solely to their ancestors' achievements, which are then subordinated to Hieron and his family. In Pindar's conceit for this poem, it is no longer possible for the patronymic to play a central role in defining and articulating who someone is, because those for whom it *would* take center stage—that is, the descendants

---

[130] Also referred to in Isthmian 7.14: ἕλον δ᾽ Ἀμύκλας Αἰγεῖδαι.

of famous heroes—are so numerous that the patronymic has lost its force, and anyone

whose entire identity depends on it cannot have any achievements of their own. By

contrast, someone like Hieron is able, through the force of his singular achievements, to

subsume the glory of the past into something fresh and reinvigorate the κλέος of ancient

families until it blooms anew.

This is confirmed by the poem's final patronymic reference, in which Hieron is

finally linked not only to his father but to his entire line (including, implicitly, his tyrant

brother Gelon):

> παρὰ δὲ τὰν εὔυδρον ἀκτὰν Ἱμέρα παίδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένευς τελέσαις,
> τὸν ἐδέξαντ᾿ ἀμφ᾿ ἀρετᾷ, πολεμίων ἀνδρῶν καμόντων. (*Pyth*. 1.79–80)

> And by the well-watered bank of Himera shall I complete a hymn to the sons of
> Deinomenes,
> which they earned in virtue of their excellence, while enemy warriors were
> suffering.

The poet's speech-act announces and enacts his hymnic offering, explicitly transforming

the praise of Hieron into a familial tribute to the brothers specifically as the "sons of

Deinomenes." At the same time, it preserves them from the anonymization that it

previously inflicted on the Pamphylid, Heraclid, and Tyndarid descendants by insisting

that the hymn was earned ἀμφ᾿ ἀρετᾷ. The sons of Deinomenes thus retain their

individual distinction, and the poet's praise accrues to them as something that befits a

warrior. Nonetheless, Pindar makes no secret of his own role in securing their reputation:

his performative enactment of the praise hymn as familial praise cannot fail to remind

both the poem's subject and all other members of the audience that the family's

reputation, like Hieron's, is rendered epic only by the poet's own artifice, and indeed,

only with the help of an accomplished poet like Pindar can individuals and families with

no special lineage of their own hope to compete with and surpass those families whose reputation is given already through a famous patronymic; those families, in turn, may well lose their reputations unless they too earn a hymn from the poet (and pay him in full).[131]

In Pindar's hands, then, the patronymic is an extraordinarily versatile tool for connecting individual deeds with familial reputations in ways that augment his subject and dilute or efface those to whom his subject might be compared. Pindar's own self-positioning is integral to the proper functioning of this tool: it is able to serve variegated functions only against a background of already-existing song in which some families are far more famous than others. The poet positions himself as a mediator of fame and as the person able to rectify the inequalities of history. For a family like that of Hieron, he employs patronymic identifications in a very particular order that connects the ancestors and family of a highly achieving subject with the strength and dynamism of a present-day community of which they are a part. From this perspective, he grants appropriate renown to those people and families who hold power and influence in the present day, redistributing it away from the anonymized families referred to *only* by their patronymic identifiers, who are famous by virtue of an ancestor's deeds but whose living members have not distinguished themselves in any way that would merit identification beyond the patronymic. As the poem implicitly notes, these families may very well be living in communities alongside or under the newcomers; the poet's task can thus be a delicate one. He achieves it in part by legitimizing his praise of the present through analogical association with the past, as when he likens Hieron to Philoctetes. The analogy makes

---

[131] See also Nemean 4.4.8 and 7.11–16; Isthmian 1.50–51, 4.40–42, and 7.16–19.

Hieron a figurative peer for these others and allows his relatively undistinguished

ancestry to be bolstered by the imputed antiquity and nobility of a heroic "type" whose

dignity he acquires through the poet's work of analogy. In a similar process to the one

that imputes the glory of present achievement to the subject's father through the

reservation of the patronymic, the analogic nobility given to the subject can also be given

to his family. This function of the poet as a contemporary mediator of fame who can

augment the deserving and bring down the unworthy as he sees fit parallels typologically

the figure of the poetic professional in Irish and Indic cultures, and has led scholars like

Calvert Watkins to hypothesize this professional mediating role as a cultural inheritance

from Proto-Indo-European.[132]

Such analysis is not uncontroversial: the function of the praise-poet for hire is

very different from that of the archetypal bard of the Homeric tradition, and seems to

emerge later, though the often tense relationship between poets and rulers is evident both

in the Homeric poems themselves and in the self-positioning of Hesiod, who clearly

marks the differing social functions of ruler and poet while lamenting the inadequacy of

poetic truth-telling to substitute for the legal and ritual function of the ruler's right

judgment.[133] Nonetheless, the private mediator of fame who bestows it for a price is not

---

[132] Watkins 1995 throughout, but esp. ch. 5, "The Indo-European poet: His social function and his art."
[133] Indeed, this is part of the program of the *Works and Days* from its inception:
κλῦθι ἰδὼν ἀιών τε, δίκῃ δ᾽ ἴθυνε θέμιστας
τύνη· ἐγὼ δέ κε Πέρσῃ ἐτήτυμα μυθησαίμην. (*Op.* 9–10)

Pay heed, looking and listening, and by justice make straight your judgments,
and I would tell true things to Perses.

readily visible in the archaic material available to us: even by Pindar's own account the profit-loving muse seems to be a more contemporary invention in the Greek world.[134]

§5. Taking the Credit in Isthmian 2

The profit-loving muse is herself an interesting study in Pindaric epithet: Isthmian 2 positions itself as a lament for the bygone world of authentic poetry and recalls the supposedly honest songs of antiquity:

> οἱ μὲν πάλαι, ὦ Θρασύβουλε, φῶτες, οἳ χρυσαμπύκων
> ἐς δίφρον Μοισᾶν ἔβαινον κλυτᾷ φόρμιγγι συναντόμενοι,
> ῥίμφα παιδείους ἐτόξευον μελιγάρυας ὕμνους,
> ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας
> εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν.
> ἁ Μοῖσα γὰρ οὐ φιλοκερδής πω τότ᾽ ἦν οὐδ᾽ ἐργάτις·
> οὐδ᾽ ἐπέρναντο γλυκεῖαι μελιφθόγγου ποτὶ Τερψιχόρας
> ἀργυρωθεῖσαι πρόσωπα μαλθακόφωνοι ἀοιδαί. (*Isth.* 2.1–8)

> The men of old, Thrasybulus, who mounted
> the chariot of the Muses with the golden headbands, joining with the glorious
>   lyre,
> lightly shot forth honey-voiced songs for youths,
> whichever one was beautiful and had the ripeness,
> sweetest and reminiscent of golden-throned Aphrodite.
> The muse then was not profit-loving nor a hireling:
> nor were sweet odes for sale from honey-voiced Terpsichore,
> with silver faces and gentle voices.

It is difficult not to read these lines ironically, particularly in their picture of spontaneous poetry lightly composed for beautiful young men: indeed, not for particular loves, but for ὅστις ἐὼν καλὸς εἶχεν Ἀφροδίτας / εὐθρόνου μνάστειραν ἀδίσταν ὀπώραν. The figure of the δίφρον Μοισᾶν brings the reminiscence near to absurdity: Pindar imagines a world of omnicompetent poet-athletes for whom excellence at the chariot and excellence in song

---

[134] This is the line taken by Maslov in his discussion of Isth. 2 (2015, ch. 4), and it seems sound, although the discussion of "genre hybridity" out of which it arises should be read carefully, since Isth. 2 is a strange poem, as the reader will see below.

become nearly identical. The enjambed epithet for Aphrodite is not metrically Homeric,

and has no specific epic counterpart: it is far more reminiscent of previous lyric

treatments of the goddess, particularly the vocative ποικιλόθρον᾽ ἀθάνατ᾽ Ἀφροδίτα that

opens Sappho 1. They had a muse that was neither profit-loving nor a hireling, signifying

by negation that the muse of the present day is both of these things. As for φιλοκερδής

itself, the epithet would be metrically admissible in Homer, but is attested only in

Theognis prior to Pindar's use:

> Χρῆμα δ᾽ ὃ μὲν Διόθεν καὶ σὺν δίκηι ἀνδρὶ γένηται
>   καὶ καθαρῶς, αἰεὶ παρμόνιμον τελέθει.
> εἰ δ᾽ ἀδίκως παρὰ καιρὸν ἀνὴρ φιλοκερδέι θυμῶι
>   κτήσεται, εἴθ᾽ ὅρκωι πὰρ τὸ δίκαιον ἑλών,
> αὐτίκα μέν τι φέρειν κέρδος δοκεῖ, ἐς δὲ τελευτὴν
>   αὖθις ἔγεντο κακόν, θεῶν δ᾽ ὑπερέσχε νόος. (Theog., *Eleg.* 1.196–201)

> The possession which comes to a man from Zeus both justly
> and without stain is forever lasting.
> But if a man unjustly, at the wrong time, or with a profit-loving heart
> acquires it, or if he takes it by an oath contrary to what is just,
> at the time he believes that he has some wealth, but in the end
> evil comes in turn to him, and the mind of the gods prevails.

The sense of the epithet is plainly pejorative in Theognis, and Pindar's negation of it to

describe a golden age of spontaneous poetry suggests that his use is nearly identical,

though he lacks the concern with fundamental justice that characterizes Theognis's use of

the term. It is unclear whether ἐργάτις carries connotations of prostitution in this context,

but this is certainly not out of the question.[135] The central question, then, turns out to be

the precise extent of Pindar's ironizing in these opening lines. If φιλοκερδής is tied up

with his ironizing about the past, this would favor the view that his position is not a novel

one, and that the muse was, in fact, just as commercially rapacious in those days as she is

---

[135] The sole earlier attestation is in Archilochus fr. 208, in which it is the only surviving word. The Pindaric scholia are silent on it.

in his own time. If, however, one reads him as ironizing only about his present, then his profit-loving muse is merely a piece of sly self-deprecation, or at best an implied comparison of himself with nebulous other poets whose inspiration is, presumably, less "pure" or authentic than Pindar's own.

Nonetheless, Pindar is realistic about both the current state of things and his own role in it:

> νῦν δ᾽ ἐφίητι τὸ τὠργείου φυλάξαι
> ῥῆμ᾽ ἀλαθείας ἐτᾶς ἄγχιστα βαῖνον,
> 'χρήματα, χρήματ᾽ ἀνήρ,' ὃς φᾶ κτεάνων θ᾽ ἅμα λειφθεὶς καὶ φίλων.
> (*Isth.* 2.9–11)
>
> Now, however, she bids us heed the Argive's
> saying, which most closely approaches the real truth:
> "Money, money is what a man is," he said, having lost both his wealth and his friends.

Watkins (1995, p. 80–82) reads this as a poetic genre related to the *dānastuti*, the Vedic hymns that praise the patrons who have given gifts to the poet. This seems to be rather a typological stretch: certainly there are resemblances, but one struggles to connect them genetically with one another or with the Irish praise and blame poetry that Watkins also discusses. It is possible that such a relationship exists, but the resemblance seems to be much more the "family resemblance" of Wittgenstein than a family resemblance construed linguistically:

> And this is true—Instead of producing something common to all that we call language, I am saying that these phenomena have no one thing in common which makes us use the same word for all,—but that they are *related* to one another in many different ways. And it is because of this relationship, or these relationships, that we call them all 'language.'[136]

---

[136] Trans. G. E. M. Anscombe. Original: "Und das ist wahr.—Statt etwas anzugeben, was allem, was wir Sprache nennen gemeinsam ist, sage ich, es ist diesen Erscheinungen garnicht Eines gemeinsam, weswegen wir für alle das gleiche Wort verwenden,—sondern sie sind mit einander in vielen verschiedenen Weisen *verwandt*. Und dieser Verwandtsschaft, oder dieser Verwandtschaften wegen nennen wir sie alle 'Sprachen.'" Wittgenstein 1958, p. 31.

Pindar offers something typologically similar to a *dānastuti*: he makes explicit reference to the trading of money for reputation. His own role in the matter, however, is tastefully elided. While the saying of the Argive—Aristodamus, according to the scholiast, though the fragment of Alcaeus supplied as proof designates him a Spartan while still attributing the name to the quotation—is "the closest to the real truth," this circumlocution allows him an escape from claiming its straightforward veracity, and in saying that "a man is his money" and that the Argive lost both his money and his friends at the same time, he still omits precisely how this occurs. The savvy reader knows, of course: this is a warning about what happens when a patron cannot afford to pay his poet. In this way it shows a resemblance and a possible common lineage with Irish blame poetry, though without the latter's ascribed supernatural powers. A similar conclusion was reached by biographic critics, among whom Bury stands out when he summarizes his gloss of the first 12 lines thus:

> "[Y]ou cannot forget that, twenty years ago, inspired by a scene which also inspired you, I wrought a song in your praise, seeking no hire for my work…Since then, my hymns have been indeed silvered; I have written for money, that is my trade…Your father asked me to write an epinician in memory of his Isthmian victory; and of course he would have paid me well and I should have expected him to do so…But still,—for the sake of that disinterested παίδειος ὕμνος…accept, O Thrasybulus, as a gift from your mercenary friend, this, let us call it an Isthmian, hymn" (Bury 1892, p. 34).

In this case the past generosity is the family's, not that of Thrasybulus, though the bond of a family commitment is fair game to call on; Bury's reading, however, highlights the father's past and the poet's current generosity and denigrates the patron's by omission. This is rather outside the scope of *dānastuti*, which, when it appears, is straightforwardly positive about patrons, reminding them of their past generosity and what sort of

reputation it earned them. In this way, its "family resemblance" comes back around to encompass comparison with the prayer of Chryses in *Iliad* 1, Sappho 1, and other precatory discourse whose primary object is the ongoing relationship between a deity and a worshipper. Both parties, reminds the worshipper, have kept up their end of the bargain in the relationship, and it can continue if the deity will answer the suppliant's current prayer. Even in Bury's reading, Pindar seems to be varying this well-attested form, though under Bury's eye the poem becomes an attempt to renew or sustain a reciprocal relationship that has to some extent gone dormant: the poet's gift offers a new beginning and the hope of a newly vital reciprocity, inviting the son to step into the identity of his father in this way. In this way it strongly resembles Pythian 6, commissioned by the same Xenocrates and likewise mostly devoted to Thrasybulus, even including good stewardship of money (*Pyth.* 6.47). This, then, is an inversion of the rhetorical maneuver of Pythian 1: rather than grafting the reputation of an undistinguished family onto its glorified current scion and thus retroactively glorifying the family, Pindar emphasizes the good works of the father and encourages the son to step into that same relationship, treating the poet as a patron ought to.

The second section of the poem, in which Pindar recounts the chariot-victory of Thrasybulus's father Xenocrates, illustrates one of Pindar's key innovations in his appropriation of Homeric modes of identity. The previous chapter dealt in part with the Homeric use of contrafactual narration and characterization, in which the poet explicates a narrative possibility contrafactually before curtailing it and proceeding with the

narrative that he has chosen (or is constrained to choose).[137] Pindar's rhetoric refines this

into sharp litotes, much sharper than usually found in Homer.[138] As below:

> ἐσσὶ γὰρ οὖν σοφός, οὐκ ἄγνωτ᾽ ἀείδω
> Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκαν,
> τὰν Ξενοκράτει Ποσειδάων ὀπάσαις,
> Δωρίων αὐτῷ στεφάνωμα κόμᾳ
> πέμπεν ἀναδεῖσθαι σελίνων,
> εὐάρματον ἄνδρα γεραίρων, Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος. (*Isth.* 2.12–17)

> For you, then, are wise, and I sing the not unknown
> Isthmian victory with horses,
> which Poseidon granted to Xenocrates,
> and a garland for his hair did he send him
> of Dorian celery to crown himself,
> honoring the man of fine chariot, light of the Acragantines.

Pindar begins the account of the victory with a double negation: the victory is οὐκ

ἄγνωτα, an arch understatement in keeping with the tone set in the first part of the poem.

But this negative characterization is immediately thrown into relief through both the

invocation of Poseidon and the subsequent elaboration of the extraordinarily visible

reward that Xenocrates won. Where the Homeric negative characterization recognizes the

reality of an excluded possibility at the same time that it keep it out of the narrative,

Pindar's negative predication is not nearly so accommodating. The crowning with Dorian

celery is unmistakably public, a visible sign of the god's favor, and as if this were not

sufficient, the line-final Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος hammers the point home. The force of the

understatement is inverted to such an extent that it definitively excludes even the

---

[137] Ch. 3, §5 of the present study.
[138] *Il.* 1.330 and 15.11 are the two major standouts. Many other examples, like *Od.* 17.415, negate but then proceed to state the contrast ("not the worst, but the best"), and so are not litotes proper. See Donnelly 1930 for a discussion of litotes in Homer, although his criteria are broad enough to include things like the pseudo-litotes described above.

possibility of anonymity from Xenocrates's character, and in doing so allows his son

Thrasybulus to partake of the same.

The account of an actual race, brief though it is, continues this pattern:

κλειναῖς δ᾿ Ἐρεχθειδᾶν χαρίτεσσιν ἀραρὼς
ταῖς λιπαραῖς ἐν Ἀθάναις, οὐκ ἐμέμφθη
ῥυσίδιφρον χεῖρα πλαξίπποιο φωτός,
τὰν Νικόμαχος κατὰ καιρὸν νεῖμ᾿ ἀπάσαις ἁνίαις. (*Isth.* 2.19–22)

And joined with the renowned favors of the Erechidae
in splendid Athens, blameless was
the chariot-preserving hand of the horse-driving man,
with which Nicomachus gave timely rein to the horses.

The hand that preserved the chariot is "blameless," phrased as a negated verb whose line-final use directly before ῥυσίδιφρον χεῖρα accentuates the severity of the understatement. Once again, foreclosed possibility is so severely inverted as to result in a genuine opposite that is not admissible into the character of the poem's subject. Of course, the feat of the chariot-driver is not Xenocrates's own either: the chariot-rescuing hand is that of the πλαξίπποιο φωτός, but this choice of epithets allows Pindar to elide the identity of the chariot driver with that of Xenocrates, the Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος. The driver Nicomachus is finally named in the last line of the scene: Pindar is not in the business of flatly lying about his patrons. At this point, however, the act of elision has already been made: while the relationship between φάος and φωτός in this poem might better be characterized as homolexical rather than homophonic (since φῶς, φωτός is confined to Attic), the wordplay nonetheless seems deliberately arranged so as to conflate the accomplishments of these two and to allow Xenocrates as the patron of the chariot to claim an even greater share of the credit than his patronage entitles him to.

This use of Ἀκραγαντίνων φάος and πλαξίπποιο φωτός to conflate rather than distinguish the identities of persons is almost anti-Homeric in the way it aims at confusion and overlap. In Pindar's hands the poet remains technically truthful in admitting (and thus memorializing) the name of the person who drove the chariot and thus in keeping the persons decisively separate, but it is precisely this decisive separation that allows the confusion via epithet to take place. The chiastic structure of these nominal items names Xenocrates first and then names him "light of the Acragantines" before designating the horse-driving φώς as the reason for victory and finally giving a name to him as well. In stark contrast to the Homeric epithet that marks out and distinguishes one "essential idea" from another in the context of a highly dispersed and contradictory characterization with heavy overlap even of tightly realized elements in the form of non-unique epithets, Pindar's move presupposes a highly individuated characterization in which a person's deeds are theirs and perhaps their family's: it is the poet who has the power to upset this stability and weave the deeds of others or of mythic figures into the characters of his subjects. This technique, however, exists perpetually in the shadow of Homeric characterization, because it is precisely the presumptive clarity and distinctiveness of the epithet that allows Pindar to use consonance for the purpose of character elision. If epithet distinguishes one from another, then a feigned consonance of the epithet can and must lead to a feigned identity between two entirely separate persons. The technique is not purely poetic: Pindar can accomplish this only within a cultural framework that already ascribes the achievements of the chariot-driver to the patron and honors the patron with immortality. In effect, much of his work has already been done for

him, but he relies for the rest of it on the specifically Homeric presumption of distinction as the work of epithet.

The way in which Pindar mixes positive and negative characterization in the conclusion to the poem deserves attention, as it illuminates the role that each plays in building up the well-fitted πεδίλον of his patron's reputation.

> ἁδυπνόῳ τέ νιν ἀσπάζοντο φωνᾷ
> χρυσέας ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας
> γαῖαν ἀνὰ σφετέραν, τὰν δὴ καλέοισιν Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς
> ἄλσος· ἵν᾽ ἀθανάτοις Αἰνησιδάμου
> παῖδες ἐν τιμαῖς ἔμιχθεν.
> καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἀγνῶτες ὑμῖν ἐντὶ δόμοι
> οὔτε κώμων, ὦ Θρασύβουλ᾽, ἐρατῶν,
> οὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοιδᾶν.
> οὐ γὰρ πάγος, οὐδὲ προσάντης ἁ κέλευθος γίνεται,
> εἴ τις εὐδόξων ἐς ἀνδρῶν ἄγοι τιμὰς Ἑλικωνιάδων. (*Isth.* 2.25–34)

> And with sweet-breathing voice they greeted him
> who had fallen into the lap of golden Victory
> in their land, which they call Olympian Zeus's
> grove, where the sons of Aenesidamus
> were linked to immortal honors.
> Nor are your homes ignorant
> either of lovely processions, Thrasybulus,
> or of sweet-boasting songs.
> For it is no hill, nor is the road steep,
> if someone brings the honors of the Heliconians to the homes of famous men.

The man whom the Elean heralds greet is still supposedly Nicomachus the driver, whose victory is mythologized through its connection to a place called Ὀλυμπίου Διὸς ἄλσος. The poem passes, however, back to Xenocrates in the following clause concerning the sons of Aenesidamus, in which Pindar makes the now-familiar and quite Homeric move of glorifying a present subject with his family's past victories: their honors are already immortal, and Pindar's present composition admits only to affirming this.[139] Note once

---

[139] "The acquaintance of the house of the tyrants of Akragas with song ensures immortality to their fame." (Bury 1892, p. 46).

more the elision of identity: the chariot driver is gone, and the family line of Xenocrates is the one that assumes the glory though the patronymic epithet. Returning to addressing Thrasybulus, the poet links him to this history by observing that his homes are οὐκ ἀγνῶτες, here nearly identical with "not unfamiliar," with parades and (presumably celebratory) songs. In light of the narrative of Xenocrates's victory, understatement as double negation is once more transformed into superlative: the fame of Thrasybulus's family is such that even the craft of the poet, which Pindar has elsewhere highlighted, is lightened or erased. The implicit metaphor of a poetic "journey" becomes a device for negating its difficulty: οὐ γὰρ πάγος, οὐδὲ προσάντης ἁ κέλευθος γίνεται. His construction of their fame as already given partly effaces his own reliance on the mercenary Muse: to bring fame to a famous house is no great poetic effort, and conversely, if there is no great effort being made, then the family's fame must be "natural" and intrinsic to them rather than the product of hired poetic genius.

For Pindar, to minimize the role of the Μοῖσα φιλοκερδής is implicitly to position himself as a torchbearer for the aureate poetics that he imagines in the first part of the poem.[140] As other odes have shown, however, this is one of multiple postures that he shows himself capable of adopting. Indeed, his minimizing the profit-loving Muse rather than disavowing her entirely is an essential part of this positioning: he is a torchbearer who knows the old way of poetry but is savvy enough to make his way in a modern world

---

[140] That is not the only place in which Pindar claims to represent an ancient tradition. See also the final lines of Nemean 8:

> ἦν γε μὰν ἐπικώμιος ὕμνος
> δὴ πάλαι καὶ πρὶν γενέσθαι τὰν Ἀδράστου τάν τε Καδμείων ἔριν. (*Nem.* 8.50–51)

> Indeed, the victory hymn existed
> long ago, even before there arose strife between Adrastus and the people of Cadmus.

that has no place for these innocent verses. This is a flattering picture to paint for clients

whose family reputations exist already but need to be made new in song, as he notes at

the end of Pythian 3:

> Νέστορα καὶ Λύκιον Σαρπηδόν᾽, ἀνθρώπων φάτις,
> ἐξ ἐπέων κελαδεννῶν, τέκτονες οἷα σοφοὶ
> ἄρμοσαν, γιγνώσκομεν. ἁ δ᾽ ἀρετὰ κλειναῖς ἀοιδαῖς
> χρονία τελέθει. παύροις δὲ πράξασθ᾽ εὐμαρές. (*Pyth.* 3.112–115)

> Of Nestor and Lycian Sarpedon, still spoken of among men,
> through sounding words, such as wise craftsmen
> fit together, do we know them. And excellence by famous songs
> becomes long-lasting, but to few is this easy to do.

His positioning toward those who lack such reputations in the first place is very

different. Here the practical craftsmanship of the poet takes center stage: he is selling a

particular kind of identity, crafted explicitly for their needs in a way that makes them at

least the equals of the Tyndaridae or Heraclidae, if not their superiors. This the poet can

promise, as he does to Herodotus of Thebes in Isthmian 1:

> χαίρετ᾽. ἐγὼ δὲ Ποσειδάωνι Ἰσθμῷ τε ζαθέα
> Ὀγχηστίαισίν τ᾽ ἀϊόνεσσιν περιστέλλων ἀοιδὰν
> γαρύσομαι τοῦδ᾽ ἀνδρὸς ἐν τιμαῖσιν ἀγακλέα τὰν Ἀσωποδώρου πατρὸς αἶσαν
> Ὀρχομενοῖό τε πατρῴαν ἄρουραν (*Isth.* 1.32–35)

> Farewell! But while I array Poseidon and sacred Isthmus
> and Onchestus's shores with song
> I shall tell, with the honors of this man, the famous fate of Asopodorus his father,
> and their ancestral land of Orchomenus…

The poet promises to link the praise of the god and of Isthmus to the praise of

Herodotus's victory and family—a daring move, but necessary for someone whose fame

is new. The assurance that old money wants to buy will not do here: the *arrivistes* need to

know that they have something bigger and better than what was available before, and

157

who better to give it to them than the thoroughly urbane and modern Pindar, who knows the way the world works now?

§7. Turning the Tables on Family

But the poet's modernity is not his determinative asset: even a subject with little family history to speak of requires an analogous lineage that connects him via *exemplum* to antiquity and the age of heroes. Nowhere is this more evident than in Nemean 2, which is taken up in large part by the manufacture of these analogies.

> ὅθεν περ καὶ Ὁμηρίδαι
> ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων τὰ πόλλ᾽ ἀοιδοὶ
> ἄρχονται, Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου· καὶ ὅδ᾽ ἀνὴρ
> καταβολὰν ἱερῶν ἀγώνων νικαφορίας δέδεκται πρῶτον Νεμεαίου
> ἐν πολυυμνήτῳ Διὸς ἄλσει. (*Nem.* 2.1–5)

> Just as the poets of the Homeridae
> begin many of their woven verses,
> from a proem of Zeus: so also this man
> has first received a down-payment of victory
> at the much-hymned grove of Nemean Zeus.

The poet immediately establishes his own credentials by beginning his poem ὅθεν περ καὶ Ὁμηρίδαι: this is praise with a pedigree, and the poet's performative link with the ways of the Homeridae gives him access to the memorializing power of the poet. Here Watkins's aforementioned view of Pindar's connection to pan-Indo-European poetic functions is most believable: the poet's social function as a truth-speaker entails not only the capacity for remembering and re-creating the truth of the past, but also a creative capacity for the production of truth in the present.[141] This capacity, as discussed above, is one that Pindar most certainly recognizes not only in himself but also in the poets who

---

[141] Watkins 1995 introduces this theme in ch. 6 (pp. 85–93) and continues it through his final section on the transition from poetry to magical spells (pp. 519–544). The original discussion of the poet's capacity for creative truth production is Detienne 1967 (English translation: 1996).

precede him. The patronymic epithet of the Homeridae, already understood as a kinship of practice rather than of blood,[142] is used in order to rupture its own implied boundary: by naming this kinship of practice and then aligning his practice to theirs, Pindar passes over the boundary that marks off the Homeridae from other poets and assumes the authority and capacities of a traditional singer of epic, giving to his truth production the pleasant atmosphere of a venerable institution. This is not necessarily a cynical ploy: Pindar clearly sees a common capacity in himself and his forebears.[143] It is precisely this capacity that reveals the figurative kinship boundary established by the patronymic as an illusory and therefore permeable barrier. Pindar further emphasizes his own equal capacity when he follows the patronymic with a mention of the ῥαπτῶν ἐπέων that characterize the rhapsode's art. He, as an equal craftsman, will begin his poem in a way analogous to their custom of beginning with a praise to Zeus; indeed, by encompassing their proemia within his own, he has already done so.

In a sudden turn, however, the simile reveals itself not as the boast of the poem's author—though it has already served this function before the disclosure of the second element of the comparison—but as a figuration of Timodemus's athletic victory: the beginning of a Homeric recitation, reserved for Zeus, becomes the καταβολή…νικαφορίας received by the subject of the ode. The victory, it seems, is only the first taste of what is to come: indeed, of what is happening in the poem's present moment, since Timodemus's athletic victory is merely the necessary prelude to the fame

---

[142] This is a *communis opinio* even in pre-Oralist Unitarian Homeric criticism, e.g. Allen 1907: "Learned antiquity therefore regarded the Homeridae as a gens, first hereditary and then adoptive, which possessed the exclusive right of reciting their parent's works." (p. 138)

[143] Bury 1890 notes the possibility "that Ὁμηρίδαι here simply means *poets* (successors of the Poet) and not specially the Homerid school of Chios" (p. 32). If this is so, then my argument still stands: the figurative boundary of kinship delineated by the patronymic epithet has *already* become completely imaginary and open to appropriation by any poet.

he will accrue as a result of the poem that Pindar is singing for him. The proem to Zeus becomes a proem to Timodemus, following which the deeds of his "ancestors," the mythic figures to which he will become analogously related, will be told in the fashion of a Homeric hymn. The hymnic lineage of Pindar's encomium and its claim of Timodemus to hymn-worthiness are both further reinforced by Pindar's situating the pankratic victory ἐν πολυυμνήτῳ Διὸς ἄλσει. What was hymn-worthy then is hymn-worthy now, and winning victory at the games of a "much-hymned" grove invites the audience to consider the victory sufficient to fold Timodemus into the tradition of hymning Nemea.

When it comes to Timodemus himself, however, Pindar does not abandon his paternal metaphor:

> ὀφείλει δ᾽ ἔτι, πατρίαν
> εἴπερ καθ᾽ ὁδόν νιν εὐθυπομπὸς
> αἰὼν ταῖς μεγάλαις δέδωκε κόσμον Ἀθάναις,
> θαμὰ μὲν Ἰσθμιάδων δρέπεσθαι κάλλιστον ἄωτον, ἐν Πυθίοισί τε νικᾶν
> Τιμονόου παῖδ᾽. (*Nem.* 2.6–10)

> And it must be—if, guiding
> him straight along the road of his father,
> his life has given him as ornament to great Athens—
> that he will pluck the fairest bloom at the Isthmian games, and win in the Pythian
>   ones,
> the son of Timonous.

The suspension of line-final πατρίαν without complement until after both the particle and the preposition in the following line clearly indicates that Pindar intends to tie Timodemus's accomplishment to his parentage or ancestry in some way, and indeed the πατρίαν ὁδόν is here the course of Timodemus's own life, which is leading him εὐθυπομπός along that course. The suggestion by the poet is that Timodemus's father, who is thus far unnamed, has passed on his athletic prowess to his son, who will continue to win victories if his life guides him along the same path trod by his father. So far this is

160

all very standard: the scion's accomplishments further amplify the victories won by his family, presumably at the Nemean, Isthmian, and Pythian games, if this is how one construes δρέπεσθαι κάλλιστον ἄωτον.

But before speaking of their victories, Pindar elects to tie the family to mythological antecedents. He continues:

> ἔστι δ᾽ ἐοικὸς
> ὀρειᾶν γε Πελειάδων
> μὴ τηλόθεν Ὠαρίωνα νεῖσθαι.
> καὶ μὰν ἀ Σαλαμίς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατὰν
> δυνατός. ἐν Τρωΐᾳ μὲν Ἕκτωρ Αἴαντος ἄκουσεν· ὦ Τιμόδημε, σὲ δ᾽ ἀλκὰ
> παγκρατίου τλάθυμος ἀέξει. (*Nem*. 2.10–15)

> And it is right
> that from the mountain Pleiades
> Orion does not travel far.
> And indeed Salamis is able to raise a man as a warrior.
> And in Troy Hector heard of Ajax: Timodemus, your strength
> in the pankration, stouthearted, exalts you.

The image of Orion's travels seems to continue the metaphor of the πατρίαν ὀδόν that Timodemus is to follow: it is right for Orion not to stray far from his appointed place, just as it is right for Timodemus not to stray from the course established by his illustrious ancestors. Pindar also likens him to Ajax, whose reputation reached Troy: in the same way, Timodemus gains fame through his victory in the pankration. The use of mythic *exempla* here serves not to bolster an undistinguished family reputation—Timodemus's family is already distinguished in athletics—but rather to elevate athletic accomplishment to the level of war or statecraft. The poet's task here is to mediate between qualitative degrees of reputation: Orion's reputation is, of course, of such transcendent magnitude that he is visible in the night sky, and to say that "καὶ μὰν ἀ Σαλαμίς γε θρέψαι φῶτα μαχατὰν / δυνατός" invokes the fame brought to Salamis by its outstanding warrior

"progeny." This is among Pindar's most straightforward parallels: the glory that Timodemus will bring to his family by continuing along the πατρίαν ὁδόν of athletic victory is here made equivalent to the glory brought to a city-state by victory in warfare.

All this while, the role of the paternal figure in securing these various forms of glory remains paramount. The enjambed paternal epithet that begins line 10 (Τιμονόου παῖδ᾽) bookends the reference to the πατρίαν ὁδόν and defines Timodemus with reference to his ancestry: it is by following in the path that they blazed that Timodemus will be able to win greater fame. Salamis,[144] too, exercises decisive control over the warriors who bring it fame, for it is only in being formed by the city-state that they become able to excel in battle and win their victories. So far, then, the paternal or parental figure is decisive in securing fame for their progeny: it is only *as a member* of the literal or metaphorical familial unit that a person grows into someone capable of winning a reputation. This represents a stark turn from Pindar's treatments of reputation explored previously in this chapter, in which a savvy contemporary poet is capable of distributing the "goods" of fame in a more sensible and equitable fashion, elevating an outstanding modern victor over those whose reputation comes primarily from an accomplished but long-dead forebear.

This side of Pindar's craft re-emerges, however, in the final part of the poem. After seeming to establish the necessity of following paternal or patriotic templates for success on athletic or martial fronts, the poet breaks this mold and announces Timodemus as the namesake of his line:

> Ἀχάρναι δὲ παλαίφατοι
> εὐάνορες· ὅσσα δ᾽ ἀμφ᾽ ἀέθλοις,

---

[144] The sudden mention of Salamis is an old problem that vexed the Pindaric scholiasts. See Instone 1989, pp. 114–115 for a brief discussion.

162

Τιμοδημίδαι ἐξοχώτατοι προλέγονται.
παρὰ μὲν ὑψιμέδοντι Παρνασῷ τέσσαρας ἐξ ἀέθλων νίκας ἐκόμιξαν·
ἀλλὰ Κορινθίων ὑπὸ φωτῶν
ἐν ἐσλοῦ Πέλοπος πτυχαῖς
ὀκτὼ στεφάνοις ἔμιχθεν ἤδη·
ἑπτὰ δ᾽ ἐν Νεμέᾳ τὰ δ᾽ οἴκοι μάσσον᾽ ἀριθμοῦ
Διὸς ἀγῶνι. τόν, ὦ πολῖται, κωμάξατε Τιμοδήμῳ σὺν εὐκλέϊ νόστῳ·
ἀδυμελεῖ δ᾽ ἐξάρχετε φωνᾷ. (*Nem.* 2.16–25)

Acharnae is long known
to have fine men. And for those things to do with contests,
the Timodemidae are proclaimed the most outstanding.
Beside high-ruling Parnassus they won four victories in the games,
while by the Corinthian men
in the glens of noble Pelops
they were joined to eight crowns,
and seven times at Nemea, and at home beyond counting
in the contest of Zeus. Make a victory procession for him, citizens, with
        Timodemus's glorious homecoming.
Begin with a sweet-singing voice!

The home deme of Timodemus is said to have a long reputation: it is παλαίφατοι / εὐάνορες, and the enjambment of the adjective places it in an emphatic position. The adjective εὐάνορες itself has a somewhat martial pedigree, describing both wine and bronze when deployed in Homer,[145] although Pindar uses it exclusively of settlements, in which context it denotes a place abounding in men of quality. The parallel construction with Salamis in lines 13–14 seems self-evident, fundamentally maintaining the heroic pedigree of the term, but in this case the scions of Acharnae surpass their place of origin: "ὅσσα δ᾽ ἀμφ᾽ ἀέθλοις / Τιμοδημίδαι ἐξοχώτατοι προλέγονται." In the course of eight lines, Timodemus goes from being Τιμονόου παῖδα to the namesake of the family. Only here does Pindar elaborate the number of the family's victories, which are numerous indeed: four victories in the Pythian games, eight in the Isthmian, and seven in the Nemean, and victories beyond counting at home. The substitution of Timodemus's name

---

[145] *Od.* 4.622: εὐήνορα οἶνον. *Od.* 13.19: εὐήνορα χαλκόν.

into the patronymic retroactively appropriates these victories: rather than following the πατρίαν ὁδόν, he now sets the course for the family that bears his name, and the family's ancestral victories now belong to him.

This ode, then, showcases the extraordinary malleability of the patronymic epithet and the way in which this supposedly foundational component of personal identity can be appropriated and re-figured in the hands of a skilled poet. The use of a plural epithet rather than a singular is key to this: the claim of collective paternity already implies a certain kind of figuration even in cases of direct blood descent, because of course the epithet has already transformed the direct paternity of its Homeric use into a looser collective descent from a common namesake. The Ὁμηρίδαι make a claim of kinship by practice with one another and descent by practice from Homer and enforce the boundaries of this kinship with a monopolistic guild and associated legal strictures: Pindar's implicit claim is that this structure of kinship is already open to appropriation by a poet with the talent to do so. In this sense, it no longer lies at the foundation of identity, because it no longer describes a particular direct relationship with a single immediate ancestor. A poet's singular paternity is not altered by his assumption into the Homeridae, and this more figurative paternity can be assumed or grafted onto others far more easily than the Homeric paternity of blood, as Pindar gestures at doing in the opening line of Nemean 2.

Just as these figurative kinship circles are more easily penetrated, they are also more easily redrawn. Timodemus's immediate descent from his father cannot be rewritten: he is Τιμονόου παῖδα regardless of what else he might be called. But the lines of his descent *can* be redrawn in such a way as to place Timodemus at the head of the

family line as its namesake, and thus to give him credit for the family's accomplishments despite his own fame's being new-born. Whether he keeps to his assigned track like Orion or the sons of Salamis is now perhaps beside the point: he has, in an important sense, surpassed these mythic predecessors by setting the agenda for those members of his family who are yet to be born.

§7. Conclusion

What seems most evident in Pindar's manipulation of patronymic epithet and mythic analogy is a determination to forge the present reputation of his subjects out of the malleable raw material of the past. It is malleable in that it can be shaped by a skilled poet into adornment for a contemporary person: the accomplishment of the chariot driver in Isthmian 2 is folded into the *kleos* of Xenocrates, whose "accomplishment" then forms part of the backdrop against which Pindar renders tribute to his son Thrasybulus. But this raw material is not unmarked detritus: in the case of mythic analogies, it is stamped with the identity of mythic exemplars, and this is precisely what makes it useful. It is the fullness of Orion that makes his example a potent comparandum for duty in Nemean 2, and it is the mythic ancestry of the Heraclidae, Pamphylidae, and Tyndaridae in Pythian 1 that makes Hieron's rule of the former two and martial parity with the last a feat worth commemorating. Hagesias, the subject of Olympian 6, is doubly implicated in this: his descent from a line of prophets makes him worth commemorating, but this is bolstered by a lengthy analogy to Iamus (*Ol.* 6.29–70), who is likewise a noble and a prophet.[146] The entanglement of ancestry with myth is beneficial to the function of epinician, but it

---

[146] See the introduction to this ode and the commentary in Gildersleeve 1865.

severely complicates the project of sorting out exactly what elements of identity Pindar identifies and privileges.

This seems to be another version of the paradox of the hermeneutic circle, and this is not an unreasonable assessment: a hero as a summation of malleable characteristics vs. characteristics whose desirability derives from their being stamped with heroic association. But this circle does have an entry point, because for Pindar these stamps of association are already given: the mythic backdrop is and must be a starting point from which the poet shapes contemporary reputations. Pindar's "circle" thus remains a productive dialectic, for the feigned analogy to the Homeridae in Isthmian 2 demonstrates that a contemporary person who emulates or assumes these heroic attributes can and does become heroic, or at least becomes worthy of being heroized by a poet. In this way, the stuff of heroic identity is reappropriated, revitalized, and spun out into the proper adornment of notable contemporaries, and a new heroic figure can, like Timodemus, give his name to a line of worthy descendants.

CHAPTER V

Concluding Remarks

"Identity" is a tricky term with a great deal of currency far outside academic circles, in discussions that touch on urgent political questions as well as deeply personal ones. But in these variegated uses, it remains something that we speak about in order to narrate a story. The Homeric poems, rife though they are with the cultural assumptions of eastern Mediterranean people from the Bronze Age through the Archaic period, are strikingly modern in their internal consciousness of this fact, and it is worth circling back to the observation that led to this study. It is worth emphasizing the necessity of narrative for Homeric identity in part because this necessity is not uniquely Homeric. We can speak of identity in the first place only because of the need to talk about who a person is and what they have done, and to make some kind of sense of these things;[147] discussion of my own identity presupposes that there is a narrative to my life of which I am trying to make sense. So it is likewise with Achilles or Hector or Helen. Identity is an emergent phenomenon of narrative: the flexibility to accommodate narrative is built in from the start, and built into the epithet system that developed as the most important mechanism of characterization for the mature, metrically rigid poetic tradition in which the Homeric poems are composed.

---

[147] Needless to say, the philosophical literature on this point is vast and contentious: I describe only my own reasons for pursuing the present study, and certainly make no claim to have settled any millennia-old philosophical arguments.

The present study has outlined how identity is conveyed in the Homeric poems and sought to formulate a working theory for what exactly is being conveyed in a noun-epithet formula. The result is still much in need of development: although the articulation of Homeric identity as an indexed list of potential characteristics—realized at moments of narrative necessity through the epithet system or other formulaic modes of reference—solves the major problem presented by Foley's otherwise extremely useful functional description of traditional referentiality, it still needs to be tested and refined through an extended character study, preferably of a single hero whose words and actions receive a great deal of poetic attention throughout at least one of the poems. This would allow room for further exploration of the ways in which the poet uses the threat of realizing a narratively untenable aspect of character, as it does most explicitly with negated hypotheticals as discussed in chapter 3, both to manipulate dramatic tension and to put the poem in dialogue with possible alternative traditions. It would also provide far more opportunity to better articulate the ways in which this much looser conception of Homeric identity deals with biographic contradiction: for example, with the famous dual parentage of Aphrodite found in Homer and in Hesiod.

Hesiodic poetry is the other major unexplored frontier for this project, and a study of noun-epithet indexing in Hesiodic poetry is certainly necessary. This is especially the case for the *Works and Days*, since so much of that poem deals not with proper nouns but with maxims and fables. Although much of it, *per* West, has the look of traditional or proverbial advice (West 1978, p. 51), unnamed kings and farmers do not have the kind of heroic identity that lends itself to traditional referentiality. Nonetheless, the proverbial character of much of the narrative may allow for a kind of archetypal or stereotypical

characterization of these nameless subjects, and Hesiod's characterization of Perses certainly merits attention.

Finally, the last chapter of the present study explored the way in which a malleable heroic identity is consciously exploited for distinctive poetic aims and effects by a single lyric poet in a single lyric genre. Obviously this is not exhaustive of the possible afterlife of Homeric characterization, and although this study made some small use of Sappho in framing the problem of epithet and characterization, it is already clear that her uses of Homeric characterization differ quite sharply from Pindar's, and there is no reason to suspect that any two other lyric poets will be of a kind either. Homeric characterization already seems not to have a single afterlife, but many of them, and accounting for any significant number of them would be at least one major book project by itself. Any consideration of the afterlife of Homeric characterization in tragedy would need to grow from that, and such a project could easily fill the rest of a scholarly career.

Some work has been done; much remains. But the work is worth doing, I think, because the storytelling impetus in human beings is very strong—so strong that it has at many points been regarded as constitutive of being human: the ζῷον λογικόν is precisely the animal capable of making sense of things, of making a story about them so that their relationships can emerge. Hopefully this project has brought a new kind of sense to parts of the Homeric poems, whose value as historical and literary artifacts depends in large part on their value as stories. The philosopher and theologian Herbert McCabe observed that "concepts like courage and honesty have to belong to characters in a story. If there is no story then there is no courage or honesty either. You might as well speak of the honesty and courage and integrity of the warrior ant" (McCabe 2007, p. 42). Artifacts do

169

not readily tell us what people thought about courage, or what for them constituted honesty, but stories and poetry do, and I think that a contribution to understanding how we impute courage to Hector or Patroclus and how the stories of their deaths are not diminished but enriched by retelling was a contribution worth making.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alden, Maureen. *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the* Iliad. New York: Oxford University Press. 2000.

Allen, T. W. "The Homeridae." *Classical Quarterly* 1.2. 1907. 135–143.

Austin, Norman. "The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 7.4. 1966. 295–312.

Bakker, Egbert. *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1997.

Barnes, Timothy. 2011. "Homeric ἀνδροτῆτα καὶ ἥβην." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 131. 1–13.

Berg, Nils. "Parergon metricum: der Ursprung des griechischen Hexameters." *Münchener Studien zur Sprachwissenschaft* 37, 11–36. 1978.

Bergren, Ann L. T. "'The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite': Tradition and Rhetoric, Praise and Blame." *Classical Antiquity* 8.1. 1989. 1–41.

Bliss, Alan Joseph. *The metre of 'Beowulf'*. Oxford: Blackwell. 1958.

Boeckh, August, ed. *Pindari opera quae supersunt*. Leipzig: J. A. G. Weigel. 3 vols. 1811–1821.

Boedeker, Deborah Dickmann. *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic*. Leiden: Brill. 1974.

Boll, Franz.
—. "Zur homerischen Presbeia." *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* 68. 1–6. 1917/1918.
—. "Noch einmal zur Presbeia." *Zeitschrift für osteuropäische Geschichte* 69. 414–416. 1919/1920.

Bowra, C. M.
—. *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1930.
—. *Heroic Poetry*. London: Macmillan & Co. 1952.
—. *Pindar*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1964.

Brown, H. Paul. "Addressing Agamemnon: A Pilot Study of Pragmatics and Politeness in the 'Iliad.'" *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 136.1. 1–46. 2006.

Buck, Carl Darling. *Introduction to the Study of the Greek Dialects*. 2nd ed. New York and London: Ginn and Company. 1928.

Bundy, E. L. *Studia Pindarica*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1962.

Burkert, Walter. *Greek Religion*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1985.

Burr, Viktor. *ΝΕΩΝ ΚΑΤΑΛΟΓΟΣ: Untersuchungen zum homerischen Schiffskatalog*. Leipzig: Dietrich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung. 1944.

Bury, J. B.
—. *The Nemean Odes of Pindar*. New York: Macmillan. 1890.
—. *The Isthmian Odes of Pindar*. New York: Macmillan. 1892.

Cable, Thomas. *The English Alliterative Tradition.* Philadelphia. University of Pennsylvania Press. 1991.

Calder, William Musgrave III and Stern, Jacob (eds.). *Pindaros und Bakchylides*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft. 1970.

Čolaković, Zlatan. "The Singer Above Tales: Homer, Međedović and Traditional Epics." *Seminari Romani di Cultura Greca* 9.2. 2006. 161–187.

Cook, Albert. "Visual Aspects of the Homeric Simile in Indo-European Context." *Quaderni Urbinati di Cultura Classica* New Series 17.2. 1984. 39–59.

Croiset, Alfred. *La Poésie de Pindare*. Paris: Émile Martinet. 1880.

Currie, Bruno. *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2005.

Danek, Georg. "Der Schiffskatalog der Ilias: Form und Funktion." In Heftner, Herbert and Tomaschitz, Kurt (eds.). *Ad Fontes! Festschrift für Gerhard Dobesch.* Vienna: Wiener Humanistischen Gesellschaft. 2004. 59–72.

De Jong, Irene
—. *Narrators and focalizers: the presentation of the story in the Iliad*. Amsterdam: Nachdruck Amsterdam. 1987.
—. "Diachronic Narratology (The Example of Ancient Greek Narrative)." In Hühn, Peter; Meister, Jan Christoph; Pier, John; Schmid, Wolf (eds.) *Handbook of Narratology*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 2014.

Derrida, Jacques. *Speech and Phenomena*. Translated by David B. Allison. Evanston: Northwestern University Press. 1977.

Detienne, Marcel. *The Masters of Truth in Archaic Greece*. Trans. Janet Lloyd. Cambridge: MIT Press. 1996.

Driessen, Jan and Macdonald, Colin. "Some Military Aspects of the Aegean in the Late Fifteenth and Early Fourteenth Centuries B.C." *The Annual of the British School at Athens*. 1984. 49–74.

Donnelly, Francis P. "Homeric Litotes." *The Classical Weekly* 23.18. 1930. 137–140.

Edwards, Mark W. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1987.

Else, Gerald. *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument*. Leiden: E. J. Brill. 1957.

Fiedler, Klaus and Schwarz, Norbert. "Questionable Research Practices Revisited." *Social Psychological and Personality Science* 7.1. 2016. 45–52.

Finkelberg, Margalit
—. "Is *ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ* a Homeric Formula?" *The Claassical Quarterly* 36.1. 1986. 1–5.
—. "A Note on Some Metrical Irregularities in Homer." *Classical Philology* 83.3. 1988. 206–211.
—. "Ajax's Entry in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women." *The Classical Quarterly* 38.1. 1988. 31–41.

Fitch, Edward. "Pindar and Homer." *Classical Philology* 19.1. 1924. 57–65.

Foley, John Miles
—. *The Theory of Oral Composition*. Bloomington: University of Indiana Press. 1988.
—. *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and Serbo-Croatian Return Song*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1990.
—. *Homer's Traditional Art*. State College: Penn State University Press. 1999.

Frame, Douglas. *Hippota Nestor*. Hellenic Studies Series 37. Washington, D.C.: Center for Hellenic Studies. 2009.

Gildersleeve, B. L., ed. *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes*. New York: American Book Company. 1865.

Greenhalgh, P. A. L. *Early Greek Warfare*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1973.

Hainsworth, J. B.
—. "Structure and content in Epic Formulae: The Question of the Unique Expression." *Classical Quarterly* 14. 1964. 155–164.

—. *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1968.

Health, Malcolm. "The Origins of Modern Pindaric Criticism." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 106. 1986. 85–98.

Hesk, Jon. "Uncertainty and the Possibility of Violence: The Quarrel in *Odyssey* 8." In Bassino, Paola; Canevaro, Lilith Grace; Graziosi, Barbara (eds.) *Conflict and Consensus in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2017. pp. 109–131.

Heubeck, Alfred and West, Stephanie and Hainsworth, J.B. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey, Volume. I.* Oxford: Clarendon Press. 1988.

Heverly, W. Gerald. *Neglected Warnings in the* Iliad: *A Study in Characterization*. University of Pittsburgh, Ph.D. dissertation. 1993.

Hoekstra, A. *Homeric Modifications of Formulaic Prototypes: Studies in the Development of Greek Epic Diction*. Amsterdam: N.V. Noord-Hollandsche Uitgevers Maatschappij. 1965.

Instone, Stephen. "Pindar's Enigmatic 'Second Nemean.'" *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 36. 1989. 109–116.

Jackson, Peter. *The Transformations of Helen: Indo-European Myth and the Roots of the Epic Cycle*. Detelbach: J. H. Röll. 2006.

Jamison, Stephanie.
—"Draupadí on the Walls of Troy: *Iliad* 3 from an Indic Perspective." *Classical Antiquity* 13.1. 1994. 5–16.
—. "Sanskrit." In Woodard, Roger (ed.) *The Ancient Languages of Asia and the Americas*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2008. 6–32.

Jakobson, Roman. "Linguistics and Poetics." *Style in Language*, ed. Thomas A. Seboek. Cambridge: MIT Press. 1960. 350–377. Reprinted in Jakobson, *Selected Writings,* vol. 3. New York: Mouton. 1981. 18–51.

Janko, Richard. "The use of προς, προτί, and ποτί in Homer." *Glotta* 57. 1979. 24–29.

Kantorowicz, Ernst. *Laudes Regiae: A Study in Liturgical Acclamations and Medieval Ruler Worship*. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1946.

Kirk, G. S. (ed. gen.) *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
    -Kirk, G. S. *Volume I: books 1–4*. 1985.
    -Janko, Richard. *Volume IV: books 13–16*. 1992.
    -Richardson, Nicholas. *Volume VI; books 21–24*. 1993.

Krischer, Tilman. *Formale Konventionen der homerischen Epik*. Munich: C. H. Beck. 1971.

Kurke, Leslie. *The Traffic in Praise*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1991.

Lesky, Albin. *Homeros*. Druckenmüller: Stuttgart. 1967.

Littauer, M. A. and Crouwel, J. H.
—. "Review of P. A. L. Greenaugh. *Early Greek Warfare. Horsemen and Chariots in the Homeric and Archaic Ages*. Cambridge University Press 1973." *Classical Philology* 72. 1977. 363–365.
—. "Chariots in Late Bronze Age Greece." *Antiquity* 57. 1983. 187–192.

Lohmann, Dieter. *Der Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*. Berlin: de Gruyter. 1970.

Louden, Bruce. "Pivotal Contrafactuals in Homeric Epic." *Classical Antiquity* 12.2. 1993. 181–198.

MacFarlane, John. "Aristotle's Definition of Anagnôrisis." *American Journal of Philology* 121. 2000. 454–456.

Magoun, Francis P., Jr. "The Oral-Formuaic Character of Anglo-Saxon Narrative Poetry." *Speculum* 28. 1953. 446–467.

Mann, Rupert. "Pindar's Homer and Pindar's Myths." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 35. 313–337. 1994.

Martin, Richard P. *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the* Iliad. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1989.

Maslov, Boris. *Pindar and the Emergence of Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2015.

McCabe, Herbert. *Faith Within Reason*. London: Continuum. 2007.

McIntyre, Rusty B.; Paulson, René M.; Lord, Charles G. "Alleviating women's mathematics stereotype threat through salience of group achievements." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 39.1. 2003. 83–90.

Metzger, Friedrich. *Pindars Siegeslieder*. Leipzig: Teubner. 1880.

Morgan, Kathryn A. *Pindar and the Construction of Syracusan Monarchy in the 5th Century B.C.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2015.

Morrison, James V. "Alternatives to the Epic Tradition: Homer's Challenges in the *Iliad*." *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 122. 1992. 61–71.

Moulton, Caroll. "Homeric Metaphor." *Classical Philology* 74.4. 1979. 279–293.

Mühlestein, Hugo. "Euphorbos und der Tod des Patroklos." *Studi Miceni ed Egeo-Anatolici* 15. 1972. 79–90.

Murphy, Mary C. and Taylor, Valerie Jones. "The Role of Situational Cues in Signaling and Maintaining Stereotype Threat." In Inzlicht, M.; Schmader, T. (eds.) *Stereotype Threat: Theory, Process, and Application*. New York: Oxford University Press. 2012. 17–33.

Nagler, Michael. *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer.* Berkeley: University of California Press. 1974.

Nagy, Gregory
—. *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1974.
—. *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1990 (a).
—. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca: Cornell University Press. 1990 (b).
—. *Poetry as Performance: Homer and Beyond*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1996.
—. "Is there an etymology for the dactylic hexameter?" In Jasanoff, Jay; Melchert; H. Craig; Oliver, Lisi (eds.) *Mír Curad: Studies in Honor of Calvert Watkins*. Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. 1998. 495–508.
—. *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*. 2nd ed. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1999.

Nelson, Stephanie. "The Drama of Hesiod's Form. *Classical Philology* 91.1. 1996. 45–53.

Nickel, Roberto. "Euphorbus and the Death of Achilles." *Phoenix* 56.3. 2002. 215–233.

Ong, Walter J. *Orality and Literacy: 30th Anniversary Edition*. New York: Routledge. 2002.

Page, Denys
—. *Sappho and Alcaeus: An Introduction to the Study of Ancient Lesbian Poetry*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1955.
—. *History and the Homeric* Iliad. Berkeley: University of California Press. 1959.

Palmer, L. R. *The Greek Language*. New York: Faber and Faber. 1980.

Parry, Milman

—. *L'épithète traditionelle dans Homère.* University of Paris. Doctoral thesis. 1928 (a). Reprinted in Parry 1971, pp. 1–190.

—. *Les Formules et la métrique d'Homère.* University of Paris. Thèse complémentaire. 1928 (b). Reprinted in Parry 1971, pp. 191–239.

—. "The Traditional Metaphor in Homer." *Classical Philology* 28. 1933. 30–43.

—. *The Making of Homeric Verse.* Parry, Adam (ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1971.

Patten, Glenn. *Pindar's Metaphors: A Study in Rhetoric and Meaning.* Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag Winter. 2009.

Percy, William A. *Pederasty and Pedagogy in Archaic Greece.* Chicago: University of Illinois Press. 1998.

Price, Simon. *Religions of the Ancient Greeks.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1999.

Puhvel, Jaan. *Comparative Mythology.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press. 1987.

Race, William H.

—. *The Classical Priamel from Homer to Boethius.* Leiden: Brill. 1982.

—. *Style and Rhetoric in Pindar's Odes.* Atlanta: Scholars Press. 1990.

Ready, Jonathan L. *The Homeric Simile in Comparative Perspective: Oral Traditions from Saudi Arabia to Indonesia.* New York: Oxford University Press. 2018.

Rix, Helmut. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben.* Weisbaden: Reichert. 2001.

Rubino, Carl and Shelmerdine, Cynthia (eds.). *Approaches to Homer.* Austin: University of Texas Press. 1983.

Russom, Geoffrey. *Old English Meter and Linguistic Theory.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1987.

Sammons, Benjamin. *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue.* New York: Oxford University Press. 2010.

Sandars, N. K. "Later Aegean Bronze Swords." *American Journal of Archaeology.* 1963. 117–153.

Schadewaldt, Wolfgang. *Der Aufbau des Pindarischen Epinikion.* Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag. 1928.

Schein, Seth. "Divine and Human in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*." In Bouchon, Richard and Brillet-Doubois, Pascal and Le Meur-Weissman, Nadine (Eds.). *Hymnes de*

la Grèce antique: approches littéraires et historiques. Actes du colloque international de Lyon, 19–21 juin 2008. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée Jean Pouilloux. 2013. 295–312.

Schironi, Francesca. *The Best of the Grammarians: Aristarchus of Samothrace on the Iliad.* Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press. 2018.
Schmidt, Leopold. *Pindars Leben und Dichtung.* Bonn: Adolph Marcus. 1862.

Schmitt, Rüdiger. *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit.* Wiesbaden: Otto Harrassowitz. 1967.

Scott, W. C.
—. *The Oral Nature of the Homeric Simile.* Leiden: Brill. 1974.
—. *The Artistry of the Homeric Simile.* Hanover: Dartmouth College Library & Dartmouth College Press. 2009.

Segal, Charles "The Embassy and the Duals of *Iliad* 9.182–98." *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 9. 1968. 101–114.

Shih, M. J.; Pittinsky, T.L.; Ho, G. C. "Stereotype boost: Positive outcomes from the activation of positive stereotypes". In Inzlicht, M.; Schmader, T. (eds.) *Stereotype Threat: Theory, Process, and Application.* New York: Oxford University Press. 2012. 141–156.

Shih, M. J.; Pittinsky, T.L.; Trahan, A. "Domain-specific effects of stereotypes on performance." *Self and Identity* 5.1. 2006. 1–14.

Shipp, G. P. *Studies in the Language of Homer.* 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1972.

Sievers, Eduard. *Altgermanische Metrik.* Halle: Niemeyer. 1893.

Sigelman, Asya C. *Pindar's Poetics of Immortality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 2016.

Sihler, Andrew. *A New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin.* New York: Oxford University Press. 1995.

Simmons, Joseph P.; Nelson, Leif D.; Simonsohn, Uri. "False-Positive Psychology: Undisclosed Flexibility in Data Collection Allows Presenting Anything as Significant." *Psychological Science* 22.11. 2011. 1359–1366.

Snell, Bruno. *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis.* Leipzig: Teubner. 1953.

Sondheim, Stephen. *Finishing the Hat: Collected Lyrics (1954–1981) with Attendant Comments, Principles, Heresies, Grudges, Whines and Anecdotes.* New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 2010.

Spelman, Henry. *Pindar and the Poetics of Permanence.* New York: Oxford University Press. 2018.

Stanley, Keith. *The Shield of Homer: Narrative Structure in the* Iliad. Princeton: Princeton University Press. 1993.

Steele, Claude M. and Aronson, Joshua. "Stereotype threat and the intellectual test performance of African Americans." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 69.5. 1995. 797–811.

Teodorsson, Sven
—. *The Phonemic System of the Attic Dialect 400–340 BC.* Gothenburg: Institute of Classical Studies. 1974.
—. *The Phonology of Attic in the Hellenistic Period.* Gothenburg: Institute of Classical Studies. 1978.

Tichy, Eva
—. "Hom. ἀνδροτῆτα und die Vorgeschichte des Daktylischen Hexameters." *Glotta* 59.1. 28–67. 1981.
—. *Älter als der Hexameter? Schiffskatalog, Troerkatalog unt vier Enzelszenen der Ilias*. Bremen: Hempen. 2010.

Visser, Edzard. *Homers Katalog der Schiffe*. Stuttgart and Leipzig: B. G. Teubner. 1997.

Volk, Katharina. "ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ Revisited." *Classical Philology* 97.1. 2002. 61–68.

Walton, Gregory M. and Cohen, Geoffrey L. "Stereotype Lift." *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology* 39. 2003. 456–467.

Watkins, Calvert.
—. "Let Us Now Praise Famous Grains." *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 122.1. 1978. 9–17.
—. "*Is tre fír flamethon*: marginalia to *Audacht Morainn*." *Ériu* 30, 1979. 181–198.
—. *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics*. New York: Oxford University Press. 1995.
—. "Pindar's *Rigveda*." *Journal of the American Oriental Society* 122.2. 2002. 432–35.

Webster, T. B. L. *From Mycenae to Homer*. London: Methuen. 1958.

Weil, Simone. "The *Iliad*, or the Poem of Force." Trans. Mary McCarthy. Reprinted in *War and the Iliad*, ed. New York Review of Books. New York: NYRB. 2005. 1–38. Originally published 1945.

West, M. L.

—. "Greek Poetry 2000–700 B. C." *The Classical Quarterly* 23.2. 1973 (a). 179–192.

—. "Indo-European Metre." *Glotta* 51.3. 1973 (b). 161–187.

— (ed.). *Works and Days*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1978.

—. *Greek Metre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1984.

—. *Introduction to Greek Metre*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1987.

—. "Homer's Meter." *A New Companion to Homer*. Ian Morris and Barry Powell (eds.). Leiden: Brill. 1997. 218–237.

— (ed.). *Homeri Ilias* (2 vol.). Leipzig: K. G. Sauer Verlag. 1998-2000

— (ed.). *Homeri Odyssea*. Leipzig: K. G. Sauer Verlag. 2017.

Wittgenstein, Ludwig. *Philosophische Untersuchungen* (2nd ed). Oxford: Blackwell. 1958.

Wright, Matthew. *The Lost Plays of Greek Tragedy (Volume 2): Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides*. New York: Bloomsbury. 2018.

Yong, Ed. "Replication Studies: Bad copy." *Nature* 485. 2012. 298–300.