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Abstract

This dissertation is a study in the style of paradeigmata (παραδείγματα, mythological exempla, exemplary tales) in Archaic Greek poetry and wisdom discourse. Part One comprises two corpus-based studies of Homeric poetry in terms of three linguistic features (discourse markers, relative clauses, and register); each of these studies is followed by a comparative study in Hesiodic poetry. Here I suggest that genealogical catalogue poetry known from the Hesiodic tradition is an important traditional resource for these narratives. Part Two makes an analogous study of non-hexameter poetry from the Archaic Period as well as wisdom discourse attributed to Aesop and the Seven Sages. In these chapters I emphasize two strategies in particular: the creation and ‘mythologization’ of authoritative personae, and the sociocultural import of the stylistic features of genealogical catalogue in select Pindaric odes. Drawing on the findings of Part One and Part Two, the two studies in Part Three present readings of the Iliad and Odyssey through an analysis of how the linguistic features and themes of paradeigmata work at the level of poetic composition.
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## Abbreviations and editions

The texts of Homer’s *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are cited from T. W. Allen’s *Homeri Ilias* (3 vols., Oxford 1931) and P. von der Mühl’s *Homeri Odyssea* (Basel 1962), unless otherwise indicated. Similarly, Hesiod is cited from Merkelsbach and West (M–W); Pindar from Snell and Maehler (S–M); Sappho and Alcaeus from Voigt (V). I have attempted to use standard abbreviations for collections and editions of texts and reference works. Journals are generally referred to as in *L’Année philologique* except where noted otherwise below. Ancient authors and their works are abbreviated as in the *OCD* or, failing that, *LSJ* or *Oxford Latin Dictionary* (Oxford 1996). Deviations and the more obscure include:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bkg</strong></td>
<td>T. Bergk, ed., <em>Poetae lyrici Graeci</em> (Leipzig 1900–14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CA</strong></td>
<td><em>Classical Antiquity</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CP</strong></td>
<td><em>Classical Philology</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CEG</strong></td>
<td>P. A. Hansen, ed., <em>Carmina epigraphica Graeca, saeculorum VIII–V a. Chr. n.</em> (Berlin 1983)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chantraine</td>
<td>P. Chantraine, <em>Grammaire homérique</em> (Paris 1948–53)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EGF</strong></td>
<td>M. Davies, ed., <em>Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta</em> (Gottingen 1988)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the transliteration of Greek words, I have used Latinized versions of the most common
(e.g., Achilles, Aeschylus) with a tendency toward the less Latinate (e.g., Menelaos).
With less familiar names and terms, I adopt a transliteration that is closer to the Greek
(e.g., epinikion rather than epinicion). I do this inconsistently in the case of the Greek up-
silon, preferring, for example, Lykaon to Lukaon. With some reluctance, I write syn-
tagm(s) rather than syntagma(ta).
Introduction

“Τὸ δὲ κεῖσθαι τὸν Μελέαγρον πάνυ καιρίως εἶπεν. οὕτω γάρ που καὶ περὶ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως ἀπρακτοῦντός φησι. τὸ δ’ αὐτὸ δηλοὶ καὶ παρακατιὼν ἐν τῷ «ταύτῃ παρκατέλεκτο χόλον θυμαλγέα πέσσων».
Eustathius, vol. 2, p. 803. v. 14–16
“A story is fine, but one that is used at the right moment is even better.”
Qtd. in Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1974: 287

Through the use of mythological paradeigmata in their speeches, the heroes of Homeric poetry apply a form of poetry itself to their own performance context within the poems. Their hortatory or conciliatory narratives are abridged, sometimes allusive, versions of stories that are often unknown to us otherwise, or known to us with different details. Within Homeric poetry these paradeigmata present numerous problems: as early as the Alexandrian critics the passages are variously condemned for their illogic or digressive nature, and the presence of ‘late’ linguistic features and Homeric ‘invention’ in the inset stories does little to redeem them in the eyes of modern scholars. Yet the study of these potentially interpolated, inset stories reveals a surprising complexity in the way they interact with their framing narrative, to such an extent even that this interaction can lead to contradictory conclusions: for some, it points to the work of a single creative genius; for others, it suggests that these narratives must have evolved with their framing narrative over a long period of competitive composition-in-performance.

Yet, for all these criticisms and contradictions, the paradeigmata in Homeric poetry have inspired little comparison with their counterparts in other forms of Archaic Greek
discourse. After all, the mythological *paradeigma* is not unique to Homeric poetry, and two of our most recent lyric papyri—the “New Archilochus” (*P. Oxy. 4708* fr. 1) and the “New Sappho” (*P. Köln 21351*)—seem to feature mythological *paradeigmata*, as do many other lyric poems besides. I say “seem to feature”: we often cannot be certain what function mythological material might have served in these fragments, because the papyri and quotations through which they survive are too often scrappy and do not carry with them clear indication of performance context. There is much to gain, then, by considering the discursive features of exemplary tales in Archaic Greek poetry as a whole: in Homeric poetry the *paradeigmata* have pragmatic contexts built into their framing narrative, and in the non-hexameter traditions we get a broader sense of what one might expect from *paradeigmata* as a genre of spoken discourse in Archaic Greece. Nor was the mythological *paradeigma* the only form of exemplary narrative in Archaic Greece. Indeed, I suggest that we might make meaningful comparison of discourse characteristics found in other Archaic Greek speech genres such as the fables of Aesop or the *apophthegmata* of the Seven Sages.

Within Homeric scholarship, studies focused on the mythological *paradeigmata* have centered on their formal structure, mythographic tradition and audience competence, literary and narratological aspects, and the shaping of the poetic composition. The earliest, and most intense, scholarly debate focused on the issue of tradition and innovation in these passages. At least as long ago as 1925, scholars have been interested in the way in which the content of these passages seems to be conspicuously adapted to the surrounding narrative frame, most notably in the stories of Meleager and Niobe.¹ In the wake of Parry and Lord, Malcolm Willcock (1964) renewed interest in these passages and the treatment of them as ad hoc invention.² This period of scholarship might be seen as cul-

---

¹ On Meleager in *Il. 9*, see, e.g., Howald 1925 and Sachs 1933. On Niobe in *Il. 24*, Kakridis is often quoted: “Niobe in book 24 eats for the simple reason that Priam must eat” (1949: 99). For an important *Stellensammlung* with commentary across much of early Greek literature, see Öhler 1925.

minating in an article by Wayne Ingalls (1982), who, in support of these results, enumerates the ‘late’ linguistic features of the *paradeigmata* by drawing on the work of G. P. Shipp (1972). Meanwhile, scholars began to engage in two other approaches. First, important contributions to the study of the structural and formal aspects of these speeches were made by Dieter Lohmann (1970), Wolfgang Schadewaldt (1987), and Julia Haig Gaisser (1969a), who revives the work of W. A. A. van Otterlo (1944). Simultaneously, Norman Austin (1966) led the way in examining the significance of these passages for our interpretation of the *Iliad* as whole, while Victoria Pedrick (1983) made an important study of the paradigmatic nature of Nestor’s ironically addressed recollection in *Iliad* 11. On the level of the character and plot, George Held (1987) uses the parables and paradigmatic tales of the *Iliad* to argue (*contra* James Redfield [1994]), for the development of Achilles’ character throughout the poem. Finally, Mabel Lang (1983, 1995) and Maureen Alden (2000)—representing oralist and unitarian approaches, respectively—address issues related to the place of *paradeigmata* in the fabric of the poetic composition of the *Iliad.*

Outside of Homeric poetry, the *paradeigma* has not been treated to any such extent. Alongside the Homeric instances, Öhler (1925) collects numerous lyric instances with brief commentary, but it is Pindar who has received most of the attention, where the relationship of myth to victor has been the subject of much debate. Yet the debates tend to be limited to a given *epinikion*, and, like Homeric scholarship, Pindaric scholarship has been largely restricted to Pindaric poetry. Yet, following up observations by Elroy Bundy, scholars have more recently studied Pindar in terms of the conventions and verbal genres he incorporates: Glenn Most (1985) notes the relationship of *Pythian* 2 to beast fable and Leslie Kurke (1990) situates *Pythian* 6 with respect to traditional advice poetry.

---

3. Studies of the *Odyssey* are conspicuously absent, although the poem is even predicated on the applicability of previous *nostoi* (on which see further pp. 313–325 below).


noting the *paradeigma*’s comparanda in several other Pindaric *epinikia*. Yet these studies remain the exception in scholarship that dismisses *paradeigmata* in lyric as often as in Homeric poetry: just as Wilamowitz (1922: 136–139) condemned Pindar’s inclusion of the Antilokhos *paradeigma* of Pythian 6, D. L. Page remarks of the mythic narrative of Helen in Sappho *fr.* 16 V that “the thought is simple as the style is artless” (1979: 56). As recently as 2005, however, Claude Calame (2005: 66–69) has offered a more balanced assessment of the pragmatic situation and status of the Sapphic narrative. Indeed, it is the lack of such explicit pragmatic context that so often hinders our appreciation and understanding of the narrative, and speculation as to the extent and significance of the apparent mythological *paradeigma* in the Telephos fragment of Archilochus is emblematic of the difficulty one faces in reconstructing not just letter forms and lacunae but performance context as well.7

Scholars, ancient and modern alike, have long assumed they know what to expect from Homeric poetry or Pindaric *epinikia* by virtue of their stating the ways in which a *paradeigma* does or does not ‘fit’. Yet it strikes me that insufficient allowance has been made for the possibility that the *paradeigmata*, both within Homeric poetry and beyond, have their own stylistic conventions—their own register, formulae, and syntax—or that their conventions might be those of a different tradition altogether. After all, the study of Archaic Greek poetry has increasingly been concerned with the study of poetic traditions that surround and feed into one another, whether that study is conducted at the level of genres of discourse or in the revived *Quellenforschungen* of Neoanalysts. By virtue of the breadth of my corpus, I shall consider the mythological *paradeigma* not as something uniquely Homeric, but as something Greek, and as a discursive strategy that may draw on traditional resources as diverse as para-Homeric epic traditions, parables from wisdom traditions, or even the Aesopic fable.8 In broadening the scope of the analysis, then, this

---

7. Cf., e.g., West 2006: 15–16.
8. Cf. Nagy (1992: 325), who presents one example of the way in which Homeric poetry “goes out of its way to make an indirect reference to the tradition [of fable in Archilochean iambic
study takes seriously several claims by modern scholars that Homeric and Pindaric poetry are hybridized super-genres, the study of which benefits from, if not even requires, comparison with other poetic traditions.

There are several methodologies developed outside of Classics to which one might look in the study of inset paradigmatic narrative. One is the narratological approach, which has already been productive in the field of Classics and even applied to para-deigmata specifically; another might be the more recent cognitivist approach to literature, which has far less traction in Classics as yet. But my own approach may be most closely aligned with the field of linguistic anthropology, and I shall at times borrow terminology from this discipline and compare findings conducted with these methods in other languages and cultures. Yet to call the methods of my study an ‘approach’ or to attach a name to them may be misleading. To my mind, the approach of this study is quite simple: it is an immersion into the texture of the language and literature of a people—hardly different from the advice the most traditional of textual critics would give to a student. To put it another way, this study is founded on the empirical observation of linguistic features in all of Archaic Greek discourse: from epic to lyric, from fables to inscriptions. Thus the scope of my analysis is all extant Archaic Greek writings, at least in the sense

11. I count as equivalent the fields of sociolinguistics and discourse analysis. Egbert Bakker (esp. 1997b) has productively applied concepts and methods of discourse analysis to Homeric poetry, treating Homeric discourse as speech, while Martin 2000b uses similar methodology at a larger scale (cf. too, e.g., Foley 2002). For the aim to identify and describe the speech genres appropriated in Homeric poetry, see especially Martin 1989; Martin 2005a. Renewed interest by these scholars in regaining the texture of ancient Greek speech may at times be at the level of the verbal tense marker and particle, but the payoff can be on the level of narrative (cf., e.g., de Jong 1997 on γάρ and embedded narrative).
that, for every claim I make for salient and significant stylistic traits in the paradigmatic “way of speaking,”\textsuperscript{12} I do so against a statistically-sound amount of background data collected with electronic databases such as the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, the *Chicago Homer*, and the *Packard Humanities Institute Greek Inscriptions*. What emerges from the organization of these data are the syntactic patterns and stylistic conventions most characteristic of *paradeigmata*.\textsuperscript{13}

Within this fairly natural approach to studying Greek poetry, there is perhaps one methodological crux: we must know, or make some assumption concerning, what kind of culture produced that poetry. Specifically, there is the question of whether or not we are dealing with oral traditional poetry. Yet, however Homeric poetry reached its current, textualized form, it is now well established that it is the product of a long period of oral traditional poetic performance.\textsuperscript{14} Archaic Greek lyric poetry reflects a different performance context, of course, but we can see clearly that it was also orally performed and even engages with material also represented in the hexameter traditions of the same period. Thus, the fact that Archaic Greek poetry reflects an oral-performance culture recommends a particular approach to its *paradeigmata*, one which is conducted, to the extent that is possible, as an ‘ethnography of speaking’;\textsuperscript{15} that is, as an empirical study of Archaic Greek discourse’s ‘linguistic habits’ in telling different kinds of stories.

\textsuperscript{12} For the phrase “way of speaking” see especially Hymes 1974: 31–66.

\textsuperscript{13} Moreover, in choosing to study a *particular* speech type-scene, or at least a limited, related group of them, I hope to avoid the charge leveled against previous studies of stylistic traits in Homeric poetry, namely that the sample studied has not been appropriately selected. See the exchange of Redfield and Friedrich (1978, 1981) with Messing (1981). On the development of linguistic corpora, see the recent summary in Sinclair 2005. For an interesting reflection on the possibilities of quantitative approaches to literature, see Moretti 2005 and, most recently, Moretti 2009b (with Trumpener 2009 and Moretti 2009a).

\textsuperscript{14} While at no point will my argument depend on an assumption that Homeric poetry remained fluid in form, some skepticism of its early fixation is healthy in this study, especially given the nature of *paradeigmata* and the many scholarly precedents in thinking that, in this type of passage, at least, the text was *not* fixed.

In the present study three main discourse features of paradeigmata come to be salient criteria—discourse markers, syntax, and register—each of which happens to have been productive in the study of ‘talk’ in many other languages. Each of these criteria will be discussed more fully in time, but it is worth briefly describing them here. Discourse markers are particles that designate stretches of discourse as performing a particular function, and in this way they may help to shape our interpretation of a given story. Within the syntax of these narratives I shall primarily focus on relative clauses and the way in which they tend to combine genre-specifically with particles and adverbs at various points in exemplary tales. Finally, my study of particles and syntagms across the poetic and wisdom discourse of Archaic Greece suggests that they belong to a particular register, occurring most often within a specific nexus of lexical items and themes. Taken one step further, this study attempts to make sense of this style with a view to understanding the sociocultural aspects of these linguistic features in the culture in which they were produced.

The plan of this dissertation falls into three parts. In Part One I begin with a study of the Niobe paradeigma of Iliad 24, in order to sketch the problems and frame the terms of the discussion. Following that introduction I present two diptychs, with alternating panels of studies in Homeric and Hesiodic poetry. The first diptych comprises a discourse-centered survey of Archaic hexameter in an attempt to create and describe typologies of a corpus of paradeigmata in Homeric poetry along with a comparative study of stylistic features in Hesiodic poetry. The second diptych is an analogous pairing, but focuses instead on the use of relative clauses and their concomitant formulae, register and themes. Finally, we return to the paradeigma of Niobe as a summarizing touchstone for the conventions and style of the paradeigmata in Homeric poetry. The combined, local-
ized stylistic features suggest that one resource for the style and mythological material of Homeric *paradeigmata* was the genealogical catalogue such as it survives in the Hesiodic *Theogony* and *Catalogue of Women*.17

Part Two attempts an analogous study of Archaic Greek exemplary tales in lyric and elegiac poetry, as well as wisdom discourse, in order to investigate the way in which these discourse characteristics correspond to, or require modification in contrast to, those in hexameter poetry. In my introduction to Part Two I offer initial surveys of textual and interpretive problems in the New Sappho and the New Archilochus papyri, as well as some of the issues that one confronts in the study of lyric poetry and wisdom discourse. The chapters that then follow are roughly analogous to those in Part One. I deal first with discourse markers and discourse units in non-hexameter Archaic Greek discourse, offering many readings of lyric fragments and detailing the use of conventional discourse markers in the construction of authoritative *personae*. Against this backdrop, I make a specialized study of discourse markers and units in Pindaric poetry. The last chapter in Part Two is also dedicated to Pindaric poetry, but it is instead a lengthy study devoted to the syntax and style of *Pythian* 9. In both of these chapters on Pindaric poetry I argue that the import of certain stylistic traits has sociocultural implications for these odes composed to celebrate the elite athletic victors of fifth-century Greece.

Informed by the studies of *paradeigmata* in Part One and Part Two, the two chapters of Part Three present connected readings of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* focused through the formulae, syntax, and themes of the paradigmatic way of speaking. Of primary concern is the way in which the *paradeigmata* inform our interpretation of each speech in its context, as well as how foregrounded elements relate to the poems on a larger scale. For, how Homeric heroes conform to and diverge from the discursive practices conventionally associated with *paradeigmata*, and even how they apply the *paradeigma*’s stylistic traits in exceptional circumstances, sheds light on both the character of the speakers

---

17 The codification of these discursive properties as suitable to exemplary tales, in turn, is suggestive for the sociocultural associations of the genealogical tradition.
and the texture and themes of the composition in general. This, in turn, reveals a thematic complexity expressed even at the level of particle, syntagm, and register, and permits suggestions concerning the very idea of the *paradeigma* as articulated in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* at the level of the monumental composition.
PART I:
THE POETICS OF PARADEIGMATA IN HEXAMETER

οὔτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, ὡς κέν τιν᾽ ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἱκίοι δωρητοὶ τε πέλοντο παράρρητοι τ᾽ ἐπέεσσι. 
μέμημαι τόδε ἔργον ἐγὼ πάλαι οὐ τι νέον γε ὡς ἦν ἡν ὅ ὅμιαν ἔρεω πάντεσσι φίλοισι.

Il. 9.524–8
Chapter 1 | Paradeigmata: adaptation and application

While it has long been suggested by scholars, on the grounds of everything from verb morphology to mythological content, that the paradeigmata of Homeric poetry must be later innovations, it has also, and more recently, been suggested that they are part of a systematic structure of correspondences devised by single poetic genius.\(^1\) Indeed, the way in which paradeigmata interact with the framing narrative is very intriguing, although not unimaginable in light of the workings of oral poetic traditions.\(^2\) While one study has tried to add linguistic support to an earlier claim for the ‘lateness’ of the paradeigma passages,\(^3\) that linguistic support rests solely on the occurrence of late morphologies, or on words otherwise extant primarily in ‘late’ texts. Those who argue against ‘authenticity’ by means of the ‘innovative’ mythological material in the Homeric paradeigmata too often make arguments ex silentio, suspecting speculative sources or privileging other mythological traditions. Such methodology is dangerously circular, and I seek to revise this unproductive approach in a number of ways.

There has been no recent, comprehensive study of the paradeigmata in hexameter poetry that seeks to describe this particular ‘way of speaking’ on the level of discourse, meter, formulae, syntax, and, generally, stylistics.\(^4\) In a discourse-centered approach I

---

1. See on p. 2ff. above for a discussion of past approaches.
2. In the case of Avdo Medjedović, see esp. Lord et al. 2000: 78.
4. Öhler 1925 was the first and last study of any scope.
shall first discard any previous notion of a corpus of *paradeigmata*; that is, I shall ignore previous assumptions about what constitutes a *paradigma*, and look also, via shared discourse features, at similar speech genres. This approach introduces two new terms to this particular investigation: discursive properties and speech genres. These terms, which I shall define below, in turn introduce another approach to a systematic study of the *paradeigmata*, namely oral poetics. Within the framework of such an approach, what is ‘innovative’ is properly seen as ‘according to καιρός’, or ‘suited to a particular moment of performance’.

Though some work has been done on this front, I shall show—again, via a discourse-centered analysis of syntax, meter, markers, formulae, and theme—precisely how a Homeric performer might have drawn on traditional resources, particularly those which, in the Greek poetry extant today, might be best represented within the Hesiodic tradition.

### A An example: Achilles, Priam, and Niobe

An excellent example of the application, and possible adaptation, of traditional mythological material is Achilles’ Niobe *paradigma* of *Iliad* 24, a speech which has more than once been considered the paradigm of *paradeigmata* in Greek poetry.

Sound methodology requires that one resist working from such an assumption, but the passage’s familiarity, succinctness, and variety of discourse features recommend beginning with it

---

5. One might translate καιρός as “judicious selection and treatment” with Bundy (1986: 18). See further in n.31 on p. 17 below.


7. See Nagy 1992: 325 on an initial suggestion that “mythological exempla in Homer stem from a rich, complex, and, yes, subtle tradition.”

8. See, e.g., Öhler 1925: 5: “Wie ein solches Exemplum aufgebaut ist, zeigt am besten eine Rede des Achill in den Lytra, welche deshalb zuerst behandelt werden soll.” Similarly, Dörrie (1978: 17–18), who refers to it as “das Urbild des mythischen *exemplum*.” Willcock (1964: 141) notes: “An inquiry into the use of paradeigma in the *Iliad* must begin with Niobe.” Nor should one forget E. L. Bundy’s advice, as recalled by M. Nagler (1974: ix), regarding “the importance for Western literature of the consolation speech delivered to Priam by Achilles in the twenty-fourth book of the *Iliad*.”
as an example, whatever its primacy or priority. The scene is a famous one: Priam has come to the tent of Achilles to ransom Hector, and Achilles persuades Priam to first accept a meal. At v. 598, Achilles seats Priam in a chair, and addresses him with a μῦθος (vv. 599–620):

"Your son is released to you, old man, as you asked. He lies on a bier. When dawn appears you will see him yourself as you take him away. Now let us remember our supper. You know, Niobe, with the lovely hair, she remembered to eat, the one whose twelve children were killed in her home, six daughters, and six sons in the bloom of youth. Apollo killed the sons with arrows from his silver bow, angered with Niobe; shaft-showering Artemis killed the daughters, because Niobe likened herself to Leto of fair complexion—she said Leto had borne only two, while she herself had borne many. Yet those two, though they were but two, killed all Niobe’s children. Nine days they lay in blood, nor was there anyone to bury them, for the son of Kronos made stones of the people. But on the tenth day the Ouranian gods buried them. But Niobe remembered to eat, when she was worn out with weeping. And now somewhere among the rocks, in the lonely mountains, in Sipylos, where they say lie the beds of the goddesses, the ones who are nymphs, and dance alongside the waters of Akheloios, there, though still a stone, she broods on the sorrows from"

---

9. See Martin 1989: 26–37 on the importance of μῦθος (an ‘authoritative speech-act’ or ‘self-presentation to the audience in performance’) as the marked term in its pairing with the unmarked term ἔπος.
the gods. Come now, old man, let us too remember to eat. Afterwards you may take your
dear son back to Ilium, and mourn him; and he will be much lamented.\(^{10}\)

There is no more famous comment on this scene than that of Kakridis: “Niobe in book 24
eats for the simple reason that Priam must eat” (1949: 99).\(^{11}\) Kakridis’ point is that
Achilles has adapted the story of Niobe to suit the present situation of Priam. To put it in
broader terms, Achilles has told the story according to καιρός, made it suit the perfor-
mance context. Niobe, of course, is not well known for having finally taken food while
lamenting her children; in fact, only here does this detail appear.\(^{12}\) It is commonplace to
say that the material of this paradeigma has been adapted from some other, lost poem;
that it has been subject to later interpolation;\(^{13}\) that it is malformed in its present state.\(^{14}\)
Such charges might cite its inconsistencies and illogic,\(^{15}\) or its somewhat surprising geo-
graphical specificity.\(^{16}\) Further, aside from the content of the tale, a host of its stylistic
features have been disparaged by both ancient and modern scholars: the flawed ring-com-

---

10. Unless otherwise noted, all translations are my own. Their goal is not elegance, but rather a
literal rendition of the meaning, taking into account my discourse-centered view of particles.
11. Cf. too his earlier treatment in Kakridis 1930.
12. See, e.g., Wehrli 1931: 575 and Schadewaldt 1933: 3.3.1n1. Willcock 1964: 141n2 reports
these early views without explicit acceptance.
13. The charge of interpolation of, and within, paradeigmata is generally associated with the
Analyst tradition: see Ameis et al. 1877: 101,134, Finsler 1913: 253f., as well as Öhler’s (1925: 6)
study of paradeigmata and Kakridis 1930 on the Niobe exemplum. For these scholars the
interpolation has to do with everything from lack of relevance to the ‘Hesiodic’ description of
dance (ἐρρώσαντο, 616; with Σ II. 24.616a1, cf. ἐπερρώσαντο of the Muses at Th. 8), but see
below for objections due to its placement in an otherwise tidy ring-composition. Interestingly,
Leaf (ad loc.) defends the verses against many of these objections.
15. On the illogic, Macleod compares the Meleager paradeigma in Book 9: “Homer first
modifies the motif of petrification (611), and then re-uses it here in its normal form. For the
technique, compare the story of Meleager as told by Phoenix” (ad 614–7).
16. In vv. 614–17. On the other hand, Leaf is not troubled to find “an intimate acquaintance with
the country…in this book” (ad 616) and Griffin notes Achilles’ “ability to rise beyond the
immediate confines of the action and to the contemplation of distant places” (56). Despite the
number of textual variants of the river’s name in the Iliad MSS, one might add (in anticipation of
the argument) that the most common version of the river’s name occurs also in the Catalogue of
Rivers at Th. 340, in the same metrical sedes.
position of the speech;\(^{17}\) its non-epic use of the verb φασί;\(^{18}\) its ‘late’ linguistic features;\(^{19}\) and even the ‘Hesiodic character’ of a portion.\(^{20}\)

That this passage’s perceived shortcomings require the view that it is a later interpolation, however, is our own modern lectio facilior, ignorant of advances in discourse analysis and oral poetics, and our least productive line of attack. Whether these lines represent interpolation centuries after a single poetic genius, or a poetic instance in a living tradition of composition-in-performance, the verses are transmitted to us in all of our best manuscripts. For this reason they are valuable, and I shall show that the study of this material—no matter its provenance—sheds a great deal of light on the traditional resources on which Homeric performers were able to draw.

We shall return to this passage in greater detail at the end of this chapter, having fully explored the generic nexus of the paradeigma, but one observation might suffice at this point to suggest that Achilles tells this paradeigma, in its current state of textual fixation, and beyond its own embedded boundaries, in a manner that suits its pragmatic context: one strong recommendation against considering its vv. 614–17 to be the spurious result of later interpolation is the fact that Priam’s response to Achilles at v. 639, ἀλλὰ ἀεὶ στενάχω καὶ κήδεα μυρία πέσσω (‘But I have been grieving and brooding over

---

17. The flawed ring-composition is one of the reasons for the suspicion of interpolation of vv. 614–17, on which see esp. the formal analysis of Lohmann 1970: 13n4,309. Willcock (1973: 18) expresses his uneasiness about this approach in his review of Lohmann’s work but has never seemed to commit to an opposite stance. Take, for example, Willcock’s (1964: 142n1) evaluation of these verses: “For the scheme to be exact it helps to omit 614–17 as interpolated. It is however a question whether we ought to require mathematical exactness in a matter like this.”

18. Leaf (ad loc.).


20. The scholiasts note: (614–7a.) Ariston. | Did. νῦν δὲ που ἐν πέτρῃσιν<—πέσσει>: ἀθετοῦνται στίχοι τέσσαρες, ὡς ὅ τι ἀκόλουθοι τῷ „„ἡ δ’ ἀρα σῖτον μνήσατ’, <ἐπεὶ κάμε δάκρυ χέουσα>” (Ω 613): εἰ γὰρ ἀπελιθώθη, πῶς σιτία προ<α>νέγκατο; καὶ ἡ παραμυθία γελοῖα· φάγε, ἐπεὶ καὶ ἡ Νιόβη ἔφαγε καὶ ἀπελιθώθη, ἔστι δὲ καὶ Ἡσιόδεια τῷ χαρακτήρι, καὶ μᾶλλον γε τὸ ἀμφ’ Ἀχελώιον ἔφρωοντο (616), καὶ τρὶς κατὰ τὸ συνεχές τὸ ἐν (614. 615). πῶς δὲ καὶ λίθος γενομένη θεωνέκ κήδεα πέσσει (617); | προηθετοῦντο δὲ καὶ παρ’ Ἀριστοφάνει. A
countless sorrows") directly responds to Achilles at v. 617 (ἐνθ’ ἄλθος περ ἐσσαθεὸν ἐκ κήδεα πέσσει; “…there, although she is stone, she broods on the sorrows from the gods”). Nowhere else in Archaic Poetry do the two roots κήδ- and πέσ(σ)- occur in the same verse together, suggesting that the paradeigma is clearly woven into its performance context on the pragmatic level.

B Καιρός: poetics, adaptation, and application

The scholarly focus, then, has generally been on showing that Homer, presumably Homer the poet, has failed to fully adapt mythological material. The point, however, should not be that Homeric poetry might have invented peculiar details not present in other epic poems lost to us; rather, that Achilles is, in the case of the Niobe paradeigma, depicted in the Iliad as applying the very sort of mythological material from which the Iliad itself is made. That is, the application of a µῦθος by a speaker in Homeric poetry inevitably involves the adaptation of the mythological material of other poetic traditions or performances. It is, therefore, natural for even obscure features of a myth to be foregrounded to suit the context.

Still, many of the paradeigmata in Homeric poetry comprise so-called ‘suspect’ mythological material, and this ‘suspect’ material has been the focus of scholarly dis-

---

21. Only one MS indicates variation here: πάσξω γρ. (Vratislaviensis 26 s. xiii-xiv [ol. Vrat. b]).
22. Macleod (ad loc.) makes a similar point, with a further comparison to the Meleager paradeigma of Book 9 and the Iliad as a whole.
23. We might even compare this phrasing to the twice-used χόλον θυμαλγάεα πέσσει#, applied to both Achilles (Il. 4.513) and to Meleager (Il. 9.565), as Eusthatius observes (p. 1 above).
25. On this point, as Gregory Nagy writes: “By quoting muthos, as in a mythological exemplum, Homeric poetry shows how the muthos of poetry itself can be applied” (1992: 317). I shall return to this in greatest detail in Part Three below.
26. See Kirshenblatt-Gimblett 1975 for a discussion of this very process in modern telling of parables.
discussion. Nor should this adaptation of material be taken lightly. As Nagy suggests (1992: 326):

The model is a precedent, and that precedent would lose its rhetoric, its very power, it if were to become known that someone has tampered with it…As precedent, mythological exemplum demands a mentality of the unchanging, of adherence to the model, even if its myth is changeable over time.

It is, indeed, a delicate matter to apply a μῦθος to a situation. One must make the paradeigma sufficiently fit the discursive context to be relevant to the audience, but one must also adhere closely enough to established models so as to properly draw on their authority. The line is fine, but, again, it is a line the Greeks were particularly suited to walking, poets and audience alike. On the one hand, Greek poets were constantly involved in the process of agonistic response and the selection of manifold traditional material;28 on the other, the Greek audience would be attuned to the poet’s selection.29 Regarding the former claim, we should not be surprised by mythological variation: the number of Niobe’s children seems to have been consistent in no two traditions.30 Of the latter, it has recently been argued that such agonistic practice might even have played a large role in the performance of Homeric poetry.

An essential concept for Archaic Greek encomiastic poetry—and, later, Greek rhetoric—is the notion of καιρός,31 and this applies to the paradeigmata in hexameter po-

28. For more on ‘contest’ (as well as ‘contradiction’) in the literary culture of Archaic Greece, see especially Griffith 1990 (with Griffith 2002), Ford 2002, and, most recently, Collins 2004.

29. On ‘audience competence”—that is, just how ‘active’ the Greek audience would be in listening—see the case made for the Odyssey’s audience in Martin 1993a, or, more generally, Foley 1999: 13–34. For a competing view, see Scodel 2002.


31. On the concept of καιρός, see Ford 2002: 12–22 (but passim), Bundy 1986: 18 (see also 18n44 with references) in the context of P. 9.81, Gentili 1988: 136–144, Nagy 1990b: 237, and especially the full, diachronic treatment of Trédé 1992 (who paraphrases the term as “l’àpropos et l’occasion” in her title). Barrett (ad 386–7), though skeptical of tracing the development of meaning, tentatively suggests that its temporal sense develops from an earlier spatial sense. Ford emphasizes that καιρός is “fundamentally a religious concept” (17), but a more performance-oriented discussion, centered on the sophist Alcidamas, is to be found in Collins 2004: 185, with Ritoók 1962; Ritoók 1991 and O’Sullivan 1992. The word καιρός, of course, does not itself occur
etry as well. In the epigraphs to the Introduction (p. 1 above), I introduce this notion as it applies to story-telling with quotations spanning thousands of years. To underscore the importance of this idea also to hexameter poetry, it is worth repeating here the selection from the *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* (170–1):\(^{32}\)

[Ἡσίοδος:] τῆς σοφίας δὲ τί τέκμαρ ἐπ’ ἀνθρώποις πέφυκεν;  
[Ὅμηρος:] γιγνώσκειν τὰ παρόντ’ ὀρθῶς, καιρῷ δ’ ἄμ’ ἐπεθέσαι.

[Hesiod:] What, then, is the proof of poetic skill among men?  
[Homer:] It is to rightly recognize the matter at hand, and to follow the lead of occasion.

Achilles’ appropriate application of the Niobe μῦθος, then, is a fundamental aspect of Archaic Greek poetics; it is, in fact, the very proof of poetic skill (τέκμαρ τῆς σοφίας). Achilles recognizes Priam’s situation at hand, and successfully adapts a persuasive story to encourage Priam to eat.

In sum, we can approach the Niobe *paradeigma*, as all others, on at least two levels. First, one might say that the poet Homer only partially adapted the story of Niobe for the purpose of Achilles’ speech. Second, we might say that competitive Homeric rhapsodes treated *paradeigmata* as loci of elaboration, and that some form of this elaboration became fixed, or even crystalized, in our text.\(^{33}\) Luckily, it matters little which view we choose in the first portion of the present investigation; for, in any case, we shall track discourse strategies and narrative patterns for evidence of generic associations, whether or not they do represent synchronic poetic performance practices in an oral tradition. It is especially the notions of ‘tradition’ and ‘innovation’, then, that I want to emphasize as we look more broadly at other mythological *paradeigmata*. But, rather than looking at inno-

\(^{32}\) On the influence of Alcidamas on this passage, see Ford 2002: 71 with refs. at 71n18, and O’Sullivan 1992.

vation in the actual mythological material, I want to describe the tradition and innovation in the style of the paradeigmata.\textsuperscript{34}

\textsuperscript{34} Martin 1992; Worthington and Foley 2002.
C  Corpus, genre, discourse, and style

I have stated that we shall begin our study by ignoring the various corpora of para-
radeigmata as studied by past scholars. This is perhaps hyperbolic, but, instead of begin-
ning with a list of embedded stories told of the past that seem to have present implica-
tions, I begin by surveying all such pre-existing lists and letting the coincidence and
salience of discourse features define their most characteristic generic categorization. I do
this with good reason: the disconnect between modern genre and the problems of ancient
performance make beginning with the notion of a ‘historical’ genre a dubious methodolo-
gy for any study. It further seems to be especially dubious in the realm of wisdom trad-
tions in general, and exemplary tales in particular. There exist plenty of cases of failing to
note these problems,\textsuperscript{35} the study of fables providing especially clear cases. The Middle
Dutch fable, for example, lacks any normative definition: each of figure, bijspel, and ex-
emple coincide with the Middle Dutch fable.\textsuperscript{36} The only productive approach, then, is to
look not at what a story means, but rather how a story means.\textsuperscript{37}

We must add to this the further complication that those performing the Homeric
poems seem to have been capable of performing far more than just, say, the Iliad and the
Odyssey. In fact, the evidence extends well beyond Plato’s Ion that Homeric performers
did not limit themselves to Homeric poetry.\textsuperscript{38} Aside from ancient evidence, this is borne

\textsuperscript{35} The problems in Akkadian wisdom literature are described in Vanstiphout 1999. For more on
Near Eastern genres and types, and the inappropriate assignment to these categories, see Dorleijn
and Vanstiphout 2003 and West 1997: 82. In Greek literature specifically, see Adrados and Dijk
1999: 3–44 (esp. 17–44), and, more recently, van Dijk 1997: 3–115.

\textsuperscript{36} Schippers (1999: 72–75) details the immense variety of what has been classified as fable in
the several Middle Dutch fable collections.

\textsuperscript{37} Compare, for example, Bakker (1997a: 1), who argues most strongly for “grammar as
interpretation” and the importance of the “how” rather than the “what” in the production of
meaning. On trends in Akkadian wisdom traditions, see Vanstiphout 1999: 90–94: “[W]e should
approach the texts as such, and try to construct a system upon these texts themselves by using
textual analyses, context features and intertextual phenomena. I also think we should use criteria
such as (1) discourse modality; (2) thematics and content selection; (3) spread and distribution;
(4) evolution within groups and across groups” (94).

\textsuperscript{38} So Ford (2002: 68–72) of rhapsodes: “Many archaic rhapsodes must have been capable of
out in the fact that we see numerous speech genres and poetic traditions within Homeric poetry. But I do not claim—certainly do not take as a premise—that the *paradeigma* is one such speech genre. The ‘exemplum’ may be a comparable modern theoretical genre, but that does not make it a useful tool when situated in a historical context: even so-called historical genres remain modern, theoretical constructs. Nor are the different genres necessarily distinct and well-defined, but, starting from a broadly-based study of shared discursive properties, we can get a better sense of what really constituted these *paradeigmata* in performance. For this reason it is even more important that we look closely at the language and articulation from an ‘emic’ perspective.

This ‘emic’ perspective, in conjunction with the structure of my argument, has one consequence that needs to be addressed: throughout this chapter I shall be looking, in an alternating pattern, first at Homeric poetry and then Hesiodic poetry. Part of this, of course, simply results from the fact that Hesiodic poetry as we have it does not feature *paradeigmata* in the easily approached form as they exist in Homeric poetry. That is, in Homeric poetry it is clear what comparisons are being made, for *paradeigmata* are entertaining their audiences with a similar mixture of material.” (71). Again, compare Martin 2000a on the ‘Homeric’ and ‘Hesiodic’ performances within in our *h.Ap*. See further Pl. *Leg.* 2.658b, where the Athenian states: Ῥαψῳδὸν δέ, καλῶς Ἰλιάδα καὶ Ὀδύσσειαν ἥ τι τῶν Ἡσιοδείων διατιθέντα, τάχ’ ἄν ἡμεῖς οἱ γέροντες ἠδίστα ἀκούσαντες νικᾶν ἃν φαίμεν πάμπολου (‘But it’s a rhapsode splendidly performing the *Iliad, Odyssey*, or something from the Hesiodic verses that we old men would very likely take most delight in listening to, and declare him easily the winner.’)


40. See, e.g., Preminger and Brogan 1993, *s.v.* ‘exemplum’, but note two things: the term ‘exemplum’ describes specifically the *mediaeval* historical genre; and that in the most basic form of ‘allegory’ (*s.v.*) is described as comparable to a fable in its being similarly simple and subordinate to the moral point. Green 1997, similarly: “The genre was based on historically verifiable incidents but often included frankly fictional narratives that involved animals (fables), comparisons drawn from ordinary life (parables), or realistic stories that were not verifiable but that could have happened” (*s.v.* ‘exemplum’). As the level of complexity and correspondence increases, just as in Phoenix’ Meleager *paradeigma* of the Embassy, their description of ‘allegory’ seems as appropriate as ‘exemplum’.

41. For a fine introduction to genre as applied to the familiar letter in the letters of the Arzamasians, see Todd 1976: 3–18 (esp. 3–7).
plicitly embedded in a larger narrative frame, which makes clear the context and implication. Hesiodic poetry is, comparatively, ‘pure discourse’. There is in this approach the disadvantage that, on the surface, Hesiodic poetry might seem throughout to be a sort of literary model for a poet Homer. This is neither the intention nor implication of my study.

D Corpus and genre

I have begun with the Niobe paradeigma of Iliad 24 in order that, as we explore the full range of paradigmatic discourses, we have some frame of reference for our comparisons. While we must continue to distance ourselves from the assumption that the speech itself is exemplary for other paradeigmata within Homeric poetry, one reason for beginning with it is that no modern scholar rejects that this speech is paradigmatic. Such agreement is not necessarily the norm; there has been a remarkable amount of disagreement among scholars on the issue of which speeches are, in some strict sense, ‘paradigmatic’. In fact, paradeigmata such as that of Niobe are as often called ‘digressions’ because they tend to refer to non-Iliadic mythological material, material which is sometimes only later revealed to have a paradigmatic nature. One reason for such disagreement has been that scholarship has thus far pursued a ‘top-down’ approach; that is, classification of a story as ‘paradigmatic’ or not has rested largely on the role we, the modern audience, see the story playing in the poem. But about this we can be, and have apparently been, wrong, as discussions of the function of Nestor’s speech in Book 11 of the Iliad show.

More than just this should make us wary: we are further confronted with somewhat vague claims such as Austin’s that the story of Odysseus’ scar “has a pronounced

---

42. Compare, for example, the comment Gnomol. Vat. Gr. 1144 (= Hesiod. Τ 18d Jac.): Σιμωνίδης τὸν Ἡσιόδον κηπουρόν ἔλεγε, τὸν δὲ Ὄμηρον στέφανητιτόκον, τὸν μὲν ὡς φυτεύσαντα τὰς περὶ θεῶν καὶ ἥρωων μυθολογίας, τὸν δὲ ὡς ἐξ αὐτῶν συμπλέξαντα τὸν Ἠλιάδος καὶ Ὀδυσσείας στέφανον. (“Simonides used to say that Hesiod was a gardener, while Homer a garland-weaver, for the former planted the mythological stories concerning gods and heroes, while the latter plaited the garland of the Iliad and Odyssey from them.”)

paradigmatic tone, although the paradigm is a highly sophisticated one and more indirect than similar digressions in the *Iliad* (1966: 82). With no description of this paradigmatic tone, we are left to wonder *for whom* we are to consider the tone paradigmatic: the poem’s internal audience? the archaic performance audience? the modern audience? Austin would further take Helen’s recollections in the *Teikhoskopia* as paradigmatic, yet no other scholars seem to have made a similar claim. Such lack of consensus is simply symptomatic of the ‘top-down’ approach to the *paradeigmata*; all that remains clear is that the modern audience is not always attuned to judging what the Archaic Greek audience, or even a poem’s internal audience, would have considered paradigmatic.

While the suggestions of Austin and others are certainly of interest, and will be addressed fully in time, they unfortunately have no basis in—nor even an explicit connection to—an actual, indigenous poetics of the *paradeigma* as a ‘way of speaking’ in Archaic Greece. That is, is there a set of features that constitutes Austin’s “paradigmatic tone,” or that tips off the ancient audience to the paradigmatic meaning of Helen’s speech from the wall? It is to answer this question that I propose an emic, ‘bottom-up’ approach, that I plan to look not only at what scholars have previously identified as paradigmatic based on modern criteria. Instead, I plan to build a model of the essential discursive properties of telling a *paradeigma* in Archaic Greek poetry from a functional analysis of discursive properties that seem to make a meaningful difference to the Archaic Greek speakers within hexameter poetry. Only then can we determine whether the Archaic Greek audience would have been led to interpret a story as paradigmatic for other characters within the poems.

This approach necessarily involves broadening the scope of investigation, beyond *paradeigmata* proper to different types of wisdom articulations, and beyond Homeric poetry. My approach has been to start from the largest possible set of recollections of past actions that are to serve as a model for the action of the present audience, and from that aim to describe the essential discourse characteristics that mark them. Such an approach will allow us to start, not from the limits of our modern understanding of how a paradigmatic speech functions in the poem, but rather from how, at the level of discourse, an-
cient Greeks are depicted in their poetry as articulating such speeches. This will allow us not only to define the boundaries of paradigmatic discourse emically, but also to detect and evaluate deviations from the norm.

In sum, this ‘bottom-up’ approach to the entire corpus of Archaic hexameter has a few immediate payoffs. First, we shall be led to identify as paradigmatic inset narratives which have never been identified as paradeigmata before. Second, we shall be able to detect generic connections between various speech genres and the way in which speakers employ various combinations on various occasions. Third, we shall be able to detect the nuances of individual speeches, whether they represent transgressions of the norm or unusual variations. For example, while distinctions have, in the past, been made between a ‘recollection’ and a ‘paradeigma’, we shall find this far less helpful than one might expect. Once we have identified the essential emic discursive properties of paradeigmata, we shall be able to describe in detail the way in which outwardly simple ‘recollections’ or ‘genealogies’ can be told in a markedly paradigmatic way.

To call a speech ‘markedly paradigmatic’ suggests that the paradeigma constitutes a speech genre on its own. This need not be the case, but the attempt to define it as such is a worthwhile endeavor. It is nothing new to talk about the embedded speech genres in Greek poetry; just as Tzvetan Todorov predicted in 1978, “poetics [has] give[n]

44. Cf. Schiffrin 1994: 33: “[Another] direction available to functional analyses is a more emic direction: being with how particular units...are used and draw a conclusion about the broader functions of such units from that analysis. In other words, one would begin from observation and description of the utterance itself, and then try to infer from analysis of that utterance and its context what functions are being served. It is important to note that such inferences are not totally ad hoc: rather, they can be firmly grounded in principled schema as to what functions are available. But they do differ from more etic approaches because they are not as wed to the notion of system, and because they are more open to the discovery of unanticipated uses of language (see Hymes 1961).”

45. See, e.g., Achilles to Aeneas, Achilles to Xanthos, or Odysseus throughout the Odyssey (on which see Chapter 11, pp. 313–325 below).
way to the theory of discourse and to the analysis of its genres” (1990: 12). To be clear on our terms, we shall, with Todorov, describe a genre thus (1990: 17–18):

Genres are thus entities that can be described from two different viewpoints, that of empirical observation and that of abstract analysis. In a given society, the recurrence of certain discursive properties is institutionalized, and individual texts are produced and perceived in relation to the norm constituted by that codification. A genre, whether literary or not, is nothing other than the codification of discursive properties.

To place this statement in the context of our own investigation, we have discussed the shortcomings of the abstract analysis of genre above, and are rather approaching the telling of paradeigmata according to a codification of discursive properties. But what are discursive properties? Todorov takes the term in an inclusive sense, defining them for the literary genre as “any aspect of discourse that can be made obligatory” (18). These properties might have their origins in the semantic aspect of the text, in its syntactic aspect, or in the verbal aspect. Codification is nothing more than the institution of discourse features as obligatory to a particular genre; as an institution, a genre creates, not just a model for the speaker, but a set of expectations in the audience.

E Sociolinguistics, style, and discourse

These expectations are, of course, important not least in that one’s very interpretation of a given utterance is conditioned by one’s experience of that utterance’s character-

46. By 2004 it could even be called “commonplace” by Collins (2004: 167). In the context of Greek epic, the use of the term subgenre goes at least as far back as Householder and Nagy 1972.

47. Todorov (1990: 18) takes the first two terms from Charles Morris but adds the third, which he explains as “encompass[ing] everything connected with the material manifestations of the signs themselves.”

48. Of course, speakers can choose to transgress these expectations, which makes our study of the paradeigmata within the poems themselves all the more interesting.
istics in past contexts. Stylistics is sociological, and style is socially symbolic. The analysis of discourse, then, is an ‘interactional’ rather than ‘transactional’ view of language production: it treats language as expressing social relations, personal attitudes, as well as ideological orientation.

There is, again, no reason to take—even every methodological reason not to take—as premise that the telling of a paradeigma is what we might call a distinct ‘speech genre’. The outcome is irrelevant, for the real power of delineating its discourse properties will come from the possibility of highlighting nuanced sociocultural associations of the various genres and ideologies in Archaic Greek culture. From the audience’s perspective—that is, from the perspective of the ancient audience—we can begin to see what sort of sociocultural associations would have been in place for certain ways of speaking, including the paradeigma. If, however, it turns out that the paradeigma is not an effective generic category, by studying the generic resources and associations—that is, the various poetic traditions—on which Homeric performers draw in telling them, we stand to learn much about poetic performance in Archaic Greece.

---

49. Todorov’s (1990: 19) explanation of codification has further implications for our later, larger sociocultural levels of interpretation: a given “society chooses and codifies the [speech] acts that correspond most closely to its ideology.” This will become more important in Part Three, when a speaker’s style is approached not just as characterization but a means of encoding larger themes in the narrative.

50. On the call to a ‘sociological stylistics’ in the study of the novel—exposing from within all aspects of discourse, content and form alike—see esp. Bakhtin 1981: 300.


52. Thus able to ask: what really makes Achilles’ Niobe paradeigma successful?
Chapter 2 | Homer: *paradeigmata* and discourse

Comparative research into the formal traits of discourse has found that the way in which speakers use formal linguistic markers to signal the beginnings and ends of ‘paragraphs’ or ‘discourse units’ is *genre-specific*.¹ The point was perhaps first made by Grimes that there are ways of marking a new ‘paragraph’ in narrative, which are not used in formal, expository discourse.² I am in this section especially concerned with applying such findings to the way in which types of discourse are begun with particular discourse markers. For example, if someone starts a story with ‘once upon a time’ and speaks in short, choppy sentences, most audiences would try to fit the story into the genre of a fairy-tale and interpret it accordingly, even if the story deals solely with material taken directly from a television sitcom. If, on the other hand, the same sitcom were told without these discourse markers, it would most likely be interpreted as an entertaining story fit for television. Not recognizing such properties has led to no end of troubles in Homeric textual criticism, as I shall show. While work is now being done on these tiny features of natural language and oral discourse,³ the studies thus far have either been done at different levels of discourse⁴ or in much shorter form than the present inquiry.⁵

¹. See esp. Longacre 1979 and Lorimer 1950b. In the privileging the idea that discourse and coherence exist at the level of paragraph, we are moving away from the idea of ‘foci of consciousness’ as pursued by Chafe and Bakker, closer to the tradition of the ‘type-scene’.
⁴. See Bakker 1997b on a different scale. Martin (2000b), on Nestor’s speech in *Il. 11*, is working at an intermediate scale.
⁵. Irene de Jong (1997) briefly surveys the use of γὰρ in embedded narratives in Homer, Herodotus, Pindar, and Lysias. She makes the suggestion, *contra* Denniston, that γὰρ should
A Discourse units and discourse markers

A.1 Problems in Homeric discourse

In the Niobe paradeigma with which we began, Achilles introduces his tale with the particles καὶ γάρ τ’ (Il. 24.602). On the one hand, we might think that this particle string simply, or solely, works to connect the passage with the Achilles’ hortatory νῦν δὲ μνησώμεθα δόρπου (“But now let’s remember our meal”; 601). We might follow J. D. Denniston, who, in his seminal work on Greek particles, explains the particle string καὶ γάρ thus (s.v.):

I. Normally γάρ is the connective, and καί means either (1) ‘also’ or ‘even’: or (2) ‘in fact’: or (3) ‘both’, being answered by another καί.

But Denniston notes that “[i]t is sometimes hard to say whether καί refers to a single word, or to the clause or sentence as a whole.” The fact is, in the case of Homer, the two particles are often best taken together: as I shall show below, the particle string καὶ γάρ is an example of a sequentially-dependent discourse marker, which brackets a particular segment of discourse. These are not arbitrary or imprecise combinations of particles here, nor do they amount to something as simple as the English “for indeed.” They instead mark a speaker’s attitude toward a given stretch of discourse, as well as prepare the audience for a particular type of content. That is, these particles belong more to the ‘interac-

sometimes be understood to have a function at the level of ‘text’ rather than ‘sentence’, and might look forward, rather than backward; the scholia as I have presented them here could be used in support of such an argument. While she cites some examples involving καὶ γάρ, she does not distinguish it from the less marked γάρ.


7. Note that he treats καὶ γάρ alongside και...γάρ. Below I shall make clear why, with very few exceptions, these should not generally be considered equivalent. Denniston himself notes (110): “Where the particles are separated, καί usually goes closely with the following word or words.” Only two cases occur in Homeric poetry: Od. 1.317 (“οὐ μὲν γάρ τι φύγεσκε βαθείης βένθεσιν ὑλῆς | κνώδαλον, ὅττι δίοιτο καὶ ἱξυοεῖ γάρ περιήδη.”) and h.Dem. 258 (“καὶ σὺ γάρ ἀφραδίσι τεῖς μῆκιστον ἀάσθης.”).
tional’ function of language than the ‘transactional’; they create a connection with the audience, and predispose them to a certain interpretation of the discourse that follows.

Denniston is not alone in finding the varied uses of such particle strings troubling; indeed, they have caused especial difficulty for textual critics, ancient and modern alike. As I shall show, however, they have perhaps caused the most trouble for modern critics. A good example is Achilles’ paradeigma of Heracles in Iliad 18 (vv. 117–19):

οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίη Ἡρακλῆος φύγε κῆρα,
ὅς περ φίλτατος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἀνακτή
ἀλλὰ ἐ μοῖρα δάμασσε καὶ ἄργαλέος χόλος Ἡρη.

You know, not even the strength of Heracles fled destruction, although he was dearest of all to lord Zeus, son of Kronos; instead fate beat him down—that and the troublesome anger of Hera.

On οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ, Walter Leaf writes in his 1900 commentary to the Iliad (ad 18.117): “The first οὐδὲ belongs as usual to the whole sentence, which is thus brought into connexion with what precedes, while the second belongs to βίη Ἡρ., ‘for neither did even the mighty H.,’ etc.” While it fails to recognize the function of this string of discourse markers as introducing the paradeigma, it may result in a sensible translation.

There have been, however, more dire consequences for such misinterpretations. In Iliad 6, Glaukos, in the course of reciting his genealogy, elaborates it with the story of Bellerophon (vv. 200–2):

ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ καὶ κεῖνος ἀπήχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσιν,
ἡτοὶ δὲ καὶ πεδίον τὸ Ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλᾶτο
ὅν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἄνθρωπῶν ἀλεείνων.

But when that Bellerephon came to be hated by all the gods, you know, he then wandered alone over the Aleian plain, devouring his own heart, avoiding the path of men.

The particle καὶ in v. 200 has been troublesome. Indeed, it has led some even to suspect that the verses have been interpolated. Leaf nicely summarizes some of the past approaches in his own interpretation of the passage (ad 200–2).:

These lines interrupt the narration, and Köchly considers them interpolated, though there is no obvious reason why they should have been inserted here. καί seems to indicate that they belong to another context, for it is not in relation with anything else. Monro takes it to mean ‘even he, whom they had formerly loved and protected.’ Ameis’ explanation, ‘Bellerophon like Lykurgos,’ (140) is too far-fetched, and Porphyrios’ ‘like his children’ is open to the obvious and fatal objection that the anger of the gods against his children does not precede but follows. Again, as the passage stands, “τὴν δὲ” in 205 is too far separated from its antecedent in 198. If 200–2 followed 205 there would be no further difficulty.

The καί has led more recent scholars to suppose that this story once belonged to a lost catalogue poem,10 and this idea has retained its attractiveness. While Julia Haig Gaisser recognizes that it must remain speculation, even so she finds the suggestion too hard to resist (1969b: 176):

Of course none of this can be proved, since the stories themselves are the only evidence for such a catalog, but some connection between the tales is an excellent explanation for the otherwise awkward καί which introduces Bellerophon’s fall (6.200): ἀλλ’ ὅτε δὴ καὶ κεῖνος ἀπήχθετο πᾶσι θεοῖσι.

While I shall not disagree in the end that catalogue poetry is likely to have played a part in this mythopoetic process, there are three problems with this suggestion: it makes an argument ex silentio; it ignores the actual syntax and use of discourse particles as used in extant catalogue poetry; and, further, it does not do sufficient comparative work within the tradition itself or even look to the ancient grammarians’ view of such discourse markers.

As I noted, the Alexandrian scholars, particularly Aristonicus, were especially concerned with the meaning of particles, linking them even to τὸ Ὅµηρικὸν ἔθος (“the Homeric ethos”), or, more generally, an ἔθος ποιητικόν (“poetic ethos”).11 Such approaches recorded in the scholia have too often been overlooked, and really only drawn

11. Cf., e.g., the H scholion on Od. 10.189: Καλλίστρατός φησιν ὡς ὑπὸ τινος ὁ στίχος προτέτακται ἀγνοοῦντος τὸ Ὅµηρικὸν ἔθος, ὡς θέλει ἄρχεσθαι ἀπὸ τοῦ γάρ.
on by those studying the editorial criteria and techniques of the Alexandrians. One illuminating locus of disagreement in such studies has been I. 17.219–24:

\[ \text{οὐ γάρ ἐγὼ πληθὺν διξήμενος οὐδὲ χατίζων ἐνθάδ' ἄφ' ὑμετέρων πολίων ἣγειρα ἕκαστον, ἀλλ' ἵνα μοι Τρώων ἀλόχους καὶ νήπια τέκνα προφρονεώς ῥύοισθε ϕιλοπτολέων ὑπ' Αχαιῶν.} \]

Urging on all of these men Hector spoke with winged words: “Listen up, you countless tribes of neighboring allies. Neither desiring a multitude, nor needing one, did I assemble you here from your cities, but so that you might out of good will defend the wives and innocent children of the Trojans from the war-loving Achaians.

Even for those who are not concerned with issues of authenticity, the γάρ in v. 221 has been troubling, since it does not refer back to the previous line in the expected, causal way. Mark Edwards is not far off in saying that the γάρ points forward, but he is perhaps too specific. I think rather that the Alexandrian scholar Aristonicus has essentially the right idea, as reported in an A scholion there:

\[ \text{οὐ γάρ ἐγὼ πληθὺν διξήμενος: ὅτι ἀπὸ τοῦ γάρ ἢρξατο, ὡς καὶ ἐπ' ἑκείνου 'ὡς ϕίλοι, οὐ γάρ τ' ἵ<ν>μεν ὑπ' ζόφος} \]

Because it starts anew from the γάρ, as also in the case of Od. 10.190 (ὡς ϕίλοι, οὐ γάρ τ' ἵ<ν>μεν ὑπ' ζόφος).

---

13. For one revision to Denniston’s description of γάρ, see Sicking and Ophuijsen 1993 on the particle being primarily explanatory.
14. Edwards (ad loc.) does suggest that the γάρ looks forward to τῶ, in v. 227, contra Moulton 1981: 6n12. While this seems to work in this situation, I find this too specific to account for the rest of the cases. See Apthorp 1980: 8–9 for a discussion of the textual problems and the scholiastic commentary. On γάρ and ‘inversion’, see Monro 1891: 348.2, but compare Bakker 1997b: 114 for a more discourse-oriented summary of the way in which γάρ takes part in explanatory “goal-seeking statements” that look ahead.
15. For an expanded translation of this scholion, see Apthorp (1980: 9): “γάρ here does not refer back to line 220 any more than γάρ in Od. 10.190 refers back to line 189: in both places it is part of the new beginning.” On namque in Vergil’s Georgics, Thomas (ad 4.125) anticipates my argument: noting that “indicates, like καὶ γάρ in Greek, that what follows will be an independent episode; so at E 6.31 the song of Silenus begins namque canebat uti ...; or the ecphrasis on Dido’s temple at A. 1.466 namque videbat uti ...” For namque and καὶ γάρ, see also Fraenkel 1957: 185.
The point is that this is one way to begin a speech, perhaps a particular sort of speech, in accordance with τὸ Ὅμηρικόν ἔθος. Nor is this the lone case of ancient scholars recognizing that Greek particles were not only close causal connectors, but discourse markers that worked, as we have learned in modern sociolinguistics, on the level of ‘discourse unit’ or ‘paragraph’: there are at least a dozen more examples in the ancient comments on Homeric poetry.16

A.2 Discourse markers

To begin this investigation with an analysis of discourse markers is particularly appropriate to our emic approach to telling paradeigmata in Archaic Greek poetry. The study of such discourse markers has been a burgeoning field within the sociolinguistic study of oral narrative and discourse,17 with findings that describe the way in which a given community tends to show consistent patterns of discourse markers to begin different portions of their narrative performances.18 As Longacre puts it, these “mystery particles” have “a function which relates to the unit larger than the sentence, i.e. to the paragraph and the discourse” (1976: 468). In bracketing units of discourse, they are both cataphoric and anaphoric: the γάρ in Iliad 17 above is both cataphoric and anaphoric in the sense that it signals the end of a segment in announcing the beginning of a new one.19 In most Western languages these erstwhile ‘mystery particles’ tend to be conjunctions, adverbs,

16. Further examples of this very phenomenon in the scholia to both the Iliad and Odyssey include: Σ Il. 2.284 (Ariston.), 7.328 (Ariston.), 13.736 (ex.), 17.221 (Ariston.), 18.182 (Did.), 23.627 (Ariston. | Nic.); Od. 1.337 (M.S.), 10.174 (H.Q.), 10.189 (H), 10.501 (H), 14.196 (H).


18. The first comprehensive study on this topic is Schiffrin 1986. More recently, see Blakemore 2002 and Siepmann 2005. For a recent application of Schiffrin’s approach to modern Greek storytelling, see Georgakopoulou 1997; for the verbal texture regained by such approaches to folklore and oral tradition, see Hymes 1981. For a discussion at the intersection of ethnopoetics and textual criticism, see Hymes 1994.

or lexicalized phrases; in English these markers are some of our most common words: oh, well, and, but, or, so, because, now, then, I mean, and y’know. When acting as discourse markers, however, these texture-creating ‘words’ cease to be conjunctions in the grammatical sense: they are freed from syntactic constraints they might have when acting as conjunctions. Detachable in this way, they work only at the discourse level,\(^{20}\) rather than at the level of smaller units such as the ‘sentence’.\(^{21}\) One feature that makes such a phenomenon possible is that discourse markers are initial in their placement; they appear first in their particular discourse segment.\(^{22}\) Further, strings of such markers like καὶ γάρ are sequentially dependent; that is, an initial καὶ γάρ such as we saw in the Niobe paradeigma differs from each of ‘καὶ…γάρ’, ‘…καὶ γάρ’, and ‘γάρ καὶ’.\(^{23}\) As slot-dependent fixed phrases, we might usefully think of them in the context of hexameter poetry as formulae, but for the fact that they work on different planes of discourse. Formulae, that is, fulfill a definite semantic function, while discourse markers take part in a “a process of

---

20. On their local and global functions at this discourse level, see especially Schiffrin 1994. She elsewhere articulates (1986) a discourse model with different planes—a participation framework, information state, ideational structure, exchange structure—but this is less helpful and convincing.

21. Not that the ‘sentence’ is even a clear or useful concept in discourse analysis, and is used here with the understanding that the most common, ‘textual’ sense of the word is meant.

22. On the markedness of this position, see especially the discussion of the ‘fronting’ of particles in Wills 1993: 64: “Of importance for us is the fact that even some particles can be in first position … These particles are probably not being emphasized but are archaic survivals of times when they were sentence-introductory elements, like Hittite nu-u or Old Irish no. Because some particles can be fronted, the most accurate examples of unmarked particle order are instances where a non-particle occupies the first position in the sentence and where we can be then sure that none of the particles have been fronted.”

23. Many such ‘strings’, or ‘chains’, of particles undergo a process of ‘univerbation’ in which they become formulaic to the extent of being inseparable. On this process, and more generally the order of particles in Homer, see especially Wills 1993. Regarding the significance of these appositive clusters to poetic grammar, Calvert Watkins states: “Prepositives alone are ‘inert’; but when they are themselves followed by a postpositive, they do count as an initial group” (Watkins and Oliver 1994: 1009). Compare, then, our καὶ γάρ to the lone postpositive γάρ, which cannot occupy the emphatic first position (on this type of ‘epic regression’ see Krischer 1971: 136–140 and Bakker 1997b: 113–115). See Siepmann 2005 for a study especially of multi-word discourse markers.
social interaction” and are comparable to indexicals, or, in a broad sociolinguistic framework, contextualization cues” (Schiffrin 2001: 56,58).24 We are not, therefore, investigating formula and theme on the transactional level of language, like Parry and Lord, but rather a sort of formula and style at the interactional level of language.

A.3 Coherence, style shifting, and exemplification

That a speaker uses discourse markers to segment his or her speech has two immediate effects: first, it lends a coherence to that ‘unit of talk’ and, second, signals to the audience that the new ‘unit of talk’ is different from the preceding or following discourse. This signaling of difference is key, for a primary reason for marking discourse as different seems to be ‘style shifting’, especially as shaped by interactional contexts.25 Discourse markers, then, are cues to the contextualization, and therefore interpretation, of a given utterance.26 Such findings are clearly relevant to our attempt to describe fully the discourse properties of embedded narratives or digressions that are to be interpreted by its native audience as paradeigmata. It is even the case that modern discourse analysts have found such uses of discourse markers in the process of exemplification in discourse. As Diane Blakemore remarks (1997: 109):

the hearer must recognize that an utterance is intended as an exemplification before he or she can understand it, for the assumption that the state of affairs is an example plays a central role in the recovery of its contextual effects.

On the one hand, the initial, sequential discourse particles such as καὶ γάρ signal a particular relationship to the previous statement. But that relationship is not, as is so often supposed, simply a local, causal connection. Beyond any local function, such a string of discourse particles also functions at a global scale, which indicates to the audience that a shift in style is imminent, and, in turn, recommends what attitude they are to take toward the upcoming discourse. Just as we saw in Aristonicus’ analysis above, these particles

24. On the complex ways in which cultural, social, and situational norms have an effect on the distribution and function of markers, see esp. Celle and Huart 2007 and Siepmann 2005.
can simply mark the beginning of a stretch of discourse according to a particular ethos, or orientation toward the audience.

B Discourse markers and paradeigmata in Homeric poetry

To emphasize once again, the demarcation of shifts in style is not a process that exists only in a self-conscious speaker. As we have noted, as listeners we have a propensity to look for regularities in discourse and generalizing about the expectations of a particular genre.27 This is, of course, based on a listener’s past experience of similar speeches, and the linguistic features therein. To return to our simplest example, when a speaker begins a story with “Once upon a time,” he gives the listener a good clue about what to expect in what follows: the listener is to expect a fairy tale.28

So too, I argue, do such discourse ‘formulae’ of particles mark the paradeigmata in Homeric poetry, albeit in a different register. Consider, for example, the paradeigma of II. 19.87–138,29 which begins with exactly the same two-word, line-initial discourse marker, that we encounter in Achilles’ speech to Priam in Book 24. In Book 19, as

27. Discourse markers are but a single case among those features which are acknowledged in discussions of the principles of ‘local interpretation’ and of ‘analogy’ (on which see esp. Brown and Yule 1983: 61–63).

28. Likewise, when a story begins with “Three guys walk into a bar,” the listener surely expects a joke, most likely an off-color one. To begin a story with “Once upon a time three guys walked into a bar” is a blatant disruption of generic convention and, thus, an audience’s expectations. Compare Bauman’s (2001: 58) independent formulation: “When an utterance is assimilated to a particular genre, the process by which it is produced and interpreted is mediate through its relationship with prior texts. The invocation of a generic framing device such as ‘Once upon a time’ carries with it a set of expectations concerning the further unfolding of the discourse, indexing other texts begun by this opening formula. These expectations constitute a textual model for creating cohesion and coherence, for producing and interpreting particular constellations of features and their formal and functional relations, that is, for generating textuality” (58).

29. No modern study denies that this speech is paradigmatic, but I shall show below how extraordinarily unique it is for Homeric poetry. That it was paradigmatic was recognized also in antiquity; see also Σ 19.95a4: μακρολογεῖ δὲ θεραπεύων Αχιλλέα, ὡς οὐκ αὐτός αὐτῷ ἀπωλείας αἰτίος Πατρόκλου. καλῶς δὲ ἐκ Πελοποννήσου τὸ παράδειγμα ἔλαβεν (cf. Τ 115—8). b(BE3)Γ (5).
Agamemnon defends his having been deceived by ἀτη in the presence of the Achaean host, he tells the story of Zeus having once been deceived in this way (vv. 19.95–9):

καὶ γάρ δὴ νῦ ποτὲ Ζεὺς ἄσατο, τὸν περ ἀριστον ἀνδρόν ἦδε θεὸν φασὶ ἐμμεναι: ἀλλ᾽ ἁρα καὶ τὸν Ἦρη θῆλυς έουσα δολοφροσύνης ἀπάτησεν, ἠματι τῷ ὃτ᾽ ἐμελε βίην Ἡρακληεῖν Ἀλκμηνη τέξεσθαι ἐὔστεφάνῳ ἐνὶ Θήβῃ.

You know, Zeus was deceived once too, whom they say is the best of gods and mortals. But even him Hera deceived in her craftiness, though she’s a woman, on that day when Alkmene was about to give birth to the strength of Herakles in strong-walled Thebes.

The two-word story is simple: Ζεὺς ἄσατο (“Zeus was deceived”; v. 95). The simplicity is almost proverbial, and made the more so by this particular string of particles καὶ γάρ, here emphasized by the additional δὴ νῦ ποτὲ. Agamemnon, in the language of paradeigma, is saying: “You know, Zeus was deceived once too,” and then lends authority to its relevance with a retelling of the story in a way that suits his purpose.

B.1 καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ

That Agamemnon chooses to begin his story in this way is not surprising: καὶ γάρ and its negative counterpart, οὐδὲ γάρ, are two of the most common ways for a speaker to introduce a story which is to be understood paradigmatically, whether positively or negatively. Following the corpus-wide search methodology described above—rather than limiting ourselves to previous notions of which stretches of discourse in Archaic Greek hexameter are paradigmatic—we can see that, while not all, many paradeigmata

30. The word ποτε, of course, regularly occurs with καὶ γάρ. See, e.g., Od. 18.138, 19.75. On the separate mechanics of the particle chain δὴ νῦ ποτε, see Wills 1993: 76–77.

31. As Denniston (1996: 111) notes, s.v. οὐδὲ γάρ; οὐδὲ...γάρ. West (1966) agrees; see his comment on οὐδὲ γάρ at Th. 614.

32. I must note here that the particle γάρ alone seems never to introduce an embedded narrative that is meant to be paradigmatic. The string καὶ γάρ is distinct from the uses of γάρ that de Jong (1997) details, including ‘epic regression’. This distinction further underscores the importance of a discourse-oriented approach to particles as summarized above.
begin with just such a string of particles. Table 1 below indicates this trend in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*:

**Table 1: Discourse markers καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ in paradeigma candidates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Discourse Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>II.</em> 2.292</td>
<td>Odysseus to Agamemnon (generic man)</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ τίς θ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>II.</em> 6.130</td>
<td>Diomedes to Glaukos (Lycurgus)</td>
<td>οὐδὲ γάρ οὐδὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>II.</em> 18.117</td>
<td>Achilles to Thetis (Heracles)</td>
<td>οὐδὲ γάρ οὐδὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>II.</em> 9.533</td>
<td>Phoenix to Achilles (Meleager)</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>II.</em> 9.502</td>
<td>Phoenix to Achilles (<em>Litai</em>)</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ τ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>II.</em> 19.95</td>
<td>Agamemnon to Achaean (Zeus)</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ δὴ νῦ ποτε</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>II.</em> 24.602</td>
<td>Achilles to Priam (Niobe)</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ τ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 4.199</td>
<td>Peisistratos to Menelaos (Antilokhos)</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 8.32</td>
<td>Alcinous to Phaeacians</td>
<td>οὐδὲ γάρ οὐδὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 10.327</td>
<td>Odysseus reporting Circe to Phaeacians</td>
<td>οὐδὲ γάρ οὐδὲ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 18.138</td>
<td>Odysseus to Amphinomos (self)*33</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ ἐγὼ ποτ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 19.75</td>
<td>Odysseus to Melantho (self)</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ ἐγὼ ποτ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 19.265</td>
<td>Odysseus to Penelope</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ τίς θ’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 19.510*34</td>
<td>Penelope to Odysseus (geese)</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ δὴ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We shall see shortly that a number of shared characteristics of *paradeigmata* follow such discourse markers as καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ,*35* but a first observation might be the habit of a speaker to heap additional markers onto the bases καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ.

Agamemnon in Book 19, as we saw above, is a great example of this. Further, the addition of the second οὐδὲ simply underscores the point that the first οὐδὲ is best taken as part of the discourse marker οὐδὲ γάρ.*36* One result of approaching *paradeigmata* in this way is that, in speeches such as that of Phoenix in the Embassy, attention has never been

*33.* In Chapter 11 (pp. 313–325 below), we shall discuss the more poetic implications of this way of speaking in the service of self-mythologization: *Od.* 18.138 (Odysses to Amphinomos, καὶ γάρ ἐγὼ ποτ’); *Od.* 19.75 (Odysses to Melantho, καὶ γάρ ἐγὼ ποτε); *Od.* 4.199–202 (Peisistratos to Menelaos, καὶ γάρ).

*34.* See below pp. 40–42 below.

*35.* The full list of occurrences of οὐδὲ γάρ is: *II.* 5.22, 6.130, 10.25, 13.269, 14.33, 14.503, 18.117, 19.411, 24.566; *Od.* 8.32, 10.327, 23.266. Many such instances deserve remark for their slight variation upon the *paradeigma’s* ‘way of speaking’, but are edge cases.

*36.* *Contra* other interpretation discussed at p. 29 above.
drawn to the καὶ γάρ. In yet more speeches, the approach uncovers stories told that have never been recognized as paradigmata, or at least drawing on the paradeigma’s ‘way of speaking’. They may not refer to the mythic past, that is, but they are told in the same way as those which do; this makes them all the more interesting for the expectations they must have elicited from their ancient audience.

B.2 Phoenix and Meleager (II. 9.524–605)

If Achilles’ Niobe paradeigma might be taken as the Iliad’s model of the speech-genre, Phoenix’s paradeigma of Meleager in Book 9 is certainly its centerpiece. In a speech stretching over 170 lines (vv. 434–605), the paradeigma itself spans verses 529–599. At such a scale it is natural that some critics would be inclined to charge it with a lack of structure or a meandering course, but scholars have also done well to begin to describe its generic diversity. Attending to such aspects as its generic coherence and observing properties of oral discourse, I shall argue that it is marked for the audience by a καὶ γάρ in just such a way as we have seen already.

It is worth looking at the structure in detail. Phoenix does not enter into his narration immediately, rather he prefaces it with a description of the uses of κλέα ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων τῶν πρόσθεν, a veritable programmatic statement of the ‘genre’ of paradeigma (9.524–8):

οὖτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν ἡρώων, ὅτε κέν τιν’ ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἤκοι·
δωρητοὶ τε πέλοντο παράρρητοί τ᾽ ἐπέεσσι.
μέμνημαι τόδε ἁργὸν ἐν γάρ πάλαι οὐ ἄλογον γε ὡς ἦν ἐν δ᾽ ὡμίν ἐρέω πάντεσσι φίλοις.

Likewise we have heard the glorious deeds of men of old who were warriors, when furious wrath came on one of them; they could be won over by gifts, and turned aside by

---

37. Cf. Griffin (ad 434), who remarks on Phoenix’s unpredictable course, as if he were, like Ajax, thinking out the speech as he goes.
words. I myself recall this deed of past days and not of yesterday, how it was; and I will tell it among you who are all my friends.

In these lines Phoenix emphasizes that the speech he makes among his dear friends. We might expect the paradeigma to begin with the discourse marker καὶ γάρ immediately. Instead we get a four-verse segment setting up the paradeigma proper:

Κουρήτες τ᾽ ἐμάχοντο καὶ Αἰτωλοὶ μενεχάρμαι ἀμφὶ πόλιν Καλυδῶνα καὶ ἀλλήλους ἐνάριζον, Αἰτωλοὶ μὲν ἀμιμόμενοι Καλυδῶνος ἔρανης, Κουρήτες δὲ διαπραθέειν μεμαζότες Ἄρηι.

The Kouretes were fighting, with the steadfast Aitolians about the city of Calydon, and they were slaughtering one another: the Aitolians defending lovely Calydon; the Kouretes eager to sack it in war.

These four lines which describe the general state of affairs contain only two finite verbs, the imperfects ἐμάχοντο (529) and ἐνάριζον (530). As such, they are less bound to the exemplary tale: in discourse-analytic terms they are the story’s ‘orientation’, which is most often optional in narrative oral discourse. Instead, just like Achilles in Book 24 and Agamemnon in Book 19, Phoenix marks the beginning of the paradeigma itself, the ‘complicating action’, when he comes to the next verb, the aorist ὀρσε in v. 533 (vv. 533–6).

---

40. On the poetics of the phrase ἐν δ᾽ ὑμῖν ἐρέω πάντεσσι φίλοισι, see esp. Nagy 1999: 106; for the connection to parainesis and lyric poetry, see also p. 238.

41. On the term ‘orientation’ and its occurrence in oral narrative structure, see Labov and Waletzky 1967: 32, where they describe the ‘orientation’ section of a narrative as occurring in 11 of 14 oral narratives, while lacking in the simpler ones. Their best example of a narrative with an ‘orientation’ (#6; p. 16) comprises a total of 8 verbs: 5 imperfects and 3 past tense of stative (rather than eventive) meaning. As Georgakopoulou (1997: 9–10) found in her study of Modern Greek storytelling, the orientation section, which comprises past progressive verbs, is often missing in contexts of shared assumptions and familiarity. (That Labov and Waletzky were interviewing strangers may explain their rather high frequency of initial ‘orientation’ sections.) In any case, the length and unusually large audience of Phoenix’ speech is the interesting exception of the usual lack of up-front orientation in paradeigmata.

42. The only past paradeigma to begin with an imperfect verb, as opposed to an aorist, is that of Diomedes (II. 6.123–43). But it is a special case, being the imperfect of εἰμι, which has no aorist in use.
καὶ γάρ τοῖς κακῶν χρυσόθρονος Ἀρτεμίς ᾄρσε
χωσιμένη ὑπὸ οἷς οὐ τι βαλύσια γαυνῷ ἀλωῆς
Οἰνεὺς πέξ᾽ ἀλλοί δὲ θεοὶ δαίσυνθ᾽ ἑκατόμβας,
οὐ δ᾽ οὐκ ἔφεξε Διὸς κοῦρη μεγάλοιο

You know, on them golden-throned Artemis sent an evil, angry about the fact that Oineus had not offered first-fruits to her among the produce of his orchard: the rest of the gods had their share of the hecatombs, but to her alone, the daughter of great Zeus, he gave nothing.

If we were to suppose that the particle string καὶ γάρ linked Artemis’ action as explanatory of the war between the Aitolians and the Kouretes, we would be missing several steps in the causal chain. Phoenix is here using καὶ γάρ just as Achilles and Agamemnon do, but in a less abbreviated narrative, one which allows a fuller ‘orientation’ before the ‘complicating action’.

B.3 Discourse marker καὶ γάρ and the language of allegory

The table “Discourse markers καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ in paradeigma candidates” (p. 37) contains several loci that are not normally included in discussion of paradeigmata in Homer. This is not a fault of my methodology, but rather a virtue. For, the discourse particles used for paradeigmata are often the same used for extended gnomic statements and allegories, and, therefore, these deserve our attention, too. For example, in that table, I have included Phoenix’ allegory of the Litai (Il. 9.502–7), which employs the very same discourse particles with which Achilles begins his paradeigma in Book 24. The allegory is, strictly speaking, separable from the paradeigma, and normally omitted from such studies, but there is also something instructive and interesting about the fact that both are introduced by the same expanded form καὶ γάρ τ᾽. Phoenix introduces his description of the Litai within the Meleager paradeigma in Book 9 in this way (vv. 502–7):

καὶ γάρ τε λιταί εἰσι Διὸς κοῦραι μεγάλοιο
χωλαί τε ρυσαί τε παραβλώπες τ᾽ ὀφθαλμώ,
αἱ βαῖ τε καὶ μετόπιοι ἀττις ἀλέγουσι κιοῦσαι.
> ἦ δ᾽ ἀτη σθεναρῇ τε καὶ ἀρτίπος, οὔεκα πάσας
ζούλλον ὑπεκπροθεῖ, φθάνει δὲ τε πᾶσαν ἐπὶ αἰαν
βλάττουσ᾽ ἀνθρώπωσ᾽ αἱ δ᾽ ἐξακέονται ὀπίσσω.

You know, there are Litai, the daughters of great Zeus—lame, and wrinkled, and looking askance—who toil on their way behind Ate. but she, Ate, is strong and nimble-footed, and
so she far outruns all the Litai, and outruns them into every land to harm men. And the Litai heal the men behind her.

That Phoenix uses the discourse marker καὶ γάρ for both purposes—paradeigma and allegory—in the same speech lends certain support to there being a meaningful connection between the uses. In fact, combined with the λιταί εἰσι just following it, the discourse marker creates a kind of statement recognized as characteristic of admonitory literature.43

We may go still further, and compare Phoenix’ allegory of the Litai to Penelope’s allegory of the geese in Odyssey 19 (vv. 518–52). There Penelope uses the expanded form καὶ γάρ δὴ to introduce the discourse comprising the allegory (vv. 509–14):

“ξεῖνε, τὸ μὲν σ’ ἔτι τυτθὼν ἐγὼν εἰρήσομαι αὐτή: καὶ γάρ δὴ κοίτοι τάχ’ ἐσσεται ἡδέος ὀρη, ὅν τινα γ’ ὑπόνοι ἔλοι γλυκερός, καὶ κηδόμενον περ. αὐτάρ ἔμοι καὶ πένθος ἀμέτρητον πόρε δαίμων: ἡμιτα μὲν γὰρ τέρπο τρόπον ὀδυρομένη, γοώσα, ἐς τ’ ἐμὰ ἐργ’ ὀρόσωσα καὶ ἀμφιπόλον ἐνὶ οίκῳ.

Stranger, I’ll ask you this myself, for a little while longer. You know, it will soon be time for pleasant sleep, for whomever sweet sleep seizes, even the one who’s troubled. But to me a daemon gave infinite sorrow. My days I spend them mourning, lamenting, as I see to my work and that of the handmaids in my house.

43. On this form of utterance, καὶ γάρ τε λιταί εἰσι, cp. West (1978: ad 11–46) on admonitory literature and utterances of the form ‘There is such a god as…’ West compares WD 10–11: Οὐκ ἀρα μοῦνον ἔν Ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ γαίαν | εἰσὶ δύω (see also Martin 2004a: 36–41 on this ἀρα, as well as West ad loc.), WD 256 (ἡ δὲ τε παρθένος ἐστὶ Δίκη, Διὸς ἐκγεγαυῖα), Alcman 1.36 (ἔστι τις αἰῶν τίς), Antimachus fr. 53 Wyss: ἔστι δὲ τις Νέμεσις μεγάλη θεός, ἥ τάδε πάντα | πρὸς μακάρων ἔλαχεν. One might further compare Penelope’s description of the horn and ivory gates (Od. 19.562): δοιαὶ γάρ τε πύλαι ἀμετηρών εἰσὶν ὄνειρων, which is itself reminiscent of Achilles’ description of the two jars (Il. 24.518–51): δοιοὶ γάρ τε πίθοι κατακέιται ἐν Διός οὐδεί. Cf. Held 1987 for more on parable and paradeigmata in Homer, and the discussion in Chapter 12.
The speech is elaborated to include a lament of her present state of affairs and a simile involving Pandareus’ daughter the nightingale. But the centerpiece is clearly the allegory of the geese and the eagle (vv. 535–37):

> ἀλλ’ ἄγε μοι τὸν ὅνειρον ὑπόκριναι καὶ ἄκουσον.  
> χήνες μοι κατὰ οἶκον ἑξίκοσι πυρὸν ἔδουσιν  
> ἐξ ὕδατος, καὶ τέ αφίνανοι ἐἰσορόωσα.

But come now, listen to and interpret this dream. I have twenty geese throughout my house, eating wheat, out of the water, and I grow warm just looking upon them.

The allegory is, of course, interpreted for Penelope by the dream’s own eagle, and through this symbolic dream Penelope describes the return of her husband to Odysseus.

### B.4 ἦτοι μὲν γάρ

It would be surprising, and actually rather disappointing, if all paradeigmata began with some form of καὶ γάρ or οὐδὲ γάρ. While καὶ γάρ is the most common discourse particle for the introduction of paradeigmata, another such particle string is ἦτοι (μὲν) γάρ. In Homeric poetry this string is generally used to introduce a paradigmatic

---

44. The story is not known from any other ancient source (cf. Russo in Heubeck et al. 1988, ad 518–24), but note the discussion of Penelope’s other, paradigmatic story—of Pandareus’ daughters—at p. 93 below, which I tie to metamorphosis in catalogue poetry such as the Catalogue of Women. Interestingly, a scholion (ad 518) notes an alternate tale, which involves a certain Aedon jealous of Niobe’s large family—an interesting comparison to Achilles’ Niobe paradeigma of Iliad 24.

45. In fact, if allegorical in its depiction of Penelope as nightingale, it is also prophetic in potentially predicting the loss of her own son. I submit that the presence of καὶ γάρ only helps this interpretation. See more below at p. 93.

46. On such an ‘omen’ scene, see de Jong 2001 (ad 525–69) with refs.

47. There are two possible objections to my parentheses here. First, I have emphasized the importance of discourse markers being sequentially dependent (p. 33 above), but I here consider ἦτοι μὲν γάρ and ἦτοι γάρ together. I consider ἦτοι μὲν γάρ to be the full form in Homeric poetry, and shall explain the two deviations in place. A second objection might be that, in the MS tradition of Homeric poetry, occurrences of ἦτοι and ἦ τοι are often confused. In the cases I have listed here in Table 2 (on p. 43), there is in Allen 1931 no variation between ἦτοι and ἦ τοι reported in the MSS, underscoring the status of this particle string as a recognized discourse marker.
narrative about someone already introduced explicitly, or whom the context has already made clear as the topic of discourse.48 Such is the case in Agamemnon’s speech to Diomedes in Iliad 4 (vv. 372–80):

That wasn’t Tydeus’ way, to crouch in fear, but rather to fight with the enemy far ahead of his own companions. So they say, those who saw him going at it; I never met nor even saw him, but they say he surpassed all others.

We shall discuss more of the discourse features of this speech below, but for now I proleptically call attention here only to the way in which Agamemnon begins this paradeigma primarily as a genealogical comparison,49 repeating the verb φασί.50

In Table 2 below (Discourse marker ἤτοι (μὲν) γάρ in paradeigma candidates) I have outlined all of the uses of ἤτοι (μὲν) γάρ in Homeric poetry, a phrase which happens to be limited to the Iliad.

Table 2: Discourse marker ἤτοι (μὲν) γάρ in paradeigma candidates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verses</th>
<th>Context</th>
<th>Discourse Marker</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


49. The rebuke however is collapsed with, or derived from, praise. The ex. Σ 372 reads: τὴν ὑβρίν μειοὶ ὁ ἐπαινοῦ τοῦ πατρός· ἦδεα γάρ τὰ τῶν πατέρων ἐγκώιμα λεγόμενα. ξενικωτέρας δὲ διαλέξεις βουλεῖται εἰσαγαγεῖν, ἢ ἐν κεφαλαίοις μὲν εἰρήται, τῇ δὲ ποιήσει ἐπιτέταται.

50. On the use of which in genealogical and paradigmatic contexts in Homer, see n.173 on p. 102 below.
Not all of these Homeric occurrences in the table above might seem to be paradigmatic at first; some are indeed just recollections of past events still in memory. But recollections, as we shall see, can be articulated especially authoritatively or emotively when marked in the way an audience might expect a paradeigma to be.

Such an example is to be found in Andromache’s speech in Book 6 of the Iliad. She tells Hector the story of her father Eëtion, her brothers, her mother, and the fall of the city in general, Citing all the various members of her family as precedents for Hector’s own death, should he choose to face Achilles in battle (vv. 411–32):

\[
\text{oú γάρ ἑτ' ἄλλη}
\]
\[
\text{ἔσται θαλπωρῆ ἐπεὶ ἄν σὺ γε πότιμον ἐπὶπῆς ἀλλ' ἄχε'- οὐδὲ μοι ἐστὶ πατήρ καὶ πότιμα μήτηρ.}
\]
\[
\text{ἤτοι γὰρ πατέρ' ἀμοῦ ἀπέκτανε δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς,}
\]
\[
\text{> ἐκ δὲ πόλιν πέρσεν Κιλίκων εὖ ναϊετάουσαν}
\]
\[
\text{Θήβην ὑψίπυλον· κατὰ δ' ἐκτανὲν Ηετίωνα,}
\]
\[
\text{> οὐδὲ μιν ἐξενάριξε, σεβάσσατο γὰρ τὸ γε θυμῷ,}
\]

51. The MS tradition on this particular line is troublesome. There exist combinations ἤτοι γὰρ, μὲν γὰρ, ἤτοι μὲν, and even a single ‘full-fledged’ ἤτοι μὲν γὰρ (Venetus 459 s. xv cont. A-H). (There is even an ἤδη μὲν γὰρ [Palatinus 222 s. xiii-xiv cont. A-Z], which may bolster the status of the lone ἤτοι μὲν γὰρ.) The string ἤτοι μὲν is a well-defined particle string in its own right, the essential function seeming to belong to the catalogue context (e.g., Il. 3.168, 213 [Teikhoskopia] and Th. 116, 1004). Bakker (1997b: 82n72), too, briefly discusses this string in the context of a study of μὲν.

52. In fact, we may come to rule out this instance below.

53. Note that most scholars do not consider this a paradeigma at all; as far as I can tell, only Mark Edwards (1987: 98) does. In the sense that it comprises only her own lamentable family history, it does not belong to the ‘mythic’ past; indeed, Il. 9.189 states that Achilles’ φόρμιγξ is a spoil from the sack of Eëtion’s city (so this is a recent event). But Eëtion seems to have been clearly part of the Catalogue, for example: see fr. 177 M–W and West 1985a: 96f., 160f. In any case, as I repeatedly emphasize, temporal relations of events matter less than the way in which the stories are told.

54. On the language of lament and the fall or destruction of a city, see Alexiou et al. 2002: 83–101 and below, including the language of ὀρφανικὸν and χήρην.
...there will be no other consolation after you have gone to your destiny, just grief. Nor do I have a father or reverend mother. You know, it was brilliant Achilles who slew my father, and he destroyed the well-founded city of the Kilikians, Thebes with the towering gates. Yeah, he killed my father Eëtion but did not strip his armor, for in his heart he showed respected to the corpse. Instead he burned it with all its elaborate armor and heaped a grave mound over it, and the mountain-dwelling nymphs, daughters of aegis-bearing Zeus, planted elms around it. And I had seven brothers at home, who all went to Hades on a single day, for swift-footed brilliant Achilles killed them all out among their shambling cattle and white sheep. As for my mother, who was queen in leafy Plakos, he led her here along with the rest of his possessions—she at least he released again, taking huge ransom. But arrowing-pouring Artemis struck her down in the house of her father. But you, Hector, you are my father and my reverend mother, and my brother, and it’s you who are my young husband. Come now, take pity on me, stay here on the wall, so that you may not make your child an orphan, your wife a widow.

While the complexity and details of Andromache’s speech will have to be analyzed in greater detail below, there are many items of immediate concern here. First, after she tells of the death of her father, she continues, in catalogue form, with the killing of her brothers:

οἳ δὲ μοι ἐπτὰ κασίγνητοι ἔσαν ἐν ἐντεσί δαιδαλέοισιν, ὡστε εἰπώμην ἐξενε

For there will be no other consolation after you have gone to your destiny, just grief. Nor do I have a father or reverend mother. You know, it was brilliant Achilles who slew my father, and he destroyed the well-founded city of the Kilikians, Thebes with the towering gates. Yeah, he killed my father Eëtion but did not strip his armor, for in his heart he showed respected to the corpse. Instead he burned it with all its elaborate armor and heaped a grave mound over it, and the mountain-dwelling nymphs, daughters of aegis-bearing Zeus, planted elms around it. And I had seven brothers at home, who all went to Hades on a single day, for swift-footed brilliant Achilles killed them all out among their shambling cattle and white sheep. As for my mother, who was queen in leafy Plakos, he led her here along with the rest of his possessions—she at least he released again, taking huge ransom. But arrowing-pouring Artemis struck her down in the house of her father. But you, Hector, you are my father and my reverend mother, and my brother, and it’s you who are my young husband. Come now, take pity on me, stay here on the wall, so that you may not make your child an orphan, your wife a widow.

While the complexity and details of Andromache’s speech will have to be analyzed in greater detail below, there are many items of immediate concern here. First, after she tells of the death of her father, she continues, in catalogue form, with the killing of her brothers:

οἳ δὲ μοι ἐπτὰ κασίγνητοι ἔσαν ἐν ἐντεσί δαιδαλέοισιν, ὡστε εἰπώμην ἐξενενε

As we shall see below, the formulaic prepositional phrase ἐν μεγάροισιν (repeated again at v. 428) is best associated with genealogical catalogue poetry. After adding her mother to the list of victims, as well as the two verses on Hector...
being her entire family, she ends her speech with the formulaic ἀλλὰ ἀγε νῦν combined with imperatives: ἀλλὰ ἀγε νῦν ἐλέαιρε καὶ αὐτοῦ μίμεν ἐπὶ πῦργῳ (431).

ποδάρκης δίος Ἀχιλλεύς (v. 423), is the way in which discourse proceeds within a ‘unit of talk’ bracketed by the larger-scale discourse markers that we have been studying.

57. Understandably, the verse-end formula πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ occurs most often in genealogical contexts; in fact, almost exclusively. I draw particular attention, for now, to Phoenix of Alkyone: Φοίβου Ἀπόλλωνος καλλισφύρου εἵνεκα νύφης, | τὴν δὲ τὸτ ἐν μεγάροις πατὴρ καὶ πότνια μήτηρ (II. 9.561).
Chapter 3 | Hesiodic textures I: digression and small-scale poetics

While we have seen that discourse markers such as καὶ γάρ, οὐδὲ γάρ, and ἦτοι (µὲν) γάρ are regularly used to introduce a paradeigma of the deep past in Homeric poetry, I have also been emphasizing that they are additionally employed in different, but related, discourse situations. In such a discourse-centered approach, I emphasize hexameter poetry’s use of these discourse markers to bracket off a particular ‘unit of talk’, and, based on the particular discourse marker, to predispose the audience to a certain interpretation of the story thus bracketed based on prior experience of such discourse characteristics. We ought not stop at discourse markers alone, however: the affinities of the discourse characteristics and strategies marked by particular particles are essential to our argument. In this section, as in the sections to follow, we shall, by focusing our discussion on the texture and small-scale poetics of Hesiodic comparanda, begin to get a larger sense of the codification of these discursive properties and strategies.

καὶ γάρ and genealogical digression

Turning to Hesiodic poetry, we note first the use of καὶ γάρ in the treatment of Hekate within the genealogical sections describing the grandchildren of Ouranos in the Theogony. Hekate’s description falls in the section devoted to the children of Phoibe and Koios, although she herself is the exception in her being a child of Perses and Asteria (and so a grandchild of Phoibe and Koios). A structurally marked digression by default,

---

1. See, e.g., Grethlein 2006 passim on this approach.
then, this digression (vv. 416–52), detailing the honors she enjoys, is marked by καὶ γάρ (vv. 411–22):

And Asteria became pregnant and gave birth to Hekate, whom Zeus, son of Kronos, esteemed above all. He gave her splendid presents: to have a share both of the earth and the barren sea. She has a share of honor also in the starry sky, and she is honored most of all by the immortal gods. You know, nowadays when some earth-dwelling man performs fine rites according to custom and prays to the gods, that man calls on Hekate. Plentiful is the honor that easily follows him whose prayers the goddess receives gladly—and she gives him happiness, since she has this power. For, of all those who were born of Earth and Sky and have a province, she has a fitting portion.

The καὶ γάρ, leading into the temporal adverb νῦν, seems here to introduce not a past paradigm, but rather a more general explanation in the present, making it most similar to the cases of the allegories we have just seen above. While this might seem to be hedging at first glance, without such a discourse-centered approach we would have to resort to ad hoc explanation of the discourse particles, for they do not seem to look backward to the previous statement.³

If, however, remembering the advice of Aristonicus’ scholia as well as our own studies above, we treat this particle string as looking forward, the entire section on Hekate is shown to have a structure never before noticed. In turning to the children of

---

² West (1966: 17) slightly differently identifies vv. 414–52 as the “Commendation of Hecate.”
³ E.g., West (ad 416), who, recognizing that the γάρ does not look backward, suggests that the γάρ is “justifying the change from aorist to perfect in the preceding lines, rather than the actual proposition they contain.”
Kronos and Rhea (vv. 453ff.), the poet closes off the section on Hekate thus (vv. 448–52):

οὕτω τοι καὶ μουνογενῆς ἐκ μητρὸς ἐουσά
πάσι μετ’ ἀθανάτοιοι τετίμηται γεράεσαι.
θήκε δὲ μιν Κρονίδης κουροτρόφον, οἶ μετ’ ἐκείην
ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἵδουτο φάος πολυδερκέος Ἑοῦς.
οὕτως ἐξ ἀρχῆς κουροτρόφος, αἱ δὲ τε τιμαί.

And so, even though she is an only child from her mother, she is honored with privileges among all the immortals. And Kronos’ son made her the nurse of all the children who after her see with their eyes the light of much-seeing Dawn. Thus since the beginning she is a nurse, and these are her honors. (trans. adapted from G. W. Most)

While West (ad loc.) suggests that vv. 448–9, beginning οὕτω τοι καί,⁴ complete a ring-composition in response with vv. 426–8 (where the rare word μουνογενής also occurs), several factors suggest that they in fact close off the discourse unit begun by καὶ γάρ in v. 416. First, the verse οὐδ’, ὅτι μουνογενής, ἥσσον θεὰ ἐμὸρε τιμῆς (426), with which West claims responson, does not constitute a strong beginning.⁵ In fact, this section is but a weak transition in the continued description of her honors, one which happens to bring again to the foreground the genealogical nature of the context.⁶ This, in turn, brings us to the peculiarity of this ending’s modification of μουνογενής, namely the addition of ἐκ μητρὸς. Of this phrase West (ad 448–9) admits: “I do not know what is the point of the addition ἐκ μητρὸς.” Indeed, it does not make a great deal of sense in the context of West’s analysis, for, according to his schema, it has no equivalent in the verses that it is supposed to conclude. If, however, we look back to our discourse marker καὶ γάρ in v. 416, it is quite clear why such a phrase exists: it brings us back to our initial point of digression away from her mother Asteria, the topic and subject of v. 411. The

---

⁴. We shall return to such conclusions below, in the discussion of the syntax of paradigmatic similes.

⁵. In fact, such a transition occurs nowhere else in hexameter poetry, nor can this be a corruption of the slightly more common οὐδ’ ὅτε (5X II. [of which 4, oddly, were atheitized]).

poet or performer thus reactivates the genealogical context of both initial departure and transition, creating a coherence to the entire digression within the catalogue.

I have just called the passage a digression, but it is a digression that is marked out as having a present implication. Its present implication, however, is not solely by virtue of the νῦν, but rather the normalized use of καὶ γάρ as a discourse marker in hexameter poetry. I have further begun again to highlight the combination of these discourse particles with the discourse features and themes of genealogical poetry. Cases such as the digression on Hekate are, in fact, not without good parallel in Homeric poetry, where genealogical diction and theme similarly predominate. In Book 22 of the Iliad Priam uses the deaths of his sons Polydoros and Lykaon to convince Hector to come back inside the walls of Troy (vv. 44–8, 56–8):

ὅς µ’ ὑἱῶν πολλῶν τε καὶ ἐσθλῶν εὖν ἔθηκε κτείνων καὶ περνᾶς νήσων ἔπι τηλεδαπάσων. καὶ γάρ νῦν δύο παῖδε Λυκάονα καὶ Πολύδωρον οὐ δύναμαι ἰδεῖν ἰδῆς νόσων εἰς ἀστυ ἀλέντων, τοὺς µοι Λαοθόη τέκετο κρείουσα γυναικῶν. 45

ALL’ εἰσέρχεο τεῖχος ἐµῶν τέκος, ὁφρὰ σαώσῃς Τρώας καὶ Τρῳάς, µὴ δὲ µέγα κύδος ὅρεξῃς Πηλείδῃ, αὐτὸς δὲ φίλης αἰῶνος ἀµερής.

Achilles has made me bereaved of my many brave sons. He killed them, or sold them off among the distant islands. You know, right now I have two sons, Lykaon and Polydoros, whom I cannot see among the Trojans shut up in the city, sons whom Laothoëa, queen among women, bore to me … Come then inside the wall, my child, so that you may rescue the Trojans and the women of Troy, and not give great glory to the son of Peleus, and yourself be deprived of your own life.

---

7. This reading is consistent in all papyri and MSS save the 14th-c. Laur. conv. soppr. 158, which reads καὶ γάρ δὴ (cp. Il. 16.180, 19.95, Od. 19.510 [see p. 41 above], 22.29). I note this to emphasize that, while the expansion of the extended discourse marker might differ between contexts, the core καὶ γάρ remains the same, while the extension is selected from but a few particles.

8. Beyond those examples discussed here, see esp. Od. 13.131 and 17.566, alongside perhaps Od. 22.29.
This element of Priam’s argument presented to Hector is particularly pitiful, underscoring his ignorance of his sons’ fates. For the moment, however, this passage’s interest lies in its striking genealogical undertones. As Richardson (ad 22.48) points out, while the word κρείουσα occurs only here in Homer, the verse as a whole has an excellent comparandum in the Hesiodic Catalogue (fr. 26.5–13 M–W):

Φ ἡ οἷα [κό]|"
3 τρ[ἱς, ο]ι[αί τε θε[αί, περικαλλέα [ἔρυ’ εἰ[δυ[α]].
1 τ[ᾶς ποτε [Λ]αο[θό]ὴ κρείου[ν]’ Ὑπερη[ῒς ἀ[μ]ῶν
7 [.][.]... Ἐ[χ]ο[ν][Π]αρνηθ[σ]σσού τ’ ἀκρα κάρ̣[ηνα
8 [.][.]...[.]με[ν][αι χρυσο[σ]τεφάνου Ἀφροδίτης
9 Or like them: the daughters who were born from Porthaon, three, like goddesses, [skilled] in very beautiful [works]; whom once [Laotthoe,] blameless ruler of Hyperesia, bore after she went up into Porthaon’s vigorous marriage-bed, Eurythemiste and Stratonice and Sterope. [They…] companions of the beautiful-haired Nymphs…of the Muses on the wooded mountains…they possessed, and Parnassus’ lofty peaks…of golden-crowned Aphrodite… (trans. adapted from G. W. Most)

This manner of genealogical preoccupation is present even in similarly short, generalizing comparisons as Odyssey 19.262–8:

“ὦ γυ[ναὶ αἰδοίῃ Λαερτίαδεω Ὀδυσῆος,
μηκέτι νῦν χρόα καλὸν ἐναίρεο,
πόσιν γοόωσα νεσσῶ αἰ γενὲν·
καὶ γάρ τίς θ’ ἠλλοῖον ὅδυμεται ἀνδρ’ ὅλεσσα
κουρίδιον, τῷ τέκνα τέκη φιλότητι μυγείσα.

9. The sons have, of course, already died, making this scene interesting on larger levels of theme and composition. See Richardson (ad 46–8; 49) on the similarities to Helen on the wall in Book 3 (vv. 236–8), and on the scholiasts’ comment on the pitiful nature. Not all of the underlining in this passage is immediately relevant, but will be in later discussion of genealogical register.
10. Richardson (ad loc.) also compares Theocr. Id. 17.132, which shares the syntax: …οὕς τέκετο κρείουσα Ρέα. He also notes that the word κρείουσα “belonged primarily to genealogical poetry.”
11. Rather than the νῦν that Priam’s speech shares with Th. 416 above, this speech shares the τίς. A similar comparison might be to II. 2.292: καὶ γὰρ τίς 0’ ἐνα μὴνα μένων ἀπὸ ἔς ἀλόχοιο | ἀσχαλᾶσ σὺν νηὶ πολυζύγῳ.
Respected wife of Odysseus, son of Laertes, ruin no longer your beautiful skin, and don’t cause your heart to waste away at all in lamenting your husband. I hold nothing against you. You know, someone who’s lost a different sort of man, she mourns the husband for whom she’s borne children and mingled in love—a man other than Odysseus, whom they say is like the gods. Come now, cease your weeping and heed my muthos.

As is most usual in Homeric poetry, καὶ γάρ introduces a genealogically infused comparison looking ahead to an ἄλλα introducing an imperative. Of course, Odysseus’ speech here is part of his systematic self-mythologization in the Odyssey—based especially in the manner of paradeigmata—as we shall explore in Part Three.

Lastly, we begin to see evidence of a similar discourse strategy in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Though the context is somewhat lacunose, one fragment shows just such use of καὶ γάρ to mark the beginning of what seems to be a paradigmatic digression (fr. 133.1–5 M–W):

…boundless earth; You know, onto their heads she poured a dread itch; for a scabby illness seized hold of all of their skin, and their hair fell from their heads, and their bountiful heads became bald. (trans. adapted from G. W. Most)

---

12. The relationship to genealogical catalogue poetry of the narrative stance of φασί (v. 267) and the diction τέκνα τέκῃ φιλότητι μιγεῖσα (v. 266) are described below (n.173 on p. 102 and 132–139 respectively).

13. As for the survival of this passage, it is worth remarking on its being preserved as a ‘unit of discourse’ delimited by the discourse marker καὶ γάρ. Note the way that Eustathius cites it (in Hom. Od. 13.401 [p. 1746.9]):

…φέρων καὶ χρῆσιν ἐκ τοῦ παρὰ Ἡσιόδω καταλόγου περὶ τῶν Προιτίδων, καὶ γάρ σφιν κεφαλῆς κατά κυνός αἰνόν ἔχειεν, ἀλφὸς γάρ χρόα πάντα κατέσχε, ἐν δὲ νῦ χαίται ἔρρεοι ἐκ κεφαλέων, ψίλωτο δὲ καλὰ κάρηνα. παράγει δὲ τὸ τοιοῦτον κυνῷ ἐκ τοῦ κυνῷ, ἐξ οὗ καὶ ἢ κόνις, ὡς ἄλλαχοι φαίνεται, …

Herodian excerpts it in the same way (De prosodia catholica 16; p. 445.16 Lentz).
While it may be dangerous to suggest that this digression is paradigmatic simply because it occurs in a catalogue and is marked by καὶ γάρ, there exist good Near Eastern parallels for sickness and disease as a result of divine punishment, and specifically for passages explaining the symptoms as the consequence of a transgression.

\[B\] ήτοι (μὲν) γάρ and catalogues

Just as the discourse marker ήτοι (μὲν) γάρ for Andromache marks the beginning of the catalogue of her family members whom Achilles has slain, so too does the particle string prove to be a discourse marker in the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. In fact, the particles articulate the narrative unit in such a way as to promote its being excerpted by Strabo. In fr. 234 M–W of the Catalogue, the Lelegan people are described in this way:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ήτοι γάρ} & \text{ Λοκρὸς Λελέγων ἡγήσατο λαῶν,} \\
\text{τοὺς ρά ποτε} & \text{ Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἀφῆτα μήδεα εἴδως} \\
& \text{λεκτοὺς ἐκ γαῖς ΛΑΟΥΣ πόρε Δευκαλίωνεν:}
\end{align*}
\]

For Lokros led the Lelegan people, whom once Kronos’ son Zeus, who knows eternal counsels, gave to Deukalion, pebble-people gathered up from the earth. (trans. adapted from G. W. Most)

While brief and devoid of context, this fragment shows the distilled character of an abbreviated, exemplary narrative, even down to the syntax of the relative clause τοὺς ρά ποτε. We might further compare the ‘pebble-people’ of this abbreviated narrative to


15. If we read the fragment with Henrichs 1974, who shows that Hera is the angered divinity, it describes the symptoms of a more general μανία (or μαχαιροσύνη). In that sense, the fragment is indeed exemplary of the dangers of such Wahnsinn. For a bibliography of the Proitides as well as ancient disease, see Hirschberger 2004: 300–301.


17. Although Hirschberger (F *16) and Most (F 251) do not place this within the fragments of the Catalogue, West’s emphasis on the connections to the story of Deukalion and fr. 9 are compelling. Hirschberger suggests, “Man könnte an einen Truppenkatalog ähnlich dem Schiffskatalog der Ilias denken.” See D’Alessio 2005: 225 on the transfiguration of this tradition in Opous’ mythical past in Pind. O. 9.

18. For the syntax of the relative clause following the introductory verse, see p. 70.
Achilles’ Niobe *paradigma*: both are drawing on a tradition of etymological word-play most common in Hesiodic poetry.\(^\text{19}\)

While it is fairly straightforward to see how, like καὶ γὰρ, the particle string ἦτοι γὰρ might mark out a particular sort of abbreviated narrative in a catalogic context, we have passed over some of the examples of ἦτοι γὰρ in Table 2 (p. 43). So let me return to those now. In the *Theomachia of Iliad* 20, for example, it is not immediately obvious why the lineup of gods warrants such an introductory discourse marker, or what relation the narrative introduced by ἦτοι γὰρ might bear to the preceding, simile-like description of the sound of gods quarreling (vv. 66–75):

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τόσσος ἀρα κτύπος ὦρτο θεῶν ἐρίδι ξυνιόντων,} \\
\text{ητοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἔνατα Ποσειδάωνος ἀνακτὸς} \\
> \text{ιστατ’ Ἀπόλλων Φοῖβος ἔχων ἢ ππερόεντα,} \\
> \text{ἄντα δ’ Ἑναλίοιο θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη:} \\
\text{‘Ἡρη δ’ ἀντέστη χρυσηλάκατος κασινήτη} \\
\text{Ἀρτέµις ᾠχεάρα κασιγνήτη ἐκάτοιο:} \\
\text{Λητοῖ δ’ ἀντέστη σῶκος εριούνιος Ἐρμῆς,} \\
\text{ἄντα δ’ ἀρ’ Ἡφαίστοιο μέγας ποταμός βαθυδίνης,} \\
\text{ἐν θεοὶ ἀντεστὶ σῶκος ἐριούνιος Ἐρμῆς,} \\
\text{ἄντα δ’ Ἰανδροῦ καλέουσι θεοί, ἀνδρὲς δὲ Σκάμανδρον.} \\
\text{ὡς οἱ μὲν θεοὶ ἁλταθεών ἵσιν. αὐτάρ Ἀχιλλεὺς} \\
\end{align*}
\]

So great was the din that rose as the gods came together in strife. You know, against lord Poseidon Phoibos Apollo took a stand with his feathered arrows, and against Enyalios the grey-eyed goddess Athene. Against Hera stood Artemis, noisy, with the golden distaff, pouring arrows, sister to the far-striker. Opposite Leto stood strong, generous Hermes, and against Hephaistos stood the great, deep-eddying river which the gods call Xanthos, but mortals call Skamandros. That’s how the gods went up against gods, but Achilles…

While it is not obviously paradigmatic, the marker bears the same relation to a catalogue as it does in Andromache’s speech. We may also note the way in which the passage follows on the preceding simile, for which comparanda from Hesiodic poetry are not far to seek: that capping verse describing the sounds of the gods’ quarrel, which ends in τόσσος ἀρα κτύπος ὦρτο θεῶν ἐρίδι ξυνιόντων, finds its closest parallel in the simile-

\(^{19}\) See below at p. 146, as well as the discussion of metamorphosis in general at p. 138.

\(^{20}\) On the way in which the rivers have different names among gods and men, see West 1966: 387 for a listing and bibliography, as well as Edwards (*ad loc.*) for a more recent discussion of the literature.
capping verse of the Titanomachy at Th. 705: τόσσος δοῦπος ἔγεντο θεῶν ἔριδι ξυνιόντων (“So great was the sound of the gods in collision”). But ‘Hesiodic characteristics’ and linguistic peculiarities are, for now, less important than the fact that, just as in Andromache’s speech, the particle string introduces a narrative elaboration of highly catalogic nature.

I use the term ‘narrative elaboration’ in the most neutral sense. I do not attribute such a passage to later interpolation, though it has been suggested that these verses are not ‘genuine’. Not often, however, has this been suggested, rather only by Edwards, who is surprised to be alone in his condemnation of the passage (ad 67–74):

The passage performs no useful function…There is no parallel in Homeric battles to this listing of combatants as they line up to face each other…Though it never seems to have been seriously considered in ancient or modern times, the passage conflicts with the norms of Homeric narrative structure and does not belong here; I think it has been added to the monumental poem at a later date, the pairings read back from encounters in book 21.

He’s right: the scholia do not feel this passage is out of place at all, though they do suggest that passages surrounding it are. Some might suspect that these verses were not sung in every performance, or were not present in every transcript. But that they exist for us, and further show such a localization of particular discourse features as I have sketched, argues, I think, decisively against athetization. It suggests instead the stance that such an abbreviated narrative expansion was part a particular performance tradition or a particular rhapsodic habit. Such a poetic habit might have been the habit of a single poet, a roster of competitive rhapsodes, or generations of Homeridae; it is of no consequence to this discussion. What is at stake here is an understanding of the various poetic styles that are made discernible by the constant coincidence of their elements with one another, and what associations these textures would have had for an audience.

22. See Bolling 1925: 184–186 for a discussion.
The particle string ἕτοι (µὲν) γὰρ, as noted above, does not occur very often. Nevertheless, it is possible to see that the genealogical context of *Il.* 4.376 in which it occurs is naturally part of a tradition of abbreviated narrative expansions in larger genealogical contexts. While genealogy and *paradeigma* bear a close relationship, neither seems to be primary; rather they seem to be symbiotic, as is seen in the way that Andromache’s speech catalogically introduces several elements of her own genealogy in recounting Achilles’ having killed her family members. Nor should it be overlooked that, in the case of her brothers, their element in the list is further expanded with narrative. That the style of such abbreviated narratives should have a catalogic context is not so surprising, and to see a (by all appearances) digressive story in the *Catalogue* introduced in exactly this way should be equally unsurprising. Finally, the catalogic nature of the oddly placed *Il.* 20.66–75 further underscores the way in which ἕτοι (µὲν) γὰρ was a means of introducing an explanatory narrative in the midst of some other context. That in each case the genealogical or catalogic characteristics shine through so clearly is remarkable.
The study of the formal structure of *paradeigmata* has shown that they generally abide by the narrative schemata described by sociolinguists, and very often display features such as ring-composition. Yet there are a number of cases in which they deviate from that schema. So, while studying the formal structure of *paradeigmata* might be one means of interpretation,¹ its interpretive power is greatest in allowing us better to detect deviations from codified norms in their telling. In order to investigate this conventionalization, this section will show that more than just principles of ring-composition are at play in the performance of *paradeigmata*, and that these other formal characteristics are at least as significant in the articulation of exemplary tales. I shall further detail the way in which their subject matter is bound up with, not only larger systems of diction and theme, but also with those of syntax and discursive properties.² This, in turn, will suggest that *paradeigmata* are part of a system of elaboration that shares many discourse features

---

¹. On the formal aspects of speech as a means of interpretation—the idea that ‘what’ a speaker is saying is often based on ‘how’ he or she is saying it—see, e.g., Brown and Yule 1983: 94,190. For a comparable approach to register, see Dillon (2007: 160): “Insofar as *style* is bound up with individual difference and the figure of the author, we need a term for a variant that is characteristic of writings in a genre. For this, the linguistic term that lies closest to hand is *register*. In effect, writings in genres where the author principle is weak exhibit the voice of the genre: in such cases, the genre speaks, assuring the reader that the text is a well made instance of a familiar type performing its expected function (Foucault 1972: 221–2). Indeed, this concept of genre register has little to do with the style of individuals and more to do with what Benjamin Lee Whorf called *the fashion of speaking* of particular cultures” (160).

². Syntax, of course, is a part of stylistics. See Bakhtin (1986: 66): “the speaker’s very selection of a particular grammatical form is a stylistic act.”
with other traditional speech genres, especially the catalogic genealogy, as best represented within the Hesiodic tradition.

While the ring-composition of paradeigmata such as *Il.* 1.259–74 (Nestor) and 24.602–17 (Niobe) have often received scholarly attention, this structure is not the case for all paradeigmata, nor can we say that such a feature is specific to paradeigmata.³ we may more fruitfully concentrate on other discourse features that I suggest are more essential to the speech genre. I shall in this section detail the way in which these formal characteristics help create stylistic cohesion within the paradeigmata, but also create a more coherent picture of the corpus of paradeigmata.

### A The internal shaping of paradeigmata

When Öhler made his study of paradeigmata in Greek poetry, he applied the criteria of ‘die straffe Fügung’ and ‘die lose Fügung’ to indicate the extent to which the speeches demonstrate ‘loose’ or ‘tight’ cohesion. Agamemnon’s paradeigma at *Iliad* 19.87–138, for example, exhibits ‘die lose Fügung’, which, to Öhler’s generation of scholars, suggested that it may be an interpolation. After all, ‘die straffe Fügung’, which is normally accomplished through *Ringkomposition*, seemed to Öhler to be a hallmark of the paradeigma.⁴ Ring-composition, however, beyond not being specific to paradeigma-

---

³ On ring-composition, see esp. Lohmann 1970. Willcock (1964) rightly notes that ring composition “is a stylistic method common in *digressions of all sorts* in early Greek poetry, particularly the Homeric poems” (142; my emphasis), although several pages later he places too much emphasis on this feature (147). See, e.g., Bakker 1997b: 120 for the extent to which ring composition is a marker of Homeric poetry drawing on “the resources of ordinary speech.” Öhler (1925: 41) makes the point that ring-composition is suited to paradeigmata that recommend a positive course of action, while paradigmatic consolation speeches instead rely on the accumulation of material, citing Dione’s speech in *Il.* 5. This distinction hardly seems useful, if even tenable, in light of, say, *Il.* 14, which is catalogic, but not conciliatory. Nor is it clear that exhortation is so clearly demarcated: consider the case of *Il.* 18.117–22 (with Öhler 1925: 10), the Niobe paradeigma of *Il.* 24 (with Minchin 2007: 261), or even Dione’s speech in *Il.* 5, where the ‘consolation’ is, in fact, a command to ‘endure’.

⁴ Öhler 1925: 11. For these reasons, Öhler notes, Finsler (1913: II.² 200; I.² 45) athetized the verses. Gaisser (1969a: 38) includes it in her list of digressions showing complex ring-
ta, is just one of the various techniques available to a speaker in the creation of ‘texture’ or ‘cohesive relation’ in discourse. In this section we shall be concerned not only with the means of creating cohesive relations within a stretch of discourse, but also with the marking of changes in this texture with audience-recognizable discourse boundary markers. The marking of boundaries, after all, creates cohesion within what is delimited from a broader perspective, external to the story. As I shall show, certain syntactic patterns serve as such boundary markers in Greek hexameter poetry. Further, when accompanied by specific, additional characteristics, these ordered combinations of discourse features underscore discourse texture and serve to create audience expectations of the unit of discourse, not unlike the discourse markers described above. Yet I shall also present another significant finding, namely that the syntactic formulae and discourse markers with which we are here dealing serve to bracket not only stories as a whole, but distinct sub-systems of diction, formulae, and themes.

A.1 Anaphora and foregrounding

Aside from Ringkomposition, scholars have identified two other structural principles in their explanations of the compositional style of the digressions, or inset stories, of Homeric poetry: these are Ritournellkomposition and ‘repeated theme’. Ritournellkomposition, as opposed to the cyclic Ringkomposition, works linearly, in such a way that each section of a story or a speech begins with a particular phrasing or verse. The examples in van Otterlo’s seminal study include Iliad 4.223–421, the Epipoleis. In the ‘repeated theme’ style of composition, which is but a small step from Ritournellkomposition, as composition.

5. I here avoid talking of ‘texture’ so as not to depend also on the term ‘text’. But, if one leaves aside the implications of the word ‘text’ for orality-literacy debates, the notion of texture is a function of a text’s various cohesive relationships. See further Halliday and Hasan 1976: 2–4 on the way in which formal markers are used to indicate these cohesive relationships.


7. Compare, e.g., vv. 250–1 (‘Ὤς ὅ γε κοιρανέων ἐπεπωλεῖτο στίχας ἀνδρῶν· ἦλθε δ’ ἐπὶ Κρήτεσσι κιὼν ἀνὰ οὐλαμόν ἀνδρῶν.) and 272–3 (‘Ὤς ἐφατ’, Ἀτρείδης δὲ παρῷχετο γηθόσυνος κῆρ· ἦλθε δ’ ἐπ’ Αἰάντεσσι κιὼν ἀνὰ οὐλαμόν ἀνδρῶν’).
Gaisser notes, “the device is the same, except that the repetitions are generally those of thought rather than wording” (Gaisser 1969a: 5). Gaisser’s primary example is Nestor’s tale at *Odyssey* 3.102–200, which repeats the theme of Zeus’ hostility toward the returning Greeks. The question remains, however, whether such structural characteristics tell us anything about poetic composition and audience interpretation in Archaic Greece.

Aside from their being hardly different from each other, these two structural principles are also hardly different from rhetorical anaphora, a feature which has been noticed at least since Öhler’s study. In many *paradeigmata* the anaphora is due to their being catalogic in nature, as, for example, in the case of *Iliad* 5.382–404 (Dione) and 14.313–28 (Zeus’ Catalogue of Lovers). Yet we cannot attribute the anaphora of all *paradeigmata* to this catalogic nature. Take, for example Antinoos’ speech to Odysseus at *Od. 21.293–306*, with its initial, and continued, anaphora:

οἶνὸς σε τρώει μελινής, ὃς τε καὶ ἄλλος
βλάπτει, ὃς ἂν μιν χανθὸν ἐλη μηδ' αἰσία πίνη.
οἶνὸς καὶ Κένταυρον, ἀγακλητὸν Εὐρυτίωνα,
ἀσσι' ἐνι μεγάρῳ μεγαθύμου Πειριδόοιο,
ἐς Λατίθας ἐλθόνθ' ὁ δ' ἐπεὶ φρένας ἀσσεν οἶνῳ,
μαινόμενον κάκ' ἐρεξὲ δόμον κάτα Πειριδόοιο.


9. Bear in mind the different uses of the term ‘anaphora’ in rhetoric and in discourse analysis. In the former, the term designates “an isomorpheme that repeats one or more words at the beginning of successive clauses, sentences, or verses, thus enhancing the importance of the repeated element” (s.v. Sloane 2001). In discourse analysis, anaphora is the process of ‘looking back’ in a ‘text’ for the process of interpretation, as in the ‘it’ of “Look at the kettle. It’s turning black.”; cataphoric relations (“It’s turning black quickly, the kettle”) depend on their ability to ‘look forward’ in the ‘text’. An excellent, succinct explanation is to be found at Klein 1985: 17–19, and see also Brown and Yule 1983: 190–204. I shall refer to the two usages, respectively, as ‘rhetorical’ anaphora and ‘syntactic’ anaphora, while the unmarked usage will refer to the ‘rhetorical’ variety.

10. For Öhler’s emphasis on rhetorical anaphora, or repetition, see pp. 6, 8, 13, 18–19, 21, 34–6, 60.
It’s the wine that wounds you, honey-sweet wine that harms others, too, whoever takes it with a wide mouth and doesn’t drink in moderation. Wine wounded even the Centaur, very famous Eurytion, in the hall of great-hearted Peirithoos, when he went to the Lapithae. After he blinded his mind with wine, he worked evils raving throughout the home of Peirithoos. Grief seized the heroes, and they leapt up and dragged him outside through the doorway, and chopped off his ears and nose with ruthless bronze. And he, impaired in his mind, went bearing his delusion with a witless heart. From this time there has been a feud between men and Centaurs, but he found evil for himself first, heavy with wine. So too for you do I declare great harm, if you were to string this bow.

While Gaisser does not include this passage in her study of digressions, one would have to assume that, while it does not show the sort of structure that van Otterlo’s examples of Ritournellkomposition do, ‘repeated theme’ would be an understatement for the degree of verbal repetition underlined in the passage above. Despite all of this verbal repetition, Antinoos’ story is not very formulaic in terms of other extant hexameter poetry.\(^\text{11}\) We may recognize the initial ὃς τε καὶ ἄλλως from Phoenix’ similar use in the story of Meleager in \textit{Iliad} 9,\(^\text{12}\) but the passage relies less on formulaic composition than the repetition of lexical items.\(^\text{13}\) It may, perhaps, be asking too much that this passage be built of formulæ very familiar to us, for it concerns a subject not normally dealt with in Homeric poetry: the story of Peirithoos, the Lapithai, and the Centaurs.\(^\text{14}\) Nevertheless, even if the Centaurs and Lapithai tend not to be mentioned, Peirithoos himself is featured in several passages important to the study of paradeigmata in Homeric poetry, if not paradeigmata

\(^{11}\) This passage has been condemned to various extents by many editors. Fernández-Galiano (\textit{ad} 293–310) defends the its structure and style, despite its oddities.

\(^{12}\) \textit{Iliad} 9.553: ἀλλὰ ὅτε δὴ Μελέαγρον ἔδυ χόλος, ὃς τε καὶ ἄλλως (“But when the anger came upon Meleager, an anger which also [swells in the hearts] of others”).

\(^{13}\) Where it is most formulaic, it shares phrasing (at vv. 300–1) with Antinoos’ speech at \textit{Od}. 18.79–87. See also the formula διέκ προθύρου at v. 299. The verse-end ἀεσίφρονι θυ at v. 302 finds its only parallels at \textit{WD} 315, 335, 646.

\(^{14}\) On the \textit{Iliad}, see Hainsworth \textit{ad} 12.128, Kirk \textit{ad} 1.263–5 (on Nestor’s recollection of involvement); for the \textit{Catalogue}, see West 1985a: 85–86.
proper: *Il.* 1.263 (Nestor to Agamemnon and Achilles), 2.741–2 (Catalogue of Ships), 12.129 (genealogical), and 14.318 (Catalogue of Zeus’ Lovers), as well as *Od.* 11.631 (Nekyia). Common to each of these, as we shall explore more below, is the catalogue style.

Yet we ought not to make too much of the catalogic style surrounding Peirithoos in other contexts just now; instead, we should concentrate instead on the significance of verbal repetition. This repetition is begun by the οἶνος of v. 295, echoing that of v. 293 and markedly followed by a ‘particularizing’ καί. The repetition continues to such an extent that Öhler concludes that this repetition must be due to the fact that Antinoos’ audience is thought to be an uneducated beggar, and so would need constant reminders of what the story being told is about. In that way, Öhler states, “[a]uch die Person, an die das Exemplum gerichtet ist, kann dessen Form beeinflussen” (9). This is a sensitive and attractive proposal, a pragmatic approach which ought not to be dismissed out-of-hand, but his proposal must also hold up in the case of other paradeigmata. We must also consider, for example, the way in which Dione’s paradeigma addressed to her daughter, the goddess Aphrodite, in *Iliad* 5, while built upon a catalogic superstructure, shows this same compositional style both within and between catalogue entries.

15. On the syntax of this passage cf. also p. 99 below.
16. On v. 742, τὸν ῥ’ ὑπὸ Πειριθόῳ τέκετο κλυτὸς Ἱπποδάµεια, see discussion of the ὁς-ῥα syntagm at pp. 74–80.
17. The only other extant occurrences of Peirithoos’ name are Sc. 179 and Hes. fr. 280.28.
18. On what we may call the ‘particularizing’ καί, see below at p. 335 below, if not also Achilles’ paradeigma of Patroclus at *Il.* 21.107: κάθανε καὶ Πάτροκλος, ὥπερ οὲο πολλὸν ἀμείνων.
19. Öhler 1925: 8–9: “Weil Antinous glaubt, einen ungebildeten Bettler vor sich zu haben, spricht er in dieser Weise, wie man eben einfachen Leuten eine Lehre gibt. Daher ist die breite Lehrhaftigkeit, die Wiederholungen zu verstehen. Auch die Person, an die das Exemplum gerichtet ist, kann dessen Form beeinflussen (“Because Antinoos believes that he has before him an uneducated beggar, he speaks in this way, just as one gives a lesson to ordinary people. Therefore, it is the general didacticism which explains the repetitions. Even the person to whom the exemplum is addressed can affect its shape”). Compare Fernández-Galiano (*ad* 293–310), who suggests that “Antinous’ moralizing digression sits ill on the lips of a wastrel like him.”
20. On this passage, see on p. 104 below.
We have at our disposal a number of explanations for this sort of lexical cohesion in discourse. Closest to Öhler’s proposal are studies that suggest that verbal repetition in discourse eases processing difficulties,\(^{21}\) and that it is even characteristic in the ‘caretaker speech’ of adults speaking to children,\(^{22}\) an explanation which would nicely connect the fact that Antinoos is speaking to a presumably uneducated beggar and Dione is speaking to her daughter. This, again, is not the worst possible explanation, for it is true that no audience could miss the importance of ἄτη or οἶνος here, given the speaker’s insistence.

But we might at least add the speaker’s point of view to this explanation: it is most common in ‘unplanned talk’ that the repetition of lexical items acts as an ‘evaluative’ device in highlighting the point of a given story.\(^{23}\)

Yet the way in which the repetition is effected here is not so easily described as ‘simple’ or ‘dumbed-down’. For, while the verbal roots are repeated, there is a great deal of variation throughout their generally non-formulaic articulation: ἄασ…μεγαθύμοι Π., φρένας ἄασεν, φρειν…ἀσαθέις, ἄτην, άεσίφρονι θυμῷ; οἶνός, οἶνος, οἶνῳ, οἰνοβαρείων. In this respect, we might follow the lead of Roman Jakobson, who suggests that parallelism and similarities force their audience also to consider every difference and variation.\(^{24}\) Indeed, this manner of verbal repetition may seem to us less the

\(^{21}\) As Öhler intuitively supposes, but so too modern sociolinguists: see, e.g., Dubois and Sankoff 2001: 290.

\(^{22}\) See Johnstone 1987a: 209 for references.

\(^{23}\) On the prevalence in ‘unplanned talk’, see Ochs 1979. Repetition is, after all, a very effective means for lending cohesion to a narrative (on which see Brown and Yule 1983: 194). On the ‘evaluative’ aspect of repetition, see Labov 1972: 379. Given the only slight reliance on formulae in the paredeigma, and the relative alienness of the topic to the Homeric tradition, this may be an attractive idea. We shall revisit this idea of ‘unplanned talk’ in the elaboration of catalogues in the case of Dione’s paredeigma below.

\(^{24}\) Jakobson (1983) writes of a slightly different, but relevant, phenomenon: “Against the background of constant variation, the repeated units become incomparably more striking. By focusing on parallelisms and similarities in pairs of lines, one is led to pay more attention to every similarity and every difference that occurs between contiguous couplets of verse and between hemistichs within a single line. In other words, this approach confers particular importance on each similarity and each contrast” (103).
pedant hitting his audience over the head with an idea, and more the docent showing them each side of it.25 As in Agamemnon’s *paradeigma* of *Iliad* 21,26 there is *figura etymologica* here in the juxtaposition of ἄτη/ἄατη and ἄαω, especially in vv. 301–2: ὁ δὲ φρεσὶν ἥσιν ἂσθεὶς | ἦμεν ἣν ἄτην ὄχέων ἄεισφρονι θυμῷ.27 Consider, too, the way in which the all-important connection between ἄτη and οἶνος is explicated by the combination of the phrase ἣν ἄτην ὄχεων ἄεισφρονι θυμῷ (v. 302) and, two verses later, the word οἰνοβαρεῖων (v. 304). Indeed, it is through this final verbal resonance of οἰνοβαρεῖων,28 through the striking description of a man actually bearing ἄτη’s heft,29 that the performer ties the idea of οἶνος to ἄτη: after all, ἄτη is nothing if not βαρείη in Homeric poetry.30

We may provisionally suggest, then, that this manner of composition is not necessarily revealing of a simplicity either of attitude or of style. While it may be that it displays characteristics of ‘unplanned talk’, the way in which it foregrounds the key ele-

25. To say that the “repeated word-play emphasizes the destructive moral blindness caused by ἄτη” (as Fernández-Galiano ad 295–302) may be missing the mark. Consideration of the same *figura etymologica* in *Il* 19 may be sufficient to show that there is more at stake, both in terms of composition and theme.

26. *Il*. 19.91 (πρέσβα Διὸς θυγάτηρ Ἀτη, ἢ πάντας ἄαται), 129 (αὐτίς ἔλευσεσθαι Ἀτην, ἢ πάντας ἄαται), and 136 (οὐ δυνάμην ἕλαθεσθ’ Ἀτης ἢ πρῶτον ἂσθην).

27. The form ἄεισφρονι is well attested in Homeric and Hesiodic poetry, but forms of ἄασιφρων are transmitted by ancient scholars (e.g., Th. 502) and modern alike (Wilamowitz ad WD 315). See also Apollonius *Lex. Hom.* (s.v.) ἄασιφρων· βλαψίφρονι· εἴρηται καὶ ἄεισφρων· σηまれῖ τῷ ἔχοντι κεκοιμημένας τὰς φρένας καὶ οὐ διεγηγερένας· ἄσιφρονι· φρενοβλάβεια; Hesychius *Lex.* ἄασιφρονι· βλαψίφρονι· φρενοβλάβει. n (p) ἀάσαι γὰρ τὸ βλάψαι (φ 302). Further details at Fernández-Galiano *ad* 302.

28. The word is otherwise used of Polyphemus (9.374) and Elpenor (10.555) in the *Odyssey*, verse-final in each case. Achilles applies the adjective οἰνοβαρές to Agamemnon at *Il*. 1.225.

29. The phrase otherwise occurs only at *Sc*. 93 (ἤν ἄτην ὄχέων: ἢ δ’ οὐ παλινάγρετος ἐστιν), but an unusual physical aspect of ἄτη is evident also in *Od*. 4.261–2 (…) ἄτην δὲ μετέστενον, ἢν Ἀφροδίτῃ | δώχ’ and *Od*. 23.223 (τὴν δ’ ἄτην οὐ πρόσθεν ἔω ἐγκάτθετο θυμῷ). Fernández-Galiano (ad 302) emphasizes instead a meaning of ‘bear, to put with’ for ὄχέων, with the additional requirement that the participle’s object is not “ἄτη itself, but its consequences.”

30. For the collocation of ἄτη and βαρεῖν, see also *Il*. 2.111 (=9.18; Ζεύς μὲ μέγα Κρονίδης ἄτη ἐνέδησε βαρεῖν) and *Od*. 15.233 (ἐῖνεκα Νηλῆος κόμης ἄτης τε βαρεῖν).
ments of the narrative is sufficiently varied that we may instead emphasize the *rhetorical* aspect of its verbal repetition.³¹ But we may make one more distinction: this narrative differs from many other *paradigmata* in that it foregrounds thematic elements of a story rather than an individual.³² In what follows, we shall investigate further ways in which *paradigmata* thematize various elements of a story and how they, in so doing, draw perceptibly on the syntax and formulae of other traditions.

### A.2 Cohesion and thematization

While there does exist a number of ways of creating cohesive links or relations in a given stretch of discourse, we shall focus primarily on the *thematization* of these relations. Thematization describes the process by which the sentential subject—‘what the sentence is about’, or ‘theme’—is moved ‘left’ to the front of a given ‘sentence’, becoming its starting point.³³ Following the ‘theme’ in the discourse is the ‘rheme’, or what the speaker has to say about that starting point.³⁴ In many forms of narrative one finds a sentential thematization of the time or space adverbials;³⁵ that is, the temporal or spatial element of the narrative sequence of events is highlighted by being pushed to the front of any given discourse unit. Nestor’s way of speaking in *Iliad* 11 is a good example of this, for the geographical structure of his narrative is clear in the repetition of ἔνθεν and ἔνθα.

---

³¹. That is, we may consider that the “linguistic foregrounding of an idea…serve[s] to make it more persuasive even without logical support,” as has been suggested in the case of Arabic persuasive prose (Johnstone 1987a: 208), but see esp. Koch 1983; Johnstone 1987b.

³². As noted above (n.17 on p. 62 above), Homeric poetry does seem to refrain from too much mention of Peirithoos and the Lapithai.

³³. The spatial metaphor of ‘left-most’ is unfortunately text-based, but otherwise not unhelpful in measuring the perceptual salience of a given idea in a serial stretch of oral discourse.

³⁴. Fuller explanation of theme is to be found most easily at Brown and Yule 1983: 126–133; in particular, various uses of the word ‘theme’ are laid out. Our use here is in agreement with that of Halliday 1967.


Though she does not note it in the case of Nestor’s speech in particular, Gaisser (1969a: 5–6) draws attention to such narrative structure in her study of digressions, specifically to the use of introductory expressions (whether conjunctions or adverbs) to order the events of a story. Many such ordering expressions are found in the digressions, but the most important ones seem to be ἀλλ’ ὅτε δῆ, αὐτὰρ, and ἔνθα. We find an example in Antenor’s story of the embassy of Odysseus and Menelaus to Troy (Iliad 3.204–224) [where] the important phrase is ἀλλ’ ὅτε δῆ.

The progress of the story, as Gaisser recognizes, “depends upon the repetition of the introductory expression” (7). And, indeed, several of the digressions in Homeric poetry feature such ordering expressions: aside from Antenor’s story of Odysseus and Menelaos, we might note the descent of Agamemnon’s scepter (Il. 2.100–109: αὐτὰρ ἅρα, αὐτὰρ ὅ αὖτε, αὐτὰρ ὅ αὖτε) and the portent at Aulis (Il. 2.299–332: ἔνθ’, ἔνθα, ἔνθα). But it is worth observing that these particular historical digressions, which thematize time, are generally not paradeigmata.

We may also speak of thematization for units of discourse larger than the sentence. Grimes was perhaps the first to do so, calling the process ‘staging’. Staging is a means of organizing discourse in such a way that a particular element is taken as a discourse’s point of departure, with every other clause, sentence, and paragraph organized around it. “It is,” Grimes writes, “as though the speaker presents what he wants to say from a particular perspective” (1975: 323). Speaking in terms of human cognition, Chafe describes this process as ‘foregrounding’, whereby one referent is established in the


38. While Nestor characteristically, perhaps archaically, does tell his stories in a manner that thematizes time and geography, there exist other markers that identify his tales as paradigmatic for some—but problematically not all—of his audience. See Pedrick 1983 and Martin 2000b on Nestor’s speech in Iliad 11, a speech which is most significant for its being paradigmatic, yet not marked clearly as paradigmatic.

39. I must note that my approach and findings, while different, are not necessarily inconsistent with those of Bakker 1997b: 156–206 (esp. 164), where the term ‘staging’ is applied especially to the formulae that introduce noun-epithet epiphanies of gods and heroes.
foreground of consciousness, with other discourse referents relegated to the discourse’s ‘background’.40

As ever, what these terms and concepts alone can tell us of Archaic Greek poetry is debatable, if not entirely suspect. On the other hand, observing patterns of ‘thematization’, ‘staging’, and ‘foregrounding’ can be quite productive. After all, within these concepts of cohesion, thematization and syntactic structure, it is well to note that such patterns of reference in discourse tend to be genre-specific; that is, the conventionalized distributions of subordinate clauses, pronouns, and general richness of information differ by speech genre.41 This phenomenon is well documented specifically in narrative studies, where sequences of events in time, together with inference and implication, are both culture- and genre-specific.42 In a well-known and often-cited study by Linde and Labov (1975), describing the way in which speakers organize descriptions of their apartments (of all things), it emerges that within given speech genres there exist stereotypical orderings, which consistently lend perceptual salience to various items in discourse.43

Relative clauses are one such criterion, and one which I argue is especially useful in the typologies of paradeigmata in Archaic Greek hexameter poetry. Rather than simply a ‘back grounding device’,44 relative clauses are part of rich syntactic patterns of expressing given and new information in a way that promotes cohesion and interpretation. Of particular interest is the ‘presentational’ relative construction, such as is found in the

42. See, e.g., Grimes 1975 and Becker 1979.
43. See also Leveilt 1981 and van Dijk 1977. For discourse markers in this context, see Schiffrin 1986: 261–266.
44. In English relative clauses are generally considered background because the temporal sequence of a narrative is not thought to depend on their order (Reinhart 1984: 796; but see Depraetere 1996 [esp. 252–92]). (On the background/foreground distinction, cf., e.g., Labov 1972: 359–362 and Depraetere 1996: 252–257.)
English-language fairy-tale *incipit*, “There once was a man who…” Although the main clause need not be as simple as the copula or existential construction, the fact that it can readily be such a straightforward, semantically-neutral ‘orientation’ statement underscores the significance of the choice of the relative clause construction. Its most important characteristic is that it establishes the referent of the relative pronoun as the discourse topic, and that, especially when accompanied by additional discourse markers, it does so in the most salient possible way.\(^{45}\)

That there exist discourse markers in combination with these relative clauses should not be surprising. For, in our previous study we emphasized the way in which tale-initial discourse markers can, at the level of paragraph, shape the audience’s expectations of a particular stretch of discourse,\(^{46}\) thematizing the *interactional* aspect of the narrative that follows.\(^{47}\) Yet discourse markers continue to shape the structure of narrative and interpretation as a given speech progresses. In fact, it is just such discourse markers that, when combined with particular syntactic constructions, can create cohesion in a given stretch of discourse. Discourse markers, after all, “are keyed on participant expectations about narrative structures and storytelling procedures” and “guide listeners back to the main sequence of narrative elements following interruptions and digressions” (Norrick 2001: 849).\(^{48}\) We shall, in what follows, look especially at the Greek particle ἄρα (in-}

---


\(^{46}\) The discourse marker καὶ γάρ was a particularly important instance of meta-linguistic commentary on how to interpret what is being said.

\(^{47}\) In fact, these discourse markers allow us to distinguish this use of the relative clause from those relative clauses that more properly belong to the *Relativstil* that Norden (1974: 168–176) studies in the context of hymns and religious poetry more generally. While we shall return to this in the context of Pindar below, for now it is useful to distinguish our current object of study—the relative clauses with discourse markers—from, say, the speech of Chryses in *Iliad* 1 (37–8): κλῦθι ὀφυ ἀργυρότοξ, ὃς Χρύσην ἀμφιβέβηκας | Κίλλαν τε ζαθέην Τενέδοι τε ἴφι ἀνάσσεις.

\(^{48}\) Norrick (2001: 849) further remarks that “discourse markers signal a sequential discourse relationship...[with a] function not related to any lexical meaning...due to its highly coded
including ρα and ἄρ as “means of shaping the story, means of defining through repetition the structure the narrator intended the text to disclose.”

Again, consistent genre-specific patterns of this sort are one way we find that the paradeigmata separate themselves from other, unmarked historical digressions in Homeric poetry.

A.3 Formulae, diction, and register variation

Discourse markers are, as we saw above, one way of bracketing units of discourse, and that bracketing is a meta-linguistic comment on the meaning of the discourse that follows. Yet there are other productive means of discourse-bracketing, too, especially those means associated with changes in ‘register’ or ‘style-shifting’. Within a speech, as I shall show, paradeigmata often feature discernible differences in register or style, and, moreover, they tend to mark the boundaries of these shifts in style with ‘syntagms’, or “syntactic[s] unit comprising two or more linguistic signs or elements.” These syntagmatic markers can include both lexical and syntactic elements, as well as discourse particles, and the change in style can likewise be discernible both lexically and syntactically: we may refer to this particular type of syntagm as a ‘transition boundary marker’, and to the change in style as ‘style-shifting’. I argue that paradigmatic narratio

sequentiality and storytelling conventions.” See further Segal 1991.


52. S.v. OED. The term originally appears in Saussure et al. 1916: 170–175. I shall, at times, also use the term ‘syntactic formula’ both to avoid awkwardness and underscore the oral poetic aspect of this compositional technique.

53. Two notes on ‘transition boundary markers’: first, they are a superset of discourse markers in that they can be, or can comprise, discourse markers, but can also be larger, more complicated markers tracing more distinct discourse boundaries; second, one may encounter the term ‘transaction boundary markers’ in such studies as Coupland 1983, which term be seems to have been supplanted by this more general term (as Coupland’s study really did marked transitions to transactions in speech).

54. For a similar argument in the case of the simile (though without discussion of, e.g., syntax or
tives in Greek hexameter poetry regularly foreground their transitions into different ‘styles’ or ‘registers’—marking the transition boundary and creating cohesion—and that they do so in a consistent way.

What this approach further provides us is the ability to look at these syntaxes and formal characteristics in conjunction with particular patterns of diction. For, as well shall see, the characteristic syntaxes are triggered by, as well as introduce and foreground, a certain nexus of lexical items. It is this sense of syntacto-lexical appropriateness, this sort of *Sprachgefühl* or native linguistic feeling, that defines the register of this way of speaking. This marked register, or style, further contributes to the internal cohesion, or texture, of a given unit of discourse. As it happens, this intersection of syntax, boundary marking, and diction reveal catalogic and genealogical underpinnings in the *paradeigmata*.

**B Syntax, style, and style-shifting**

One such cohesive syntax that proves characteristic of the telling of *paradeigmata*, I suggest, is the relative clause. The relative clause is a strong form of syntactic anaphora, controlling the status of information within a structure of ‘new’ and ‘given’ information through syntax and word order. Yet control of the ‘new’ and the ‘given’ boundary markers), see Martin 1997. Bonifazi 2004 builds on Martin’s observation in a study of Pindar, coupling it with findings in Bakker 1993. It will become clear below how greatly my approach differs from each of these studies, and how it revises assumptions and findings in both Bakker and Bonifazi.

55. While I somehow find this the most apt, even accessible, term here, I do not aim to invoke the matter of linguistic evolution and decay, which is original to the comparativist August Schleicher’s use of the term (1973: 36,65).

56. For a corpus-based approach to profiling generic registers in English, see Dillon 2007. Similar studies include Moon 1998 and Stubbs 2001.

57. Now that we have seen how lexical repetition can not only lend cohesion to a narrative, but also thematize the particularly salient elements, we might also consider what larger-scale lexical foregrounding in the *paradeigmata* achieves.

58. See Dasinger and Toupin 1994: 468–469. The seminal work in this area is Halliday 1967, but
makes it sound far simpler than it is in practice. Crosslinguistic studies in sentence construction have shown that the ‘rhetorical norms’ of relative clauses are not easy to pin to factors such as language typology, nor to the age or educational level of the speaker. Failing explanation by these more traditional means, sociolinguists have found most plausible the explanation that the use of relative clauses in narrative is simply a ‘linguistic habit’.\textsuperscript{59} Moreover, and not unexpectedly, syntaxes such as the relative clause are among those shown to follow a genre-specific distribution in many languages.\textsuperscript{60}

Relative clauses, of course, are by no means uncommon in Homeric poetry—however much scholarly attention to the essentially \textit{paratactic} nature of oral poetry might seem to preclude them\textsuperscript{61}—but I suggest that, by paying close attention to the use of discourse markers within relative clauses, we can begin properly to observe and understand the ‘linguistic habit’ that is characteristic of relative clauses in the \textit{paradeigmata}. To begin, let us revisit two examples discussed above. The first is \textit{Iliad} 6.130–3, the opening of Diomedes’ tale of Lycurgus:

\begin{quote}
\text{οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ Δρύαντος μιὸς κρατερὸς Λυκόοργος}
\text{δὴν ἦν, ὡς ἡθεοῖσιν ἐπουρανίοισιν ἔριζεν·}
\text{ὡς ποτὲ μαίνομένου Διωνύσῳ τιθήνας}
\text{σεῦ κατ’ ἠγάθεον Νυσήϊον·}
\end{quote}

You know, not even the son of Dryas, mighty Lycurgus, lived long, who tried to fight with the gods in heaven, and once chased the attendants of raging Dionysus down over the Nysian hill.

---

\textsuperscript{59} See, e.g., Dasinger and Toupin 1994: 485–498, who take up a suggestion of Bates and Devescovi (1989). Dasinger and Toupin make the attractive proposal that the relative clause may be an ‘evaluative syntax’ in the sense of Labov 1972: 366–375.

\textsuperscript{60} See n.41 on p. 67 above.

\textsuperscript{61} Relative clauses in Homeric poetry are best viewed as \textit{appositional} clauses, rather than as \textit{embedded} (‘subordinate’) clauses. On parataxis in Homeric poetry, see Parry 1971: 252 on the ‘adding’ style’; Kirk 1976 (esp. 78–81 and 152–72) on ‘cumulation’; and, more recently, Bakker 1997b: 39–43 on ‘oral style’ and cognition.
After the tale-initial discourse marker οὐδὲ γάρ οὐδὲ and the facts of Lycurgus’ parent-age and life cut short, Diomedes starts in on his story via two relative clauses (vv. 131, 132). These relative clauses, by means of their constant topicalization of Lycurgus, tightly knit the transitional lead-in of this paradeigma, and amount to a high degree of internal cohesion.

That the two relative pronouns occur in such quick succession is remarkable in itself, but observe also the two discourse markers, ῥα and ποτε, coupled with the relative pronouns. These markers,62 I suggest, are keys to understanding the syntax of the relative clause in paradeigmata. That is, we can get some sense of the work that the markers do by observing the way in which the syntax and function of a given pronoun are determined by the particles or markers used with it. These pronoun-particle combinations within the paradeigmata are listed in Table 3 (just below).

Table 3: Transitional relative clauses in the paradeigmata of Homeric poetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Il. 5.640</td>
<td>ὅς ποτε δεὺρ’ ἐλθὼν ἔνεχ’ ἵππων Λαομέδεντος</td>
<td>Tleopolemus to Sarpedon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 6.131–2</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα θεοίσιν ἐπουρανίοισιν…</td>
<td>Glaukos to Diomedes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 7.124ff.</td>
<td>ὅς ποτέ μ’ εἰρόμενος μέγ’ ἐγήθεεν ὃ ἐνι οίκῳ</td>
<td>Nestor of self</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 1.405</td>
<td>* ὅς ῥα παρὰ Κρονίωνι καθέζετο κύδει γαῖων…</td>
<td>Achilles to Tleopolemus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 5.650</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα μιν ἐν ἔρανεν κακῷ ἠνίπαπε μυθό</td>
<td>Sarpedon to Tleopolemus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 9.504</td>
<td>αἵ ῥά τε καὶ μετόπισθ’ ἁτῆς ἀλέγουσι κιοῦσαι</td>
<td>Phoenix of Litai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 19.522</td>
<td>παῖδ’ ὅλοφυρομένη Ἡτυλον φιλοῦ, ὃν ποτε χαλκῷ</td>
<td>Penelope of nightingale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 18.118</td>
<td>ὃς περ φιλτατος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι</td>
<td>Achilles to Thetis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 19.95</td>
<td>καὶ γάρ δὴ ὑπ’ ποτε Ζῆν’ ἄσατο, τὸν περ ἄριστον</td>
<td>Agamemnon of Zeus63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 21.107</td>
<td>κάτθανε καὶ Πάτροκλος, ὃ περ σεό πολλὸν ἀμείνων</td>
<td>Achilles to Lykaon64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

62. The temporal adverb ποτε is, of course, not a ‘particle’ in the sense that ἄρα is, but it remains a ‘discourse marker’. Compare the way in which, as part of certain formulae, English ‘now’ and ‘then’ serve not as temporal adverbs but as discourse markers (Schiffrin 2001: 246–248). Cf. Spanish ‘ahora’ and ‘entonces’, or French ‘alors’ and ‘done’.

63. For the καὶ γάρ…ὅν περ, see also the τις-speech of Il. 2.292–3. On the compatibility of περ and ποτε in Pindar, compare: τὸν ὄντερ ποτ’ Οἰκλέος παῖς ἐν ἔπτασθείς ιδών (P. 8.39–40); ὃπερ καὶ Κινύραν ἔβρισε πλούτῳ ποντίᾳ ἐν ποτε Κύπρῳ (N. 8.18). For ὄντερ without ποτε, cf. also Pind. P. 3.100.

64. In this case, beyond the required sense, the verse-end phrase is certainly conditioned by the
In this table we see the pronoun consistently coupled with the markers ῥα and ποτε, as well as περ,65 suggesting that the use of the relative clause to mark the transition into paradigmatic narrative in Homeric poetry may indeed be something of a ‘linguistic habit’. It also indicates that these two elements can—over even must—be treated profitably as a syntactic unit, or syntagm.

Nor am I the first to suggest that the syntax and function of pronouns are bound up with the particles that accompany them: based in his study of Pindaric poetry W. J. Slater has made a similar observation concerning the use and function of particles in combination with pronouns.66 In his entry for the lemma ὁ, ὅ, ὅς he writes (s.v.): “The uses are relative, demonstrative, articular: where ὁ is not followed by a particle, it is often impossible to decide whether the use is relative or demonstrative.”67 The same may be said in the case of Homeric poetry.68 Thus, in speaking here of ‘relative’ clauses and pronouns, we shall here be concerned with all asyndetic uses of the relative and demonstrative pronoun—regardless of whether it appears as τὸν or ὃν in our editions—and especially when combined with the discourse markers ἀρα and ποτε.

65. We shall not yet deal separately with the examples where the sense requires περ rather than ῥα or ποτε. Its concessive use, visible even in Table 3 (p. 72) is restricted to comparison. (N.B. its accompaniment by φίλτατος, ἄριστον, and ἀμείνων.) Nevertheless, this syntagm fills the same syntactic slot. In the case of II. 19.95 note the postponed transitional ἀλλ’ ἀρα καὶ τὸν (cp. Hes. fr. 197.7 Μ–Ω, …ἀλλ’ ἀρα καὶ τοὺς); in II. 21.107 note the transitional ὁιος in the following verse.


68. Cf. Chantraine GH II 153–70 (e.g., p. 167).
B.1 The pronoun with ἀρα

That we are dealing with a specialized type of relative clause is initially suggested by its marked occurrence just after the paradigmatic discourse markers in Diomedes’ tale of Lycurgus. Let us recall now another example from previous discussions, the description of the Litai in Phoenix’ speech of Iliad 9 (vv. 502–4): 69

καὶ γάρ τε λιταί εἴσι Διὸς κοῦραί μεγάλοιο
χωλαί τε ρυσαί τε παραβλώπες τ’ ὑφθαλμώ,
αἵ ῥά τε καὶ μετόπισθ’ ἄτης ἀλέγουσι κιούσαι.70

Here, again, we notice the confluence of the particle string καὶ γάρ with a nominative relative pronoun followed by ῥα.71 One’s immediate reaction must be that forms of ἀρα, including the enclitic form ῥ(α),72 are exceedingly common in Homeric poetry and that the lemma’s meanings are legion. Denniston is not far wrong in suggesting: “It stands, in fact, for something like ‘Siehe!’, though it is a word to be felt rather than translated” (s.v.; my emphasis).73 This meta-communicative aspect of Denniston’s description is

69. See further p. 40 above.
70. It may be objected that the αἵ ῥά is here followed by τε καί. While an ‘epic’ τε regularly combines with ῥα to change the texture of the syntagm (to that of one better suited to introduce a generalizing statement as in a simile), we have here a different phenomenon, occurring otherwise in D. P. Orb. descr. 230 and Arat. Phaen. 1.226, 245 (in which one may compare the catalogic context, Aratus’ poetic debt to Hesiod [on which see Fakas 2001, as well as Call. Epigram 27 Pf. with Hunter 2005: 239–241 and refs.], and the fact that an astronomical treatise did come to be associated with Hesiod’s name). The sole use in a simile at Q.S. 2.478 defies convention.
71. It is no accident that this syntax favors the nominative, as it relates to foregrounding and topicalization. The particle ῥά occurs with the nominative relative pronoun 127X in Homeric and Hesiodic poetry, as opposed to 61X with the accusative, yet this has primarily to do with distribution across gender and number. That is, while the subject nominative has been found in some languages to be most effective (see, e.g., Mak et al. 2008), Archaic Greek hexameter has nearly equal affinity for the object accusative in the singular (65X ὅς ῥα vel sim.; 56X ὅν ῥά vel sim.). I use the terms ‘subject nominative’ and ‘subject accusative’ so as not to obscure the fact that the subject accusative remains in these cases the ‘subject’ or ‘topic’ of discourse.
72. Note, however, that ῥα—what we shall focus on here—is far less common. Hoenigswald 1953: 298: “Leaving ἀρ aside, we find that ἀρα and ῥα’ seem to occur quite freely in Homer. ῥα, on the other hand, does not.”
73. Denniston may be criticized for following Hartung’s proposal (1832: 417–450 [esp. 422–3; 437–8]) that ἀρα expresses surprise (cf. Bakker 1993: 16n42), but I draw attention only to the
found also in the proposal of Chantraine, who notes of its Homeric usage that “la particule sert à établir un contact entre le poète et l’attente de l’auditeur: elle n’a pas de valeur logique.” Such, in broad terms, was the conclusion of Grimm, who wrote that the particle expresses “eine Berufung auf einen bestimmten bekannten Sachverhalt” (1962: 20), yet Grimm emphasizes that this contact between poet and audience is decidedly ‘visual’.

Although recent commentators have made more sweeping suggestions regarding the function of ἄρα, building primarily on Grimm’s work, I do not consider it productive to consider the particle in isolation. It is, after all, difficult to imagine a satisfactory set of definitions of the particle—a particle which arises in so many different configurations—when it is divorced from its surrounding syntax. We shall rather consider the particle when coupled with the relative pronoun, thereby forming a syntagm. A proper understanding then is two-way: a given particle can give meaning to a pronoun; and, the syntax of the pronoun grants some tractability to understanding the use of the particle. For now, therefore, it suffices to use it as something of a linguistic ‘radioisotope’ to track a particular set of relative clauses, and treating is as part of the ‘linguistic habit’ that rela-

succinctly-put, meta-communicative aspect of Denniston’s explanation, which I have here italicized. See also Frisk 1960 (s.v.), Schwyzer and Debrunner 1950: 558f. and Hoenigswald 1953.

74. Chantraine 1999, s.v.
75. Grimm (1962) consistently uses the phrase “vor Augen” (pp. 13, 18, 22–3). Bakker’s view is in agreement with Grimm, as he himself notes (Bakker 1993: 16n42). Bakker only seems to differ in that he emphasizes the role of this visualization within the mind of the poet, making the visual experience of the audience secondary (not unlike Ps.-Longinus’ description of φαντασία in De. subl. §15).
76. Bakker (2005: 98), working in the tradition of Chafe and his ‘immediate’ and ‘displaced’ modes of discourse, remarks that “ἄρα does not mark a ‘fact’ so much as a mental disposition.” Unfortunately, Bakker seems to base his interpretation on a few specific examples which emphasize the visual and deictic (e.g., ll. 20.344–8). See also Bakker 1993: 15–23; Bakker 1997b: 205, with Elmer 2005: 28.
77. I must stress that, while I may emphasize the use of ἄρα in the relative clause, I do not follow the proposal of Gährken (1950) that ἄρα is originally a Relativpartikel.
tive clauses seem to be. For, here again, it is clearly at the interactional, rather than the transactional, level of language that we must work.\textsuperscript{78}

In our last two examples, both studied above and both clearly paradeigmata, we have seen that the relative clauses marked by ῥα follow closely on our discourse-initial markers οὐδὲ γὰρ and καὶ γάρ. Yet we have not ruled out that this combination of relative and particle—ὁς ῥα and the like—is not simply a straightforward, unmarked storytelling convention; we have not shown that it is actually indicative of a particular discourse strategy which would have been a stylistic, interpretive signal to the audience. While I cannot here present my study of all instances of ῥα’s combination with the relative pronoun in hexameter poetry,\textsuperscript{79} that study makes clear that the paradeigma employs a syntax that is otherwise found especially in similes, genealogies, and aetiologies.

One recent and suggestive study of this syntagm is made by Egbert Bakker, who has studied instances of the appositional relative clause such as ὁς ῥα in the context of the androktasia. Bakker describes the poetics of this syntagm as follows (1997b:
118n58):

This poetics of the androktasia, in which the kleos of the warrior slain serves as context for the kleos of the victorious hero, is grounded in the mentality and point of view of the epic heroes themselves… Note, furthermore, that the appositional relative clause introducing the victim’s tradition is frequently, as here, marked by the evidential particle ἄρα (ὁς ῥ’ or ὁς ῥα), stressing the validity of the present speech as based on previous speech. Likewise, the relational pronoun introducing the description of the killing proper is often marked by the same particle (τόν ῥα), emphasizing that the description is prompted by evidence produced by the present discourse itself…

This summary succinctly reformulates his 1993 article, an article in which he argues in detail that epic narrative differentiates itself from other modes of storytelling by putting the poet or speaker in the position of witness, participant, and interpreter of visualized past events and evidence, which are provided by the poet’s memory.\textsuperscript{80} In the case of the

\textsuperscript{78} On ‘interactional’ versus ‘transactional’ approaches to language, see the discussion at n.51 on p. 26 above.

\textsuperscript{79} See Appendix B (p. 358). The combination καὶ ῥα also deserves treatment, but space does not permit.
*androktasia*, he rightly emphasizes a need to reevaluate the traditional view of the relative clauses begun with ὁς ἃς as being simply ‘background’ or ‘information’ in typical cases such as *Il.* 5.69–73:

Πήδαιον δ’ ἄρ’ ἔπεφνε Μέγης Ἀντήνωρος τούς ὁς ἃς νόθος μὲν ἔην, πῦκα δ’ ἔτρεψε διὰ Θεανό ἴσα φιλοισί τέκεσι χαριζομένη πόσει ὅ. τόν μὲν Φυλείδης δουρὶ κλυτὸς ἐγγύθεν ἐλθὼν βεβλήκει κεφαλῆς κατὰ ἱνίον ὅξει δουρὶ.

And so Meges killed Pedaios, son of Antenor, who was a bastard, and lovely Theano nursed him closely, just as with her own children, pleasing her husband. Him now the son of Phyleus, famous for his spear, closed in on him and struck him behind at the tendon of his head with a sharp spear.

Bakker here characterizes the relative clause not as ‘background’ in narratological terms, but as “biographical detail…at the center of the performer’s strategies to bring this world back to the present” (1993: 20). In that sense, it is an “activation of the tradition,” and Bakker suggests that the particle ἃρα here “signals that what is said in the relative clause is based on evidence from kleos.”

While there is much to recommend in Bakker’s approach to this formulaic syntax, I suggest that his approach is, though far-reaching within the context of Homeric poetry, too narrow to suit the broader tradition of hexameter poetry in Archaic Greece.

For, even within Homeric poetry, his explanation of the syntagm fails to be truly descriptive in all cases: we saw above the way in which it appears in Phoenix’ description of the *Litai* at *Il.* 9.504, and there exist other examples where kleos does not seem the apt term.

---


81. Compare Grimm’s emphasis (pp. 14, 37) on *Berühmtheit*, or κλέος ἄφθιτον. As for the ‘activation of tradition’, see Grimm’s more general reference to “eine Fülle mündlicher Epik” which would have been known to poet and audience (31). Though he cites some genealogical examples in his discussion, he never pinpoints genealogical poetry specifically (but, like Beye, he simply would not have had our familiarity with the *Catalogue* fragments).

82. Similar value can be found in Bonifazi 2004, which draws on Bakker 1993 in a study of the relative clause in Pindar, but see Appendix A (p. 350).

83. My complaint may well be due to the focus in Bakker’s research on Homeric poetry, for he refers only to heroic, epic narrative (see esp. pp. 19–20). For an explicitly broader view of kleos, see Nagy 1990b: 200nn5–6, who extends it also to genealogical and theogonic poetry.
or where the \textit{tradition activated} seems hardly that of Homeric poetry. For this reason it is worth returning to the findings of Charles Beye, on whom Bakker draws in his own work. Beye focuses his research on the similarity of the \textit{androktasiai} to the Catalogue of Ships, suggesting that they may be traditional to some extent. For Beye, the \textit{androktasia} is a tripartite scheme consisting of ‘basic information’, ‘anecdote’, and ‘contextual information’; so too an entry in the Catalogue of Ships, where the self-contained hexameters are as easily delineated. “The battle scenes are narrative,” he suggests, “that seems to hint at some other formal arrangement” (349). In that way, the \textit{androktasia} and the catalogue entry share a ‘general rhythm’ and the battle-field elaborations are to be compared also the Catalogue of Nereids in the \textit{Iliad} and the \textit{Nekyia} in the \textit{Odyssey}. Indeed, for Beye, “formally the battle narratives are akin to commonly acknowledged catalogues and to a degree \textit{alien to the usual means of epic narrative}” (353; my emphasis). He observes the tendency of battle narrations to be reduced to the bare delivery that characterizes not only the list of the Nereids, but so much of the \textit{Theogony}; specifically, “[a]lthough the \textit{androktasiai} are more or less dramatic narrative, underneath them all persists, in greater or

\begin{footnotes}
\footnote{Note especially \textit{Od}. 15.319 (Odysseus to Eumaeus regarding Hermes) and \textit{Od}. 12.39 (Circe to Odysseus of the Sirens), as well as the didactic stance taken in each speech (in that both begin with imperative \textit{ἀκοῦσον}).}
\footnote{Beye 1964, continuing the topic of his 1958 Harvard dissertation.}
\footnote{Note also Beye: “an examination of the basic difference between lists like the Catalogue of Ships and those like the Nereid list helps to define the relationship of the Homeric and the Hesiodic style and mentality” (346). See n.93 on p. 137 below for further discussion.}
\footnote{In the context of the \textit{II}. 5.69–73 above, for example, v. 69 is the ‘basic information’, vv. 70–1 the ‘anecdote’, and vv. 72–3 the ‘contextual information’. What we are studying in the ὅς ῥα-type clause, then, is the ‘anecdote’.}
\footnote{Beye 1964: 351–353.}
\footnote{See esp. Beye 1964: 365–369. His conclusion is this: “The frequently appearing bare lists of names in the \textit{Iliad’s androktasiai are indication of a trend toward something like the Nereid list. This is the Hesiodic style, representing the antiquarian, indexing, collecting mentality that in every literature has reduced the ornate, emotional pictorial and dramatic material of saga epic to its so-called essentials—that is, ‘the facts’, personal names, place names, and the like” (369).}
\end{footnotes}
less degree, the catalogue form” (367). Table 4 (just below) lists numerous instances of the ὅς ῥα syntagm in catalogic portions of Homeric poetry.

**Table 4: Relative clauses featuring ῥα in catalogic sections of Homeric poetry**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Il. 2.632</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα Ίθάκην εἶχον καὶ Νήριτον εινοσίφυλλον</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 2.752</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα ἔς Πηνείον προέι καλλίρροου ὦδωρ,</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 2.853</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα Κύτωρον εἶχον καὶ Σήσαιμον ἀμφενέμοντο</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 13.793</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα ἐς Πηνειὸν προΐει καλλίρροον ὦδωρ,</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 14.324</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα ἀναφανδὸν ὁπυὶε πορὼν ἀπερείσια ἑδνα</td>
<td>Zeus’ Catalogue of Lovers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 5.336</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα Ὁδυσῆ' ἐλήσεν αλώμενον, ἄλγε' ἔχοντα·</td>
<td>Sea-nymph Leukothea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 11.267</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα Ἡρακλήα θρασυµνόνα θυµολέοντα</td>
<td>Nekyia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 11.299</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα ὑπὸ Τυνδαρέω κρατερόφρονε γείνατο παιδε,</td>
<td>Nekyia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 11.313</td>
<td>ὅς ῥα καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἀπειλήτην ἐν Ὀλύµπῳ</td>
<td>Nekyia90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This is not to obscure, of course, the many examples outside of obviously catalogic portions of Homeric poetry as well that feature this syntagm. In fact, I have included above an example of a passage that may not, at first glance, appear to be catalogic in nature (Od. 5.333–8):

```plaintext
τὸν δὲ ἱδεὶν Κάδμου θυγάτηρ, καλλίσφυρος Ἰνῶ, Λευκοθέη, ἦ πρὶν μὲν ἐνι βροτὸς αὐδήσεια, νῦν δὲ ἀλὸς ἐν πελάγεσιθειὸν ἐξέμυρορ τιμῆς. ἦ ῥα' Ὁδυσῆ' ἐλήσεν αλώμενον, ἄλγε' ἔχοντα· αἰθυίῃ δ' εἰκώνα ποτῆ ἀνεδύσετο λίµης, ἵζε δ' ἐπὶ σχεδίης καὶ μὲν πρὸς μῦθον ἐειπε·  
```

And she saw him, the daughter of Cadmus, beautiful-ankled Ino, Leukothea, who previously was a mortal of human speech, but now in the depths of the sea has a share of honor from the gods. She pitied Odysseus, wandering as he was beset by sorrows. And she rose up from the water like a seagull in flight and she sat on the raft and spoke a *mythos* to him.

Yet the ability to fully address the discourse characteristics of this passage—a passage which has been suspected of accretion or even wholly condemned91—as part of our inves-

90. To bolster the distinction between ὅς ῥα and ὅς ῥά τε by means of their contrast within a single ‘run’ (in this case the *Nekyia*), note the addition of the τε in the simile at Od. 11.414: ὅς ῥά τε ἐν ἀφνειοῦ ἄνδρος μέγα δυνάμενοι. Cf. Ruijgh 1971: 438–445.

tigation into paradigmatic discourse has an interpretive appeal. While we shall come to appreciate the folk-like figure of the sea-nymph Leukothea in later discussions, for now it is sufficient to note what our study of the ὅς-ῥα syntagm suggests for the initial τὸν δὲ ἱδεν of this passage. Hainsworth (ad 333) doubts the motivation of the phrase in this context, but perhaps he errs in comparing it to the Iliadic τὸν δ’ ὃς οὖν ἐνόησεν. We may better compare it to the catalogic transitional formula observed in the Nekyia (e.g., τὴν δὲ μὲτ’ Ἀντιόπην ἱδον, 11.260), which has the advantage of having the same verb and better suiting the current context. It is the recovery and interpretation of discourse texture such as this that we can expect as we seek the texture of paradeigmata through the full confluence of syntagmatic formulae, register, and theme.

B.2 Foregrounding, lexical triggers, and υἱός

Now that we have seen how syntagms can mark transition boundaries in discourse in a way that is suggestive of genre-specificity (particularly that of catalogue), let us look to another concept we introduced above, that of ‘foregrounding’ or ‘staging’. Our interest, however, is not in staging per se—that is, in how it is executed or how staging varies in the paradeigmata—but rather in the recovery of a sort of residue of this staging that remains coupled, by means of compositional habit, with the ὅς-ῥα syntagm. To do so, let us look in greater detail at the way in which that syntagm interacts with its foreground in

---

92. The sea-nymph Leukothea, of course, was once Ino, daughter of Kadmos. While the Odyssey tells us nothing of the metamorphosis, the Catalogue does (frr. 68, 70.6–7 M–W). See further Gantz 1996: 176–177. On the register of this passage, compare ἀλὸς ἐν πελάγεσσι (v. 335) with ἃλος ἐν ἡμερία (457).

93. E.g., Il. 3.21.

94. Closer still may be Od. 4.556–7, τὸν δ’ ἱδον ἐν νῆσῳ θαλερὸν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα, unless, with Bentley, one deletes the δ’ to preserve the digamma. (See S. West [ad loc.] on early papyrus witnesses to that phrasing.) Even here note the diction of this passage: υἱός (455), νῦμφη ἐν μεγάροις (457).
Homeric poetry. A succinct and typical example from the Catalogue of Ships is *Il.* 2.726–8:

οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ’ οἱ ἀναρχοί ἔσαν, πόθεον γε μὲν ἀρχόν·
οὐδέ μὲν οὐδ’ οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν,
πόθεον γε μὲν ἀρχόν·

Yes, these men were not leaderless, though they longed for a leader. But Medon, assembled them, the bastard son of Oileus, whom Rhene bore to Oileus, that sacker of cities.

Above I have underlined the word ἕσαν, and with good reason. For, of the 81 examples of the ὅς-ῥα syntax in the *Iliad*, ranging well beyond contexts such as the Catalogue of Ships, some form of the word ἕσαν or a patronymic in ἐν-δης occurs within the few preceding verses in at least 26 instances.95 Thinking back to Diomedes’ tale of Lycurgus (*Il.* 6.130–3),

we notice how it is the noun ἕσαν that further betrays the distinctly genealogical style.96

That the ὅς ῥα syntax, then, is associated especially with catalogue and genealogy—and, in turn, *paradeigmata*—is becoming a very attractive conclusion. That is, even outside of a genealogical context, in Homeric poetry these genealogical lexical items—both as antecedents to pronouns and as staging for topic entities—are retained in the traditional transition to related narrative. An excellent example comes from Achilles’ catalogue of Myrmidons in *Iliad* 16 (vv. 175–83):


96. With less frequency, one may also encounter πατήρ (*Od.* 2.46; see on p. 83) or even παῖς (*CEG* 12 [Attica], ἔστι δὲ Σιληνὸς παῖς Φώκο, τόμ ποτ’ ἔθρεψεν), on which see p. 310 below.
Him did the daughter of Peleus bear, lovely Polydore, to tireless Spercheius, when a woman lay with an immortal; but in name born to Borus, son of Perieres, who wed her openly, giving an immense bride-price. And of the next battalion Eudoros was leader, a virgin’s child, and him did lovely-in-dance Polymele bear, that daughter of Phylas. Her did strong Argeïphontes desire when he saw her with his eyes among the dancers in a chorus of echoing Artemis of the golden-distaff.

Here one quickly notices not only the genealogical language but also the catalogic context that so easily accommodates it.

B.3 The pronoun with ποτε

We may recall that Diomedes’ Lycurgus paradeigma of Iliad 6—aside from featuring the ὃς ὅσις syntagm and ‘staging’ υἱός—also featured a relative clause beginning with ὃς ποτε.98 In Table 5 (just below) I have listed all instances of the masculine nominative pronoun with ποτε in Archaic hexameter:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.629</td>
<td>ὃς ποτε Δουλίχιον δ’ ἀπενάσσατο πατρὶ χολωθείς</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 5.640</td>
<td>ὃς ποτε δεῦρ’ ἐλθὼν ἔνεχ’ ἵππων Λαομέδοντος</td>
<td>Paradeigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 6.132</td>
<td>ὃς ποτε μαινομένοις Διοκύσσοι τιθήνας</td>
<td>Paradeigma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 7.127</td>
<td>ὃς ποτέ μ’ έιρόμενος μέγ’ ἐγήθεεν .Child ἐνι οἰκῳ</td>
<td>Nestor of Peleus99</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

97. Notice here the theme of woman having lay with a god, γυνὴ θεῷ εὐνηθεῖσα, a theme to which we shall return in our consideration of the Hesiodic Catalogue. This verse-final phrasing is paralleled otherwise only at Th .380: καὶ Νότον, ἐν φιλότητι θεᾷ θεῷ εὐνηθεῖσα.

98. Note that the observations just above on the ‘triggering’ υἱός applies also to the ὃς-ποτε syntagm: see II. 4.474, 11.139, 23.679 (with, e.g., Hes. fr. 161.2 M–W).

99. In this example, not only is it Nestor speaking, but it is Nestor speaking to Achilles of
A similar table, Table 6 (just below), represents this finding for the feminine accusative singular pronoun with ποτε in Archaic Greek hexameter:

Table 6: Relative clauses featuring τὴν/ἡν ποτε in Archaic hexameter poetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hes. Th. 409</td>
<td>γείνατο δ’ ἀστερίην εὐώνυμον, ἦν ποτὲ Πέρσης</td>
<td>Asteria, mother of Hecate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 11.281</td>
<td>καὶ Χλώριν εἶδον περικαλλέα, τὴν ποτὲ Νηλεὺς</td>
<td>Nekyia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 11.322</td>
<td>κούρην Μίνωος ὀλοόφρονος, ἦν ποτὲ Θησεὺς</td>
<td>Nekyia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 19.56</td>
<td>δινωτὴν ἐλέφαντι καὶ ἀργύρῳ, ἦν ποτὲ τέκτων</td>
<td>Genealogy of bedchamber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 1.430</td>
<td>τὴν ποτὲ Λαέρτης πρίατο κτεάτεσσιν ἑοῖσι</td>
<td>Genealogy of Eurycleia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 7.9</td>
<td>τὴν ποτὲ Ἀπείρηθεν νέες ἠγαγον ἀµφιέλλεσαι,</td>
<td>Genealogy of Eurymedusa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cypria, fr. 9.2</td>
<td>τὴν ποτὲ καλλίκομος Νέμεσις ῥηλότητι μυγεῖσα</td>
<td>Nemesis’ birth to Helen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 19.393</td>
<td>οὐλήν, τὴν ποτὲ μιν σὺς ἠλασε λευκῷ ὀδόντι</td>
<td>Odysseus’ scar</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Achilles’ father Peleus. Still more, Nestor is describing Peleus thus: ὡς ποτὲ μ’ εἰρόμενος μέγ’ ἐγήθεεν ὃ ἐνί οἰκῷ | πάντων Ἀργείων ἔρεων γενεὰν τε τόκον τε. (7.127–8; “…who once, as he was questioning me in his house, was very pleased as he listened to the generation and blood of all of the Argives”). In this way Nestor is using a genealogical syntagm to describe Peleus listening to actual genealogical performance. See more at p. 302 below.

100. It is significant that this syntactic formula occurs only here in the Works and Days, for it is that passage where the poet reminds Perses of how their father sailed from Aeolian Kyme to Ascra. On the poet’s mythologization strategy here, see Chapter 11, where I shall also take up the way in which this passage, along with Od. 2.46, are exploiting this ‘way of speaking’. Looking at this phrase in combination with Od. 2.46, where Peisenor speaks of his father, we may well think of this formula in the epigraphic evidence, on which see below.

The first three verses—all very explicitly genealogical—are quite similar in syntax, word order, and metrical shape. The fifth and sixth—Od. 1.430 and 7.9—begin the genealogical digressions on Eurycleia and Eurymedusa, respectively.\textsuperscript{103}

While these tables together represent only two forms of the pronoun,\textsuperscript{104} it is quite clear that hexameter poetry of the Archaic period uses this phrase in limited situations, namely those which are either paradigmatic or genealogical.\textsuperscript{105} One example in particular may even confirm the distinctive register of the syntax. That example comes from the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite, closely following Aphrodite’s paradigmatic simile. At this point in her speech, Aphrodite is complaining that the gods no longer fear her as they once did (vv. 247–51):

\begin{verbatim}
αὐτὰρ ἐμὸι μέγ’ ὄνειδος ἐν ἄθανάτοισι θεοῖσιν ἐσεῖται ἡματα πάντα διαμιτρές εἰνεκα σείο, οἱ πρὶν ἐμὸις ὀάρους καὶ μῆτιας, αἷς ποτε πάντας ἄθανάτους συμείεσκα καταθητήσοι γυναιξιν. τάρβεσκον, πάντας γὰρ ἐμὸν δάμνασκε νόμα.
\end{verbatim}

But for me there will be a great reproach to me among the immortal gods, continually, for all my days, because of you. Those who used to be used to fear my whispers and wiles, with which I once joined all the immortals gods with mortal women. For my mind used to overpower them all.

\textsuperscript{103} In the cases where, to some critics, such an interpretation may seem strained—as in the case of Odysseus’ scar or the chair in Penelope’s bedchamber—I would suggest the careful application of this “way of speaking” to the genealogy of ‘significant objects’ in the narrative. Compare the use of $\textit{ἥ ῥά}$ in h.Merc. to begin the story of how Hermes first made the tortoise shell into a singer: Ἐρμῆς τοι $\textit{πρώτιστα}$ χέλιν τεκτήνατ’ ἄοιδόν, | $\textit{ἥ ῥά}$ οἰ ἀντεβόλησεν ἐπ’ αὐλείῃσι θύρῃσι (vv. 25–6). Here, too, do we see the almost aetiological aspect of the primarily genealogical syntagm. Cf. too the $\textit{ἥ ῥά}$ of Leto at h.Ap. 6.

\textsuperscript{104} See Appendix B (p. 358) for a full analysis of all of the forms of the demonstrative and relative pronoun coupled with this adverb—τὸν $\textit{ποτε}$, ὃν $\textit{ποτε}$, οἱ $\textit{ποτε}$, etc. There one will also find a table listing combinations of the relative pronoun with both $\textit{ῥὰ}$ and $\textit{ποτε}$.

\textsuperscript{105} Conspicuous among these are such cases as the tomb of Hector’s imagined victim, which he indicates would read, ὃν $\textit{ποτ’}$ ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἐκτώρ (Il. 7.90). Note this syntagm in attested inscriptions, e.g., Attica 4, 12, 27, 431; Boeotia 112 $\textit{CEG}$. Cf. Tsagalis 2008 with p. 373 below.
What is especially striking here is that Aphrodite is using the pronoun-ποτε syntagm to refer to the tradition of immortals coupling with mortal women (ἀθανάτους συνέμεξα καταθνητήσι γυναιξί, 250); that is, to the very tradition of which the Catalogue of Women is part.

B.4 Markedness and register variation

At this point, an obvious and pressing question is whether or not this syntax truly constitutes a marked syntax, rather than simply a story-telling universal in which paradeigmata and genealogical digressions happen to participate. I have emphasized that this syntactic discourse strategy is particularly important in style-shifting and register variation, but have not yet shown that this style-shifting is actually significant in, or specific to, the symbiosis of genealogy and paradeigmata. The importance of genealogical catalogue plays no part, for example, in M. L. West’s explanation of αἵ νῦ ποθ’ at Th. 22, where he has this to say of the relative pronoun with ποτε (my underlining):[106]

106. West 1966. In the course of our study of lyric, we shall have reason to also consider the comments of Pfefifer (1999: 37–41), who couples this syntax with his description of the “fictional mimesis of extempore speech” in Pindar.

There is much of interest here, and much we shall have to take up later, but our primary concern right now must be, as underlined above, the fact that West makes no stronger suggestion than that this syntax is characteristic of ‘historical digressions’, albeit of varying degrees of familiarity. In this way, West’s suggestion hardly differs in specificity.

107. It is not clear to me that ῥα really is “more familiar.” We might wonder whether West’s Z (the 15th c. Mutinensis αT9. 14, on which see West 1966: 58) represents a sort of poetic self-fashioning akin to the way in which Hesiod represents his father, or the way in which Odysseus represents himself among the Phaeacians and Ithacans.
from Bakker’s position, which we discussed above. The issue is the phrase ‘historical digression’, which is simply the least marked, least specific term to describe the phenomenon as it occurs in *paradeigmata*. That is, there is no distinction between ‘historical digression’ and *paradigma* in West’s description of the ποτε or ῥα relative constructions.

It remains to show, then, that the paradigmatic mode of storytelling, whether it be with the marker ποτε or ῥα, is, in fact, marked out from other modes of digression in Homeric poetry. We shall do this by briefly considering some of other types of ‘historical digressions’, taking as our point of departure the study of Gaisser (1969a). If we look at the examples she considers,\(^\text{108}\) the markedly different ways in which the tales are told is itself revealing. Among these, a first example might be the digression of *Il.* 15.18–33, which describes how Zeus bound Hera:

> ἂν οὖν μέμυ ὅτε τ’ ἐκρέμω ύψόθεν, ἐκ δὲ ποδοῖν ἀκμονᾶς ἰκα δύω, περὶ χεροὶ δὲ δεσμὸν ἤλαχρόσεν ἄρρηκτον, σὺ δ’ ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλησιν ἐκρέω, ἦλα μὴ ἄκµονας ἡκι δύω, ἤτο τ’ ἐκρέω ἅλστεον δὲ θεοὶ κατὰ µακρὸν Ὀλυµποῦ, λύσαι δ’ οὐκ ἐδύναντο παραστάδον· ὅν δὲ λάβοι

> ῥίπτασκον τεταγὼν ἀπὸ βηλοῦ ὅφρ’ ἄν ἰκηται γῆν ὀλιγηπελέων· ἐµὲ δ’ οὐδ’ ὃς θηµὸν ἀνίει αζηχῆς ὀδυνῆς Ἡρακλῆος θείοιο, τὸν οὐ ἐµὸν Ἀφρέη ἀνέµῳ πεπίδοοσα τιύλλας πέμπας ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον πόντην κακὰ ὑπιόωσα, καὶ μὲν ἔπειτα Κόων δ’ ἐν ναιµοµένῃ ἀπένεικας, τὸν µὲν ἑγόν οὐθεν ραµµάµεν καὶ ἀνήγαγον αὐτὶς Ἀργος ἐς ἰππόβοτον καὶ πολλὰ περ ἄθλησαν. τὸν ο´ αὐτὶς µὴσον ἢν’ ἀπολλέψεις ἀπατάων, ὅφρα ἰδὴ ἦν τοι χραίµῳ φιλότης τε καὶ εὐνή, ἦν ἐµήγης ἐλθοῦσα θεῶν ἀπο καὶ µ´ ἀπάτησασ. 20

> ἦν δὲ µέµυ ὅτε τ’ ἐκρέμω ύψόθεν, ἐκ δὲ ποδοῖν ἀκμονᾶς ἰκα δύω, περὶ χεροὶ δὲ δεσμὸν ἤλαχρόσεν ἄρρηκτον, σὺ δ’ ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλησιν ἐκρέω, ἦλα μὴ ἄκµονας ἡκι δύω, ἤτο τ’ ἐκρέω ἅλστεον δὲ θεοὶ κατὰ µακρὸν Ὀλυµποῦ, λύσαι δ’ οὐκ ἐδύναντο παραστάδον· ὅν δὲ λάβοι

> ῥίπτασκον τεταγὼν ἀπὸ βηλοῦ ὅφρ’ ἄν ἰκηται γῆν ὀλιγηπελέων· ἐµὲ δ’ οὐδ’ ὃς θηµὸν ἀνίει αζηχῆς ὀδυνῆς Ἡρακλῆος θείοιο, τὸν οὐ ἐµὸν Ἀφρέη ἀνέµῳ πεπίδοοσα τιύλλας πέμπας ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον πόντην κακὰ ὑπιόωσα, καὶ μὲν ἔπειτα Κόων δ’ ἐν ναιµοµένῃ ἀπένεικας, τὸν µὲν ἑγόν οὐθεν ραµµάµεν καὶ ἀνήγαγον αὐτὶς Ἀργος ἐς ἰππόβοτον καὶ πολλὰ περ ἄθλησαν. τὸν ο´ αὐτὶς µὴσον ἢν’ ἀπολλέψεις ἀπατάων, ὅφρα ἰδὴ ἦν τοι χραίµῳ φιλότης τε καὶ εὐνή, ἦν ἐµήγης ἐλθοῦσα θεῶν ἀπο καὶ µ´ ἀπάτησασ. 25

> ἦν δὲ µέµυ ὅτε τ’ ἐκρέμω ύψόθεν, ἐκ δὲ ποδοῖν ἀκμονᾶς ἰκα δύω, περὶ χεροὶ δὲ δεσμὸν ἤλαχρόσεν ἄρρηκτον, σὺ δ’ ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλησιν ἐκρέω, ἦλα μὴ ἄκµονας ἡκι δύω, ἤτο τ’ ἐκρέω ἅλστεον δὲ θεοὶ κατὰ µακρὸν Ὀλυµποῦ, λύσαι δ’ οὐκ ἐδύναντο παραστάδον· ὅν δὲ λάβοι

> ῥίπτασκον τεταγὼν ἀπὸ βηλοῦ ὅφρ’ ἄν ἰκηται γῆν ὀλιγηπελέων· ἐµὲ δ’ οὐδ’ ὃς θηµὸν ἀνίει αζηχῆς ὀδυνῆς Ἡρακλῆος θείοιο, τὸν οὐ ἐµὸν Ἀφρέη ἀνέµῳ πεπίδοοσα τιύλλας πέμπας ἐπ’ ἀτρύγετον πόντην κακὰ ὑπιόωσα, καὶ μὲν ἔπειτα Κόων δ’ ἐν ναιµοµένῃ ἀπένεικας, τὸν µὲν ἑγόν οὐθεν ραµµάµεν καὶ ἀνήγαγον αὐτὶς Ἀργος ἐς ἰππόβοτον καὶ πολλὰ περ ἄθλησαν. τὸν ο´ αὐτὶς µὴσον ἢν’ ἀπολλέψεις ἀπατάων, ὅφρα ἰδὴ ἦν τοι χραίµῳ φιλότης τε καὶ εὐνή, ἦν ἐµήγης ἐλθοῦσα θεῶν ἀπο καὶ µ´ ἀπάτησασ. 30

Although this has been called a *paradigma*, we may better call it simply a ‘reminder’ or the ‘citing [of] a precedent’.\(^\text{109}\) Ring composition this digression may well have; a recollection of that past it may be; but it is, I argue, no *paradigma*. Yet how does one draw

---

\(^\text{108}\) See Appendix B (p. 358) for a full analysis of that study, in which one can easily see that non-paradigmatic digressions do not share this ‘genealogical’ way of telling *paradeigmata*.

\(^\text{109}\) See, e.g., Öhler 1925: 25. Janko (*ad* 15.14–77) rightly goes no further than calling it a ‘precedent’ as part of a threat.
this distinction without relying on unremarkable structural features\textsuperscript{110} or subjective ideas of plot and historicity in epic narrative? I suggest two ways, in light of our discussion above: first, while it does have prominent relative clauses (e.g., vv. 22, 31), the pronouns are not marked by discourse markers as we have seen in genealogy and \textit{paradeigma}; second, the underlined formulae it comprises are not from the same lexical register as those we have seen, or shall come to see.\textsuperscript{111} We could, for example, make the same observations of the digression in which Hephaestus recounts his debt to Thetis (\textit{Il}. 18.394–409).\textsuperscript{112}

Lest we take all our examples from the speeches of gods,\textsuperscript{113} let us turn to another form of historical digression, one in which we might more certainly expect genealogical features: the descent of Agamemnon’s scepter. This digression, in the voice of the performer, describes the pedigree of the scepter, all that took place for the scepter to be in Agamemnon’s hand at that moment (\textit{Il}. 2.100–8):

\begin{verbatim}
σπουδὴ δ’ ἔξετο λαός, ἐρήμτυθεν δὲ καθ’ ἐξής
παυσάμενοι κλαγγῆς, ἐστὶ σκήπτρον ἐχὼν τὸ μὲν Ἡραίος κάμε τεῦχον.
Ἡραίος μὲν δῶκε Δἰι Κρονίωνί αὐτοῖς, 100
αὐτὰρ ἄρα Ζεὺς δῶκε διακτόφων ἀργείφοντι
Ἐρείας δὲ ἄναξ δῶκεν Πέλοπι πληξίππῳ,
αὐτὰρ ὁ αὐτή Πέλοπος δῶκ’ Ἀτρέι ποιμένει λαῶν,

105
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{110} After all, Gaisser calls attention to its ‘simple ring composition’ thanks to its framing ἦ οὐ μέμνη ὅτε (18) and τῶν ο’ αὐτίς μνήσα (33). Such repetition is, in fact, an unmarked feature of all oral narrative. Cf. Moran 1975: 199–200.

\textsuperscript{111} The formulae are these: δεσμὸν ἡλιος only otherwise at \textit{Od}. 8.443, 447, 21.241; τεταγὼν ἀπὸ βηλοῦ otherwise at \textit{Il}. 1.591 (Hephaistos to Hera in \textit{paradeigma}); θυμὸν ἀνεὶ many and unmarked; Ἀσκλήπιος θεοίο otherwise only at \textit{Il}. 20.145, Sc. 138; Ἐφεσίδ οὖν ἀνέμω otherwise at \textit{Od}. 14.253, 299, 19.200; ἀνέμω πεπιθοῦσα otherwise at \textit{WD} 671 (different metrical \textit{sedes}); κακὰ μητίσσα otherwise at \textit{Il}. 18.312, \textit{Od}. 1.234; καὶ μν ἐπειτά Κόων δ’ εὖ ναιμένην ἀπενείκασ otherwise at 14.255 (Hypnos’ recollection to Hera); εὖ ναιμένην many and unmarked; Ἀργος ἐξ ἱππόβοτον otherwise at \textit{Il}. 3.75, 258, \textit{Od}. 15.239.

\textsuperscript{112} According to Gaisser’s reading (1969a: 9), this speech exhibits ‘complex ring composition’ in that v. 394 is echoed by vv. 406–9, and, within that, the ἦ μ’ ἐσάωσα (395) is taken up by σ’ ἐσάωσαν (405). I do not know that this aids our interpretation.

\textsuperscript{113} That is, in case one might argue that \textit{Göttersprache} differs considerably in this respect. On the gods’ different proper names for various items, see West \textit{ad Th}. 813, Edwards \textit{ad Il}. 20.73–4, and Kirk \textit{ad Il}. 1.403–4.
Ἀτρεύς δὲ θνῄσκων ἔλιπεν πολύαρνι Θυέστῃ, αὐτὰρ ὃ αὖτε Θυέστ', Ἀγαμέμνονι λείπε φορήναι, πολλήσιν νήσοις καὶ ἀργεῖ παντὶ ἀνάσσειν.

This historical digression, while it may show simple ring composition, does not show the ὅν-ῥα syntagm as it, and other ‘pedigree pieces’ such as the silver mixing bowl of Iliad 23 (740–749), very easily could have. We may notice that the structuring, repeated αὐτὰρ (vv. 103, 105, 107), and, with Gaisser, call such repeated uses “in the catalogue style” (1969a: 23). Yet we should be careful that we do not mistake ‘anaphoric thematized adverbs’ for ‘catalogue style’, for they are decidedly not. A good comparandum is Nestor’s non-paradigmatic story of the Return of the Greeks (Od. 3.102–200), in which he repeatedly uses the spatial adverb ἐνθα to structure his telling (108–112). As we saw above, paradeigmata do not normally thematize space or time so much as they thematize the point of comparison.

Last in our attempt to create a proper backdrop to the claim for the markedness of the relative clause syntagm in genealogy and paradeigmata, we might turn to what is

---

114. In the case of II. 2.101 here, even a simple substitution of τὸ ποτ’ (cf. Pind. P. 4.10) for τὸ μὲν would do. Allen reports no variants but the τομὲν of B C V6.

115. What then do we make of the pedigree of Meriones’ helmet in the Doloneia (10.254–72)? After all, it begins at v. 266 with the syntagm τὴν ῥά ποτ’ (on which see Table 19 [p. 370 below]). The Deukalionid Autylokos, as son of Philonis and Hermes, shows up among the Catalogue fragments (fr. 64.15, 66.2 M–W). Notice especially fr. 66, which concerns Autolykos as thief, and presumably the act of cattle-stealing (West 1985a: 129), as well as Etymol. Magn. α 317 L.-L. (= 67b M–W), which concerns the word ἀείδελον and the story of Autylokos as being a thief who stole horses and cattle and changed their colors to go undetected. All of which seems exceedingly apt to the Doloneia.

116. See also the Portent at Aulis (II. 2.299–332) with its ἔνθα’, ἔνθα, ἔνθα.

117. Nor can we afford to call Iliad 18’s Shield of Achilles catalogic in style simply because it repeats the spatial phrase ἐν ἐ’ τέτιθη (vv. 541, 550, 561, 573, 607).

118. In a lengthier treatment one might consider some of Gaisser’s other examples, e.g. II. 3.204–224 (Menelaos and Odysseus in Troy); Od. 8.499–521 (The Wooden Horse); Od. 8.266–367 (The Loves of Ares and Aphrodite); Od. 4.347–592 (Menelaos’ Story of Proteus). These non-paradigmatic narratives follow the same compositional principles of temporal or geographic thematization, as in the ἡδῆ γὰρ καὶ, ἀλλ’ ὀτε δῆ, ἀλλ’ ὀτε δῆ, ἀλλ’ ὀτε δῆ, ἀλλ’ ὀτε δῆ, ἀλλ’ ὀτε δῆ sequence of II. 3.204–224.
one of the most famous historical digressions in the *Odyssey*,\(^{119}\) the Quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles (8.72–82):

\[
\textit{αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἐντο, Μοῦσ’, ἄρ’ ἀσιδόν ἀνήκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἄνδρῶν},^{120}
\]

οἵς, τῆς τότ’ ἀρα κλέας οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἴκανε, νείκος Ὁδυσσῆος καὶ Πηλεΐδεω Αχιλῆος, ὡς ποτε δηρίσαντο θεῶν ἐν δαιτὶ θαλείῃ ἐκπάγλοις ἐπέεσσιν, ἄναξ δ’ ἀνδρῶν ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν δηριόων, χαῖρε νῷ, ὅτ’ ἄριστοι Ἀχαιῶν δηριόων.

But when they had dispatched their desire for food and drink, the Muse moved the singer to sing the famous deeds of men, from a song whose fame had by then reached wide heaven, the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles son of Peleus, how once they had argued with violent words at a rich feast for the gods, and lord of men Agamemnon was glad at heart that the best of the Achaeans were quarreling, for thus had Phoebus Apollo had told him in response at sacred Pytho, when he had stepped over the stone threshold to inquire the oracle. For then the beginning of misery was rolling toward both Danaans and Trojans, on account of great Zeus’ will.

The ὡς ποτε, or “how once” is markedly different from genealogy or *paradeigma* in its being introduced with ὡς, rather than with οἵ ποτε or the like.\(^{121}\) In fact, this phrasing and this manner of tale-telling is in line with other representations of large-scale epic storytelling in Homeric poetry,\(^{122}\) rather than genealogical or paradigmatic digressions. Com-

---

\(^{119}\) See Nagy 1999: 42–58 on this pointing to other *epic* traditions.

\(^{120}\) On κλέα ἄνδρῶν, see Nagy 1990b: 200–206. Especially pertinent are 200nn5–6, where he discusses is aptness also to genealogical and theogonic poetry.

\(^{121}\) The syntagm οἵ ποτε (as relative, so ignoring *Il.* 4.219) occurs nowhere in Archaic Greek hexameter poetry, but see Aesch. epigram 7.255.3–4 *AG* (ζωὸν δὲ φθινόν ταῦτα τραχύν), οἵ ποτε γυίοις | τάλιμυνος Ὁσσιάν ἀμφίεσαντο κόινων and the τοῖ ποτε of Pind. *Pae.* 52d.42 (but not *I.* 4.70).

pare the following instances of ὡς, ‘how’, and the way in which they follow verbs closely associated with epic storytelling:  

> μέμησαι τόδε ἐργον ἑγὼ πάλαι οὐ τι νέον γε  
> ὡς ἦν· ἐν δ’ ὑμῖν ἐρέω πάντεσσι φίλοισι.  

Il. 9.527–8

> οὐνόσαι ὡς μ’ ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἐρέξεω  
> Άτρεΐδης ὡς εἶ τιν’ ἀτίμητον μετανάστην.  

Il. 9.647–8

> ἀτρείδην δὲ καὶ αὐτοὶ ἀκούετε νόσφιν ἔοντες,  
> ὡς τ’ Ἡλθ’ ὡς τ’ Ἀἴγισθος ἐµήσατο λυγρὸν ὀλέθρον.  

Od. 3.193–4

> ἠρέστο δ’, ὡς πρῶτον Κίκονας δάμασ’, αὐτὰρ ἐπείτα  
> ἠλθεν Λωτοφάγων ἀνδρῶν πίειραν ἀρουραν.  

Od. 23.310–11

Here we notice that the verbs introducing this particular style of abbreviated narrative are those strongly associated with epic storytelling: μιμήσκω, ἀκούω, and ἄρχω. They are not paradeigma; instead they narrate a larger-scale series of events.

Broadly speaking, then, M. L. West is correct that the ὡς-ποτὲ syntagm is used in historical digressions, but we can now be more precise, for it is only used in a specific set

---

123. We might add to this list the case of Il. 15.18, discussed on p. 86 above, which begins: ἦν οὐ μέμην ὁτε.

124. This is an especially good illustration of the way in which an epic-scale story (μιμήσκα...ὡς ἦν) might comprise a nested paradeigma-scale story marked by καὶ γάρ (v. 533), even if it is only that paradeigma which is framed. (It is less useful, then, to emphasize ring-composition with v. 547 as Willcock [1978, ad loc.] does.) These features identify Phoenix’ speech all the more as a mise en abîme of the Iliad itself. Notice the imperfect tenses (vv. 529–33, e.g. ἦν) that set that epic-scale scene of the war between the Kouretes and Aitolians before coming to the specific paradigmatic event introduced by καὶ γάρ; on those tense markers and the ‘orientation’ of a story, see n.41 on p. 39 above.

125. It is remarkable that here Achilles employs Phoenix’, Demodocus’, and the Odyssean narrator’s means of telling an epic tale, but is referring to his own story in the Iliad. See more in Chapter 11 (pp. 313–325 below).


127. The verb ἀκούετε, of course, is unusually audience-focused. For the way in which it relates to story and kleos in the Odyssey, see Mackie 1997 (esp. p. 90).

128. For the technical song-making sense, cf. Th. 1, μουσάων Ἑλικωνιάδων ἀρχωμεθ’ ἀείδειν, as well as Th. 36, [48], Od. 8.499 (Demodocus), and Arat. 1. One might further compare the speech-introductory formula used of esp. Nestor (e.g., Od. 3.68) and Penelope (e.g., Od. 19.508), τοῖσι δὲ μῦθων ἠρχε.
of these digressions; that is, by means of its topicalization and discourse marking, the use of the relative plus ποτε creates audience expectations that do not exist for just any “historical digression in epic.” Moreover, it is used strictly in digressions that betray a genealogical style, which includes many of the paradeigmata. Other historical digressions, as we have just seen, are either built upon temporal or geographical relations, or even in the manner of larger-scale epic narrative. Anaphora or repetition, then, is an unmarked means of cohesion; but the elements being arranged anaphorically are important. In those digressions which are not paradigmatic there exist neither discourse markers nor relatives with discourse markers. And, while it is possible that they incorporate some genealogical material, it is unmarked or not sufficiently high-profile.

C Paradigmatic syntax, simile, and genealogy

Several of the discourse features we’ve noted in paradeigmata also occur in similes and genealogical rebukes. Instead of weakening our argument for the specificity of this group of characteristics, these passages will allow us to draw necessary distinctions as well as observe the way in which Homeric poetry seems to comment on the place of paradeigmata within epic narrative and its tradition.

129 Again, Nestor is the exception, in that he can tell paradigmatic stories without the usual discourse features. On the problems this causes even for the characters within the Iliad, see n.38 on p. 66 above.

130 See also the ἐν δὲ in the Shield of Achilles or Scutum.

131 Take, for example, Diomedes’ genealogy at Il. 14.110–27 and Aeneas’ at 20.213–41. Despite suggestions that such speeches are paradeigmata (see Edwards 1987: 98 on Diomedes’ speech), neither of these genealogies is paradigmatic either in function or discourse features. Note even the choice of ὃς δὴ (v. 20.220, 233), rather than ὃς ῥα, to introduce the description of Erikhthonios (after νίον Ἐριχθόνιον βασιλῆα, v. 219) and Ganymedes (v. 232). The relative does not occur with a form of ἄρα in either genealogy.
C.1 Simile and paradeigma: Od. 19.510–52

It has been observed that the particle ἄρα is also especially common in “statements rounding off similes.” Indeed, there are at least eleven instances of ὅς/ἥ/αἵ ῶα in the similes of Homeric poetry, and yet more in oblique cases of the pronoun. That similes and paradeigmata share a proclivity to build relative clauses with the same particle may not seem remarkable. Similes and paradeigmata, after all, are not entirely unlike one another: both involve comparison of some aspect of the present situation to situations known otherwise to the audience. Moreover, both are speech genres that include transition between registers or styles, and that thematize interaction. The main difference lies in the material they comprise—the simile tends to draw from naturalistic scenes, while the paradeigma draws from the heroic or mythological past—and this difference in material leads to different verbal tense markers: the simile tends to employ present tense verbs, while the paradeigma aorist or imperfect. One could say that, by default, the simile works along a synchronic axis, while the paradeigma works along a strictly diachronic axis. Yet no matter their abstract relationship, the difference between simile and paradeigma is clearly marked even at the level of syntax at which we are working. That is, of the sixteen instances of ὅς ῶα in similes I mentioned above, all but two are actually instances of ὅς ῶά τε. This τε, probably best described as a ‘generalizing τε’, is an im-

133. See especially Il. 3.61, 4.483, 13.63, 13.796, 15.411, 15.631, 17.549, 21.494, 22.23, 22.27, and Od. 22.403.
134. Il. 5.137, 5.503, 17.110, 17.674, 21.283.
135. On this intersection, see further McCall 1969 (esp. 25–7 and 187–92) and Feeney 1992. On verbal aspect as differentiating similes and fables, fables and proverbs, especially in a comparison of Theognis and Archilochus, see Adrados and Dijk 1999: 32.
136. See again the work of Martin, Bonifazi, and Bakker listed in n.54 on p. 69 above.
137. Deviations from this scheme are, of course, where it becomes especially interesting. In Part Three below (pp. 313–325) I shall address instances where Odysseus in particular mythologizes himself by the conscious manipulation of ways of speaking.
138. Of the instances in n.133 above, the τε is lacking in only Il. 5.503 and 17.110.
important marker in this case: it combines to mark a ‘style-shift’, but it helps mark a different style shift than we have seen with the ὅς ῥα alone in the genealogical context.¹⁴⁰

It is valuable, then, to explore the connections between the style-shifting we have thus far observed, and couple our discussion of the syntax of paradeigmata with a brief discussion of the simile. Especially useful will be a comparison of two speeches by Penelope, who in each case compares her present wish or situation with that of (one of) Pandareus’ daughters. One is a simile; the other a paradeigma.¹⁴¹ What these two passages share, however, are the discourse characteristics we have described as marking speeches as paradigmatic for their audiences. We may further suggest that this convergence of simile and paradeigma in terms of discourse characteristics further removes the style of the paradeigma from the ‘historical narrative’, aligning it more closely with the speech genre of the simile.¹⁴²

In the first of these two instances, at Od. 19.510–52, Penelope, in speaking to Odysseus qua stranger, compares her own lamentable situation to that of one of Pandareus’ daughters, specifically the girl’s transformation into a nightingale.¹⁴³ The simile, which begins at v. 518, aligns its comparison along the present tense verb ἀείδῃσιν in v. 519, as one would expect:

ζεῖνε, τὸ μὲν σ’ ἐτι τυθὼν ἐγὼν εἰρήσομαι αὐτή·
καὶ γὰρ δὴ κοίτοι τάχ’ ἐσσεται ἡδέος ὄρη,
δὲν τινὰ γ’ ὑπυνόν ἔλοι γλυκερός, καὶ κηδόμενόν περ.

In the first of these two instances, at Od. 19.510–52, Penelope, in speaking to Odysseus qua stranger, compares her own lamentable situation to that of one of Pandareus’ daughters, specifically the girl’s transformation into a nightingale.¹⁴³ The simile, which begins at v. 518, aligns its comparison along the present tense verb ἀείδῃσιν in v. 519, as one would expect:

ζεῖνε, τὸ μὲν σ’ ἐτι τυθὼν ἐγὼν εἰρήσομαι αὐτή·
καὶ γὰρ δὴ κοίτοι τάχ’ ἐσσεται ἡδέος ὄρη,
δὲν τινὰ γ’ ὑπυνόν ἔλοι γλυκερός, καὶ κηδόμενόν περ.

¹⁴⁰ A distinction made by Grimm (1962: 15) but not, as far as I can tell, Bakker (1993; 1997b).
¹⁴¹ This distinction will become even more important when addressing the matter of performance and composition. On the role of similes in composition and elaboration, see especially Miller 1982b: 101. On the repetition of these similes in a ‘run’, or in an improvisational context, see further Miller 1982b: 42. More recently, see the work of Muellner (1990) and Martin (1997) on similes and performance. No one to my knowledge has made systematic comparison the paradeigma to the simile, even in discussion of ‘late’ linguistic features.
¹⁴² I would argue that, even here, the καὶ γὰρ of v. 510 has greater force in introducing her paradigmatic simile than to explain the content v. 509.
¹⁴³ As I shall show below (p. 138), the metamorphosis of a woman suits no poetic tradition better than it does the Hesiodic Catalogue. Neither Pandareus nor his daughters, however, appear in the fragments of the Catalogue that survive.
αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ καὶ πένθος ἀμέτρητον πόρε δαίμων: ἥματα μὲν γὰρ τέρποι' ὀδυρομένη, γοῶσα, ἐς τῇ ἐμῇ ἐργῇ ὀρόσας καὶ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ οίκῳ: αὐτὰρ ἐπὶ τῇ ἐμῇ ἐλίθη, ἐλησὶ τῇ κοίτῃ ἀπαντάς, κεῖμαι ἐνὶ λέκτρῳ, πυκνῆς δὲ μιᾷ ἀμφ' ἄριν κηρ σὲ ἐνεῖμαι δυσμενῆς ὀδυρομένης ἐρείποιαι.

ὁς δὲ ὁ Πανδαρέου κοῦρ, χλωρήσας ἀηδῶν, καλὸν ἀειδησιν ἔαρος νέον ἱστήμενο: ἤς τ᾿ ἐμὰ ἐργὰ ὁρῶσα καὶ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ ὀίκῳ:

αὐτὰρ ἐπὶς νῦν νύξ ἔλημεν, καὶ ἐντὸς ἀνατρητὸν πόρος δαίμων:

ὡς δὲ ὁ Πανδαρέου κοῦρ, χλωρήσας ἀηδῶν, καλὸν ἀειδησιν ἔαρος νέον ἱστήμενο: ἤς τ᾿ ἐμὰ ἐργὰ ὁρῶσα καὶ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ ὀίκῳ:

αὐτὰρ ἐπὶς νῦν νύξ ἔλημεν, καὶ ἐντὸς ἀνατρητὸν πόρος δαίμων:

ὥς δ᾿ ὅτε Πανδαρέου κοῦρ, χλωρήσας ἀηδῶν, καλὸν ἀειδησιν ἔαρος νέον ἱστήμενο: ἤς τ᾿ ἐμὰ ἐργὰ ὁρῶσα καὶ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ ὀίκῳ:

αὐτὰρ ἐπὶς νῦν νύξ ἔλημεν, καὶ ἐντὸς ἀνατρητὸν πόρος δαίμων:

ὥς δ᾿ ὅτε Πανδαρέου κοῦρ, χλωρήσας ἀηδῶν, καλὸν ἀειδησιν ἔαρος νέον ἱστήμενο: ἤς τ᾿ ἐμὰ ἐργὰ ὁρῶσα καὶ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ ὀίκῳ:

ὥς δ᾿ ὅτε Πανδαρέου κοῦρ, χλωρήσας ἀηδῶν, καλὸν ἀειδησιν ἔαρος νέον ἱστήμενο: ἤς τ᾿ ἐμὰ ἐργὰ ὁρῶσα καὶ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ ὀίκῳ:

ὥς δ᾿ ὅτε Πανδαρέου κοῦρ, χλωρήσας ἀηδῶν, καλὸν ἀειδησιν ἔαρος νέον ἱστήμενο: ἤς τ᾿ ἐμὰ ἐργὰ ὁρῶσα καὶ ἀμφιπόλων ἐνὶ ὀίκῳ:

ὥς δ᾿ ὅτε Πανδαρέου κοῦρ, χλωρήσας ἀηδῶν, καλὸν ἀειδησιν ἔαρος νέον ἱστήμενο: ἤς τGROUNDtruth-1183331917.11 V.

This simile, as Öhler noted long ago, is paradigmatic in the sense that it pertains to Penelope’s situation in the framing narrative. Unlike other similes, however, it refers not to a general situation but to a particular story from the mythological past; moreover,
just as in many other *paradeigmata*, the peculiarity of this mythological material, which is not known to us from any other ancient source, has been noted.\(^{147}\)

While we may not be able to find a version of this tale similar in detail,\(^{148}\) analysis of its discourse characteristics may be revealing. Penelope’s speech, after a one-line address, begins with the discourse marker καὶ γάρ, just as we are accustomed with paradigmatic material. There follows a gnomic-sounding statement about sleep,\(^{149}\) and a brief description of Penelope’s present situation. At v. 518 Penelope begins the simile of Pandareus’ daughter. While this is not the only *paradeigma* in Homeric poetry to take the syntactic form of a simile,\(^{150}\) it is especially noteworthy for its self-consciousness. After all, Penelope is telling the story of a mother who, having killed her son either inadvertently or due to madness,\(^{151}\) laments. More importantly, in lamenting this nightingale modulates her voice: ἥτε θαμά τρωπῶσα χέει πολυδευκέα φωνήν (521). So, too, does

---

\(^{147}\) See Russo (in Heubeck et al. 1988) *ad* 19.518–24. We may do well to note, however, that it does belong to a class of myths in which women are metamorphosed following the death of their children, such as in the story of Niobe, discussed again below (p. 141). There indeed exists a version of this tale in the scholia (*ad* 518), in which the personified nightingale Aedon attempts to kill her sister-in-law Niobe’s children, but instead kills her own son. In this version, just as in the Niobe *paradeigma* of *Iliad* 24, the motive is jealousy of the other’s number of children.

\(^{148}\) van der Valk (1949: 203) suggests Penelope relates an Ionic myth; Apollodorus (3.14.8) relates a version in which Procne herself kills Itus and serves his boiled flesh to her husband.

\(^{149}\) For the gnomic use in the *Odyssey*, note Odysseus’ balanced phrasing at 11.379: ὡρη μὲν τολέων μῦθων, ὡρη δὲ καὶ ὑπνοῦ. (Compare further, perhaps, the verse-end γίνεται ὡρη at *Il*. 2.468 and *Od*. 9.51.) On the idea of there being a season for various actions in the context of a possible *paradeigma* in elegiacs, see West’s comments on v. 4 of *P. Oxy*. 4708 fr. 1 (“The New Archilochus”) in West 2006: 13.

\(^{150}\) See more below, and compare further the way in which Aphrodite uses the story of Eos and Tithonos to convince Anchises that she cannot make him immortal in the *h. Ven.* (5.218–19): ὡς δ’ αὖ Τιθωνὸν χρυσόθρονον ἢρπασεν Ἡώς | ψυμήρης χενεῖς ἑπιείκελον ἀθανάτοιοι. Note two further features: it introduction by ἤτοι μὲν at v. 202 (following West and the codd. [praeter Estensis 164 iii E 11] rather than Allen’s ἤ τοι μὲν), on which see n.51 on p. 44 above; its return to the present via v. 239: οὐκ ἄν ἐγώγε σὲ τόιον ἐν ἀθανάτοιοι ἐλοίμυν.

\(^{151}\) On the δι’ ἀφραδίας of v. 523, one scholiast (*ad* 518) suggests Pandareus’ daughter killed her son by mistake; Russo (*ad* 518–24) suggests instead “in her senseless folly.” See further Papadopoulou-Belmehdi 1994: 136–137.
Penelope ‘modulate’ her voice in her lament, and she does this, I argue, on several levels. First, as Öhler notes rather vaguely, “dem häufigen Wechsel der Klagenmelodie der Aeedon entspricht der häufige Wechsel der Stimmung der Penelope.” A similar, but more elaborate, point is made by Nagy, who details the way in which this simile is an instance of “epic representing…lyric.”

But for now, one simple, smaller-scale point pertaining directly to the syntax of style-shifting in paradeigmata is most relevant to our discussion. In line with our observations above, we can now add to these interpretations that even within the simile Penelope is changing her melody. Looking again to vv. 521–3, we notice that she uses the style-shifting relative phrase ὅν ποτε to mark the transition to the story as it relates to Itylos:

ὅτε τε θαυμά τρωπώσα χέει πολυδεικέα φωνήν,
παῖδ᾽ ὀλοφυρομένη Ἰτυλον φίλον, ὥν ποτε χαλκῷ
κτείνε δι᾽ ἀφραδίας, κούρων Ζῆθοιο ἄνακτος.

Though this tiny, inset story, describing the events that lead to the transformation from girl to nightingale, is not otherwise known, we do find two bits of evidence that may suggest the tradition with which one might associate it. First, the only other extant mention of Zethos in Homeric poetry occurs in the Nekyia. While this may be due only to

152. Öhler 1925: 17, following Ameis-Hentze (ad loc.).
153. Nagy 1996b: 7. Further, Papadopoulou-Belmehdi 1994: 133–147. On this same scale of vocal modulation, I would add to this that, some lines after the conclusion of the simile, Penelope goes on to relate her dream of geese—thus including a style-shift if not shift in speech genre—which itself includes direct quotation of the eagle, even if its speech is mortal (φωνῇ δὲ βροτέῃ; 545). For the nature of Penelope’s next speech (19.560–81), presenting the allegory of the ivory and horn gates, compare especially the syntax of Achilles’ Two Jars allegory in Iliad 24.
154. See p. 93 above for discussion, including a translation.
155. See the survey at Gantz 1996: 488.
156. Od. 11.262: καὶ ῥ’ ἔτεκεν δύο παιδ’, Ἀμφίονα τε Ζῆθόν τε. It has been assumed that Palaephatus, in referring to Hesiod having told the story of Zethos and Amphion, means the Catalogue specifically (De incredibiliibus 41.1–3): Περὶ Ζῆθου καὶ Ἀμφίονος ἱστοροῦσιν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἡσίοδος ὁτι κιθάρα το τεῖχος τῆς Θήβης ἔτειχον. Cf. West 1985a: 98. We cannot ignore that Palaephatus, possibly of the late 4th cent. BCE, specifies that others (ἄλλοι) have told the tale as well. This, for Palaephatus, would have likely also included Pherecydes (79+102 FHG)
the statistics of survival—catalogue poetry is more likely to preserve references to lesser
known figures and stories—the underlined verse-final hemistich above, κοῦρον Ζήθοιο ἄνακτος, has only one formulaic equivalent in extant Archaic hexameter poetry, in the
Hesiodic Catalogue of Women (fr. 137 M–W):\(^{157}\)

καὶ κοῦρην Ἀράβοιο, τὸν Ἐρμάδων ἀκάκητα
γείνατο καὶ Θρονίη κοῦρη ἰδίλλιο ἄνακτος.

And the daughter of Arabos, born from guiltless Hermes and Thronia, daughter of lord Belos. (trans. G. W. Most)

Penelope’s transition to the catalogic narrative style, I suggest, is yet another way in
which one might say that her speech changes its melody; yet another way in which Penelope engages in style-shifting. She does it via a syntax that suggests the tale’s genealogical underpinnings, and she does it, not at the beginning of a narrative as we have seen above, but at the very end of the simile’s ‘vehicle’, just before turning, via ὡς καὶ ἐμοὶ, to her own situation in the simile’s ‘tenor’.\(^{158}\) Thus, it is just before turning to the present application of the paradigmatic simile that she enters into the expected formal pattern.\(^{159}\) As we shall see in greater detail below, this manner of style-shifting at the close of a speech is part of a system of signals to the audience—no less than the καὶ γάρ with which this

\[97\]

and Euripides (Antiope, frr. 179–227 Nauck). Of especial interest, however, might have been Asius of Samos (?6th cent. BCE), known for his genealogical poetry and known to have treated Antiope and Zethos (fr. 1 PEG). I would, however, like to think that Palaephatus’ singling out of Hesiod is of some significance, as well as his interest in stories like that of Niobe, the wife of Zethos’ twin brother Amphion: Φασὶν ὡς Νιόβη γυνὴ ζώσα λίθος ἐγένετο ἐπὶ τῷ τύμβῳ τῶν παιδῶν (8.1–2). See further Gantz 1996: 484–488.

\(^{157}\) Note too that the two verses comprising these equivalent hemistichs are, in fact, nearly identical in word order and perfectly identical in metrical shape.

\(^{158}\) For the terminology, first applied to metaphor, see Richards 1965: 96. For a fine discussion of its application to the Homeric simile, see Muellner 1990: 61 with his n. 6.

\(^{159}\) On this practice, see Bauman 2001: 77, who remarks that ‘the assimilation of an utterance to stylistic orienting frameworks, whatever their basis, is always a matter of inter-discursive calibration, negotiating the gap between the conventional and the emergent in communicative interaction.’
speech begins—to consider the relevance of this story to the potential fate of Telemachus, should Penelope fail to marry.\textsuperscript{160}

Nor is this an isolated example of the confluence of simile and \textit{paradeigma} in terms of their syntax and discourse characteristics. The other common means of returning to the ‘tenor’ of a simile is the use of the demonstrative pronoun \textit{τοῖος} (\textit{Il}. 5.864–7):\textsuperscript{161}

> Οἵης δ’ ἔκ νεφέων ἐρεβεννή φαίνεται ἁήρ
καύματος ἐξ ἀνέμοιο δυσαέος ὄρυμιένοιο,
\textit{τοῖος} Τυδεΐδῃ Διομήδει χάλκεος Ἀρης
φαίνεθ' ὀμόν νεφέεσσιν ἱών εἰς οὐρανόν εὐρύν.

As when from the clouds the air shows darkening after a day’s heat when the stormy wind uprises, thus to Tydeus’ son Diomedes Ares the brazen showed as he went up with the clouds into the wide heaven.

So much is known, but one may do well to compare this syntax to that used in various \textit{paradeigmata}. Note, for example, the way in which Agamemnon rounds off his \textit{paradeigma} to Diomedes when recounting the deeds of Tydeus (\textit{Il}. 4.399–400):\textsuperscript{162}

\textit{τοῖος ἐν} Τυδεὺς Αἰτώλιος· ἀλλὰ τὸν υἱὸν
gείνατο εἷο χέρεια μάχῃ, ἄγορῇ δὲ τ’ ἀμείνῳ.

Such was Tydeus, the Aitolian; yet he was father to a son worse than himself at fighting, though better in the agora.

This is not simply to do with the fact that both passages happen to mention Diomedes and Tydeus, for other arguably paradigmatic passages employ similar use of this demonstra-

---

\textsuperscript{160} Russo (in Heubeck et al. 1988) \textit{ad} 518–24: “Penelope’s choice of this comparison to express her mental state is, moreover, appropriate because she harbours a fear that she too may cause the death of her own son, if she continues, by refusing marriage, to exasperate the suitors and drive them to desperate plots against Telemachus.” On Penelope’s \textit{mētis}, see Winkler 1990: 129–161.

\textsuperscript{161} The examples are numerous and well-known, but compare: \textit{τοῖον ἄρ’} Ἀτρεΐδην θῆκε Ζεὺς ἠματι κείνῳ (“such was the son of Atreus as Zeus made him that day,” \textit{Il}. 2.480–3); \textit{τοῖον ἄρ’} Ἀνθεβιδῆν Σιμοεἰσιον ἐξενάριξεν (“such was Anthemion’s son Simoeisios whom [Ajax] killed,” \textit{Il}. 4.488); \textit{τοῖοι Μηριόνης τε καὶ Ἑδομενεὺς ἄγοι ἀνδρῶν} (“such were Meriones and Idomeneus, leaders of armies,” \textit{Il}. 13.304). One notes in both \textit{Il}. 2.482 and 4.488 (as well as \textit{Il}. 3.153 [next page]), the presence of an \textit{άρα} after the demonstrative pronoun, which may well be compared to the style-shifting discussed above.

\textsuperscript{162} For a similar formulaic syntax, see \textit{Il}. 18.105–6: \textit{τοῖος ἐὼν} οἰὸς οὗ τὶς Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτῶνων | ἐν πολέμῳ ἀγορῇ δὲ τ’ ἀμείνονες εἰσὶ καὶ ἄλλοι.
tive pronoun. Take, for example, the speeches of Nestor in *Iliad* 1, the narrator in the *Teikhoskopia*, and Telemachus to Penelope in the *Odyssey*:

> οὐ γάρ πω τοίους ἰδον ἀνέρας οὐδὲ ἰδομαί, yet have I seen nor shall see again such men as these were, *Il.* 1.262
> τοῖοι ἄρα Τρώων ἡγήτορες ἔντε ἐπὶ πύργῳ. Such were they who sat on the tower, chief men of the Trojans. *Il.* 3.153
> τοῖος ἡών οἰός ποτ’ ἐυκτιμήνῃ ἐνὶ Λέσβῳ. Being just such as he was once, in well-built Lesbos *Od.* 17.133

We shall return to these particular passages below, but we shall conclude our look at similes by drawing further attention to the aptness of the genealogical comparisons in similes and *paradeigmata*. The οἵος…τοῖος structure of the simile *Il.* 5.864–7 above is, in fact, explicitly connected to genealogy in what is likely the most famous simile of the *Iliad* (6.146):

> οἷη περ̄ φύλλων γενεὴ τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν. As is the generation of leaves, so too that of men.

Here, in a single line, the *Iliad* not only encapsulates the function of genealogical comparison in paradigmatic discourse, but also does so in a syntax at the intersection of *paradeigma* and simile. Nor do I think it coincidence that we see in this, as well as the other examples of similes and *paradeigmata* above, that pronoun by which we sometimes identify the *Catalogue*—οἵη.


We have seen above that genealogy and *paradeigmata* share in their strategy of introducing a narrative by means of a relative clause with certain particles. We have also observed their propensity to include, if not actually be introduced by, the verb φασί. Nor should we expect otherwise, for genealogies are often used paradigmatically, as in the case of *Il.* 4.370–400 discussed above. Indeed, Maureen Alden has recently argued, based predominantly on the scale of the composition of the *Iliad*, that genealogies play a paradigmatic role in the *Iliad*. Specifically, she notes the way in which the extended ge-

---

nealogies of Glaukos and Aeneas serve to create greater parallelism—so-called “rafts of correspondences”\textsuperscript{164}—between Diomedes and Achilles and the events in their respective halves of the poem (169). Alden is, of course, right that genealogies in the \textit{Iliad} are often paradigmatic, but the means and ends of that claim require some consideration. As we have already begun to see, it is not so much that genealogies are used paradigmatically, but that \textit{paradeigmata} and genealogies are, poetically speaking, cut from the same cloth; that is, the fact that genealogies and \textit{paradeigmata} resemble each other both formally and formulaically is more properly attributed to their being part of very similar, related speech genres. In fact, as far as composition-in-performance is concerned, I would argue that both are part of a shared system of elaboration.

The relationship between \textit{paradeigma} and genealogy is very clearly seen in the genealogical rebuke.\textsuperscript{165} The rebuke, or ‘flyting speech’,\textsuperscript{166} often contains genealogical material, and we can easily notice in them discourse characteristics studied in the context of \textit{paradeigmata}. I cite just two such Iliadic rebukes, matching each other in initial questions,\textsuperscript{167} as well as the fact that they lead to paradigmatic genealogies:

\begin{verbatim}
τί πτώσσεις, τί δ’ ὀπισθεὶς πολέμου γεφύρας;
οὐ μὲν Τυδεὶ γ’ ὠδὲ φίλου πτωσακέμεν ήν
ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρὸ φίλων ἐτάρων δηλοὶ μᾶχεσθαι,
ὁς φάσαν οἷς μιν ἐγὼ ποιήσαςον· οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ γεφύρα
ἐμὴσ’ οὐδὲ ἢδ’ οἷς περὶ δ’ ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι.
ήτοι μὲν γὰρ ἀτερ πολέμου εἰσῆλθε Μυκήνας…
Σαρπῆδον Λυκίων βουληφόρε, τίς τοι ἀνάγκη
πτώσσειν ἐνθάδ’ ἐόντι μάχης ἀδαή σφωτί;
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{164}. For an alternate approach to such distant symmetries and verbal parallelisms, see Miller 1982a; Miller 1982b. For a more recent summary of views, see Nagy 1996a: ch2n4.


\textsuperscript{166}. On the ‘flyting speech’, including the importance of genealogy to it, see esp. Martin 1989: 127.

\textsuperscript{167}. On the verb \textit{πτώσσειν} in flyting speeches, see, e.g., Martin 1989: 70.
In each case, the question leads to a refusal to accept the validity of another’s genealogy, followed by a story of an ancestor’s valor: in the first, Agamemnon scolds Diomedes for not being more like Tydeus; in the second, Tlepolemos berates Sarpedon for falling short of past generations of Zeus’ descendants. This form of rebuke, after all, is based on the idea that a hero’s lineage is indicative of the likelihood of his success in the present.169

If the genealogical comparison is conventional in the depiction of Homeric warfare,170 the encounter between Glaukos and Diomedes in *Iliad* 6 is perhaps the most famous instance of that convention. Yet very close in form to that is the encounter between Achilles and Asteropaios in Book 21 (vv. 139–204),171 and it is worth rehearsing some of its details. For, in it Achilles expresses an awareness of the relationship between genealogy and *paradeigma*, and he does it by means of discourse characteristics that we have discussed. Asteropaios is descended from Pelegon, the son of Periboia and the river Axios, we are told, just before Achilles himself asks Asteropaios of his lineage (vv. 150–1).172

---

168. For this metrical *sedes* of the participle *ψευδόμενοι*, see *h.Merc*. 6. On participial enjambment in performance in general, especially as a means of representing extemporaneity in later literature, see Collins 2004: 189 with refs.

169. This is sometimes framed as divine favor, but that too is of genealogical basis.


171. Anacreon *fr*. 156 PMG speaks of Asteropaios similarly embedded in the *παίς* ‘trigger’ and ὅς-ὁς syntagm: ἐν Παρθενείοις: ἵππες ὅπασι τοῖς ἱππεῖσιν. ὅποιον ἔτη τίμησε, ὅποιον ἔτη τίμησε ἤγειρεν ἅτα. ὅς ἔπειτο ὅποιον ἔτη τίμησε, ὅποιον ἔτη τίμησε ἤγειρεν ἅτα. ὅς ἔπειτο ὅποιον ἔτη τίμησε, ὅποιον ἔτη τίμησε ἤγειρεν ἅτα. ὅς ἔπειτο ὅποιον ἔτη τίμησε, ὅποιον ἔτη τίμησε ἤγειρεν ἅτα. (vv. 6–8). Richardson (*ad 141*) notes other interest in Asteropaios (e.g., PMG 501), and see Slater 1983: 119 on the relationship of this to other ‘flashbacks’ involving Achilles’ adversaries, among which Slater considers the Lykaon encounter “an intended tour de force of its type.”

172. Vv. 150–1: τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν ὃ μὲν ἔτης ἀντίς ἔλθει; | δυστήνων δὲ τε πάιδες ἐμῷ μένει ἀντιώσι. Note that the formulaic question τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν—comprising the Indo-European alliteration of labiovelar stops in *k*“is *k*”odhen—occurs otherwise only in the *Od*. (7x). Within the *II*. one might compare the more usual phrasing of τίς δὲ σὺ ἔσσι φέριστε (6.123, 15.247, 24.387).
Asteropaios responds with little elaboration, and, after each man fails with his spear, Achilles slays him with his sword. As he boasts over the slain body of Asteropaios, Achilles responds to Asteropaios’ genealogy not with a simple genealogy of his own, but instead extends the speech genre further (21.184–99):

\[\text{κεῖσ' οὕτως· χαλεπόν τοι ἐρισθενέος Κρονίωνος} \]
\[>\text{παίσι' ἐριζέναι ποταμοίο περ ἐγχεγαώτι.} \]
\[>\text{φήσαθα οὐ μὲν ποταμοὺ γένος ἐμεμναι ἐσφυρρόντος,} \]
\[>\text{αὐτάρ ἐγὼ γενεῆν μεγάλου Διὸς ἔχουσαι εἶναι,} \]
\[>\text{τίκτέ μ' ἀνήρ πολλοῖσιν ἀνάσσων Μυρμιδόνεσσι} \]
\[>\text{Πηλεύς Αἰακίδης: ὃ δ' ἄρ' Αἰακὸς ἐκ Διὸς ἦν.} \]
\[>\text{τῷ κρείσσων μὲν Ζεὺς ποταμόν όλιμπρήντων,} \]
\[>\text{κρείσσων αὐτῷ Διὸς γενεῆ ποταμοῦ τέτυκται,} \]
\[>\text{kai γάρ σοι ποταμός γε πάρα μέγας, εἰ δύναται τι} \]
\[>\text{χραιμεῖν· ἀλλ' ὅν ἐστὶ Διὶ Κρονίωνοι μάχεσθαι,} \]
\[>\text{τῷ οὐδὲ κρείσσων Αχελώοιο ἵοσαρίζει,} \]
\[>\text{οὐδὲ βαθυρρείταο μέγα σθένος ὦκεανοῖο,} \]
\[>\text{ἐξ οὗ περ πάντες ποταμοὶ καὶ πᾶσα βάλασσα} \]
\[>\text{καὶ πάσαι κρήνης καὶ φρεῖα ἀκρὰ κάκισθαι·} \]
\[>\text{ὅτ' ἀπό οὐρανόθεν σαραγήσῃ.} \]

Lie as you are: it is difficult even for those born of a river to fight against the children of almighty Kronos. You say that you are of the race of the wide-flowing river, but I boast the lineage of great Zeus. The man who is my father is lord over many Myrmidons, Peleus, son of Aiakos, but Aiakos was born of Zeus. So as Zeus is stronger than rivers that run to the sea, so too the lineage of Zeus is made stronger than that of a river. You know, there is a river beside you, a big one, if it were able to help at all; but it is impossible to fight Zeus, son of Kronos. With him not even powerful Akheloios vies, nor even the enormous strength of deep-flowing Ocean, from whom all rivers are and the entire sea and all the springs and all the deep wells. But even fears the lightning of great Zeus and his terrible thunder when it crashes from the sky.

---

173. Though note his use of the φασί in v. 159. I find it compelling that, within the Iliad, the verb φασί is almost entirely restricted to speaking of genealogy (4.375, 5.635, 6.100, 16.14, 20.105, 20.206, 21.159). The exceptions include cases of ὅθι φασί (2.783 [Typhos], 24.615 [Niobe]), family history (24.546), Heracles (5.638), and Zeus (13.631).

174. Aristonicus reports that Zenodotus did not include v. 195, presumably because he wished the Ἀχελώοιο to be the source of all rivers (γίνεται γάρ ὁ Ἀχελώος πηγή τῶν ἄλλων πάντων, 195a2–3). But one may also wonder whether it was the ‘Hesiodic’ character of the verse which offended him (see n.93 on p. 137 below), noting the phrase βαθυρρείταιο... ὦκεανοῖο (cp. only ὦκεανοῖο βαθυρρείταιο, Th. 265) and the different cosmogony (cp. Th. 337–70).
What is striking here is that the usual genealogical boast is strictly complete at v. 191. Yet, at v. 192, Achilles effects a transition from genealogy to paradeigma with καὶ γάρ σοι ποταμός γε πάρα μέγας (“You know, there’s a river right beside you, a big one!”). The discourse marker καὶ γάρ,¹⁷⁵ which introduces the entirety of vv. 192–9, marks a παράδειγμα, but not in the exact sense to which we have been accustomed. Instead, Achilles uses it to ‘point out’—δείγμα < δείκνυμι—what is literally ‘beside’—πάρα—Asteropaios, stating that no river—not the Scamander beside him, not the Akheloios, nor even Ocean—could match Zeus. Achilles, then, in going beyond the typical triumphal boast, dissects the genealogy’s latent paradeigma and maps it onto the present: no river can match Zeus; no descendent of a river can match a descendent of Zeus.¹⁷⁶

D  
Catalogue and syntax

D.1  
Catalogues

As we have already seen, bound up with genealogy in various ways is the catalogue form, whether it be by the syntax of relative clauses, meter, or even the specific example of Andromache in Iliad 6.¹⁷⁷ Just as the catalogues of the Trojan and Achaean heroes in the Catalogue of Ships are readily elaborated by genealogies, so too can genealogies be elaborated with catalogues, as in the famous example of Aeneas’ catalogic genealogy at Iliad 20.208–41. Catalogues and genealogies, it is clear, can be used to elaborate each other, and genealogies often seem to provide the raw material for paradeigma-

¹⁷⁵. We might further compare Achilles’ collocation of this discourse marker with the syntax of the following gnome in v. 193 (ἀλλ’ οὐκ ἔστι Διὶ Κρονίωνι μάχεσθαι) with the closing gnome of ὅς οὐκ ἔστι Δίῳ κλέψαι νόσον οὐδὲ παρελθεῖν (Th. 613), which closes the καὶ γάρ (v. 535) of the Theogony’s Prometheus paradeigma. For other examples of οὐκ ἔστι c. inf., see only Il. 12.327 (μυρία, ἂς οὐκ ἔστι φυγεῖν βροτῶν οὐδ’ υπαλύξαι) and 13.787 (ἀρ δύναμιν δ’ οὐκ ἔστι καὶ ἔσσυμένον πολέμιζειν).

¹⁷⁶. What Achilles, and the Iliad, seem to be asking is as simple as: What does the past have to do with the present?

¹⁷⁷. See on p. 44 above.
ta. So, too, catalogues, often with genealogical connections, must have proved useful tools in the composition-in-performance of paradeigmata.178

We have seen above, in the case of Antinoos’ paradeigma of Peirithoos in Odyssey 21,179 how Homeric poetry draws on lexical repetition not only to lend cohesion to a less formulaic narrative, but also emphasize various ideas through departures from that lexical repetition. This technique is perhaps best observed in Dione’s consolation of Aphrodite after she has been struck by Amphitryon’s arrow in Iliad 5. In this passage Dione appears to use this very compositional technique in elaborating a catalogue of other immortals who have been subject to a mortal (II. 5.382–405):180


179. See on p. 60 above.

180. A nearly identical introduction to Achilles’ paradigmatic recollection to Thetis appears at the start of II. 1.586: τέτλαθι μήτερ ἐμῆ, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ. See more at p. 339 below.

181. On the double ἐν, see comments about Achilles’ Niobe speech (esp. p. 142 below).
Endure, my child, and bear up, though you are hurt. For many of us who have homes on Olympus endure hardships from men, while we inflict it on each other. Ares endured it when Otos and strong Ephialtes, sons of Aloeus, bound him in strong chains. For thirteen months he lay chained in a bronze cauldron; and Ares, insatiable of war, might even have perished, had not their lovely stepmother Eëriboia told Hermes, who stole Ares just as he was wearing out and the harsh bondage was breaking him. Hera endured when the strong son of Amphitryon struck her through the right breast with a three-pronged arrow—a pain past cure seized her. Hades endured with them, gigantic Hades endured the swift arrow when this same man, the son of aegis-bearing Zeus, struck him at Pylos, among the dead men, and put him in agony. But he went to the house of Zeus and to high Olympus grieving in his heart, pierced with pain: the arrow was driven into his hefty shoulder, and he was troubled in his spirit. But Païon applied pain-killing medicines to him and healed him. For he was not made to be a mortal. Cruel, heavy-handed, he gave no thought to the evil he was doing, who with his arrows hurt the gods that dwell on Olympus.

This passage is not terribly formulaic in terms of Homeric poetry, 182 but it has often been noted that a fragment attributed to Panyassis offers us a glimpse of what such a catalogue may have looked like in its unelaborated form (fr. 3 PEG): 183

Demeter endured, and famous Hephaestus endured, Poseidon endured, and Apollo with the silver bow, he endured serving a mortal man for a year, and grim-hearted Ares too endured, under his father’s compulsion.

182. Note repetition between vv. 401–2 and 5.900–1, but more compelling is the formula δῆσε κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ (v. 386) appearing only otherwise at Th. 618: Κόττῳ τ’ ἐδὲ Γύγῃ, δῆσε κρατερῷ ἐνὶ δεσμῷ.

183. The fragment from Panyassis is quoted in Clem. Protr. 2.35.3. Of its original context, West suggests that “[s]omeone, perhaps Athena, is consoling Heracles, recalling various mythical episodes of gods who submitted to servitude under mortal masters” and that “[t]he allusions were probably explained more fully in what followed” (West 2003: 195n10). Beye suggests “that we have relatively clear evidence that such a technique was practiced by the Greek epic poets when we compare Iliad 5.383–404 with a fragment of Panyassis” (1964: 365).
Whether or not these two catalogues of gods suffering harm—some explicitly at the hands of mortals—are related, or even derived from a single traditional motif,\(^{184}\) comparison on the formal level is useful for highlighting the means of elaboration.\(^{185}\) The anaphora of the τλῆ μὲν and τλῆ δὲ surely lends cohesion to each catalogue,\(^{186}\) but note how in the Iliadic passage the performer depends on repetition of key verbal roots both within each catalogue entry and across the multiple entries. I have doubly-underlined these words, such as, in the first entry, δῆσαν, δεσµῷ, δέδετο, and δεσµὸς.\(^{187}\) Across entries one notices repetition of the roots ἀκε-, βαλ-, κηδ-, ὀδυν-, and ὀϊστ-, a composition which certainly suggests that Dione’s paradeigma is elaborated, from catalogue form, in the manner of Antinoos’ paradeigma to the beggar Odysseus in Odyssey 21.

Of course, this is not the only paradeigma that is catalogic in form. From Dione’s consolation to Zeus’ catalogue of past lovers in Iliad 14, there are, in all, five catalogues of paradigmatic precedents in Homeric poetry, as seen in Table 7 (just below).

Table 7: Paradeigmata including catalogues, catalogues of paradeigmata

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Speaker</th>
<th>No. of exx.</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Il. 5.382–404</td>
<td>Dione to Aphrodite</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>A ‘τλα-speech’ of consolation upon her wound</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 14.313–28</td>
<td>Zeus to Hera</td>
<td>6/7(^{188})</td>
<td>Zeus’ catalogue of past lovers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{184}\) We might note the similarity of the rare epithets toward the end of each catalogue: ὁβριµωέργος at Il. 6.403 (otherwise only Th. 996) and ὁβριµόθυµος in Panyassis (elsewhere only at h.Mart. 2 and Th. 140).

\(^{185}\) On this elaboration, Beye (1964: 364) notes: “One can conceive these names as having been arranged as a bare list of names, an alternate form carried in the bard’s memory, out of which the bard elaborated [Il.] 20.381–503 in the accordion-like manner common to epic reciters.” See also his p. 372n39 with Bowra 1952: 232, and his p. 365 for the Dione-Panyassis passage comparison in particular.

\(^{186}\) This is the level of verbal repetition normally noted (e.g., at Edwards 1980: 98).

\(^{187}\) On this, I would especially compare Th. 718 (δεσµοῖσαν ἐν ἄργαλεσιν ἔδησαν, “they bound them with troublesome bonds”), as it pertains to the Titanomachy (on which see also Th. 618, with Watkins 1995: 456). One might also compare the phrase ἄτος πολέµῳ (“insatiable for battle”) at Il. 6.388 and Th. 714, but note Il. 5.863, 6.203, 13.746, and Sc. 59.

\(^{188}\) Six past lovers not including Hera; seven including her (οὐδὲ σεῦ αὐτῆς, 327).
Antinoos to Telemachus  |  3  |  Penelope compared to Achaean women
Calypso to Hermes  |  3  |  Catalogue of goddesses with mortal lovers
Odysseus to Phaeacians  |  2  |  Concerning Heracles and Eurytos

Several of the catalogues are a triad of *paradeigmata*, as Öhler has noted: *Iliad* 5.382–404, *Odyssey* 2.118–22, and *Odyssey* 5.118–129. Triads are indeed common, if not even convenient, in hexameter poetry,\(^{190}\) but note that the Zeus’ catalogue of *Iliad* 14 is at least double that number, while that in *Odyssey* 8 falls short. I would thus place less emphasis on the number three in this list.

Looking ahead, I would also revise the common suggestion that catalogues are used in *paradeigmata* simply as a means of lending further authority to one’s argument through additional precedents.\(^{191}\) We may rather consider that the catalogic style we observe here not only bolsters one’s argument, but also betrays the traditional ways of speaking from which the performers were likely drawing. In what follows, I shall set out the ways in which the *paradeigma* lends itself to the catalogue form and how these catalogues are constructed syntactically, as well as the prominence of women in them.

### D.2 The syntax of paradigmatic catalogues

Let us then look at the mechanics of these catalogic *paradeigmata* in detail, beginning with the *paradeigma* spoken by Odysseus among the Phaeacians in *Odyssey* 8. Odysseus has just stated that he would take on any of the Phaeacians in athletic contest

---

\(^{189}\) For a more detailed discussion of this *paradeigma*, see p. 329 below.

\(^{190}\) One could, of course, compare the recurrence of triplets to those lines such as *Iliad* 19.87 (*ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς καὶ Μοῖρα καὶ ἡμιροφοῖτις Ἐρινύς*) and *Odyssey* 2.120 (*Τυρώ τ’ Ἀλκμήνη τε ἐὔστεφανός τε Μυκῆνη*). These single-verse catalogues are best known as examples of Behagel’s Law of the Growing Constituents (‘Gesetz der wachsenden Glieder’; Behagel 1932) or as the Augmented Triad (West 2007: 117–118; West 2004). While such verses may seem to be frequent in *paradeigmata*, no statistics are available. Further, we ought not put such an emphasis on the numeral three, for we might well compare the triadic priamels of Pindar *O. 1* (water, gold, and sun) or Sappho *fr.* 16 V (cavalry, foot soldiers, and fleet). In any case, the phenomenon should not, with Öhler, be considered specific to *paradeigmata*.

\(^{191}\) See, e.g., Öhler 1925: 18–23.
but for his host, claiming that only Philoctetes excelled him with the bow among the Achaeans at Troy. Odysseus will not, however, dare to compete with men of the past, who themselves vied with immortals in archery. Heracles and Eurytos were two who did, and this led to Eurytos’ early death (8.223–8):

\begin{verbatim}
ἀνδράσι δὲ προτέροισιν ἐριζέμεν οὐκ ἐθελήσω, οὔθ Ἡρακλῆι οὔτ’ Ἐυρύτῳ Οἰχαλιῇ,
oἱ ῥα καὶ ἀθανάτοισιν ἐρίζεσκον περὶ τόξων.
tῶ ῥα καὶ αἴων ἤθελεν μέγας Ἐυρυτος οὐδ’ ἐπὶ γῆρας
ἰκετ’ ἐνι μεγάροιι: χολοσάμενος γὰρ Ἀπόλλων
ἐκτανε, οὔνεκά μιν προκαλίζετο τοξάζεσθαι.
\end{verbatim}

I won’t not want to compete with men of the past, neither with Hercules nor Eurytos from Oikhalea, who used to compete in archery even with immortals. That’s why, you know, Eurytos died quite suddenly and didn’t reach old age in his palace. For enraged Apollo killed him because he’d challenged him in archery.

This passage is important to our discussion of the syntax of catalogues for its combination of οἵ ῥα and τῶ ῥα in vv. 225–6, marking the stylistic transition from the two-entry catalogue of v. 224 into the narrative. Moreover, Eurytos himself is a common theme for catalogic elaborations in Homeric poetry: the verse-end formula Εὐρύτῳ Οἰχαλιῇ is known otherwise, in the genitive, from elaborations in the Catalogue of Ships

---

192. Cf. further κλεία προτέρων ἀνθρώπων (Th. 100) and Phoenix’ programmatic τῶν πρόσθεν... κλεί αὐτῶν (Il. 9.524). On its connection to genealogy, see also Antilokhos’ statement, οὕτος δὲ προτέρης γενεῆς προτέρων τ’ ἀνθρώπων, at Il. 23.790.

193. Interestingly, the transition is in two stages, with style-shifting markers at each stage: first, at v. 225, Odysseus tells the narrative common to each; then, at v. 226, he tells the tale specific to Eurytos.

194. Some may define a catalogue explicitly as a list of three or more entries (e.g., Sammons 2007: 10–11) but v. 224 clearly has the syntax of a verse from catalogue poetry. Thus, I consider it catalogic.
Finally, here again we encounter the theme of mortals striving against the gods, an issue we shall take up in detail in Part Three.

Perhaps best known among the catalogic paradigms is Zeus’ own catalogue of women in the *Dios apatê* of *Iliad* 14. Having been seduced by Hera, Zeus persuades her to sleep with him before she departs on a contrived journey to Oceanus and Tethys. In so doing he lists six past lovers in catalogue form, none of whom he desired as much as he desires Hera at that moment (*Il. 14. 313–28*):

> Ἡρὴ κεῖσε μὲν ἔστι καὶ ύστερον ὑμηθῆναι, νοῦ δ᾽ ἄγ᾽ ἐν φιλότητι τραπείον εὐνηθέντε, 315  
> οὐ γάρ πώ ποτὲ μ᾽ ὀδεθὲς ἔρος οὐδὲ γυναῖκος θυμὸν ἐνὶ στήθεσι περιπροχυθεὶς ἐδάμασσεν,  
> ὥσει νῦν ἔραμαι καὶ με γυλκὺς ἴμερος αἴρει.

For never before in this way has desire of a goddess or woman flooded and subdued the heart in my breast: not when I loved the wife of Ixion who bore me Peirithoos, equal of the gods in counsel, nor when I loved the daughter of Akrisios, lovely-ankled Danaë, who bore Perseus to me, preeminent among all men, not even when I loved the daughter of

---

195. In the case of *Il. 2.596*, consider the similarity of Thamyris’ ill-fated challenge to gods to that of the Niobe or Meleager paradigmas. For Thamyris, see otherwise Hes. *fr.* 65 M–W (where the blinding is reported as taking place Δωτίωι ἐν πεδίω, rather than in Dorion, as here) and, say, Polygnutos’ *Nekyia* as described at Paus. 10.30.8. What is striking is how natural these themes are to catalogic syntax, even if the theme seems a favorite of folk-tale (so G. S. Kirk [*ad* 2.594–600]). On Eurytos, son of Stratonic, cf. Hes. *fr.* 17a.16 and 26.28, as well as the catalogic Alcman 1.6 *PMG* and Pind. *O.* 10.28.

196. Note that this is the only instance of Dionysus in the *Iliad* outside of the paradeigma at *Il.* 6.130–41 (on which see above). In the *Odyssey*, Dionysus appears in the *Nekyia* at 11.325 and at 24.74 (properly of wine). G. S. Kirk (*ad* 130) discusses the references to Dionysus in Homeric poetry, suggesting his role is not necessarily *post-Homeric*, but rather simply *non-heroic*. On the syntax of this verse, cp. *Od.* 12.125.
far-renowned Phoenix, who bore to me Minos and godlike Rhadamanthys; not when I loved Semele, or Alkmene in Thebes: Alkmene who bore me strong-hearted Herakles as a son; Semele who bore me Dionysos, a joy to mortals; not even when I loved the fair-tressed queen Demeter, not even when it was glorious Leto, nor even yourself, not in such a way as I love you now, and as sweet desire now seizes me.

This speech, which is easily compared to Paris’ words to Helen in *Iliad* 3 (441–6), is similarly framed with a repetition of ἔρως/ἔραμαι (317, 318; cp. 3.442, 446). Zeus, however, elaborates the basic form in the manner of a catalogue. In this elaboration, moreover, the performer draws from a tradition that is absent from Paris’ speech: I mean, of course, the genealogical tradition. For, while at first the repetition of line-initial ἥ τέκε might recall the Iliadic verse-end ἥ τέκε τέκνα familiar from the Catalogue of Ships, the best comparanda are in fact from the catalogue poetry represented to us in Hesiodic poetry:

- ἥ τέκε Περσεφόνην λευκώλενον, ἥν Αἰδωνεύς
- ἥ τέκε Τήλεφον Αρκασίδην Μυσῶν βασιλῆς,
- ἥ τέκε ... βιον καὶ ἀρηψί[λον] Μενέ[λαου
- ἥ τέ[κε ...  

Th. 913
fr. 165.8 M–W
fr. 195.p5 M–W
fr. 43a.91 M–W

Nor am I the first to claim, based on genealogical formulae, that “this passage derives from the same ancient oral tradition of genealogical verse.” But we may further notice

197. But for the fact that Paris refers actually, and only, to Helen herself as past lover. Cp. Paris’ phrasing: ἄλλ’ ἄγε δὴ φιλότητι τραπεῖον εὐνηθέντε. | οὐ γὰρ πώ ποτὲ μ’ ὀδύν | ὦδ’ ὅτε...ὡς σεο νῦν ἔραμαι καὶ με γλυκὸς ἰμερος αἱρεῖ.

198. Note the athetesis by Aristophanes and Aristarchus, who argued that vv. 315–16 would have been sufficient.

199. This is not to say that the Homeric performer does not also show some stylistic artistry. Eustathius, e.g., defends the passage thus (3.650.24–651.3): Ὅτι καὶ ἑπιμένει καρίως οἶδεν ὁ ποιητής καὶ αὐθὰς ἔλλησας τοὺς λόγους προάγειν ἐν δέοντι. Πάντες δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ χορῷ τούτῳ τῇ συνήθει ποικίλα ὁ ποιητής ἐπλεόνασεν, ἐπικαλύπτων τὸ αἰσχρὸν τεχνικῷς θεωρήσασιν. Ἡ δὲ ποικίλα τοιαύτη τις, ὡς ἐκ πολλῶν ὀλίγα εἰπεῖν.


201. The ἥ τέκε in fr. 165 and 195 are supplements, but justified by the male accusative proper names in the rest of each verse.

202. Janko (*ad* 313–28), who fully details formulae and phrasing shared with *Odyssey*, Hesiod,
that the digression on Alkmene’s birth to Heracles—that which does not show the initial ἥ τέκε formulae—begins, just as we would expect from our study of the catalogic properties of even non-catalogic paradeigmata above, with ἥ ῥ᾽ (v. 324) and continues with a formula κρατερόφρονα γείνατο παῖδα familiar from the Nekyia (v. 11.299) and Theogony (v. 509).

We saw above, in the case of Od. 19.510–52, the confluence of simile and paradeigma, and now we have seen the connection between catalogue and paradeigma. Let us now consider a paradeigma that stands out from other Homeric examples in that it best resembles a catalogic arrangement of similes. In fact, Zeus’ Catalogue of Lovers has already been compared to this catalogue of similes, namely Calypso’s catalogue of goddesses who have previously been united in love with mortals.203 In Book 5 of the Odyssey, Calypso tries to convince Hermes to allow her to keep Odysseus with her (vv. 118–28):

“σχέτλιοι ἦστε, θεοί, ξηλήμονες ἔξοχον ἄλλων, οἱ τε θείος ἀγάσθε παρ’ ἀνδράσιν εὐνάξεοθαυμάζοντι, ἢν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσετ’ ἀκοῖτιν. ὃς μὲν ὄτ’ Ἡρίων ἔλετο ροδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς, τόφρα οἱ ἡγάσαθε θεοὶ μὲν ἡσύχοισι. ἦν μὲν ἐν Ὄρτυγίης χρυσόθρονοι Ἀρτέμις ἀγάπη ὁικοδομήσαντες ἀγανοῖσι βέλεσιν ἐποίχον, ὧν θυμός εἶχασα, μήγεν φιλότητι καὶ εὐνὴ νεῳ ἐνι αἰτιόλοις. οὐδὲ δὴ ἐν Ὄρτυγίῃ χρυσόθρονος Ἀρτέμις ἀγάπη ὁικοδομήσαντες ἀγανοῖσι βέλεσιν ἐποίχον, ὧν θυμός εἶχασα, μήγεν φιλότητι καὶ εὐνὴ νεῳ ἐνι αἰτιόλοις. οὐδὲ δὴ ἐν Ὄρτυγίῃ χρυσόθρονος Ἀρτέμις ἀγάπη ὁικοδομήσαντες ἀγανοῖσι βέλεσιν ἐποίχον, ὧν θυμός εἶχασα, μήγεν φιλότητι καὶ εὐνὴ νεῳ ἐνι αἰτιόλοις.

The adverb ὃς is normally associated with similes in Homeric and Hesiodic poetry,204 but, as we have seen in the case of Penelope above, the anaphoric ὃς μὲν/δὲ is also a viable option for a paradeigma. Still, the simile-like structuring device is unusual in the


203. On the traditionality of this scene, Burkert (1992: 202n18) makes this comparison, outside of any discussion of paradeigmata, likening the passages to Gilgamesh’s listing of Ishtar’s past lovers (6.42–78).

204. On the simile-paradeigma, see references at n.135 on p. 92 above.
case of Penelope, and is the more unusual here for its being used as the basis of a cat-
logue—a combination not otherwise familiar from Homeric poetry. Here again, the best 
comparanda are very likely from Hesiodic poetry, as in fr. 176 M–W:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{τῆισιν δὲ φιλομειδής Ἀφροδίτη} \\
\text{ἡγάσθη προσιδούσα, κακῆι δὲ σφ' ἐμβαλε φήμη.} \\
\text{Τιμάνδρη μὲν ἔπειτ' Ἐχειμον προλιποῦσ' ἐβεβήκει,} \\
\text{ἔκετο δ' ἐς Φυλήα φίλον μακάρεσσι θεότιν.} \\
\text{ὡς δὲ Κλυταιμήστρη <προ>λιποῦσ' Ἀγαμέμνονα δῖον} \\
\text{Ἀγίσθωι παρέλεκτο καὶ εἶλετο χείρον' ἀκόττην'} \\
\text{ὡς δ' Ἐλένη ἡς ἔσχυνε λέχος ξανθοῦ Μενελάου}
\end{align*}
\]

Smile-loving Aphrodite was angry with them when she saw them, and she cast bad repute 
upon them. Then Timandra left behind Ekhemos and ran away, and came to Phyleus, 
who was dear to the blessed gods; so, too, Clytemnestra, leaving behind godly 
Agamemnon, lay beside Aegisthus and preferred a worse husband; so too Helen shamed 
the marriage-bed of blond Menelaos

There is no consensus as to where exactly this fragment ought to be placed within the 
Hesiodic corpus,\(^{205}\) but we may find it striking that this use of ὡς δ' is fairly specialized:\(^{206}\) 
aside from these two catalogic uses, we might only compare the paradeigma of Tithonos 
in \textit{h.Ven.} 218.\(^{207}\) That the simile and paradeigma share syntax is not here the most re-
markable aspect; what is more remarkable is that here too we see this catalogic tendency 
at the very intersection of the simile and paradeigma, and one which we find attested in 
Hesiodic poetry as well.

---

\(^{205}\) This fragment (from Σ Eur. \textit{Or.} 249) is placed by West in the Atlantides section of the 
\textit{Catalogue} (but see West 1985a: 96,123 on the contradictions concerning Helen). Glenn Most 
suspects they may be from the \textit{Catalogue} or the \textit{Megalai Ehoiai}, but, due to those contradictions, 
places it among his \textit{Other Fragments} (F 247). So, too, Hirschberger among her ΕΞ ΑΔΗΛΩΝ 
ΕΠΩΝ (F *8).

\(^{206}\) Different, of course, from ὡς δὲ, but similar to the catalogic ἢ ὡς in later poets, on which see 
the section on ‘Hesiodic Elegy’ in Cameron 1995: 380–386, as well as Skutsch 1982: 50–60 and 

\(^{207}\) Of the other instances, the most common is the fuller ὡς δ’ αὐτῶς in the transition from the 
vehicle to the tenor of a simile (14x, e.g., \textit{Il.} 3.339, 7.430). Instances of the simpler ὡς δὲ include 
E  Summary

While such discourse characteristics on the level of syntax are compelling on their own terms, the way in which these syntaxes bracket, or are even foregrounded by, certain formulaic phrases is equally so. In particular, we spoke above about the way in which discourse markers and syntagms mark transition boundaries in the course of ‘register variation’; we also saw how *paradeigmata* differentiate themselves from other historical digressions, not only in syntax, but in lexical items.208 We could, then, continue our analysis of Calypso’s speech just above, and note the way in which her catalogue of *paradeigmata* is introduced by the phrase φίλον ποιήσετ’ ἀκοίτην (Od. 5.119–21):

οἵ τε θεαῖσ’ ἀγάσθε παρ’ ἀνδράσιν εὐνάξεσθαι
ἀμφαθών, ἢν τίς τε φίλον ποιήσετ’ ἀκοίτην.
ὡς μὲν ὧτ’ Ὥριον’ ἔλετο ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἡώς, 120

This phrase, the first element of which varies in its other three occurrences in Homeric poetry,209 is a fixed formula in Hesiodic poetry, where it regularly appear as θαλερὴν ποιήσατ’ ἀκοίτην, similarly describing marriage between divine and mortal. The thirteen occurrences, in fact, are limited to the *Theogony*’s last one-hundred verses, the *Catalogue of Women*, and the *Megalai Ehoiai*.210 While such an observation is hardly cogent in isolation, we shall in the next section look more closely at the way in which ‘paradigmatic syntax and style’ in Homeric poetry brackets a particular combination of diction and themes. We shall do this in the context, again, of ‘Hesiodic textures’, for this confluence of discourse characteristics is distinctly catalogic and genealogical.211

208. See pp. 69–70 and 85–91 respectively.
209. As Achilles at *Il.* 9.397 (φίλην as attributive adjective) and, speaking of his genealogy to Priam, at 24.537 (θεὰν as predicate noun); *Od.* 7.66 (lacks first element, but note surrounding diction).
210. *Th.* 921, 946, 948, 999; *frr.* 17a.12, 23a.31, 33a.7, 85.5, 190.6 (θαλερὴν suppl. West), 251a.8 (omn. verb. suppl. West), 10a.22 (φίλην, suppl. West), 10a.59 (=14.5).
211. In the course of this chapter we shall return to the catalogic nature of the *paradeigmata* in light of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, including Andromache’s speech at *Il.* 6.407–39. Note further the discussion of Priam’s speech to Achilles in *Iliad* 24 (vv. 486–506) in Chapter 12.
Chapter 5 | Hesiodic textures II: *paradeigma*, catalogue, and genealogy

In this penultimate chapter of Part One, before returning to the Niobe *paradeigma* with which we began, we shall once more explore the connections we have just discussed in the Homeric *paradeigmata* in terms of discourse within the ‘Hesiodic’ poetic tradition. In particular, we shall look at confluences of syntax, diction, and formulae, and how these traits are bound up with theme. These confluences will further show how useful our approach here is in looking more carefully at the small-scale poetics that we can discern when we approach a ‘text’ on the level of its discourse ‘textures’.

A Digression, formulae, and small-scale poetics: Hekate (Th. 411–52)

Above we looked briefly at the use of καὶ γάρ in the story of Hekate in the *Theogony*, particularly the way in which it brackets a somewhat generalizing, digressive passage as a distinct ‘unit of talk’ that happened to be, not solely a paradigmatic digression focusing on the past, but also one with implications in the present. If we look more closely at the context of this digression, its features become even more intriguing, for it occurs in the catalogic Children of the Titans portion of the *Theogony*, when the performer turns to Asteria’s bearing Hecate by Perses (vv. 411–16):  

---

2. Translation on p. 48 above.
We have previously seen in detail how very symbiotic genealogies, catalogues, and paradigmata must have been, and here again we find a confluence of these discourses.

Note first how the introductory verse of this section devoted to Hekate begins with ἡ δ᾽ ὑποκυσαμένη Ἑκάτην τέκε, τὴν περὶ πάντων ("And she, pregnant, gave birth to Hekate, whom [Zeus esteemed] beyond all…"; 411). This verse-initial formula occurs most frequently in, though is not limited to, the extant Hesiodic Catalogue of Women:

- ἡ δ᾽ ὑποκυσαμένη τέκετο κρατερόφρονα τέκνα. Th. 308
- ἡ δ᾽ ὑποκυσαμένη Διὶ γείνατο τερπικεραύνωι
- ἢ [δ᾽] ὑποκυσ[αμένη… Hes. fr. 7.1
- ἡ δ᾽ ὑποκυσαμένη διδύμονε διδυμάονε γείνατο παῖδε Hes. fr. 10a.42a
- ἡ δ᾽ ὑποκυσαμένη τέκεν Αἰακὸν ἱππιοχάρην... Il. 6.26
- ἡ δ᾽ ὑποκυσαμένη Πελίην τέκε καὶ Νηλῆα, Od. 11.254
- ἡ δ᾽ ὑποκυσαμένη Πανδείην γείνατο κούρην h.Hom. 32.15

Presented thus, the four occurrences of this formulae outside the Catalogue of Women may not seem to point us definitively toward such a poetic tradition, but we can with good evidence claim that these four occurrences themselves draw on the tradition of genealogical catalogue poetry such as the Catalogue of Women. For now, let it suffice to summarize the support: the Odyssean instance (v. 11.254) is from the Nekyia, a passage long suspected of owing a great debt to the catalogic poetic tradition now best represent-

---

3. Variation between ἡ δ᾽ and ἢ δ᾽ is frequent even in a given verse; note Allen’s report for Il. 6.26: “ἡ δ᾽ A Bm² d Oσ P² P²¹ T : ἢ δ᾽ B Bm² P¹ W¹ : ἢδ᾽ cet.”

4. But note that this verse is variously omitted or written above in a different hand (M–W: om., marg. sup. rest. m. al.).
ed by the *Catalogue of Women*; the Theogonic verse here (v. 308) is embedded in a discourse that finds its best formulaic parallels in the *Catalogue of Women*; in turn, *Il. 6.26* and *h.Hom. 32.15* are very much of the same texture as *Th. 306–8*. To take just one of these examples, let us turn briefly to the context of *Il. 6.26*, where the narrator describes Euryalos’ victims, Aisepos and Pedasos (vv. 20–8):

> Δρῆσον δ’ Εὐρύαλος καὶ Ὁφέλτιον ἐξενάριες:
> βῆ δὲ μετ’ Αἴσηπον καὶ Πῆδασον, | οὗς ποτε νῦμφη
> νηής Αβαρβαρέη τέκ’ ἀμύνοι βουκολίωι.  
> Βουκολίωι δ’ ἦν ὦδ’ ἄγαυον Λαομέδουντος
> πρεσβύτατος γενεῖ, σκότιον δὲ ε’ γείνατο μήτηρ:
> ποιμαίνων δ’ ἐπ’ ὕσσοι μὴν φιλότητι καὶ εὐνή,
> η δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη διδυμάρνε γείνατο παιδὲ.

Then Euryalos slaughtered Opheltios and Dresos, and went after Aisepos and Pedasos, whom the naiad nymph Abarbare once bore to blameless Boukolion. Boukolion was the son of proud Laomedon, eldest by birth, but his mother bore him in darkness. While shepherdng his flocks he lay with the nymph in love, and she became pregnant and bore twin boys. But now Mekistios’ son Euryalos loosed the strength and glorious limbs of these men, and stripped the armor from their shoulders.

The genealogy of the two men, which begins with the relative clause at the bucolic di-aeresis in v. 21, is essentially a five-line digression focused largely on their nymph mother, and is built especially from formulae and lexical items that maintain this cohesion.

---

5. As has long been noted, and as I shall discuss in greater detail below, the *Nekyia of Od. 11* is very much of the same tradition as that to which the *Catalogue* belongs. Studies date as far back as Zutt 1894, with further bibliography in West 1985a: 32n7. More recently, cf. Rutherford 2000: 93–96 and Cingano 2009: 112, who notes “close convergence” especially in the account of Tyro and Poseidon.

6. If such a distinction is necessary at all, that is. On *Th. 308*, note that this is a formula that actually begins the catalogue of all those to whom Echidna gives birth. Notice also localization of discourse features in vv. 306–7: φασί; μιχθείσ’ ἐν φιλότητι (on which see below, p. 136).

7. Compare: τῇ δὲ Τυφάονα φασι μιγήμεναι εν φιλότητι | … | η δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη τέκετο κρατερόφρονα τέκνα (*Th. 306–8*); τῇ ρά ποτε Κρονίδης ἐμίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνή | η δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη Παινδείν γείνατο κούρην (*h.Hom. 32.14–15*); ποιμαίνων δ’ ἐπ’ ὅσαι μὴν φιλότητι καὶ εὐνή, | η δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη διδυμάρνε γείνατο παῖδε (*Il. 6.25–6*).

8. On nymphs, see below (p. 137).
B  Catalogue, genealogy, and syntax

B.1 Syntax and relatives

The prevalence of genealogical features brings us back again to the syntax of the relative clause, as we studied above in the context of Homeric poetry. We noted especially the findings of Beye, although he was working largely with a view to understanding whether the Catalogue of Ships and the androktasiai both preserve inherited information,9 rather than inherited discursive properties.10 Beye’s original findings nevertheless do suggest that a much broader survey of this syntactic formula is necessary,11 and I suggest that we now turn to Hesiodic poetry in our survey of the syntax. It is immediately clear that this syntagm plays a crucial role in the Hesiodic tradition, as the verses below show:12

οἵ ῥα φυλάσσουσιν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα
αἵ ῥα' ἀνέων πυοίησι καὶ οἰκωνίς ἀμ' ἐπονται
αἵ ῥα πολυσερέες γαῖαν καὶ βέθεα λίμνῃς
οἵ ῥα τὸτ' ἀλλήλους ἑκατέρους ἐξοντες
οἵ ῥα τριηκοσίας πέτρας στιβαρέων ἀπὸ χειρῶν
ὅς ῥα καὶ ἡβήσας ἀπε̣ τείσατο πτερον
ὅς ῥα' ἀγαθὸς ἕν ἐην ἀγορῆι, ἀγαθὸς δὲ ἀχεσθαι
ἤρα γυναικῶν φῦλον ἐκαίνυτο θηλυτεράων

9. We might additionally note Beye’s (1964: 354) attention to the prominence of rivers in these passages.

10. Beye 1964: 357–358. That is, instead of wondering what information has been lost about a kingship of Adrestos based on Il. 2.572 (καὶ Σικυῶν', ὃθ' ἀρ' Ἀδρηστος πρῶτ' ἐμβασίλευεν), we might instead focus on the syntagm ὃθ' ἀρ', which only occurs otherwise in Nestor’s paradigmatic recollection at Il. 7.143 (στεινωπῷ ἐν ὁδῷ ὃθ' οὐ κορύνη οἱ ὀλεθρον).

11. For the full survey, see Appendix B (p. 358).

12. I leave for discussion below the case of the feminine nominative singular pronoun (ἡ ῥα). One may even compare the way in which the description of wedding gifts in a Suits of Helen fragment (200.6 M–W), καλά, τά ῥ' ἐνδοθε κεφθε δόμος Πετεώ άνακτος, exhibits the same formula used for Paris’ house at Il. 6.314 (καλά, τά ῥ' ἀυτός έτευξε σύν ἀνδράσιν οἱ τότ’ ἀριστοι) and Odysseus’ clothes at Od. 7.235 (καλά, τά ῥ' αὐτή τεύξε σύν ἀμφιπόλουι γυναιξ'). Cf. also Il. 18.379, describing the handles of Hephaestus’ twenty ‘robotic’ tripods.

13. Still more examples are to be found at Sc. 77, 84, 149, 316, 473.
The prevalence of catalogue poetry, and of the *Catalogue* in particular, in this list of instances would not have surprised Beye. Nor should it surprise us that there is just a single instance found outside of Hesiodic catalogue poetry, in the *Works and Days*.

I suggest that this apparent exception is, in fact, instructive, and that a brief investigation will underscore for us the essential discourse characteristics. For, if we look closer at its context, it should not surprise us to find this verse among the poem’s catalogic examples (*WD* 252–6):

\[
\text{τρὶς γὰρ ὑμῖν ἐσιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτεῖρη}
\text{ἀθάνατοι Ζηνὸς φύλακες θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων,}
\text{οἰ ῥα φυλάσσουσιν τε δίκας καὶ σχέτλια ἔργα}
\text{ἡρα ἐσσάμενοι, πάντη φοιτῶντες ἐπ᾽ αἰαν.}
\]

That is, our syntagm οἱ ῥα, though it lies in the non-catalogic, non-genealogical *Works and Days*, is here clearly true to its catalogic nature: the poem, leading with the numeral τρὶς in v. 252, even marks it as such. Likewise, M. L. West (*ad loc.*) is certainly correct to compare it to *Th.* 268, the context of which is properly catalogic (265–9):

\[
\text{Θαύμας δ᾽ Ὡκεανοῖο βαθυρρείται ὦγατρα}
\text{ηγάγετ᾽ Ἡλέκτρην ἡ δ᾽ ὐκεῖαν τέκεν ἦριν}
\text{ἡμυκόμους θ᾽ Ἀρτπυα, Λελλὼ τ᾽ Ὡκυπέτην τε,}
\text{αἱ ῥ᾽ ἀνέμων πυκνῷ καὶ ὀικώνοις ἀμί ἐπονται}
\text{ὡκεῖς πυρόγεσσι: μεταχρόνια γὰρ ἑαλλον.}
\]

---

14. It is worth noting that, given that the formula almost always occurs at verse-beginning, and that the verse-beginning is very often lacking in the *Catalogue* papyri, the list would most likely include far more examples from the *Catalogue*.

15. We must not forget that Beye’s article was published at a time when far less was known about the *Catalogue of Women*. Even so, Beye recognized a possible connection between the introduction to the Nereid list, the Catalogue of Ships and “the newly discovered introduction to the Ἕοῖαι (*P. Oxy.* XXIII 2354, line 14)” (352). Compare also Beye’s instinct in the following: “See also fragments 95 and following (Rzach) for a catalogue of Helen’s suitors distinctly like the Catalogue of Ships” (372n26).

16. Naturally, then, the passage continues with ἥ δὲ at v. 256. See Beye 1964: 351–352 for a discussion of numerals in lists.
Here we find the appositional relative clause expanding the explicit, itemized catalogue of vv. 266–7, rather than the notional, proleptic catalogue of *WD* 254.\(^{17}\) This syntagm, then, is a discourse characteristic shared with catalogue poetry in both the Homeric and Hesiodic tradition. It is not, as discussed above, to be thought of in terms of calling on the tradition of Homeric poetry in particular, but rather the narratives embedded in ‘Hesiodic’ genealogical poetry.

In the case of Homeric poetry, we noted the foregrounding of words like υἱός in combination with the relative-clause syntagm. We might also expect to find a similar phenomenon in genealogical catalogue poetry such as the *Theogony* or the *Catalogue*. Yet we do not, and this is precisely the point: the word υἱός is entirely unmarked in Hesiodic catalogue poetry due to the already strong genealogical context. In the cases of the ὁς-ῥα syntagm in the genealogical Hesiodic poetry listed above, they consistently mark extended *narrative* digressions away from the *genealogical* context.\(^{18}\) This lexical trigger, coupled with this syntagm, is used especially to effect *style shifts*, a phenomenon familiar from sociolinguistics and folklore studies.\(^{19}\)

We can, for example, see this style-shifting in action in the way that the *Catalogue* shifts from a list detailing Clytemnestra’s children to a narrative about Orestes’ taking vengeance on his mother (*fr*. 23a.27–30 M–W):

\[
\text{λοίθον δ’ ἐν μεγά[ροις Κλυτ[αιμήστρη κυ[υ[ω[πίς γείναθ’ ὑποδιμ[θ[είο Αγαμέμν[ον[ί δί[ον Ορέ[στην,}
\]

\(^{17}\) Cf. also the scenario of *Th*. 900–5, wherein an explicit list is expanded with αἱ τ’ at v. 902. The transmission of particles is, of course, a tenuous one in MS traditions. I would expect, but cannot confirm, that some MSS or papyri have αἱ ῥ’ in its place.

\(^{18}\) The only exception here seems to be *fr*. 161: υἱεῖς ἐξεγένοντο Λυκάονος ἀντιθέοι | ὅν ποτε τίκτε Πελασγός.

\(^{19}\) Again, for us it is about style-shifting rather than translation of a particle (‘interactional’ v. ‘transactional’). For the transactional view, see West on the αἱ ῥ’ of *Th*. 268, who translates the syntagm as “die ja” or “who as their names suggest” in Hesiodic poetry there is often a connection between a cognate noun and a verb developing it. See also West ad *WD* 254. We might compare the suggestion of Grimm (1962: 16) that ἀρα be translated as ‘ja’.
As the last one in the [halls, dark-eyed Clytemnestra,] overpowered by [Agamemnon], bore godly Orestes, who when he reached puberty [took vengeance] on his father’s murderer, and he killed his [own man-destroying] mother with the pitiless bronze. (trans. G. W. Most)

The genealogical context of vv. 27–8 leads into the narrative elaboration of vv. 29–30 by means of the ὃς ῥα. In this respect we may say that Homeric and Hesiodic poetry are identical in their style of effecting transitions between the catalogic or genealogical and style of its embedded narrative. Furthermore, while the rule may not be hard and fast, this syntagm tends to mark transitions to lengthier narrative.

This similarity is nowhere more clear than in the case of the Odyssean Nekyia and the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women; specifically, in their use of the feminine nominative singular form of our syntagm, the appositional relative clause beginning with ἥ ῥα. There exist only two instances of ἥ ῥα in Hesiodic poetry, the better known being the very narrative elaboration that becomes the Hesiodic Shield of Heracles (fr. 195.8–13 M–W=Sc. 1–6):

...ἧ ὡν προλιποῦσα δόμως καὶ πατρίδα γαίαν ἠλυθεν ἐς Θήβας µετ’ ἀρήιον Ἀμφιτρώουν Ἀλκήνης, θυγάτηρ λαοσσόου Ἑλεκτρώνος· ἥ ῥα γυναικῶν φύλον ἐκαίνυτο θηλυτεράων εἴει τε µεγέθει τε, νόον γε µὲν ου τις ἐρίζε τάων ἃς θυηταὶ θυητοῖς τέκοι εὐηθεῖσαι.

---

20. This could well be offered as evidence in support of Bakker’s less tractable suggestions about visualization and activation of traditions, but my emphasis is on the discourse features marking the interaction between traditions rather than on visualization and involvement with a given tradition; that is, I emphasize that the style-shift effects a transition to a tradition or discourse context outside of itself.

21. A counterexample to a stronger claim for the extent of elaboration might be, e.g., Hes. fr. 25.18 M–W: ἥ τέχ’ ὑποδημηθεὶς αἰαὶ Ηρακλης ἑῳ, a verse which introduces Deianeira and of the inadvertently deadly cloak she gave to Heracles. On the other hand, one might argue that the tale is less about Deianeira than Heracles, whose apotheosis is seemingly the goal of the narrative in v. 25 (if not also the obelized vv. 26–33).

22. The other instance is Sc. 149, which elaborates mention of Eris (and does so to a far greater degree than the mention of Phobos just above), who is only very briefly described.
…Or like her: leaving behind her houses and her father’s land, she came to to Thebes following warlike Amphitryon—Alkmene, the daughter of host-rousing Electryon. She surpassed the tribe of female women in form and in size; and as for her mind, no one could contend with her among those born by mortal women bedded to mortal men. (trans. G. W. Most)

That this passage was transmitted as both the introduction to the *Shield of Heracles* and seemingly as part of the *Catalogue* is compelling, given that it alone has this ἕ-ῥα discourse feature in the *Catalogue.* For, it is the ultimate expression of moving from the ἕ’ oῖη of v. 8 to a narrative digression. In the rest of the *Catalogue,* we must remember, the list of women forms a matrix for embedded narratives, not of women, but of men. There is, therefore, little opportunity in the *Catalogue* as it remains to us for the poet to use the ἕ ῃα-type of relative clause but for the case when he is actually narrating extensively the story of Alkmene; the usual way of talking of a woman in the *Catalogue* is with ἧ δὲ or in asyndeton with no accompanying particles. In the story of Alkmene in the Odyssean *Nekyia,* we find that there, too, where the women are both subject of catalogue and narrative, he has reason to use this syntagm (11.266–70):

\[
\text{τὴν δὲ μετ’ Ἀλκμήνην ἔδωκεν, Ἀμφίτριῳνος ἀκοίτιν, ἥ’ Ἡρακλῆς θρασύμενον θυμολέοντα γείνατ’ ἐν ἠγκοίνῃ Διὸς μεγάλοιο μυγείσα· καὶ Μεγάρην, Κρείοντος ὑπερθύμβοιο θύγατρα, τὴν ἔχειν Ἀμφίτριῳνος υἱὸς μένος αἰὲν ἀτειρής.}
\]

---

23. This fragment has two papyrus sources, *P. Oxy.* 2355 and 2494A. Each contains seven verses before picking up with the Alkmene ἐχοί of the *Scutum* in v. 8. *P. Oxy.* 2355 continues to *Sc.* 18; *P. Oxy.* 2494A continues to *Sc.* 5. Notice the argumentum to the Hesiodic *Sc.* (edit. Goettl. p. 108.). Τῆς Ἀσπίδος ἡ ἄρχη ἐν τῷ δ’ καταλόγῳ φέρεται μέχρι στίχων ν’ καὶ σ’. ὑπώπτευκε δὲ Ἀριστοφάνης ὡς οὐκ οὖσαν αὐτὴν Ἡσιόδου, ἄλλ’ ἐτέρου τινὸς τὴν Ὄμηροικήν ἀσπίδα μιμήσασθαι προαιρουμένου.

24. We might also note *fr.* 76.5, in which there begins a short narrative about Atalanta: ἄθλον ἔκειθ’ ἡ μὲν ῃα πρὸ ὀδώρης δι’ Ἀταλάντη.

25. In calling it the story of Alkmene, I mean only to emphasize that Heracles is not, in fact, mentioned until *Sc.* 52.

26. The syntagm ἡ δὲ occurs 25X, verse-initial in 22X; asyndetic ἡ + τέκε/οί γείνατο, 15X; ἦ εἰδ-, 9X; ἦ μὲν, 3X (including ἦ μὲν ῃα, 1X).
And then next I saw Alkmene, wife of Amphitryon, who bore Heracles, bold in battle and lion-hearted, having sex in the arms of great Zeus, and Megara, high-spirited daughter of Creon, whom the son of Amphitryon, ever tireless in courage, had as wife.

Here Odysseus, like the poet of the Scutum, is elaborating a narrative actually about Alkmene, so he uses the ἥῥα-formula, just as he does of Leda at v. 299.27 That such a syntagm occurs only once in the Catalogue should, again, not be surprising, given that the embedded narratives are consistently of men. But, the Nekyia is, as we have also stated, actually about women.28 So, naturally, the Nekyia employs another phrasing which is consistent with its catalogic underpinnings—that phrasing is ἥν ποτε (or τήν ποτε), to which we now turn.

The syntagm ἥν ποτε occurs only once in Hesiodic poetry,29 in a passage we have already begun to treat above for its use of καὶ γάρ. That passage is the so-called ‘Hymn to Hecate’,30 the Theogony’s great digression and a passage long suspected of being interpolated, even if the consensus is that it is ‘early’.31 While the matter of authenticity and interpolation is of no interest to us here, some of the motivations for scholarly suspicions are, for they are stylistic in nature. A first objection might be that of Goettling, who remarked that such a long exposition concerning a single deity does not suit the Theogony.32

---

27. Cf. also Od. 11.313 for the story of Otos and Ephialtes within the entry for Iphimedeia.
28. The Nekyia, in fact, may seem at times to be a very self-conscious gesture toward the complementarity of the narrative and catalogue transitions, for Odysseus uses the ἥῥα syntagm to mark the transition from his catalogue to a narrative—and as often a narrative concerning the woman, rather than her offspring.
29. In the masculine, plural, and the oblique cases, the ὅς-ποτε syntagm occurs also at WD 635, 651; frr. 17a.4, 26.7, 161.2, 171.7, 177.9, 234.2, 388.1 M–W. On the αἵνυπθ of Th. 22, see p. 85 above.
30. The term ‘hymn’ seems to have originated with Walcot 1958, as reported in Boedeker 1983: 79n1. West calls it not a ‘hymn’, but a ‘gospel’; Clay 1984: 27 an ‘extended encomium’.
32. “Totus ille numinis alicuius prolixus honor non decet simplicissimam theogoniae Hesiodeae expositionem,” Goettling (1831) writes. He (ad 411–522) suggests this hymn is not “ab antquuo auctore Theogoniae profectum esse,” but rather, based on its Orphic elements, added by a poet such as Onomacritus.
To this West responds that “we cannot expect a man to show this sort of feeling for more than one or two individual deities,” but I think we can now do even better, for the Theogony announces its intention of a digressive narrative using the very markers that we have been discussing in maintaining cohesion, beginning with ἥν ποτε (409–20):


Yeivato δ’ Αστερίην εὐώνυμον, ἡν ποτε Πέρσης ἤγαγετ’ ἐς μέγα δῶμα φίλην κεκλησθαι ἀκοιτιν. ἥ δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη Εκάτην τέκε, τὴν περὶ πάντων Ζεὺς Κρονίδης τιμησε’ πόρεν δε οἱ ἄγλαα δῶρα, μοῖραν ἔχειν γαῖς τε καὶ ἀτρυγέτωι βαλάσσῃς. ἥ δε καὶ ἀστερόεντος ἀπ’ οὐρανοῦ ἐμορφεῖ τιμῆς, ἄθανάτοις τε θεοῖσι τετιμημένη ἐστὶ μάλιστα. καὶ γάρ νῦν, ὅτε ποὺ τὶς ἐπιχθονίων ἀνθρώπων ἔρδων ἱερὰ καλὰ κατὰ νόμον ἱλάσκηται, κικλῆσκει Ἑκάτην πολλή τοῖς ἐσπετο τιμῆς ἔσπετο τι θεᾶ ὑποδέξεται εὐχάς, καὶ τέ οἱ ὀλβον ὀπάζει, ἐπεὶ δύνασθι γε πάρεστιν.

Yet we have now seen that the ἥν-ποτε syntagm is regularly used to mark transitions just such as this in Hesiodic genealogical poetry, particularly the Catalogue.33 Jacoby objected that the compound ὑποκυσαμένη (v. 411) is not Hesiodic,34 but we can now see that the compound simply belongs to a narrative strategy marking the transition from genealogy to extended narrative.35 With the tradition of the Catalogue now at hand, we are in a position to see that the Theogony is following what seems to be standard performance practice of the Catalogue,36 a practice followed also in appropriate portions of the Iliad and Odyssey.37 Again, while West describes this syntagm as being characteristic of historical

33. Cf. too the lead-in γείνατο δ’, 409. As West also notes, the “ποτε in 409 heralds a sizable digression” (p. 279).

34. Of course, we saw on p. 115 above that it is Catalogue-ic. Jacoby (1930) athetizes the (verse-initial) instance at v. 308, ἥ δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη τέκετο κρατερόφρονα τέκνα, leaving only the κυσαμένη of vv. 125 (mid-verse), 405 (verse-initial). Note that v. 308 refers to Typhos, in a passage marked by a similar shift in style and register variation.

35. Note also the καὶ γάρ in v. 416, as discussed above. This lends still further cohesion and traditionality to the passage as a whole.

36. Hes. fr. 7.1, 10a.47, 26.27, 145.15, 205.1 M–W.

37. E.g., Il. 6.26 and Od. 11.254 (Nekyia). Instructive too is the instance at h.Hom. 32.15.
digressions in epic, we can confidently counter that it is, in fact, specifically linked to transitions in genealogical contexts.38

B.2 Catalogues

Such observations do not necessarily lead only to ‘Hesiodic’ genealogical poetry, but, when we consider the relationship of the paradeigmata to genealogical catalogue poetry in general,39 and to the possible narrative expansions visibly accommodated within it, the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women becomes the most obvious extant comparandum.40 The poetic tradition of genealogical catalogue could have indeed been a great ‘resource’ for the abbreviated narratives, and many of the tales found there could easily be incorporated into other performances and compositions.41 The transmitted ‘structure’ and apparent ‘separability’ of the Catalogue superficially lends support to such a view, and one need only look to the ‘reappearance’ of the Alkmene-ehoie in the beginning of the Scutum to see such a process in action. This description of ‘transfer’ and ‘resource’—even ‘struc-

38. It still remains to show that this mode of storytelling, whether it be with the marker ποτε or ῥα, is, in fact, marked off from other modes of digression in Homeric poetry. Again, West has not distinguished between ‘historical digression’ and paradeigma in his description of the ποτε or ῥα relative constructions, nor does Gaisser (1969a) distinguish between the two.

39. I use the term genealogical catalogue poetry to describe what we see synchronically, but note that others would consider something like the Catalogue to be the merging of distinct traditions of genealogical poetry and non-genealogical catalogues of women (e.g., Rutherford 2000: 95–96). I am not confident, as yet, that the related traditions have been well enough described synchronically to describe diachronic aspects with any certainty.

40. As G. B. D’Alessio puts it in the case of Pindar and Bacchylides, “The ‘Hesiodic’ catalogue poems…obviously were an important source of appealing tales” (2005: 234). We might do well to emphasize that there is no need for our extant Hesiodic catalogue poems to be some ‘manuscript’ on which archaic poets and performers were drawing; what we have now could simply be instantiations of a tradition on which they were drawing.

41. There is, indeed, no clear reason at the moment to consider catalogue poetry as a source of these abbreviated narratives rather than as elaborated in a style very similar to the articulation of paradeigmata in Homeric poetry. It is as reasonable to suspect that a performer, instead of fully ‘excerpting’ such passages, could draw on the poetic diction, discourse, and style of such passages.
ture’ and ‘separability’—may certainly be true for fixed texts or later authors, but is perhaps dangerously simplistic or even misleading in the context of oral poetics.

While our findings do not necessarily rule out this frequent suggestion, I have intentionally been using the word ‘symbiotic’ in speaking of the relationship between paradigmata and genealogical catalogue poetry. I have done this not only in order to highlight that my reference to the ‘Catalogue-ic tradition’ or the ‘tradition of the Hesiodic Catalogue’ refers not to a fixed text from which the Homer performer draws but rather is a living oral tradition that could be part of the performer’s repertoire; I also use the term as a way of emphasizing that paradigmata include catalogues and catalogues seem to include paradigmata. We have seen above, in the case of Andromache’s speech in Iliad 6 as well as in our more extensive study, that some paradigmata tend toward a catalogic nature. We might look again at Dione’s catalogic and paradigmatic speech in Iliad 5 (vv. 382–404).


43. While other possible models are not ruled out by this fact, I think it worthwhile to consider what this means from the perspective of synchronic performance, on which see, e.g., the succinct statement at Nagy 1990a: 20–21. One requirement for such an approach here is the treatment of our extant Catalogue—indeed, our extant Theogony and Works and Days as well—as snapshots of a longer tradition, but our synchronic analysis may also support this diachronic symbiosis.

44. See p. 44 and pp. 103–107 respectively.

45. Translation printed on p. 105 above.
τλῆ δ᾽ Ἀίδης ἐν τοῖσι πελώριοι ὠκύν ὀϊστόν, 395
eὐτέ μιν αὐτός ἀνήρ υἱὸς Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
eὐ Πύλῳ ἐν νεκύεσσι βαλὼν ὀδύνησιν ἐδώκεν·
αὐτὰρ ὦ βῆ πρὸς δῶμα Διὸς καὶ μακρὸν ὁ Ὀλυμπὸς
κήρ ἀχέων ὀδύνησι πεπαρμένος: | αὐτὰρ ὀϊστός
οὐμο ἐνι στιβάρῳ ἡλίλατο, | κῆδε δὲ θυμόν. 400
τῷ δ᾽ ἐπὶ Παιήων ὀδυνήφατα φάρακα πάσσων
ἀχέων ὀδύνῃσι πεπαρμένος
ἔδωκεν· αὐτὰρ ὦ πρὸς δῶµα Διὸς καὶ ἀκρὸν Ὄλυσον
κῆδε δὲ θυμόν.

This catalogue, built upon ‘kernel narratives’ of just a few echoing syllables each—τλῆ
μὲν Ἅρης, τλῆ δ’ “Ἡρη, τλῆ δ’ Ἀίδης”46—are internally elaborated to varying degrees. To
focus on just one of these kernel narratives, that of the Aloadai enchaining Ares in a
bronze cauldron (vv. 385–91), Willcock (ad loc.) calls this a Homeric invention. But, as
G. S. Kirk points out (ad loc.), a different episode from among Otos’ and Ephialtes’ at-
tacks on Olympus is embedded in the ‘Hesiodic’ Nekyia of the Odyssey (11.305–20), a
narrative sparked by Odysseus’ having seen their mother Iphimedeia.47 Further still, two
ancient testimonia point to the Hesiodic tradition’s treatment of Otos and Ephialtes,48
and, since they belong to the Deukalionidai, these testimonia are unanimously placed in the
Catalogue.”49

We also discussed above that Zeus’ catalogue of past lovers in the Dios apatê of
Iliad 14 takes the form of a catalogue seemingly built on the phrase οὐδ᾽ ὅτε,50 but we did
not then point out that, as the underlining below emphasizes, it actually embeds an al-

46. We might compare Ζεὺς ἀσατο of Il. 19.95, the start of Agamemnon’s paradeigma there. Further, on the paradigmatic theme of ‘endurance’ via the root τλα-, see Part III “Syntax and suffering in Homeric poetry.”
47. Note, too, that it is their stepmother Eēriboia who intervenes (5.389). The emphasis should not necessarily be on the Catalogue-ic rather than Theogonic tradition, but rather the genealogical catalogue tradition in general.
49. See West 1985a: 61,139.
50. See Burkert 1992 on Gilgamesh compared to Iliad 14 via the Theogony, as well as Rutherford 2000: 265n39 with references.
ternate, dove-tailed catalogue built on the verse-initial relative clauses beginning with ἤ
tέκε (vv. 315–28):\footnote{Translation printed on p. 109 above. The phrase οὐδ᾽ ὅτε does not seem to be particular handy for a performer at all: in hexameter poetry outside of this passage it occurs only at \textit{Il.} 3.443, which bears, of course, a special relationship to the present one.}

\begin{quote}
oὐ γάρ πῶς ποτέ μ᾽ ὃδε θεᾶς ἔρος οὐδὲ γυναικὸς θυμὸν ἐνὶ στίχοθεοὶ περίπροχυθεὶς ἐδάμασσον, οὐδ᾽ ὅπτι ἤδαμασμὲν ἵξιονος ἀλόχοι, ἤ τέκε Πειρίθου θεόθην ήτοτωρ ἀτάλαντον οὐδ᾽ ὅτε περὶ Δανάης καλλισφύρων ἄκρισισ ἡ̣ς τέκε Περσῆα πάντων ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθην ἄκρισισ ἔστωρ᾽ ἀταλαντὸν· οὐδ᾽ ὅτε Πειρίθου θεόθη
\end{quote}

Outside of this passage, no verses in Homeric poetry begin with the syntactic formula of
this relative clause;\footnote{The closest comparison is the demonstrative construction ἤ δ᾽ ἔτεκε τρία τέκνα δαύρῳ Βελλεροφόντη (\textit{Il.} 6.196), which occurs in Glaukos’ genealogy (on which see below in Part Three).} in the Hesiodic tradition, however, such a formulation is rather com-
mon, occurring eleven times in this position and syntax, predominantly in the \textit{Catalogue}.
\footnote{See also \textit{Th.} 913, \textit{frr.} 23a.15, 43a.91, 58.10 (τέκετο), 64.15, 165.8, 175.1 (τέκετο), 195.p5, 204.94, 251a.1, 253.2 M–W. Add to these, perhaps, instances such as ἤ δ᾽ ὑποκυσαμένη τέκετο (e.g., \textit{Th.} 308), discussed above.} Consider the following example from the so-called Suitors of Helen (\textit{fr.} 204.89–96 M–W):

\begin{quote}
oὐ γάρ μὲν ἀρηήφιλος Μενέλαος νίκη̣οι' οὐδὲ τις ἄλλος ἐπιχυθοῦν ἀνθρώπων μυστερίων Ελένην, εἰ μὲν κίχε παρθένοιν οὐδαν οἴκαδε νουστήρας έκ Πηλίου ὅκις Αχιλλεύς· ἀλλ᾽ ἄρα τήν πρίν γ᾽ ἔσχεν ἀρηήφιλος Μενέλαος· ἤ τέκεν Ἐρμημόνην καλλισφυρ[ο]ν ἐν μεγάροισιν ἀελπτον· πάντες δὲ θεοὶ δίνα μημόν ἐθεντο ἐξ ἐρίδος·
\end{quote}
For neither warlike Menelaus nor any other human on the earth would have defeated him in wooing Helen, if swift Achilles had found her still a virgin when he came back home from Pelion. But warlike Menelaus obtained her first. She bore beautiful-ankled Hermione in the halls, unexpectedly. All the gods were divided in spirit in strife. (trans. adapted from G. W. Most)

From it we could easily conclude that this relative clause is a common strategy of continuation in the Hesiodic tradition.

Having seen how readily the catalogic syntax of this relative clause can be incorporated into paradeigmata, it is worth pursuing the sometimes remarkable affinity of syntactical formulae in the paradeigmata of Homeric poetry to the ἡ’ οἳη formula in the Catalogue. After all, it might seem that the very formula on which the Catalogue seems to have been built, ἡ’ οἳη (“or such as”), is a paradigmatic tool. The phrase ἡ’ οἳη is the subject of much discussion both in terms of the diachronic development of its structural role in the Catalogue as we have it, as well as the more synchronous meaning it would have had for its ancient audience. Fortunately, the matter is not crucial for our present discussion, since we shall approach the problem in terms of Homeric comparanda.

54. Nasta (2006) has independently taken a similar approach to this portion of my analysis. While he looks at a coarser grain—omitting all other discourse traits I have here identified—some of the examples used coincide.

55. It is possible to compare the syntax in the presumed reception of this sort of poetry in fragments from the Hellenistic period: Hermesianax (fr. 7): ὤται μὲν φίλος υἱὸς ἀνήγαγεν Οἰάγροιο (1) | ... ὤται μὲν Ζάυμιον μανιᾷ κατέδησε Θεανοῦς (85) | ... ὤται δ’. ἐχλίηνεν ὃν ἐξοχον ἤφαν Απόλλων (89); as well as in Phanocles’ ἔρωτες ἦ Καλόι: ἢ ὡς Οἰάγροιο πάις Ὀμήρικος Ὁρφεὺς (fr. 1) and ἢ ὡς θεῖον Ἀδωνιν ὀρειφότης Διόνυσος (fr. 3). See further Cameron 1995: 381–384. Yet this approach may be misleading, according to West: “[t]he ἡ’ οἳη device probably came from a post-Hesiodic or para-Hesiodic tradition” (167). Note, however, that West comes to this conclusion based on a comparison with arrangement of material in the Theogony, and by a strict distinction made between the Catalogue and the Megalai Ehoiai.

56. See, e.g., Rutherford 2000: 91, who suggests that the ἡ’ οἳη serves both a paradigmatic and syntagmatic purpose, following two poetic paths at once: “Thus an ‘ehoie’ on its own is paradigmatic and substitutable, whereas within the overall genealogical structure, its role is syntagmatic.” See further West 1985a: 35,121–4,167–8, Rzach 1912: 1213–1224, and Hirschberger 2004: 31.

57. In turn, perhaps, we might throw light on the problem within the tradition represented in the Catalogue.
While non-catalogic comparanda would naturally lack the disjunctive ἥ(ε) element of the formula, we have already seen how easily paradeigmata can be built on the οἷος/τοῖος syntax which, as we have seen above, is often shared by the paradeigma and the simile.³⁸

A Homeric example which clearly seems to play off of the ‘Catalogue tradition’ is Telemachus’ speech among the suitors in Odyssey 21, that speech praising his mother by means of a paradeigma (vv. 106–11):

άλλ’ ἄγετε, μνηστήρες, ἑπεὶ τόδε φαίνετ’ ἄεθλον,
οἴη νῦν σοι ἔστι γυνὴ κατ’ Ἀχαιδα γαῖαν,
οὔτε Πύλου ἱερῆς οὔτε Ἀγρεος οὔτε Μυκήνης,
οὔτ’ αὐτής Ἱθάκης οὔτ’ ἥπεροιο μελαίνης·
καὶ δ’ αὐτοὶ τόδε γ’ ἱστε· τί με χρὴ μητέρος αἴνου;⁵⁹
άλλ’ ἄγε μὴ μῦνησι παρέλκετε μηδ’ ἔτι τόξου…

Come now, suitors, since this appears as the prize, a woman such as no other in the Achaean land, not in sacred Pylos, nor in Argos, nor Mycene, nor in Ithaca itself or on the dark mainland—even you yourselves know this. Why do I need to praise my mother? But come now, don’t put it off with excuses, and no longer turn away from the bow…

Telemachus here is working directly with, but also directly against, the Catalogue tradition,⁶⁰ if not also its suspected paradigmatic nature.⁶¹ We may also note the catalogic οὔτε as well as the concluding ἄλλ’ ἄγη-, a phrase familiar from the conclusions of paradeigmata. To this, in turn, we can compare the syntax of Nestor’s paradeigma in Iliad 1, which is directed at Agamemnon and Achilles (vv. 260–8):

⁶⁸ See pp. 92–99 above, along with, perhaps, either the reception or extension of this syntax in the fragments of Hermesianax in n.55 on p. 128 above.
⁶⁹ On praise (αἴνου) and Penelope in particular, see p. 329 below. On praise and genealogical discourse, see more below.
⁷⁰ On this sort of Odyssean reuse of discourse genres, see Martin 1984, concerning specifically Od. 8 and the Theogony.
⁷¹ Finally, we might observe the context of praise in the question τί με χρὴ μητέρος αἴνου; (110). Note Rutherford 2000: 86,95 on a possible encomiastic tone of the Catalogue and perhaps an original aretalogical character.
Θησέα τ’ Αἰγείδην, ἐπιείκελον ἀθανάτοις·
cάρτιστοι δὴ κεῖνοι ἐπιθυμοῦν τράφεν ἀνθρώποιν·
cάρτιστοι μὲν ἔσαν καὶ καρτίστοις ἐμάχοντο
φηροῖν ὑπερδύσαντες καὶ ἐκπάγυς ἀπόλλεσαν.

You know, I once dealt with better men than you, and never once did they disregard me. Never yet have I seen, nor shall I see again, men such as Peirithoos, and Dryas, shepherd of the people, and Kaineus and Exadios, and godlike Polyphemos, and Theseus, son of Aigeus, who looked like the immortals. Those were the strongest of the earth-born men, the strongest, and they fought against the strongest beasts living within the mountains, and they utterly destroyed them.

The qualitative relative οἷον is, of course, equivalent to the οἵη of Telemachus’ similarly articulated passage. While one could perhaps make too much of the catalogic verses (vv. 263–5), even if they do strongly resemble verses in the Hesiodic tradition, what interests

62. Notice further the combination of catalogue and introductory syntax in examples such as Od. 2.118–22:

63. The paradeigmata against which Penelope is judged favorably are introduced with the qualitative relative οἷον in v. 118, perhaps reminiscent of the οἵη of the Catalogue of Women. The three Achaean women specified—Tyro, Alkmene, and Mykene—then occupy v. 120 in the typically catalogic pattern of the Augmented Triad (n.190 on p. 107 above). These women, of course, are all familiar from the tradition of the Catalogue of Women and Megalai Ehoiai, if not also, in the case of Tyro and Alkmene, from the Nekyia. (For Tyro, see also Od. 11.235–59, where she falls in love with the river god Enipeus, where verses and wording are common to those in the Catalogue of Women [see Heubeck ad loc., but he supposes that “[t]he poet of the Ehoiai, like the poet of the Odyssey, drew his material from old epic tradition, but also had 235–59 before him”]. Alkmene appears at Od. 11.266, and elsewhere. Mykene, daughter of Inachus is said to have been treated in the Megalai Ehoiai [Paus. 2.16.4 = 246 M–W.] One might even wonder whether they are most familiar from that tradition. See fr. 30.25 M–W, where Tyro, for one, is similarly described as ἐὐπλόκαμος. Indeed, the Catalogue of Women is our only Archaic source for the story of Tyro apart from the Nekyia, where she also has pride of place. As the daughter of Salmoneus, Tyro’s appearance here is apt due to her having warned her father not to contend with the gods (οὐὶ)Δ’ ἐίσακε θεοῖς [βροτὸν ἱσ]οφαρίζεων; fr. 30.27), on which see further Gantz 1996: 171–173.
us especially is that Nestor uses the phrase ἴδον ἀνέρας (v. 262). Having noted above the importance of the Catalogue tradition to the Nekyia of the Odyssey, we might remember that Odysseus builds his own ‘catalogue of women’ upon the verb ἴδον. Moreover, he also uses the phrase ἴδον ἀνέρας—in the same metrical sedes before a strong bucolic diaeresis—at the end of the Nekyia, when speaking of the heroes he did not have the opportunity to see (vv. 628–31):  

αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν αὐτοῦ μένον ἐμπεδον, εἰ τις ἐτ’ ἔλθοι ἀνδρῶν ἤρωιν, οἱ δὲ τὸ πρόσθεν ὀλοντο.  
καὶ νῦ’ ἐτ’ προτέρους ἴδον ἀνέρας, οὐς ἐθελόν περ, Θησέα Πειρίθοόν τε, θεῶν ἐρυκυδέα τέκνα·  

But I stayed there still, in case some hero, those who’d already died, would still come. And indeed I might have seen yet more heroes of the past, whom I longed to see, Theseus and Perithoos, glorious children of gods.

Time and again, the salient discursive features coincide with catalogue poetry. We shall return to many more such examples in Part Three, in order to explore the effects in performance of such discourse properties.

The final such example of the οἷ-/τοῖ- type of paradeigma leads us back to discourse markers as discussed above (p. 42). In Book 4 of the Iliad Agamemnon rebukes Diomedes with a genealogical comparison with his father Tydeus. The passage emphasizes its second-handedness much as others we have seen (vv. 374–5), and extends the genealogical comparison with a lengthy narrative (vv. 376–9; 396–400):  

ὦτοι μὲν γὰρ ἄτερ πολέμου εἰσῆλθε Μυκῆνας  
> ξεῖνος ἀντιθέῳ Πολυνείκεϊ λαὸν ἀγείρων·  

63. Cp. Sc. 178–80: Ἐν δ’ ἦν ύποίην Λατινάς αἰχμητάων | Καίνεα τ’ ἀμφὶ ἄνακτα Δρύαντα τε Πειρίθοόν τε | Ὀπλεά τ’ ἕξαδιον τε Φάληρον τε Πρόλοχον τε. Other names or whole phrases (e.g., Ἡσσάδα τ’ Ἀγαθίνα) are also repeated in the Sc. passage.  

64. E.g., vv. 235, 260, 266, 271, 306 (ἐσιδον), 321, 326, 329; of males, vv. 522, 528, 568.  

65. Interestingly, both this and the previous passage include verses (Il. 1.263, Od. 10.631) that ancient tradition suggest were added by Peisistratus. See Heubeck (in Heubeck et al. 1988) ad loc.  

66. Compare the φασί in the Heracles example (Il. 5.638–42).  

67. Notice that the narrative comprises further examples of such a syntax: τοῖς οἱ ἐπιρρόθος ἦν Αθήνη (390).
You know, once he came to Mycenae, not as an enemy but as a guest, along with godlike Polyneikes. He was assembling people, since they were attacking the sacred walls of Thebes, and they were asking to give him renowned companions.…On these men Tydeus sent an unseemly fate. He killed them all, but for one man he let go home again: Maion he sent home, obeying the signs of the gods. Such a man was Tydeus, the Aitolian. But he bore a son worse than himself in battle, though better in the assembly.

As we recall from our discussion of the syntax of similes and paradeigmata above, just as a simile might end with τοῖοι ἃρα Τρώων ἡγήτορες ἦντ’ ἐπὶ πύργῳ (Il. 3.153), so here do we find a similar closing phrase τοῖος ἦν Τυδεὺς Αἰτώλιος (v. 399). Aside from the ‘simile-methods’ of elaboration, this might seem unremarkable here. But what is remarkable is that in each the closing phrase is correlative with an implicit οἷος, such as elsewhere explicit. In that sense, each such case is a masculine version of an οἶη-speech, but one that emphasizes the demonstrative element.

C Genealogical formulae and themes

C.1 Formulae

Finally, the so-called ‘Catalogue-ic character’—to use this short-hand for a set of certain discursive properties, rather than provenance—of many of the paradeigmata and their discourse contexts goes, naturally enough, beyond discourse markers, meter, and syntax, even to the level of formulae and theme. To begin with the most surprising, while the phrase βίη Ἡρακληείη is not unique to the paradeigmata in Homeric poetry, of the 8

68. See pp. 92–99.
69. Such as is especially common in the Od., e.g., 24.376–82.
70. On the connection of this phrase to the theme of glory through epic (βιῆ + kléos), see Nagy 1999: 318–319.
Homeric instances, 4 are in paradeigmata,71 2 in the Catalogue of Ships, and 1 in the 
Nekyia.72 The phrase βίη Ἡρακληείη occurs 20 times in Hesiodic poetry,73 including 9 in-
stances of the phrase in the Catalogue, the catalogue of women; after all, the story of
Alkmene is clearly mostly a frame for a Heracles story.74 To take one example, Tlep-
polemos’ speech to Sarpedon, note how, after questioning Sarpedon’s genealogy, Tlep-
polemos follows with a masculine counterpart to the ‘Catalogue-ic’ syntactic formula (Il.
5.638–42): ἀλλ’ οἰόν τινα φασι βίην Ἡρακληείην.75

Having dealt with the traditional generic associations of the most unlikely formu-
la, the rest are somewhat easier to link to the ‘Hesiodic’, if not ‘Catalogue-ic’, tradition.
As Rutherford notes, “[m]arriage, conception, and birth dominate the content, and the
formulaic style reflects this” (2000: 83). He cites the formulæ ὑποδηθεῖσα (e.g., fr.
23a.8 M–W), λέχος εἰσαναβᾶσα (e.g., 25.35), and ἵπποισίν τε καὶ ἄρμασι κολλητοῖσι
(e.g., 180.15), but these seem to me even less representative, and even less productive
than others, many of which have been central to the genealogical diction to the pa-

71. One of these four is Nestor’s at Il. 11.690, on which see Pedrick 1983 and Martin 2000b.
72. On the Hesiodic character of the Catalogue of Ships and the Nekyia, see West 1985a: 5–6 and
Rutherford 2000: 83–84. The exception to these instances is Il. 15.640, which deserves closer
attention.
73. This among 33 instances total of the base Ἡρακλ. On Heracles as a “seminal figure” in the
Hesiodic corpus, see Cingano 2009: 109–110, as well as Haubold 2005.
74. Cf. West 1985a: 2, who suggests that “these legendary unions between gods and mortal
women were only a starting point for extensive heroic genealogies.” See also Rutherford 2000:
86. It seems a misjudgment on Eustathius’ part when, compared to the Nekyia, he states: “Ὅτι
πάντα δεξιῶς οἱ ποιητῆς τὴν ραψῳδίαν ταύτην ἡρώων ἁμα καὶ ἠρωίδων πεποίηκε
κατάλογον, Ἡσιόδου μονὸν γυναικῶν ποιησαμένου κατάλογον (“Quite cleverly the poet
[Homer] composed this book [Od. 11] as catalogue of heroes as well as heroines at the same time,
for Hesiod had composed a catalogue of only women”; 1.409.5, ad Od. 11.225).
75. Note that, while agreement between οἰόν and βίην is not impossible (Kirk [ad loc.] compares
Il. 11.690 for the masculine βίη Ἡρακληείη), we might see in this line a pointer to the
modification of a more standard οἰόν or οἰός formula. Both the scholiasts and modern
commentators have had difficulty with this formula, and have suggested emendations such as
ἀλλοίον.
radeigmata. The most important among these with respect to the Homeric paradeigmata are:

- ἡ δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη (verse-initial): see above (pp. 114–116)
- ἐν μεγάροισιν (vel sim.)
- γείνατο παῖδ-/τέκν- (esp. verse-end)
- ἐμίγην φιλότητι καὶ εὐνή (vel sim.)

Some of these seem to be exceedingly common, and, when approached as single lexical items, they are. But close analysis reveals that, as formulae, they tend to be localized with certain other discourse characteristics, and in passages of a particular character. To begin with the most common, and likely most troublesome, the prepositional phrase ἐν(ι) μεγάροισιν occurs some 200 times in Archaic Greek hexameter. Its use is therefore quite varied, and its distribution reliant on narrative content, but we might still say something of its use. Of the 24 instances in the Iliad, 11 of them occur in speeches normally described as paradeigmata, another 6 are in the context of the lament of children, and still more are of children with possible lament overtones (e.g., Il. 2.136–7). Again, this distribution is no doubt skewed given the martial content of the main narrative, but it is well worth noting its specific genealogical use, as meaning “[a mother is rearing or has reared] in her house.” The phrase is, in that sense, almost entirely restricted, within Hesiodic poetry, to the Catalogue, where it occurs 22 times in this way.

77. To be exact, 201 times: 24× Il., 153× Od., 22× Catalogue, 1× WD, 1× Th.
78. Il. 1.396 (paradigma, with 418 in response); 3.207 (paradigmatic tone of Teikhoskopia); 5.805 (paradigma); 6.217 (paradigma); 6.421, 428 (paradigma); 7.148 (personal paradeigma of Nestor); 9.465, 487(personal paradeigma of Phoenix); 9.561–2 (Meleager paradeigma of Phoenix), 24.603 (Niobe paradeigma).
79. Esp. Il. 24.427, 497, 539, 664, 757, 768. The relationship of lament to the genealogical tradition is here suggestive even at the level of diction, making the use of ἐν μεγάροισιν in the Niobe paradeigma even more pointed in the opposition between the production and the loss of children.
80. At Th. 384–5 (Ζῆλον καὶ Νίκην καλλίσφυρον ἐν μεγάροισιν | καὶ Κράτος ἰδέ Βίου ἀριθδέκατα γείνατο τέκνα) the sense is clearly genealogical; WD 377 concerns wealth specifically, but more
The formulaic phrase γείνατο παῖδ-, including its syntax of γείνατο + accusative, as well as its secondary forms (e.g., γείνατο πολλούς#, γείνατο τέκνα#) are, for obvious reasons, also very much embedded in the formulaic diction of the Catalogue. Thus we can better see just how imbued Zeus’ catalogue of lovers in Iliad 14 is with, not only the syntax, but also the formulae of catalogic genealogical poetry, as in the verse-end formula [κρατερόφρον-] γείνατο παῖδ- in his description of Aklmene’s bearing of Heracles:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{ἡ ῥ’ Ἡρακλῆα κρατερόφρονα γείνατο παῖδα} & \quad \text{Il. 14.324} \\
\text{ἡ ῥ’ ὑπὸ Τυνδαρέω κρατερόφρονε γείνατο παῖδε} & \quad \text{Od. 11.299} \\
\text{ἡ δὲ οἱ Ἀτλαντα κρατερόφρονα γείνατο παῖδα} & \quad \text{Th. 509} \\
\text{ἡ οἱ γείνατο παῖδας ὁμὸν λέχος εἰσ[αναβάσα}] & \quad \text{fr. 180.11 M–W} \\
\text{ἡ οἱ γείνατο παῖδας ὁμὸν λέχος εἰσαναβ[άσα],} & \quad \text{fr. 193.12 M–W} \\
\text{ὁ [ο] [γείνατο παῖδα] μεγασθενε[.........]ιο[]} & \quad \text{fr. 26.4 M–W} \\
\text{Θήβηι ἐν ἑπταπύλωι διδυμάονε γείνατο παῖδε.} & \quad \text{fr. 195.49 M–W}^{83}
\end{align*}
\]

Where this phrase does occur in Homeric poetry, it either occurs in a passage we have discussed in the context of some other discourse trait already, or there is good reason to conclude that it too draws on the Hesiodic tradition in general, if not the Catalogue tradition in particular. If placing too much emphasis on these occurrences seems a dangerous approach, a closer look at the syntactic formulae that Homeric poetry tends to deploy generally heirs. Strictly speaking the 22 instances in the Hesiodic fragments occur primarily in the Catalogue, but a few fall in what is considered the Megalai Ehoiai.

81. On γείνατο παῖδ- in particular, the verse-end, full form occurs at: Il. 6.26 (see above); 14.324 (see above); Od. 7.61 (of Periboea and her son Nausithoos by Poseidon); 11.299 (see above on Nekyia); Th. 509, Sc. 49; fr. 10a.65, 14.12, 195.49 M–W. Other positions, full form: fr. 26.4, 37.9, 43a.59, Od. 4.13 (Helen of Hermione; cf. Hes. fr. 175.1, 204.94 M–W), h.Merc. 13 (nymph Maia). Less certainly attested: Hes. fr. 193.12, 180.11 M–W

82. For the importance of this formula to phrasing in other Homeric paradeigmata—e.g., the φῇ δοιώ τεκέειν, ἡ δ’ αὐτή γείνατο πολλούς (v. 608) of the Niobe paradeigma of Iliad 24 in particular—see p. 146.

83. =Sc. 49.

84. One might also compare the verbal root τεκ- with similar results.
should create a convincing statistical backdrop: Homeric poetry is far more likely to construct a verse which ends in γείνατο μήτηρ (i.e., γείνατο + nominative) and its syntactical-metrical equivalents (e.g, γείνατο Τυδεύς), or the different metrical shape of the same syntax, such as ἐγείνατο διὰ Κορωνίς or ἐγείνατο Πηνελόπεια. What is more, this combination of syntax and metrical patterns, which Homeric poetry prefers, is very rare in Hesiodic poetry. Like γείνατο παῖδ-, which it easily follows, the formula (ἐ)μίγη(ν) φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ might also seem excessively common. Indeed, the roots of the three words are often found in various combinations. But the formulae (ἐ)μίγη(ν) φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ (including its mirror εὐνῇ καὶ φιλότητι μίγη) occurs only 9 times, and always in a paradeigma, in combination with other discourse traits we have been emphasizing, or else in the Hesiodic tradition.

Before we turn to the way in which these formulae are bound up in dominant themes of the Homeric paradeigmata, let us in closing look to a fine example of the genealogical narrative style (h.Hom. 32.14–16):

τῇ ῥά ποτε Κρονίδης ἐμίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ: ἢ δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη Πανδείην γείνατο κούρην ἐκπρεπὲς εἶδος ἔχουσαν ἐν ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι.

With her the son of Kronos one mingled in affection and bed. And she, growing pregnant, gave birth to Pandeia, the maiden with exceptional beauty among immortal gods.

85. Of the 23 instances in the Iliad and Odyssey, 11 fit these two patterns. For γείνατο μήτηρ, see: Il. 1.280, 3.238, 5.800 (γείνατο Τυδεύς), 5.896, 6.24, 13.777, 19.293, 21.109, Od. 6.25. For the longer formula, see: Od. 1.223 (-yyyy Πηνελόπεια), 21.172 (-yyyy πότνια μήτηρ). Similarly in the h.Hom.

86. Of the 45 instances of (ἐ)γείνατο in Hesiodic poetry, there are 6 that might be compared to the Homeric instances: Th. 233 (-yyyy Πόντος), 368 (-yyyy πότνια Τηθύς), 969 (-yyyy διὰ θεάων); WD 17 (-yyyy Νὺξ ἐρεβεννή), 771 (-yyyy Ἁταλώς), fr. 169.3 (-yyyy φαίδιμος Ατλας). Only three match the dominant Iliadic metrical shape, and none match the v.-e. formula γείνατο μήτηρ.

87. See Il. 3.445 (Paris paradeigma), 6.25 (nymph-centered genealogical digression), Od. 5.126 (Calypso’s simile-based (ὡς μὲν ἡτ’) paradeigma to Hermes), 23.219 (Penelope’s paradeigma of Helen to Odysseus), h.Lun. 14 (-yyyy ποτε Κρονίδης ἐμίγη φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ: ἢ δ’ ὑποκυσαμένη Πανδείην γείνατο κούρην), Hes. frrr. 17a.5, 177.12, 195.36 M–W, Sc. 36.
This stretch of discourse, which represents the entire past-tense portion of the hymn, nicely captures many of the various discourse features we have found to characterize the paradeigmena. 88

C.2 Themes

These formulae, in turn, lead to the larger themes latent in the paradeigmena. One such theme is that of nymphs; as in the example of Iliad 6.20–6 discussed above, variations on the formula (ἐ)µίγη(υ) φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ are often associated with nymphs (vv. 21–6). 89 Setting syntax and formula aside for now, I shall consider just what sort of traditions tend to describe nymphs. 90 Indeed, nymphs as a group are seldom referred to in the Iliad: only four times in total. 91 To these must be added the sea-nymph Nereids of Il. 18.39–49, but there it is worth noting the Hesiodic comparandum at Th. 243–262, 92 for which reason scholia report that Zenodotus (and Aristophanes) called the catalogue of nymphs ‘Hesiodic’ in character. 93 Nor would this have surprised Beye, whom we above cited as suggesting the catalogic origins of the androktasai, which often mention

---

88. For the combination of ρά and ποτε in the syntagm τῇ ρά ποτε, see Table 19 (p. 370) in Appendix B. This passage in general seems to be Scutum-esque in the way it ‘overdoes’ the generic traits (on which see Martin 2005b).
89. To name just one more example, see h.Herm. 1–9.
90. For an altogether different treatment of Greek nymphs, see Larson 2001.
92. See further Kyriakides 2007: 3 and Minchin 2001: 88. Note also Vergil Georgics 4.334–7, with Thomas (ad loc.), where he suggests that the influence of the more ‘Hesiodic’ Hellenistic authors must have been far greater than that of the Iliad.
93. Σ 18.39–49: ὡς Ἡσιόδ<ε>ιον ἔχων χαρακτήρα. The status of the Iliadic passage has indeed been a problem for critics, ancient and modern alike. The passage seems to have been pre-athetized by Zenodotus and Aristophanes, but Bolling (1925: 177f.) emends the scholion to suggest that the verses were even omitted in Zenodotus. Contra Bolling see Apthorp 1980: 118n137, who agrees with Erbse’s text (ad 18.39–49).
nymphs. Indeed, one place in which nymphs are clearly present is the Catalogue, even when not explicit: following West’s reconstruction, starting with Magnes (fr. 8) and Hellen (fr. 9) nymphs are practically an implicit, genealogical substrate. Further, that even mortal women who appear in the ‘Catalogue-ic’ tradition seem to have been at later times perceived as nymphs may say something of nymphs’ ubiquity in the Catalogue.

Less bound to formulaic diction is another prevalent theme, that of metamorphosis. We noted only in passing that the paradigmatic simile of Pandareus’ daughter at Od. 19.518–29 involved a metamorphosis, but recall even our having begun with Achilles’ paradeigmata of Iliad 24, which describes Niobe’s state of transfiguration. There are, indeed, several reasons for thinking that stories of metamorphosis were especially common in the ‘Catalogue-ic tradition’. One thinks immediately of the story of Zeus making men of earth and giving them to Deukalion in fr. 234 M–W, as well as of Deukalion’s appearance toward the reconstructed beginning of the Catalogue (fr. 5. M–W):

---

94. E.g., Il. 20.382–92, on which Beye (1964) notes that “the killing of Iphition by Achilles is related in the common manner, and then Achilles exults over the dead man, ironically remarking on his victim’s lineage. Again, perhaps, an anecdote” (349). See further Edwards (ad loc.), with Fenik 1968: 150–152 (on ‘type-scenes’) and de Jong 1987: 89–90 (on ‘external analepses’).

95. West emphasizes the place of nymphs as a common means of attaching genealogies and creating segues: “Nymphs evidently played an important part in this Arcadian section. Pelasgos married one, as he had to, being the first and only human being in the country. Lykaon’s wives were probably also nymphs, since he does not appear to have had sisters or looked abroad” (1985a: 92). West, then, agrees with Apollodorus (3.100) concerning the liberty with which the Catalogue could make, e.g., Kallisto one of the nymphs.


97. See n.143 on p. 93 above, where I suggest that the metamorphosis of a woman suits no poetic tradition better than it does the Hesiodic Catalogue.


κούρη δ’ ἐν μεγάροις ἀγαυοῦ Δευκαλίωνος
Πανδώρη Δὶ πατρὶ θεῶν σημάντορι πάντων
μιχθείσ’ ἐν φιλότητι100 τέκε Γραικόν μενεχάρμην

And a maiden in the halls of illustrious Deukalion, Pandora, who with Zeus the father, the
commander of all the gods, having mingled in love, bore Graikos who delighted in re-
mainning steadfast in battle. (trans. adapted from G. W. Most)

Add to this Alkyone and Keux in fr. 10a+d and the metamorphosis of Mestra in fr.
43a,101 as well as later testimonia that compel us further: according to one anonymous pa-
pyrus fragment,102 Hesiod relates, presumably in the Catalogue, the story of Arethusa’s
transformation into a fountain. Further still, in P. Mich. inv. 1447,103 a dictionary of meta-
morphoses from the Imperial Period, Albert Henrichs finds revealing Hesiodic influence
on later mythography: “Three of its five extant accounts (historiae) are attributed to Hes-
iod. The source for the entries on Aktaion and Alkyone, daughter of Aiolos, is explicitly
identified as the Hesiodic Catalogue…. Similar attributions occur frequently in the
Mythographus Homericus as well as in most of the transformation myths collected by
Parthenius and Antoninus Liberalis” (1988: 249). Such an association with metamorpho-
sis might seem speculative and no more systematic than the ‘lost cyclic epic’ too often
posited as a source, but I shall, in the next, final section of this chapter, detail the conflu-
ence of all of these discourse features—from discourse markers, to syntax, to formulae
and theme—in a return to our initial Niobe paradeigma.

100. This formula μιχθείσ’ ἐν φιλότητι, a seeming variation on (ἐ)μίγη(ν) φιλότητι καί εὔνη
above, occurs 4X in Th. (vv. 923–80), 6X in Catalogue, 1X in the Hymns (h.Hom. 33.5).
Perhaps, too, the Paean Erythraeus in Aesculapium in Collectanea Alexandrina (v. 5): μιχθείς ἐμ
φιλοτητι Κορέωνι.

101. A fragment which shares otherwise uncommon formulae with the story of Kleopatra in ll. 9.
Cp. Ἀλκυόνην καλέσκον ἐπώνυμον, οὔκει ὁρ’ αὐτῆς (9.562); τὸν δ’ Αἴθων’ ἐκάλεσσαν,
ἐπ’ οὐκεὶς λιμόν (fr. 43a.5 M–W) Cf. too Πύθειον καλέσκον ἐπώνυμον οὔκεις κεῖθι
(h. Ap. 373), Call. In Dianam (ἡ. Κραταίες καλέσκον ἐπώνυμην ἀπό νύμφης; 205), as well as
A.R. 2.910.


103. Renner (1978) provides a close analysis of this papyrus.
Chapter 6 | Conclusion: the texture of *Iliad* 24.602–20

I have gone to great lengths to detail the variety of different discourse features in the *paradeigmata* of Homeric poetry, in particular their relationship to the traditional speech genre of genealogical catalogue. It was fitting, then, that we noted along the way the altogether ‘Hesiodic character’ of many of the *paradeigmata* in terms of discourse markers, syntax, formulae, and metrical features. This ‘Hesiodic’ or ‘Catalogue-ic’ character, as I have noted, does not refer to a poet Homer’s indebtedness to a poet Hesiod, but rather a Homeric performer’s facility in using those discursive strategies that have long tended to fall under the rubric of the Hesiodic poetic tradition. In considering the *paradeigmata* in this study, comparanda from the *Theogony* have been numerous, and consistently closer in style than any non-paradigmatic Homeric comparanda. The most compelling resource for the style and mythological material of Homeric *paradeigmata*, however, was the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, and I have shown in general that Homeric *paradeigmata*, sometimes *qua* genealogies, draw on the tradition of genealogical catalogue poetry in performance. It has been suspected, but never shown in detail,¹ how Indo-European poets and rhapsodes could draw on the narrative potential of catalogues and genealogical poetry; I have now, I hope, confirmed one way in which they did this synchronically within the living oral poetic tradition of Archaic Greece. Finally, to summarize and assimilate the findings of this chapter, let us now return to the Niobe *pa-

---

radeigma of Iliad 24, where we shall see with greater clarity how all these traditions and stylistic traits converge.

Aside from Achilles’ speech in Book 24, we have no other direct literary accounts of Niobe from the Archaic period. Later authors report that Hesiod sang of Niobe, and it has been modern scholarly consensus that such a story would have been part of the Catalogue. Indeed, the descendants of Inakhos, described in Book 2 of the Catalogue, must have had some kernel story of a mortal woman who has a child by a god, and, in the case of the Inakhidai—again confirmed by Apollodorus—it was Niobe’s bearing Argos to Zeus. That her story would have been at home in the Catalogue is extremely likely given that: she is a woman; her offspring are of particular interest, involving even the gods’ intercession; and, further, she undergoes a metamorphosis. I shall now show that the formulae, themes, meter, and syntax of Achilles’ Niobe paradeigma are in fact best seen in light of the style of the ‘Hesiodic’ tradition, especially that of the Catalogue. To return to the passage as a whole (vv. 602–20):

καὶ γάρ τ᾽ ἡμύχομος Νιόβη ἐμνήσατο σίτου,
τῇ περὶ δώδεκα παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάρωις ὀλοντο
ἐξ μὲν θυγατέρες, ἐξ δ᾽ ἴνες ἡμώοντες.
τοὺς μὲν Ἀπόλλων πέφνεν ἀπ᾽ ἄργυρειοι βιοῖο
χωδόμενος Νιόβη, τὰς δ᾽ Ἀρτεμίδος ἱσχεῖσαι,

2. For a survey of the evidence, see Gantz 1996: 536–539. Non-literate evidence from the Archaic period includes only one amphora (Hamburg 1960.1; approx. 560 BCE).

3. Merkelbach and West (fr. 183), Most (F 126+127) and Hirschberger (F 88) all consider the story to have been part of the Catalogue. Hirschberger (2004: 353–354) considers the evidence in her introduction to the fragment.


5. I cannot but cite West’s (1985a: 76) suggested text for the beginning of this section, for it actually shows many features I have been emphasizing independently in the context of paradeigmata:

吸入 Νιόβη, Χαρίτων ἀμαρύγματι ἔχουσα,
κούρη ἄγακλειτοίον Φορωνέος, ἄν ποτε νύμφη
Ὡκεανίς Μελίη τέκεν ἵναχου ἐν φιλότητι.

Note the adonean relative clause in the second verse as well as the diction (νύμφη, τέκεν, ἐν φιλότητι).

6. For a translation, see on p. 13 above.
οὕνεκ᾽ ἃρα Λητοῖ ἰσάσκετο καλλιπαρῆς καὶ δοιὼ τεκέειν, ἣ δ᾽ αὐτή γείνατο πολλούς·
τῶ δ᾽ ἃρα καὶ δοιὼ περ ἐόντ᾽ ἀπὸ πάντας οὐδεμισσαν.
οἱ μὲν ἄρ᾽ ἐννήμαρ κέατ᾽ ἐν φόνῳ, οὐδὲ τίς τίνων κατάφωσιν. | λαοὺς δὲ λίθους | ποιήσει Κρονίων·
τοὺς δ᾽ ἃρα τῇ δεκάτῃ βάβαν θεοὶ Οὐρανίωνες.
ἡ δ᾽ ἃρα σίτου μνήσατ᾽, ἐπεὶ κάμε δάκρυ χέουσα.
νῦν δὲ που ἐν πέτρῃσιν ὑμᾶρ σίτου, ἐπεὶ καὶ δάκρυ χέουσα.
καὶ δοιὼ περ ἐόντ᾽ ἀπὸ πάντας ὄλεσσαν.
ὁὶ µὲν ἄρ᾽ ἐννῆμεν ἐν φόνῳ, ὡδὲ τίς ἡ γείνατο πολλούς·
τὼ δὲ Αχελώϊον ἐρρώσαντο (616). καὶ τρὶς κατὰ τὸ συνεχὲς ἐν (614. 615).
πῶς δὲ καὶ λίθος γενοµένη θεῶν ἐκ κήδεως πέσσει (617); προηθετοῦντο δὲ καὶ παρ᾽ Ἀριστοφάνει. Α

In our introduction to this paradeigma above, we noted that scholiastic comments on vv. 614–17 suggested that these four verses had been athetized in part for their ‘Hesiodic character’ (614–17a.; Ariston.| Did.):

The four verses are athetized because they are not consistent with “And so she remembered her meal, since she was grew tired weeping tears” (v. 613). For if she has been turned to stone, how could she take food? Even the persuasive consolation (παραµύθια) is laughable: eat, since even Niobe ate and was turned to stone. And it is also Hesiodic in character (Ἡσιόδεια τῷ χαρακτῆρι), especially the phrase “they danced around the Akheloiois” (v. 616). Also, three times in a row the preposition ἐν (vv. 614–5). And how is it that, having become a rock, “she broods on the sorrows from the gods” (v. 617). The verses are also rejected as spurious first in Aristophanes (of Byzantium).

Setting aside the charge of illogic for now, let us address some of the features cited for this ‘Hesiodic character’. First, the thrice repeated ἐν in vv. 614–5 is very unusual indeed, but we have seen a near-equivalent already, in Dione’s catalogue of Iliad 5 (vv. 395–7):’

7. For such a syntax in discourse of the type we are studying, cp. esp. ll. 2.721–2 (catalogic digression), 11.479–80 (simile), and 22.503–4 (Andromache of Astyanax). Similar but not of the same type are ll. 2.549 (κάδ δ᾽ ἐν Αἰθήνης εἴον ἐόῳ ἐν πίονυ νηὕ), 12.422 (not parallel), 22.483–4 (not parallel), 24.163 (not parallel), and 24.284 (not parallel). To create some normative background for such an emphasis, a listing of the more regular uses comprises cases such as ll.
τλῆ δ᾽ Αἴδης ἐν τοῖς πελώριος ὡκύν οἰστόν, εὔτε μὲν αὐτὸς ἀνήρ υἱὸς Δίος σέγιχοιο ἐν Πύλῳ ἐν νεκύεσσι βαλὼν ὀδύνησιν ἐδωκεν·

And Hades, the gigantic one, endured with them the swift arrow when this same man, the son of aegis-bearing Zeus, struck him at Pylos, among the dead men, and gave him to agony.

We have already had reason to address, in the course of our discussion above, several of the other features: φασὶ (v. 615); the verbal roots τεκ- and γείν-; and formulae παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν. 8

We also spoke above of the discernible prevalence of nymphs in the tradition of the Hesiodic Catalogue (p. 137), and might now note the enjambed νυφάων of v. 616. It is striking in itself, but even more so in light of its sole comparandum, Th. 126–30:

Γαῖα δὲ τοι πρῶτον μὲν ἐγείνατο ἱσον ἐγώιν 
Οὐρανὸν ἀστερόενθ', ἵνα μὲν περὶ πάντα καλύπτοι, 
δὲρ' εἶ ὕμακάρεσσι θείς ἔδος ἄσφαλὲς αἰεὶ, 
γείνατο δ' οὐρεα μακρά, θεάν χαρίεντας ἐναύλους 
Νυφάων, αἰ ναίοσιν ἀν' οὐρεα βησθείτα, 130

Earth first of all bore starry Sky, equal to herself, to cover her on every side, so that she would be the ever immovable seat for the blessed gods; and she bore the high mountains, the graceful haunts of the goddesses, Nymphs who dwell on the wooded mountains.

(trans. adapted from G. W. Most)

2.202 (οὔτε ποτ' ἐν πολέμῳ ἐναρίθμησθ' οὔτ' ἐν βουλῇ) without the asyndeton. Such cases are at least as common: Il. 3.445, 4.258–9, 4.258–60, 5.740–1, 6.210, 11.296–7, 13.289, 14.216, 14.331–2, 15.624, 16.370–1, 16.514, 16.590–1, 16.642–3, 17.451, 18.346–7, 18.419, 18.483–535 (adverbial passim), 24.17–8, 24.787. This is not to say that we can call what we see here ‘Hesiodic’, in which tradition only one case (Th. 971) exists among several (Th. 865, WD 599, Scutum 154 [adverbial], frr. 357.1–2, 372.12–13 M–W). It may be that, in discourse analytic terms, this is simply a form of oral discourse ‘repair’. Less easy to explain are: Il. 1.30: (ἡμετέρω ἐνὶ σκοτῳ ἐν Ἀργεί τηλόθι πάτρης) and 3.244 (but note the άθη).

8 As I have noted (n.79 on p. 134 above), I find the description of the children to be pointedly situated at the juncture of the genealogical and lament traditions (if we can clearly make this distinction). While the language of παῖδες ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν is especially suited for the Catalogue tradition, it is here and elsewhere in Iliad 24 situated within contexts of lament.
As West notes in comparing the Iliadic locution to that in the *Theogony* (*ad loc.*), the remarkable thing is the combination of the enjambed Νυµφέων/νυµφάων with the feminine genitive plural (θεᾶν/θεάων) that precedes it in each case. 9

In our initial survey of the passage we took notice of the frequent objection to a poet Homer’s *ad hoc* invention of the mythological details, particularly the number of Niobe’s children. That Hesiodic poetry differed from Homeric poetry in the number of Niobe’s children is of no concern to us, for there was almost no agreement in Greek poetry on their number. 10 Yet a possible reason for such a variation is compelling. Indeed, the most likely explanation of the number here in Book 24 is the use of the same discursive strategy as the description of Aiolos in *Odyssey* 10 (vv. 1–7):

Αἰολίην δ’ ἐς νήσον ἀφικόµεθ’· ἐνθὰ δ’ ἑναιεν
Αἴολος ἵπποτάδης, φίλος ἀθανάτοια θεοίσι,
πλωτῇ ἐν ἑνήσῳ ἀφικόµεθ’· ἔνθα δ’ ἑναιεν
Αἴολος Ἱπποτάδης, φίλος ἀθανάτοισι θεοίσιν,
πλωτῇ ἐν ἑνήσῳ ἀπωλέσαται,
τοῦ καὶ δώδεκα παιδέας ἐν ἑνήσῳ ἀρρηκτον,
ἐξ ἑκὰτερεῖς, ἐξ δ’ ἑκὰτερεῖς ἑκὰτερεῖς,
ἐνθ’ ὅ γε θυγατέρας πόρειν ἴδασιν εἰναι ἀκοίτις.

We reached the island of Aiolia. There lived *Aiolos* Hippotades, dear to the immortal gods, on a floating island. And a wall of unbreakable bronze all around it, and a smooth rock ran up it. He had twelve children in his house, six daughters and six sons in their prime. There he gave his daughters to his sons to be their wives.

Aiolos and his three sons, being the son and grandsons of Hellen, seem to have played a particularly prominent role in the *Catalogue*. 11 That this passage might draw on the same


11. See *fr*. 9.2, 10a.31, and 10d M–W, as well as *Σ Od*. 10.2 (= 4 M–W). See also West 1985a:
While not providing grounds for athetization or condemnation to any past editors, verse 608 (φῆ δοιὼ τεκέειν, η δ᾽ αὐτή γείνατο πολλούς) has the notable property of switching from indirect to direct discourse. Commentators do not fail to note the line, and usually describe it as a typically Greek phenomenon; Leaf (ad 608) remarks that “η δ᾽ αὐτή γείνατο for αὐτή δὲ γείνασθαι, the favourite relapse into the direct construction.” Such explanations, however, are too easy, for they do not take account of the

166 on the way in which “the initial position of the Deucalionids creates the illusion that Hellen with his sons Doros, Xouthos, and Aeolus stand over the whole complex, as if they were the ancestors of the entire nation.” Cf. Hall 1997: 45–64.

12. We might notice that the supplements to this portion of the Catalogue share lexical items with the Niobe paradeigma, specifically ἧυκόμους (cf. 24.602) and Ἀχελώιος (cf. 24.616). On the role of rivers such as the Akheloios in genealogies and paradeigmata in the Iliad especially, see below.

13. Cf. too Macleod (ad 148, 608), citing Kühner-Gerth II §595.5 for parallels. The further Iliadic comparanda that Macleod cites are not actually of comparable syntax. The performer certainly
competing factors that are actually taking precedence formulaically. What must really be operating here is a reliance on the formulae most familiar from the tradition of catalogue poetry, as seen in the following:

\[ \text{ποιμαίων δ' ἐπ' ὤθος μὴν φιλότητι καὶ εὐνή,} \]
\[ καὶ μὲν τῶν ὑπέλυσε μένος καὶ φαίδιμα γυῖα. } \]
\[ \text{Il. 6.25–7} \]

It is clear that \( \text{γείνατο πολλοὺς} \) fills the same metrical \textit{sedes} as the adonean in the first three examples (particularly the \( \text{γείνατο παιδ} \)-examples), and that it is the fact of the performer’s drawing on the genealogical catalogue tradition in general that motivates him to complete the verse in this way.\(^4\)

We studied above the apparent prevalence of metamorphoses in the \textit{Catalogue} (p. 138), and in this passage there are even two: that of Niobe (v. 617) as well as that of the people (v. 611). If not ‘\textit{Catalogue}-ic’ by virtue of the two metamorphoses, it is certainly ‘Hesiodic’ by virtue of the articulation of the metamorphosis of the people. For there is the strange folk etymology in the phrase \( \text{λαοὺς δὲ λίθους ποίησε Κρονίων} \) (v. 611): the ‘\textit{pun}’ is on \( \text{λαός} \) (‘people’) and \( \text{λᾶας} \) (‘stone’), where \( \text{λᾶας} \) is to be taken as synony-

\[ \text{Il. 21.159–60: ὃς τέκε Πηλεγόνα κλυτὸν ἐγχεῖ· τὸν δ' ἐμὲ φασί· γείνασθαι. } \]
\[ \text{Richardson (\textit{ad} 602–9) does not rely on such an explanation, but rather paraphrases as “she boasted that Leto had borne only two, \textit{whereas} she herself had born many” (my emphasis). This is plausible, but with Macleod I take it that the very point is that Niobe also says that she has born many. This, however, does not affect my explanation below of the most important factor for this verse construction. } \]

\(^4\) For a similar approach to anacoluthon in Homer, see esp. Russo 1994: 381–384.
mous with λίθος. In fact, we have already seen exactly this play on words in Hesiod above, in the context of discourse markers in Hesiodic poetry. Again, the fragment, preserved by Strabo, describes the Lelegan people whom Zeus gave to Deukalion (fr. 234 M–W):

\[ \text{ἡτοὶ γὰρ Λοκρὸς Λελέγων ἤγησατο λαῶν,}
\]
\[ \text{τοὺς ρὰ ποτὲ Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἀφῆτα μήδεα εἴδώς}
\]
\[ \text{λεκτοὺς ἐκ γαίης ΛΑΟΥΣ πόρε Δευκαλίωνι.} \]

Aside from this comparandum, Hesiodic poetry is, of course, generally well known for etymological word-play, especially in comparison to Homeric.  

Although it may be that Achilles chooses Niobe as topic of his paradeigma in order to appeal to a war-weary Priam, I would add emphasis to the fact that it seems performers drew especially on the tradition to which the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women belongs. Indeed, while the corpus of paradeigmata in Homeric poetry defies a simple typology—indeed, they follow no simple set of formal conventions that might justify their being called a single genre—they seem to rely above all on the discursive strategies seen in the ‘Hesiodic’ tradition of genealogical catalogue poetry. To arrive at my conclusion I have used a methodology unlike any other past approach to the Homeric paradeigmata, working at a finer grain than the traditional Quellenforschung, and framed in the terms of oral poetics. That is not to say my result has not been anticipated by a suspicion of at least one among previous commentators. In 1964 Malcolm Willcock wrote this of Kleopatra’s appearance in Phoenix’ paradeigma of Meleager (149):

The other piece of background information which we are given is a digression in 557–64 on the history of the parents of Cleopatra, Meleager’s wife. … This digression is most obscure and allusive; it does seem like an abbreviation of a longer narrative. Indeed it has

---

15. For that discussion, with a translation of this fragment, see p. 53 above.
17. Minchin (2007: 261), in accounting for the persuasive success of the Niobe paradeigma, places emphasis on Achilles’ choice of a female protagonist in a story told to an old man bereft of his many children and worn out by war.
a Hesiodic flavour, like the short biographies which we can see in the fragments of the *Eoeae*.

The digression need not be an abbreviation of a longer narrative, but I would not disagree that it is something we might find in the tradition to which the Hesiodic *Catalogue* belongs.\(^\text{19}\) I have, in fact, shown how this works at the level of discourse markers, narrative, syntax,\(^\text{20}\) meter, formula, and theme. Or, to put it in more engaging terms: in Plato’s *Ion*, Socrates asks the rhapsode whether he was as good at explaining other poetry as he was at explaining Homeric poetry, and he says that he is not;\(^\text{21}\) I am suggesting that, though he may not have been as good at explaining Hesiodic poetry, the Homeric performer certainly could *sing* it.\(^\text{22}\)

It is too early in our investigation for us to suggest precisely what social semiotics this genealogical catalogue style of the *paradeigmata* might have had for the ancient audience. But, after making a parallel analysis of lyric poetry from the Archaic period in Part Two, in Part Three we shall then be in a position to ask what it means for that rhapsode to ‘sing’ in the Hesiodic style, and frame our discussion around two additional questions about the performance of Homeric poetry: what local effects does the specific generic choice and selection of material in each *paradeigma* have, and, at the level of the

\(^{19}\) In fact, see my comment on Alkyone above (n.101 on p. 139). Nevertheless, we ought not lose sight of the fact that, according to Pausanias (10.31.3), the *Catalogue*, like the *Minyas*, depicted Meleager as being killed by Apollo, who was aiding the Kouretes.

\(^{20}\) One can even see this in the ὃς/ἡ-ῥα syntagm used of Alkyone at *Il.* 9.566 (ἐξ ἀρέων μητρὸς κεχολωμένος, ἡ βα θεοίσι).

\(^{21}\) *Ion* 531a-b.

\(^{22}\) If we view these *paradeigmata* as drawing on the recognizable tradition of the genealogical catalogue, then they are apt to be far more authoritative in context than proposed ad hoc mythological innovations could have been (see the suggestions of Nagy, p. 17 above). If there were any demonstrable correlation between codification and popularity, we might wish to combine this suggestion with the position that our *Catalogue* best reflects a sixth-century Athens (see n.49 on p. 164 below), in which case the role of sixth-century Athens in the textualization of Homeric poetry would seem all the more prominent. But parts of the *Catalogue* tradition had been around for centuries by then, and its material could have been drawn on at any point.
poems themselves, why might the Homeric performers have chosen to elaborate with the particular selection of material that exists in our manuscripts today?
PART II:
PARADEIGMA AND PERSONA IN LYRIC AND WISDOM

ἀλει, μύλα, ἄλει:
kαὶ γὰρ Πιττακὸς ἄλει
μεγάλας Μυτιλάνας βασιλεύων.
Carmina Popularia, 869 PMG

πάγχυ δ΄ εὔμαρες σύνετον πόησαι
πάντι τούτο
Sappho 16.5–6 V
Chapter 7 | 
Lyric and wisdom discourse: introduction

In turning from hexameter poetry to lyric verse and wisdom discourse, I do not start from the assumption that ‘epic’, much less ‘Homer’, is the source of all of the mythological material and traditional formulae of the ‘lyric’ poets of the Archaic period.\(^1\) It is common, indeed, and sometimes productive to seek ‘ironic’ treatment of ‘epic’ material within lyric poetry,\(^2\) but we might be wary of not only the limits of our ability to judge what was considered ‘epic’ material, but also the significance (and, possibly, the reality) of such a ‘secondary’ stance.\(^3\) Just as we have seen that *paradeigmata* share discourse traits with other ‘ways of speaking’—traits which set them apart from unmarked storytelling—we should not even assume that *paradeigmata* owe their features only to ‘poetic’ discourses. The first epigraph above, *fr. 869 PMG*, is suggestive of the fact that what may seem a Homeric way of telling a *paradeigma* was more likely part of a more general speaking style. Accordingly, in this chapter we shall explore not just lyric poetry, but Archaic Greek wisdom discourses attributed to figures such as the Seven Sages and Aesop. Increasing the scope of our investigation in this way aims also to compensate for

---

1. Misleadingly but conventionally, I use the word ‘lyric’ here to refer to all non-hexameter poetry of, in this case, the Archaic period. For a brief discussion Gerber 1997: 1–2 with Davies 1988. The immense utility of collections like Campbell’s *Greek Lyric Poetry: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac, and Iambic Poetry* (Campbell 1982) increases the convenience of the misnomer.

2. The insightful studies in Burnett 1983 and Rissman 1983 are good examples of both the propensity and the productivity.

3. Moreover, we must also remember that our working assumptions outlined in the Introduction do not require fixed Homeric texts before the institution of the competition at the Panathenaia in the sixth century BCE. On the comparative advantage of leaving this option open, see the Introduction above.
the fact that we lack explicit pragmatic contexts for our lyric papyri. Indeed, in many cases we lack both the beginning and end of the poem.⁴

Commentators’ emphasis on a ‘secondary’ stance in lyric is, at least in part, a consequence of the autobiographical focus on the lyric poet’s ‘personal’ voice. I shall not conclude that the ‘voice’ in Archaic Greek lyric does not situate itself in terms of epic tradition; at times, it does seem to do so. Yet my focus will be instead on demonstrating that, while lyric poets are competent in the conventions of telling mythological paradeigmata that we have already seen, they more often diverge from them and instead reserve these conventional discourse features for the construction of their authoritative personae. This will be brought out in a comparative analysis of the syntax and discourse markers in traditions of the Archaic period.

Part Two will roughly follow the same structure and approach as Part One. Instead of interstitial “Hesiodic Textures” sections, however, those sections will be “Pindaric Textures.” As also in Part One, let us begin the chapter with an example or two, which we shall reevaluate at the end this chapter on non-hexameter discourse. Instead of a familiar passage, however, such as that from Iliad 24 on which generations of past scholars have weighed in, our examples here will be the recently discovered papyri that are, for now, known as the “New Sappho” and the “New Archilochus.”

⁴. In Part Three we shall return to the hexameter traditions with a view to better interpreting the less conventional ways of telling paradeigmata in hexameter verse.
An example: the “New Sappho” (P. Köln inv. 21351+21376)

The “New Sappho” was identified in 2004. In this poem, after some 6 hippon-actean verses in which the speaker complains of an aging body and greying hair, the speaker further bemoans that, being human, it is impossible not to grow old (vv. 7–12):

τά ἀνεύσεως άλλα Τί κεν ποείν;  
ἀνήραν άνθρωπον ἐστιν’ οὖ δύνατον γένεσθαι  
καὶ γάρ πάντα Τίθωνον ἐραμτό βροδόπαχυν Αὔων  
εἴρων ἀθείσαν βάμεν’ εἰς ἔσχατα γάς φέροισαν,  
τί κεν ποεῖν; ἀγήραον ἄσωκτον οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι  
καὶ γάρ πάντα Τίθωνον ἐραμτό βροδόπαχυν Αὔων  
εἴρων ἀθείσαν βάμεν’ εἰς ἔσχατα γάς φέροισαν,  
τί κεν ποεῖν; ἀγήραον ἄσωκτον οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι  
καὶ γάρ πάντα Τίθωνον ἐραμτό βροδόπαχυν Αὔων

How often I lament these things. But what can you do? No being that is human can escape old age. For people used to think that Dawn with rosy arms (several words uncertain) Tithonus fine and young to the edges of the earth; yet still grey old age in time did seize him, though he has a deathless wife. (trans. D. Obbink)

A few discourse features, familiar from Part One, are immediately obvious: the paradeigma-initial καὶ γάρ in v. 9; even the π[ο]τα in that verse might recall for us the ὀσποτε syntagm of hexameter poetry or Agamemnon’s καὶ γάρ δή νῦ ποτε Ζήν’ ἀσάτο (II. 19.95); finally, the theme of mortal and divine love—even of Tithonus in particular—calls to mind Aphrodite’s application of the Tithonos myth in a paradeigma in the Hymn to Aphrodite (vv. 218–38). Although Sappho’s is the only extant lyric fragment that in-

5. *P. Köln* 21351, dated to the third century BCE, was first identified by Daniel and Gronewald 2004. We had previously possessed portions of this poem in (the third-century CE) *P. Oxy.* 17887 fr. 1.4–25, fr. 2.1 and fr. nov. (Lobel Σ. μ. p. 26). *ZPE* has featured numerous articles on the fragment since 2004, and see the essays collected in Greene and Skinner 2009.


7. Text and translation are those of Obbink 2009.

8. Aeneas’ genealogy in the *Iliad* lists Tithonus as a son of Laomedon (20.237). Tithonus might have been sitting with his brothers—Priam, Lampas, Klytios, and Hiketaon—on the wall in Book 3 (vv. 146–8) had he not already been abducted by Eos, as suggested by mention of him alongside her at *Il.* 11.1–2 (= *Od.* 5.1–2). Although an example of mortal and divine love, Tithonus, like Anchises, was a mortal man who slept with a goddess. Accordingly, Hesiodic poetry mentions Tithonus only at the end of the *Theogony* for the sons he bore Eos (vv. 984–5), but he would likely have been featured in the Atlantid genealogy of the *Catalogue* (cf. West 1985a: 97).
cludes a *narrative* of Tithonos, Mimnermus and Tyrtaeus also draw on the story of Tithonos.” In these respects, the *paradigma* seems conventional enough.

We shall return to this fragment once we have surveyed *paradeigmata* in Archaic Greece still more broadly, but notice for now two ways in which this Sapphic fragment differs from what we have seen in hexameter *paradeigmata*. First, there is the ἔφαντο (‘they say’) in v. 9, which ‘distances’ the narrative and gives the sense of quotation from another time or from another tradition. We encounter this often in Archaic lyric, especially Pindar, but the fact that the verb is imperfect here may be significant.\(^9\) Next, rather than following an imperative, as is most usual in Homeric poetry, the *paradigma* follows on a gnomic statement, ἀγήραον ἀνθρώπον ἔοντ’ οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι (“It is impossible for a human being to be ageless”), in which one must understand an ἐστί.\(^10\)

The central issues of interpreting this fragment, however, have centered on how this Cologne papyrus relates to the Oxyrhynchus papyrus that had already been known to us.\(^12\) For, while they overlap in twelve verses, each has different verses preceding and following those twelve verses. Some scholars suppose that the poem was, indeed, complete in twelve verses. If complete, questions arise about the manner of the poem’s ending without a return to the present; this leads to formal comparison with other *paradeigmata* within Sapphic and other Greek poetry.\(^13\) If not complete in twelve verses, are the differ-

---

\(^9\) Mimnermus *fr*. 4 W\(^2\): Τιθωνῶι μὲν ἐδὼκεν ἔχειν κακὸν ἀφθίτον (−×) | γῆρας, ὁ καὶ θανάτου βίγιον ἀργαλέου (“[Zeus] granted that Tithonos have evil, unwithering old age, which is even more horrible than painful death”); Tyrtaeus (*fr*. 12.5–6 W\(^2\)) draws on Tithonos’ erstwhile beauty in his negative definition of the ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς: οὔδ’ εἰ Τιθωνοῦ φυὴν χαριέστερος εἶη, | πλουτοῖς δὲ Μίδεκω καὶ Κινύρεκῳ μάλιον (“Nor even if he were more handsome than Tithonos in form, and more wealthy than Mida and Cinyras”).


\(^11\) On this figure, the *adunaton*, see Canter 1930.

\(^12\) *P. Oxy.* 1787 *frr*. 1–2 = *frr*. 58–9 V.

\(^13\) See especially Edmunds 2009 and Lardinois 2009. As Edmunds notes (p. 64), in lyric poetry only Alc. *fr*. 42 does not seem to return to the present (but see his pp. 60–1 on *fr*. 44 with Page 1979: 282, Meyerhoff 1984: 52–53, and Bernsdorff 2005). Within Pindar, note especially that *N*. 1 and 10 end with mythological material.
ent versions owed to varying performance conditions or to more mundane mechanics of anthologization?14

B An example: the “New Archilochus” (P. Oxy. 4708 fr. 1)

Before the appearance of *P. Oxy. 4708 fr.* 1—our “New Archilochus”—we had had little sense of Archilochean style in elegiac verses, and even less of the Archilochean treatment of mythological material.15 Yet the ascription of this fragment to Archilochus has been universally accepted, and it has thrown light on other fragments once hesitantly ascribed to Archilochus.16 Fitting for Archilochean verses, it seems to suggest that there is a proper time for flight in battle, and that the Greeks’ mistaken attack on Mysia on their way to Troy was one such instance.17 In that attack, as we also know from Proclus’ summary of the *Cypria*,18 Telephos puts the Greeks to flight. The 24 verses of the fragment have appeared to many scholars to preserve a *paradeigma*, but we must note that many of the typical discursive features that would indicate a *paradeigma* have been supplied by editors:19

\[\ldots\]

\[\varepsilonι\ \deltaε\] \[\ldots\] [ ] \[\varepsilonι\ \thetaεο\upiota\ \κρατη\upiota\ \[\varepsilonι\ \\upiota\ \α\upiotaν\ \\upiotaκ\upiota\] \[\varepsilonι\ \κα\upiotaκ\upiotaτ\upiota\ \λε\upiota\varepsilonι\varepsilonι.\]

14. The former position being argued especially by Lardinois 2009 and Clayman 2009; the latter by Stehle 2009.
15. On mythical material in Archilochean elegy, see West 2006: 15.
16. The argument for Archilochean attribution, in brief, rests on the following: (1) the new fragments have the same hand and format as: *P. Oxy. XXX fr.* 2507 (Adesp. Eleg. 61 W²), elegiacs hesitantly ascribed to Archilochus by Lobel (line 10 could be restored as Archil. *fr.* 1.2, but the preceding line is different from *fr.* 1.1); (2) *P. Oxy. VI fr.* 854, containing line-beginnings overlapping (at vv. 6–9) with *fr.* 4 W², is ascribed to Archilochus’ elegiacs by Athenaeus (Ἀρχίλοχος ἐν ἐλεγίοις. 483d).
17. I here print the text of Obbink 2006. Alternatives include the *editio princeps* (Gonis et al. 2005), and that of West (2006).
18. *Cypr.* arg. 7 (Procl. *Chr.*). The story is also handled in the *Ilias parva* according to Proclus (*Chr.* 3) and Pausanias (3.26.9).
19. Text and translation are that of Obbink 2006.
Thus far have tended to think it nearly so. It is not certain to what extent this fragment represents a complete poem, but scholars thus far have tended to think it nearly so.20 One may, with West, see ring-composition be-

tween a μο[ῦνος of his v. 25 (= Obbink’s [πρό]μο[ῦνος) and the μο[ῦνος of v. 5, and, if indeed “the re-telling of the myth was the main raison d’être of the poem,” the poem may not have continued much longer (2006: 15–16). Any idea of ‘completeness’, of course, is bound up with what type of poem we think we are dealing with. Might we be dealing with something akin to Simonides’ hymnic ‘Battle of Plataea’ (frr. 11–18 W²)?

Alternatively, could this Archilochean fragment have been part of some historical elegy describing the foundation of Pergamon? Is there sufficient text to suggest that it is a mythological paradeigma in the service of a consolatio in a symptotic present? It is largely assumed that Archilochus is doing just that: assuring his companions that there is a time for flight and supporting that statement with an example of Achaeans fleeing from Telephos in Mysia. Indeed, textual reconstructions of vv. 4–5 seem to “offer the mythical narrative as a comparison to or reliving of the personal experience of flight in battle” (Obbink 2006: 8).

The fragment is not without its controversies, however. First, as West (2006: 15–16) suggests, vv. 5–7 would have sufficed to make Archilochus’ point if the audience were familiar with the myth. Instead, Archilochus goes on to tell the myth at some length. To West’s mind, Archilochus “enjoys telling it for its own sake,” but West is left with “the impression that Archilochus has not thought this out properly” (15; 14 [on vv. 16–18]). His complain is that with the ο[ὶ δὲ τότὲ βλαφθέντες ὁδοὺ of v. 16 Archilochus’ narrative moves backward in time to explain why the Achaeans were in Mysia in the first place, and in v. 19 are “sore at heart” (θυμὼν ἀκηχ[δατο) though they do not yet know they are attacking the wrong city. That the telling of the myth involves some apparent illogic may not be surprising: as we noted above, ancient scholars made the same observation of Iliad 24’s Niobe paradeigma. While that illogic is not a discourse feature which came to be very useful in our analysis of paradeigmata in hexameter poetry, it suggests

21. Thus questions Obbink 2006: 8 with his n. 22.
we might do well to look for other ‘paradigmatic’ discourse characteristics in this fragment.

We might start with the way in which Archilochus seems to effect the transition from framing context to mythological time in v. 5: καὶ ποτὲ μόνος ἔως Τήλεφος Ἀρκασίδης. The transitional particle-adverb string καὶ ποτὲ—a very tenuous supplement, but a widely accepted one—will be of particular interest given our emphasis on discourse markers above. Moreover, that transition follows on the introductory gnomic statement φεύγειν δὲ τίς ὡρη (v. 4). This syntax well suits the gnomic ἀγήραον ἄνθρωπον ἔον᾽ οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι in v. 8 of the New Sappho. We shall, in due course, evaluate whether it is a reasonable supplement in the context of lyric and elegiac poetry, as well as Archaic wisdom traditions.25

The actual story of Telephos is not nearly as well attested in Archaic Greek poetry as Tithonos’ story. Athenian dramatists seemed familiar enough with the tale,26 but the only known Archaic source outside of the New Archilochus is the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women.27 This makes the epithet Ἀρκασίδης in the fragment’s v. 5 rather striking, for within Archaic Greek poetry it occurs otherwise only in the Hesiodic Catalogue,28 and of Telephos in particular (fr. 165.8 M–W): ἢ τέκε Τήλεφον Ἀρκασίδην Μυσῶν βασιλῆ[α].29 Might we, then, detect a genealogical style in these Archilochean verses?

25. Compare adesp. iamb. 38.5–11: καὶ γὰρ (10).
26. Aeschylus and Euripides both dramatized aspects of Telephos’ story in tragedies (Misoi and Telephos; Auge and Telephos, respectively); Sophocles may well have, too (on which see Gantz 1996: 428).
27. West 1985a: 155: “The story of Telephos … was parasitic on the Troy saga, and I should be surprised if it existed as early as 700.” Based on references in fr. 19 (Gyges, ruler of Lydia 687–52) and 122 (eclipse of 711, 689, or 648) W², ‘Archilochus’ is traditionally dated to the mid-seventh century.
28. Hes. fr. 129.17, 22; 165.8. Chronologically, the next occurrence of this patronymic is Call. Dion. 216: κούρην Ιασίοιο συοκτόνον Ἀρκασίδαο.
29. In the Hesiodic Catalogue, Telephos is a descendant of Pelasgos and Auge the grandchild of Arkas. West (1985a: 94) supposes that the story was probably told at some length, and concluded the Arcadian genealogies.
The phrase κρατερῆς υπ’ ἀνάγκης (v. 2) and its locus collatus of Th. 517 (Ἄτλας δ’ οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἔχει κρατερῆς υπ’ ἀνάγκης) might support that view, if not also the υἱόν … Τ]ήλεφον ὅς…[τ]ῷ[τε syntagm of vv. 22–4. The fact that the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women is the only other extant Archaic source featuring Telephos is no argument for a Hesiodic ‘source’ or ‘origin’, but these first few discourse features are initially striking.30 It is all the more important, then, that we try to develop a better sense of what constitutes the style of paradeigmata in the non-hexameter discourse of Archaic Greece. Only then can we judge whether or not the story of Telephos is intended to be paradigmatic.

**C Corpus, style, myth, and discourse**

However compelling initial Hesiodic comparanda for Archilochus’s Telephos fragment might seem on the surface, we are far from being able to cite it as a decisive influence. Further, there is, as yet, nothing to recommend such an approach in the case of the Sappho’s Tithonos fragment. In the case of the paradeigmata of Homeric poetry, we had little or no reason to anticipate that a decisive influence in their articulation would have been genealogical catalogue poetry, especially since the Hesiodic Catalogue survives to us in a form that is commonly thought to post-date the Homeric poems significantly.31 This finding underscores the fact that, in Archaic Greek “song culture,” the texts that we have are but snapshots in streams of Archaic re-performances, snapshots that are later ‘cropped’ and ‘touched up’ by Alexandrian scholars.32 In turning from hexameter poetry to lyric poetry, then, we must first discuss four distinct issues we may face in ana-

30. I also find compelling West’s observation that the Telephos poem has a “cross-generational dimension” in that it includes both Telephos and his son (West 2006: 16–17; quotation from p. 17).
31. See n. 49 on p. 164 below.
32. The term ‘song culture’ as applied to Early Greece is owed to Herington 1985, esp. 3–57; more recent discussion in Ford 2003.
lyzing the articulation of *paradeigmata* in hexameter and non-hexameter discourse as potentially simultaneous.\textsuperscript{13}

First, there is the question of the ‘lyric’ corpus and ‘style’. The plan of this chapter considers at once many very distinct styles and performance contexts, a far more heterogeneous corpus than the hexameter poetry of the first chapter. Second, no matter how one fixes dates to the textualization of oral poetry and to the advent of writing, it inevitably falls within the Archaic period that we are studying. Yet that is the extent of the consensus in chronology of the period, and we shall have to rehearse the relevant points of synchrony and diachrony in the poetic and wisdom discourse of the Archaic period. Third, can we assume that a poet composing in, say, an Aeolic-based meter would be as adept at drawing on a given tradition in hexameters as a poet who is composing in hemiepes-based elegiac couplets? As a partial answer to such a question we shall quickly discuss whether meter and performance context would have played a part in a poet’s attitude toward material from another tradition.\textsuperscript{34} Fourth and finally, Archaic Greek poetry is designed for re-performance. In accordance with καιρός, then, a given ‘poem’ may have ‘begun’ or ‘ended’ differently depending on its audience or performance context.

### C.1 Corpus and style

We shall find at once that, outside of hexameter poetry, there is more flexibility in the articulation of *paradeigmata*. Of course, we are, by virtue of organization, creating a seemingly artificial corpus by collapsing all generic distinctions among non-hexameter sources. Furthermore, we are looking at sources that would have circulated orally through different performance contexts over a span of time that may have amounted to centuries.\textsuperscript{35}

\textsuperscript{13} On my use of the term ‘lyric’ as a short-hand designation of all non-hexameter poetry, see n. 1 on p. 151 above.

\textsuperscript{34} Again, we have no evidence that Archaic Greek lyric poets knew a ‘Homer’. The point is that Archaic Greek elegiac verses would more easily accommodate material circulating (also) in hexameter form.

\textsuperscript{35} On the transmission of the lyrics of Sappho and Alcaeus, see esp. Nagy 2007a, Yatromanolakis 2007, and Nagy 2009.
Yet this is also the *virtue* of this approach, for the artificiality of this corpus is only apparent, and the span of time over which these discourses circulated in re-performance is reason in itself for considering them together. It is no doubt a mistake to think too narrowly of the speech genres on which a poetic figure would have drawn: consider the fact that we can confidently ascribe to Archilochus a tale from the Trojan saga, sexual invective against Neoboule and Lykambes, and *ainoi* of a monkey and a fox.\(^{36}\) So, too, does it conflict with the usual, modern sense of ‘Sapphic poetry’ that such a rubric likely includes also elegiac and iambic poetry.\(^{37}\) But this is not a question of Alexandrian *Kreuzung der Gattungen*; it is a fact of context-driven performance within ‘song culture’.

Moreover, some Archaic ‘sources’ that we shall consider—the *apophthegmata* of the Seven Sages and Aesopic fables—survive to us not in direct manuscript tradition but instead by quotation in authors securely dated to much later periods.\(^{38}\) Likewise, my argument will not depend on these sources, rather only serve to be enriched by the comparanda in them. But, while such a textual pedigree is less than inspiring, it may not be unreasonable to consider third-century CE sources such as Diogenes Laertius to be a valid source *by virtue of* his own literary incompetence.\(^{39}\) One might say the same of the quotations attributed to the Seven Sages in Plutarch’s *Moralia*.\(^{40}\) Even so, that every word is transmitted verbatim seems improbable. Yet what is significant and compelling is that across the combined testimonies of Diogenes Laertius and Plutarch there is a coherent

---

36. Respectively: *P. Oxy*. 4708 fr. 1; *frr*. 196+196A W\(^2\); and *frr*. 172–182 W\(^2\) (eagle) and *frr*. 185–7 W\(^2\) (ape).

37. On elegiac, see the biographer in *P. Oxy*. 1800 fr. 1 and *Suda* Σ.107. The *Suda* also mentions iambics (cf. Aloni 1997: xx-xxvi) and epigrams, but the epigrams are normally dated to to the Hellenistic period.

38. They are most accessible now in collections such as Mullach 1860. Cf. too Fehling 1985, Burn 1960: 207–209, and Snell 1960.

39. On his Diogenes Laertius’ access to traditions and the likelihood of his reproducing them trustworthily, see Martin 1993b: 109. Moreover, see Robert 1968 (= Robert 1969: V.510–V.551) for confirmation of the tradition in the 4th–3rd BCE epigraphic texts transcribed at Delphi by Clearchus of Soli, student of Aristotle. Diogenes Laertius’ *floruit* is not certain, but is usually supposed to be early third century CE.

40. On Plutarch’s use of sources, especially in the difficult case of Thales, see Hershbell 1986.
style and syntax in the sayings of the Seven Sages. Furthermore, as I shall show, this coherence of style appears in other discourses of the Archaic period.

Finally, there is the problem of Pindar. Pindar is not only the temporal endpoint in our view of Archaic Greek poetry; his poetry also statistically dominates the corpus of Archaic Greek lyric by virtue of the fact that, along with the *Theognidea*, his *epinikia* are the only poetry to survive to us through direct manuscript tradition. We must add to those considerations his being the great paradox of ‘oral’ or ‘song’ culture in that he is a poet who is simultaneously supposed to reflect the style of written composition and the most Indo-European of Greek poets. After all, the span of time that ‘Archaic lyric’ covers—from Archilochus to Pindar—is great enough that the textualization of oral epic and the advent of writing is a concern for some scholars. That such apparently contradictory conclusions are possible stem from the poetry’s notoriously abstruse and intricate style, his *poikilia*: the ancient critical touchstone was Horace’s description of Pindaric style as one *monte decurrens uelut amnis* (c. 4.2.5–12). Among moderns it may be the larger-scale problems associated with Pindar’s ‘oral subterfuge’ that are most perplexing. With such a stylistic ‘wild card’ under consideration, I shall take the precaution of treating his poetry primarily in the inter-leaved sections entitled “Pindaric Textures.” More than mere precaution, however, there is the advantage of treating holistically Pindar’s articulation of *paradeigmata*.

---


42. Cf. too Ps.-Longinus §33.5 on the ‘smooth’ Bacchylides (ἐν τῷ γλαφυρῷ πάντη κεκαλλιγραφηµένῳ) versus a ‘stormy’ Pindar (ὁτὲ µὲν οἶν πάντα ἐπιφλέγουσι τῇ φορᾷ, ἀβέλουνται δ᾿ ἀλόγως πολλάκις καὶ πίπτουσιν ἀτυχέστατα).

C.2 Synchrony, diachrony, and discourse

Pindar’s poetry, therefore, pretty well embodies the problems of synchrony and diachrony in the study of Archaic Greek poetry. In his poetry one may sense a mastery of various ‘oral’ styles at least as old as Homeric and Hesiodic poetry yet still be haunted by the suspicion that such complexity of thought must have required written composition. Style can be deceiving along a diachronic axis, however, as even a cursory comparison of the poetry of the contemporaries Pindar and Bacchylides suggests. There are two ways of formulating this: first, we might say that Bacchylides retains an ‘epic’, or ‘oral’, style that Pindar sheds in favor of a more ‘written’ style; but another way of viewing the difference is that Pindar may have more faithfully retained features of lyric poetry that Bacchylides shed in favor of the ‘oral’ style of Homeric poetry. Moreover, just as a poet such as Pindar might retain archaic features not found in hexameter verses, it may also exhibit specialized uses of language and syntax that are otherwise diluted in Homeric and Hesiodic poetry. One indication of this is that Archaic Greek lyric exhibits metrical features that structurally precede the hexameter. Indeed, the hexameter verse may well be derived from a combination of Aeolic cola, but we cannot exclude that the hexameter could, in turn, influence lyric meters. Similarly, it would have been possible for Pindar to look ‘back’ to a hexameter tradition; that is, to an earlier stage in the textualization of, for example, the Homeric or Hesiodic poems.

Aside from actively avoiding the facile assumptions of diachronic, teleological development in a demonstrably fluid ‘song culture’, it is also important to leave open the possibility that different performance traditions and speech genres continued to be em-

45. See, e.g., Martin (forthcoming) on the restricted use of the relative adverb ἐνθα in Pindar, and Watkins 2002 on determiners.
48. I shall discuss this below in Chapter 10.
bedded in, and generally influence, one another. We discussed this in detail in the Introduction, but it is now worth adding that this was borne out by our findings in Part One. There we saw that Homeric performers were capable of performing more than just Homeric poetry; specifically, they seem to have been able to perform Hesiodic genealogical poetry, not just in the manner of the *Theogony*, but also the *Catalogue of Women*.

Now, while, the *Catalogue of Women* as we have it may ‘date’ to the sixth century BCE, it had clearly been performed in the preceding century as well.49 There is, then, no obvious advantage to organizing our analysis diachronically; there are, instead, compelling reasons to leave open the possibility that our Archaic Greek poetic texts do not necessarily represent poetic *compositions* so much as different performance traditions from within the same period, even if those traditions are of varying degrees of fluidity.

**C.3 Myth and materia**

Archilochus may indeed be our ‘oldest’ instance of the Telephos myth,50 with the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, the *Cypria*, and the *Ilias parva* all being textualized some time afterward. The narrative, in that it depicts an incident that precedes the Greeks’ arrival at Troy, presupposes the story of the Trojan War, which leads West to conclude that Archilochus must be drawing from an epic.51 The same may be said of the Tithonos fragment: as brother of Priam, it may also seem unlikely that we would have a record of his story were it not for the significance of the Trojan War in the Greek epic tradition. Still,

49. Some have maintained that a canonical version of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* should be dated to the sixth century BCE (West 1985a), but linguistic and mythological criteria have led others to suggest that portions of it are as old as the Hesiodic *Theogony* or *Works and Days* (Casanova 1979; Janko 1982). Yet, while parts of the *Catalogue* may represent the time period of the First Sacred War (early 6th century BCE; Fowler 1998), sociopolitical conditions of other periods seem also to represented. Nor has there been any consensus as to whether the *Catalogue* tradition owes its origin to a particular geographical region: opinions range from Athens (West 1985a) to Thessaly (Fowler 1998), with some positing a Thessalian provenance with a degree of Athenian influence (e.g., Rutherford 2005).

50. West 2006.

51. See n. 27 on p. 158 above.
neither of these stories is explicit in our Trojan story, the *Iliad*, and we shall not here assume that *lyric* poetry must draw from *epic* traditions. The *Iliad* itself, after all, depicts Achilles as singing κλέα ἀνδρῶν to the lyre, or *phorminx*, in Book 9 (185–9):

> Μυριμόνων δ’ ἐπὶ τε κλωσίας καὶ νῆας ἱκέσθην,
> τὸν δ’ εὔρον φρένα τερπόμενον φόρμυγγει λιγείῃ
> καλὴ δαιδαλέῃ, ἐπὶ δ’ ἀργύρεον ζυγὸν ἔπνεν,
> τὴν ἄρετ’ ἐξ ἐνάρων πόλιν Ἡετίωνος ὀλέσας:
> τῇ ὅ γε θυμὸν ἔπνεεν, ἀεἰδε δ’ ἀρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν.

It may be surprising to us, then, that he is singing κλέα ἀνδρῶν to the lyre: for these deeds we associate with heroic epic and hexameter verse. We need not argue that hexameter verses were performed to the lyre, but we can at least leave open the possibility that ‘lyric’ poetry—i.e., poetry played to the lyre—was a legitimate means of performing the glories of heroes, and we have already seen that elegiac verses could accommodate para-Iliadic Trojan material.

There is also the potential difference in ‘mode’. Archilochus seems to be narrating the story of the Achaeans’ rout in a mode that we might happily call a straightforward mode of ἀπλὴ διήγησις, or ‘simple narration’. Though his *persona* is present in the frame of the Telephos myth, his narration of the past is, on the surface, not markedly different from a tale Nestor or Achilles might tell within Homeric poetry. But that is not necessarily the case for lyric poetry more generally. Archaic Greek lyric poetry programmatically weaves the mythological past into a ritual present, whereby even a ritual present can, in the future, become a mythological past. This is especially clear in the case of choral lyric poetry, where ‘choral self-referentiality’ is the norm. Most familiar, perhaps, is the example of Alcman fr. 1 *PMG*, in which “[t]he scene evoked by the chorus

53. One way of putting this is as Nagy does (2007b: 37): “*this poetry is a form of epic that is not yet differentiated from lyric.*” He suggests (38) that Sappho fr. 44 V might be one representative. On “diachronic skewing” in the depiction of Archaic Greek poetic performance, see Nagy 2003: 39–48. On the performance of hexameter poetry being recitation, see West 1981.
takes place in mythical time” (Calame 1997: 186). Further, as the poem is re-performed, the names Agido and Hagesichora may themselves become rôles, or *persona*ae, for later Spartan maidens. This taps into the ‘mimetic’ mode of poetic presentation, in which the first-person speaker, the *persona loquens*, of the poem becomes crucial. Nor are “first-person problems” limited to the complex representation of a (singular) speaker within choral poetry. While a thorough treatment of the problems is beyond the scope of my argument, there are at least two issues that concern us here.

First of all, even in a hypothetical ‘first performance’ of a poem, the *persona loquens* is not necessarily the voice of the poet. Archilochus *fr*. 19 W² is a fine example of this principle. As the fragment is quoted by Plutarch, we might conclude that the poet Archilochus himself is the one who does not overreach:

οὐ μοι τὰ Γύγεω τοῦ πολυχρύσου μέλει,
οὐδ’ εἰλέ πῶ με κῆλος, οὐδ’ ἀγαίομαι
θέων ἔργα, μεγάλης δ’ οὐκ ἐρέω τυραννίδος.

Of no concern to me are the possession of Gyges rich in gold, nor yet have I been seized with jealousy of him, nor do I envy the deeds of the gods, nor do I desire great tyranny. That is beyond my sights. (trans. D. A. Campbell)

If we are to trust Aristotle’s testimony in the *Rhetoric*, however, we learn that it is in fact a carpenter named Charon speaking these verses. The voice of Charon, Aristotle tells us, is one that Archilochus has adopted in order to avoid accusations of abuse. We cannot know how widespread this phenomenon was, but there are indeed more examples and

---

57. As also argued by Nagy (1990b: 345–349), who formulates it thus: “[Agido and Hagesichora are] acting out, on the level of the ritual presented by the chorus, the roles of the two Leukippides, who are cult figures that exist on the level of myth” (346).
58. I borrow this phrase from D’Alessio 1994, entitled “First-Person Problems in Pindar.”
59. A brief summary can be found at Gerber 1997: 6–8, with an accordingly succinct list of references at 6n23.
60. *Moralia* 470b10–c3 (*De tranquillitate animi*).
the fragmentary nature of our sources ought to make us wary of making assumptions related to a poem’s *persona loquens*, the performance context it represents,\(^{63}\) or even the group memberships of performer and audience.

Second, we ought to briefly note the mimetic nature of more than just the ritual, choral poetry of Alcman. After all, any poetry involving first-person statements that is consistently re-performed is, by default, mimetic. In fact, any time the *Works and Days* was performed by someone other than Hesiod or performed without Perses in the audience, this we might consider mimetic; similarly in the case of corpora such as the *Theognidea* or the *Anacreontea*, which traditions seem to span centuries of composition and performance.\(^{64}\) This phenomenon has been especially important in the case of Theognis and the *Theognidea*, where the meaning of the σφρηγίς, or ‘seal’, of v. 19 has long been debated in terms of the corpus’ ‘ownership’. Andrew Ford nicely summarizes the significance of the seal to the authorship of the poem and the figure of Theognis (1985: 85):\(^{65}\)

\[\text{But the seal of Theognis goes beyond these self-identifications in establishing a specific range of discourse as the singer’s own. The seal is significant not because it names and author or a singer but because it identifies a “text.” Theognis is not simply the name of a marvelous performer but the lock and key fixing a body of poetry and guaranteeing its provenience.}\]

In this sense, the name of Theognis and the exiled *persona* of the Theognidean corpus becomes, like the names of Hagesichora and Agido, the stuff of myth, becomes mythologized by virtue of the corpus being developed and re-performed. In turn, I shall show

\(^{63}\) Cf., e.g., Bowie 1986: 15: “Just as first-person statements do not offer immediate access to the person of the poet, so too allusions to supposed circumstances of a song are not a reliable guide to its actual context of performance.”

\(^{64}\) In the case of the *Theognidea*, the corpus seems to refer to historical events ranging from the seventh century (the likely reign of the Megarian tyrant Theagenes) to the Persian invasion in the fifth.

\(^{65}\) Further implications are explored at Nagy 1996b: 220–223.
over the course of this chapter how the poetry of the Archaic period, including verses of the *Theognidea*, actively foster this ‘self-mythologization’ of the *persona*.66

C.4 Textualization, performance, and re-performance

There is also the question of performance, and of the textual representations of orally performed and transmitted poems. In the case of Hesiodic poetry, at least, we are familiar with questions regarding the separability of proems,67 or even the *Catalogue of Women* as a performable extension of the *Theogony*.68 So too, it seems, in the performance of non-hexameter poetry. Here questions surrounding the *Theognidea* probably loom largest. While scholars have argued over the actual architecture of the corpus and its ‘stanzas’,69 it is all but certain that performers could pick and choose stretches of couplets to suit the καιρός of their particular performance conditions. Yet this problem is not limited to corpora with the structure of a genealogical catalogue or lengthy collections of elegiac couplets. We have already encountered the problem of ‘poem length’ in the case of the New Archilochus above, and we can add to that our New Sappho, in which despite the papyrus’ coronis, the ‘end’ is not necessarily where a performer always ended a recitation. The question of discourse units and separability is not restricted to the relatively simple matter of the representation of text on a page, or limited to the later process of the anthologization of lyric poetry; in many cases it may also be a matter of the performance reality.70

66. We did not discuss this in Part One, but we shall return to it in Part Three.
67. See, e.g., West ad Th. 1–1145.
69. Faraone 2008 with references, as well as Adkins 1985.
70. The importance is manifest in the case of Pindar’s *Paean* 6 (vv. 121–4),

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(η) ἱητει νῦν, μέτρα παινό-} \\
\text{νόιων ἱητει, νέοιτι.} \\
\text{ὄνομακλίτα γάρ ἐσσι Δωριεῖ}
\end{align*}
\]

as Kurke’s discussion of the possible performance by two choruses shows (esp. Kurke 2005: 118n106). The broader question is how can we discern performable discourse units, or how are
they marked? In this case, what can the particle γάρ in v. 123 handle pragmatically?
Chapter 8 | Lyric and wisdom discourse: *paradeigmata*

In a study like Öhler’s *Mythologische Exempla in der älteren Griechischen Dichtung*, helpful though it is, one proceeds from instances of seemingly inset mythological material and, in some cases, arrives at shared discourse features.¹ Thus, when Öhler encounters καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ in the vicinity of mythological material within lyric poetry, he is able to refer to that particle string as the “einfachste formel” or remark that it recalls Homeric *paradeigmata*.² But, as far as I can tell, he began from mythological material that may have been paradigmatic rather than from the discourse characteristics that are conventionalized within certain *paradeigmata*. Thus Öhler does not include Simonides *fr*. 595 *PMG* in his study, though it begins with οὐδὲ γάρ:³

οὐδὲ γάρ ἐννοσίφυλλος ἀήτα
τῶτ’ ὡρτ’ ἀνέμων, ἀτις κ’ ἀπεκόλυε
κιδναμένα μελιαδέα γάρνυν
ἀραρεῖν ἀκοαῖσι βροτῶν.

For at that time arose no leaf-shaking blast of the winds, which might have spread abroad and prevented honey-sweet voices from fastening on the ears of mortals.

Indeed, are they even paradigmatic? After all, Plutarch quotes these verses of Simonides in rather banal discussion of how sound carries in various wind conditions, and they refer not to what *did* happen, but what *might have*.⁴ But I think that the predominantly dactylic

---

¹ Edmunds 2009: 59n10: “I am not, however, the new Oehler whom we need.” Neither, unfortunately, am I.
² The quotation is from his p. 53, regarding Alc. *fr.* 38a *PLF*. See also his comment on Simonides *fr.* 523 *PMG*, where “Dieser Trostspruch erinnert mit der Einführung οὐδὲ γάρ an homerische Exempla” (57).
³ Their quotation in Plutarch (*Quaest. conviv.* 8.3.4 = *Mor.* 722c) would have been available.
⁴ On this more general tendency in lyric poetry, see below.
meter and the Homeric language may be a clue. I propose that these verses pertain to Odysseus and his men as they encounter the Sirens, and that the discourse characteristics, especially οὐδὲ γὰρ, are as important as an overt mythological reference. Methodologically speaking, then, we can not start from a criterion of ‘contains mythological material’; we must instead constantly iterate between mythological material that is clearly paradigmatic and then investigate fully the discourse features found there across the entire corpus.

Moreover, what of καὶ γὰρ and οὐδὲ γὰρ when they do not introduce mythological material? Excluding those instances has two possible outcomes: first, the lack of such a linguistic backdrop undermines any conclusions made about the markedness of the particle string; second, it limits our ability to discern the ways in which Archaic Greek poets might use traditional discourse markers to articulate non-mythological material. Let us rephrase that second possibility at the outset, for it is of great importance: is it possible that Archaic Greek poets use conventionalized discourse characteristics to ‘mythologize’

---

5. Campbell compares Simonides’ ἐννοσίφυλλος in v. 1 to the Homeric εἰνοσίφυλλος (e.g., Il. 2.632) and ἄῤῥα in the same line to Il. 15.626 (ἀνέμοιο...ἄφτη). Cf. too Page’s PMG (ad 2).

6. Segal (1985a: 185) compares it to Pindar’s fr. 94b.11–20 S–M in that it “asserts the power of song over the violent forces of nature.” Segal is certainly right to compare the Simonidean fragment to the Pindaric description of the siren’s song silencing the winds, but not necessarily for the reason he cites; as Page (1951: 142) notes, there was no wind to begin with. I propose that the fragment does describe siren song in as much as it pertains to Odysseus and his men as they encounter the Sirens (Od. 12.158–200). Even Plutarch’s quotation of the fragment—citing it as evidence that ὑπειρά γὰρ ῥίξοδες καὶ γαληνή (Mor. 722c)—betrays the fact that Plutarch has Odysseus’ encounter with the Sirens in mind when he quotes Simonides: in the Odyssey, although a fair wind bore Odysseus and his men to the island of the Sirens, as they approached there was indeed a ‘windless calm’ (γαληνή | ἐπλετέο ὑπειρά; Od. 12.168–9). Plutarch even cites versions of these two Odyssean verses elsewhere (Mor. 446d4–5). Regarding the placement of this fragment, one newly attractive possibility is that it belongs to the one work of Simonides that we know to have dealt with Odysseus’ journeys, the “Prayers” or “Curses” (Κατευχαί; frr. 537–8 PMG). Σ Od. 6.164 (= fr. 537 PMG) describes Menelaos and Odysseus leading men to Delos to fetch the Oinotropoi. But, in line with Segal, the meta-poetic statement also remains an attractive idea.
more than just mythological material? Given our emphasis above on the mythologized personae of Archaic lyric poetry, I suggest that this is a possibility we leave open.

My approach below will be to establish various conventionalized discourse characteristics, but to, both along the way and in conclusion, use the analysis of what is conventionalized to better understand divergences from those conventions. The establishment of conventions will not only form a necessary backdrop the “Pindaric Textures” sections, but, coupled with attention to the divergences, I shall also offer along the way new readings of fragments from Alcaeus, Sappho, Archilochus, Ibycus, and the Theogonidea. In addition, I shall discuss the creation of authority and persona across Archaic Greek poetry.

A Discourse markers and units

In the case of the New Sappho above (p. 153), the καὶ γάρ of the verse καὶ γάρ π[ο]το Τίθωνον ἔφαντο is easily discerned on the papyrus. In the case of the New Archilochus, however, one might find the papyrus reading of καὶ ποτὲ more troubling, and all the more troubling because it seems to bear the burden of the transition to the myth. The traces do not seem to accommodate a καὶ γάρ, yet neither should one dogmatically assume that it is Archilochus’ only option, even if it is a marker that an Archaic Greek poet (who may well be Archilochus)7 seems to use in a similar situation in iambs (Adesp. iamb. 38.8–14 W):

οὐ σε τοῦτ’ ἡμισχυνεν οὐδὲν [οὐκ] εὑρέγεσα τινάξας ἐτρ[άπης]
καὶ γάρ ἀλλιμωτέρους σέ[ξε] κατα[]
ταῦτ’ ἐπιβόλην[θε]+ θεοὺς γάρ [οὐκ] ἐνίκησεν βροτός·
ἀλλ’ ὀτεύκεκεν πρὸ πάντων ἐκ[]
ἡλθεῖς ἐκπλ[...]ς ὕγρα κύματ’[’ εὐρέης ἀλός]
ἀδρυφής, οὐ[...] θε[......]κλεί[]

7 The fragment does not with certainty belong to Archilochus, but Lobel suggested that it was Archilochean and West finds the ascription “even more probable” in light of the New Archilochus (2006: 12).
… this shamed you in no way, that you cast aside your well-built … and were put to flight … You know, stronger men than you these things have mastered. A mortal man does not beat out the gods. But that before everyone … you came … on the watery waves of the wide sea … unscathed …

Though this Archilochean fragment is iambic rather than elegiac, there are no metrical constraints in the New Archilochus that make the dactyl καί ποτε preferable to the spondee καὶ γάρ when preceding West’s μούνος. The question, then, is whether we can distinguish any discourse features that prompt a poet to use one discourse marker over another. Is it possible that—again, at the ‘interactional’ rather than ‘transactional’ level of language—καί ποτε communicates something different than does καὶ γάρ in how the audience should interpret the upcoming narrative?

A.1 Καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ

Based on our findings in Part One, it was no surprise to encounter use of the καὶ γάρ discourse marker in the New Sappho. Indeed, the importance of this discourse marker outside of hexameter is confirmed by Alcaeus fr. 38A PLF, in which the speaker first bids his audience or addressee not to strive for great things, and then relates the narrative of Sisyphus (vv. 1–13):

πῶνε[.....] Μελάνιππ’ ἄμι ἔμοι. τι[..].[ 5
†στα[...]]δινάεις’ Ἀχέροντα μεγ[ ζάβαις ζ ἐλίω κόθαρον φάος [ ὁμεθ’. ἀλλ’ ἄγι μὴ μεγάλων ἐπὶ]
καὶ γάρ Σίσυφος Αἰολίδαις βασιλεύς [ ἀνδρων πλείστα νοσάμενος [ ἀλλὰ καὶ πολύδρισ ἔων ὑπὰ κάρι [ δινάεις’ Ἀχέροντ’ ἐπέραισε, μη[ στὶς<θ> μόχθον ἔχην Κρονίδαις βα[ ]μελαίνας χθόνος. ἀλλ’ ἄγι μὴ τα[ 10
.].ταβάομεν αἰ ποτα κάλλοτα.[.]]ην ὄττινα τῶνδε πάθην τα[ ...... ἄνε]μος βορίαις ἐπὶ.[

Drink and get drunk, Melanippus, with me. Why do you suppose that when you have crossed the great river of eddying (?) Acheron you will see again the sun’s pure light? Come, do not aim at great things: you know, king Sisyphus, son of Aiolos, wisest of men, supposed that he (was master of Death?); but despite his cunning he crossed eddying Akheron twice at fate’s command, and king Zeus, son of Kronos, devised at toil for him to have under the black earth. Come, do not hope for these things; now if ever, while we
are young, it is fit to endure to whatever of these things God may give us to suffer. …the North wind… (trans. D. A. Campbell, modified)

In v. 10, at the close of the myth, the speaker reiterates a command, and all is just as we would expect from a paradeigma in Homeric poetry.

This straightforward example from Alcaeus, when coupled with the New Sappho, establishes that poets working outside of hexameter poetry were familiar with the discourse strategy and characteristics that are also exhibited there. It is particularly compelling that Bacchylides uses the marker in a passage that has seemed Homeric to commentators, namely Meleager’s story of his father, addressed to Heracles while in Hades (5.93–102):

\[\text{τὸν δὲ προσέφα Μελέα-γρος δακρυόεις· «χαλεπὸν θεῶν παρατρέψαι νόον ἀνδρεσιν ἐπιχοθούιοις, καὶ γάρ ἄν πλάξιππος Οἰνεύς παύσεν καλυκοστεφάνου σεμνᾶς χόλον Αρτέμιδος λευκωλέου} \]

\[\text{λισσόμενος πολέων τ’ αἰ-γῶν θυσίαισι πατὴρ καὶ βοῶν φοινικοκατωτων·} \]

And Meleager answered him in tears: “It is hard for mortal men to turn aside the purpose of the gods. You know, otherwise my father, horse-smiting Oeneus, would have checked the anger of august Artemis, white-armed, bud-garlanded, when he entreated her with sacrifices of many goats and red-backed cattle. (trans. D. A. Campbell, modified)

But here we start to notice subtle variations on this manner of articulation. Note, for example, the way in which Bacchylides combines the discourse marker καὶ γάρ with the concessive stance of ἄν in v. 97. Second, instead of following an imperative, as in Alcaeus just above and as so often in Homeric poetry, we notice that the paradeigma follows a gnomic statement. Nevertheless, while it is useful to think of these discourse fea-

---

8. Maehler (ad 97–126): “Meleager’s account closely follows Iliad 9.533–49: there, too, the exemplum is introduced by καὶ γάρ, but otherwise literal repetition is carefully avoided. Listeners who were thoroughly familiar with Homer’s account may have appreciated the choral poet’s technique of variation and embroidery.”

9. While Maehler considers the Bacchylidean passage a reversal of Od. 3.143–7, it is, in fact, in
tures in terms of the conventions in Homeric poetry, it is too early to think of them as divergences from those conventions.

The particle string οὐδὲ γάρ is not at all common in non-hexameter Archaic Greek literature. In fact, it occurs only about ten times. Above we considered Simonides fr. 595 PMG, which is not certain to be mythological or exemplary; but another, more certain instance is his fr. 523 PMG:\[12

†οὐδὲ γὰρ οἳ πρῶτερον ποτ’ ἐπέλοντο, θεῶν δ’ ἐξ ἀνάκτων ἐγένομεν ἔγένομεν τίς ἡμίθεοι, ἀπονοοῦ ὁδὸν ἄφθιτον ὁδὸν ἄκινδυον βίον ἐς γήρας ἐξίκοντο τελέσαντες.†

For not even those who lived in olden days and were born the half-divine sons of the gods, our masters, reached old age without first passing a life of hardship, destruction and danger. (trans. D. A. Campbell)

Here note not only the discourse marker οὐδὲ γάρ but also the ποτέ and the πρῶτερον within the pre-posed relative clause. One can easily imagine this passage following on a gnomic statement about the difficulty of life if not also the inevitability of old age.

The Theognidea offers a different perspective on the discourse marker οὐδὲ γάρ and mythological paradeigmata. The marker occurs just 4 times in Theognidea, but the

accord with the practice of moving from gnomic statement to paradeigma).

10. One might wonder whether οὔτε γάρ should also be considered here, in light of either textual transmission or even individual style. Indeed, textual transmission is a concern: see, e.g., Theogn. 1.537, where Bekker emends the codd.’s οὔθε’...οὐδὲ to οὔθε’...οὔτε. But, in fact, outside of the Theogn. οὔτε γάρ is rare in Archaic Greek poetry (Semon. fr. 7.22, Alcm. fr. 1.64, Solon 4c.3, [Alc. 349A.1]), it is used only of present situations, and is naturally always in combination with at least one other οὔτε. (In the II., it refers in narration to the primary frame [12.417 and 13.436, where paired and leading into simile] or in speech of the present [24.157 ≈ 24.186, where again in combination].) On the issue in Pindar, see n.53 on p. 247 below.

11. Theogn.: 4X (p. 175 above); Archilochus: 1X (p. 221 below); Aesop: 4X; Pindar: 1X (p. 246 below); Simonides 3X.

12. Stobaeus Ecl. 4.34.14, introduced as Σιμωνίδου Θρήσκων. The cruces denote that the passage is not metrical.

13. Moreover, cp. οἳ πρῶτερον ποτ’ ἐπέλοντο and οὔτε καὶ τῶν πρόσεθεν ἐπευθομεθα κλέα ἄνδρῶν | ἡρώων (II. 9.524–5).

14. I shall deal with the several instances of καὶ γάρ in the Theogn. below. I depart from modern
context is relatively restricted. In two instances όυδε γάρ introduces statements about Zeus (1.24–6; 1.801–4):15

15. The other two instances, vv. 334 and 803, will be discussed below.


17. Aside from v. 25 and v. 804, there references are oblique (1, 11, 15, 285, 1387) or in prayer (285, 337, 341, 373, 341, 373, 731, 757, 851, 894, 1045, 1120). Only v. 157 (Zeύς γάρ τοι τό τάλαντον ἐπιρρέπει ἄλλη ἄλλων) complicates this.

18. There has never been nor will there ever be a man who will please everyone before he goes down to Hades. For not even he who is lord of mortals and immortals, Zeus the son of Cronus, can please all men. (trans. D. E. Gerber)

Initially, then, it might seem that the Theognidea is using the όυδε γάρ discourse marker especially to describe events or actions within the divine sphere.16 And, while one might object that this is just two instances of the discourse marker among some 17 references to Zeus, almost all other cases are distinct in the reference to Zeus being indirect or his being the addressee in a prayer.17 I shall discuss the other Theognidean instances below, but, for now, it is worth noting how restricted this discourse marker seems in non-hexameter poetry, both in its occurrence and its markedness. Indeed, thus far there seems to be nothing subtle about either καὶ γάρ and όυδε γάρ in their application to mythological material. Their markedness is confirmed by the straightforward case of Alcaeus fr. 38a PLF,
and further supported by the overdetermined combination of καὶ γάρ, ποτα, and ἔφαντο in the New Sappho. If there is any subtlety to be sensed thus far in the use of καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ for the introduction of mythological paradeigmata in lyric, it must be in Bacchylides contrafactual use in the Meleager myth.\textsuperscript{18}

A.2 Καὶ ποτε, ποτε καὶ, and the particularizing καὶ

We may wonder that we did not notice the use of καὶ ποτε as a discourse marker in the context of Archaic hexameters in Part One. The fact is that it is not at all common, especially of the past.\textsuperscript{19} The most interesting case occurs in a speech of Heracles in the Odyssean Nekyia, in which Heracles tells Odysseus of the many ills he suffered at the hands of Eurystheus (11.620–6):

\begin{verbatim}
Ζηνὸς ἐν πάϊς ἦα Κρονίος, αὐτὰρ ὀϊζὺν
eἶχον ἀπειρεσίην· μάλα γάρ πολὺ ἵπποι φωτὶ
δεδήμημιν, ὁ δὲ μοι χαλεποὺς ἔπετέλετ᾿ ἀέθλους.
καὶ ποτὲ μ᾿ ἐνθάδ᾿ ἔπεσεν ζένους ἀέθλους· οὐ γάρ ἔτ᾿ ἄλλο
φράζετο τούδε γε μοι κρατερώτερον εἶναι ἀέθλουν.
τὸν μὲν ἐγὼν αὐτὲν εἶλαν καὶ ἕκασκιν ἐξ Ἀΐδαο
Ερμῆς δὲ μ᾿ ἐπεσεν ἁγνῷ ἀλαμβάνειν.
Εὐρυπίδης δὲν ἣν ἤγαγον ἐξ Ἀΐδαο·
Ἑρμῆς δὲ μ᾿ ἐπεσεν ἁγνῷ ἀλαμβάνειν.
I was the son of Zeus, son of Kronos, but I suffered woe beyond measure; for I was made subject to a man far worse than I, and he laid on me hard labors. Indeed once he sent me here to fetch the hound of Hades for he could devise for me no other task harder than this. The hound I carried off and led out from the house of Hades; and Hermes was my guide, and flashing-eyed Athene. (trans. mod. from Murray-Dimock)
\end{verbatim}

\footnote{18. Jebb (1905) notes the possibility of καὶ γάρ ποτε at Bacch. 5.56. I have consulted Kenyon’s facsimile of the papyrus (Kenyon 1897), and it is not out of the question but far from certain. Maehler (2004) prints τ[ὸν γάρ π]οτε reporting “a tiny trace of the crossbar of τ…visible at the beginning of the line” (ad loc.).}

\footnote{19. The only other relevant example of καὶ ποτε in hexameter poetry (excepting uses with future tenses, or instances of ποτὲ καὶ) is h.Ap. 305, on which see below.}

\footnote{20. My translation is modified from the Loeb translation of Murray-Dimock. Where that translation renders καὶ ποτὲ μ᾿ ἐνθάδ᾿ ἐπεσεν ζένους ἀέθλους as “Once he sent me even here to fetch the hound of Hades…), I have translated that καὶ ποτὲ as “Indeed once” to differentiate it from my “you know” for καὶ γάρ, but in English there is the danger of there being little discernible difference. The important point is that both work on the interactional level of language.}
This is, of course, not a *paradeigma*. Instead, Heracles is here simply giving a narrative illustrative of those hard labors he mentioned, giving a specific example of his more general, previous statement. In that respect, we may say that Heracles is using the καὶ in its *particularizing* sense, here combined with ποτέ. But this particularizing usage with ποτέ is anomalous in hexameter: elsewhere the καὶ ποτέ syntagm is combined, not with a past-tense verb, but a future-tense verb.

Yet that is not to discount the possibility, in lyric poetry, of the particularizing usage of the syntagm being employed for particularization in the sense that a myth may provide a *particular* illustration of, say, a gnomic statement. Such particularization may well be the case in Alcman fr. 80 PMG, which describes Circe’s anointing the ears of Odysseus’ companions:

καὶ ποτὲ Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος ὥστ’ ἔταίρων
Κήρα ἐπαλείψασα,

Indeed once Circe anointed the ears of the companions of patient-minded Odysseus…

Öhler suggests we might consider this fragment part of a *paradeigma* on the grounds that it begins with καὶ ποτὲ, but it is at first difficult to imagine a situation and an audience for which this mythological illustration could have been appropriately applied. Our only aid to interpretation is the fact that this fragment survives to us in a scholion to *Iliad*.

---

21. Note that this is not the case in this passage from the *h.Ap.* (305–9):

καὶ ποτὲ δεξαμένη χρυσοθρόνου ἔτρεψεν Ἡρῆς
deινὸν τ’ ἀργαλέον τε Τυφάονα πῆμα βροτοῖσιν,
ἐν ποτὲ ἂρ’ Ἡρη ἔτικτεν χολωσαμένη Διὶ πατρὶ
ἡνίκ’ ἀρα Κρονίδης ἐρικυδέα γείνατ’ Ἀθήνην
ἐν κορυφῇ: ὡ δ’ αἵμα χολώσατο πότνια Ἡρη

Yet notice the genealogical register. On its combination with πῆμα βροτοῖσιν, cp. *Od.* 12.125 (μητέρα τῆς Σκύλλης, ὃ μην τεκέ πῆμα βροτοῖσιν) and *Th.* 223 (τίκτε δὲ καὶ Νέμεισιν πῆμα βηντοῖσι βροτοῖσι).

22. E.g., *Il.* 1.213, 6.459, 6.479, 7.87; *Od.* 8.461. For ποτὲ καὶ, cf. *Il.* 19.315 (ἠ πά νῦ μοί ποτὲ καὶ σὺ; Achilles of Patroclus), but it, too, is more commonly used of the future (e.g., *Il.* 24.705, *Od.* 19.81).

16.236, within Achilles’ prayer to Dodonian Zeus for Patroclus’ glory and safety: ἡμέν δὴ ποτ’ ἐμὸν ἐπος ἐκλυσ εὐξαμένοιο (“Once before I called on you and you listened…”). The prayer is not a compelling comparandum, but it may also be hasty to put too much emphasis on its being a ‘formular’ discourse marker for past narrative.

We shall find that καὶ ποτὲ occurs a number of times in Pindaric poetry, but so too does ποτὲ καὶ. It is probably much more appropriate, then, to place the emphasis on the καὶ and its particularizing effect than on a fixed formula of καὶ ποτὲ. This is certainly what is suggested by the use of ἐπεὶ ποτὲ καὶ in the Theognidea (vv. 1341–50),

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{αἰαῖ, παιδὸς ἔρω ἀπαλόχροος, ὃς με φίλοισιν} & \quad \text{πάοι μάλ’ ἐκφαίνει κού ἐθέλοντος ἐμοῦ.} \\
\text{τλῆσμαι οὐ κρύπτῃς ἀκούσαι(α) πολλὰ βίαια·} & \quad \text{oύ γὰρ ἐπ’ αἰκελίωι παιδὶ δάµεος ἐκφαίνεται.} \\
\text{παιδοφιλεῖν δὲ τερπνόν} & \quad \text{καί ποτὲ καὶ Γανυκέδους,} \\
\text{ἡμεῖς καὶ Κρονίδης, ἀθανάτων βασιλεύς,} & \quad \text{ἁρπάξας ἐς Ὄλυμπον ἀνήγαγε καί ἐνθεὶ.} \\
\text{ὀνόματι μὴ θαύμαξε. Σιμονίδη, οὔνεκα κάγῳ} & \quad \text{ἐξεδάμην καλὸν παιδὸς ἐρωτὶ δαμεῖς.} \\
\end{align*}
\]

24. If that context is a valid clue to this Alcmanic fragment’s placement in a prayer, the fragment could represent an inventive third-person paradeigma in what is conventionally an appeal to a past shared by a first-person addressor and second-person addressee, normally a deity. In that case—again, the only case suited to our scant evidence—the speaker would be praying that some god or goddess do something for her or him on the grounds that Circe once helped Odysseus and his men. A paradeigma, indeed, and one apparently using καὶ ποτὲ to interesting effect. Beyond the example of Il. 16, cf. Sappho’s prayer in fr. 1 V (5–8): ἀλλὰ τινὶ διδ’ ἐξῆς, αἰ ποτὰ κατέρωτα | τὰς ἔμας αὕ[δας ἀείσιν πῆλοι | ἐκ]λυεῖ, πάτρος δὲ δόμον λίποισα | χρύσιοιν ἤλθες (“But come here, if ever in the past you hear my requests from afar and heeded them, and left your father’s golden house to come…”); Chryseus in Il. 1 (39–40): …ἐὶ ποτὲ τοι χαρίευτ’ ἐπὶ νηὸν ἔρεως | ἡ ἐὶ δὴ ποτὲ τοι κατὰ πιόνα μηρὶ ἐκη… (“if it ever pleased you that I built a temple for you, if ever pleased you that burned fat thigh-bones”).

25. While not uncommon, it is as frequently used of non-past narrative, e.g. Il. 7.87–8: καὶ ποτὲ τις εἴπησι καὶ ωψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων | ἡπὶ πολυκλῆβιδι πλέων ἐπὶ οἰνοπά πόντον.

26. E.g., I. 8.65, Pae. 52d42.

27. Also known as Evenus 8c, because it is addressed to Simonides, rather than Cyrnus. Cf. Bowra 1934 with West 1974 (ad loc.).

28. This symbol, reproduced from W², indicates that West considers vv. 1345–1350 to be a separate ‘poem’ (cf. 1989: 173).
Alas, I am in love with a soft-skinned boy who shows me off to all my friends in spite of my unwillingness. I’ll put up with the exposure—there are many things that one is forced to do against one’s will—for it’s by no unworthy boy that I was shown to be captivated.

And there is some pleasure in loving a boy, since once in fact even the son of Cronus, king of the immortals, fell in love with Ganymede, seized him, carried him off to Olympus, and made him divine, keeping the lovely bloom of boyhood. So, don’t be astonished, Simonides, that I too have been revealed as captivated by love for a handsome boy.

(trans. C. A. Faraone)

The burden that might otherwise be borne by a more formulaic discourse marker is taken on by other features. First, the introductory phrase παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν (v. 1345) is of a gnomic type built on an expressed or understood predicating ἐστί. This is a type of expression that we shall come to discuss at great length in this chapter. Next, and more familiarly, there is ring-composition in the sense that at v. 1349 the speaker returns from the myth to the present with οὕτω and an imperative.29 The speaker’s imperative, μὴ θαύμαζε, does not make a very forceful request; its purpose is simply to ask Simonides not be astonished by what he hears. Significantly—and this is something to which we shall return, as well—there is a καί emphasizing the ἐγώ of the persona in v. 1349.30 Following οὕνεκα, however, the speaker is essentially adding himself to the possible paradeigmata.31

This use of καί is nothing new to Pindaric scholarship, where commentators have remarked on the ‘exemplifying’ or ‘particularizing’ καί.32 A similar typology to the Ganymede paradeigma in the Theognidea is clear in Bacchylides 3 (vv. 21–9),33


30. Edmunds (2009: 62) calls it an argumentum ex love, citing other loci from the Classical period. The best comparandum, however, may be Il. 19.95–133.

31. One might suggest that the τλήσομαι in v. 1343 is in keeping with a connection between τλα- and paradeigmata (on which see below, Part III: Syntax and suffering in Homeric poetry).

32. Most 1985: 140 on the ‘exemplifying’ καί in N. 7.7 and Race 1990: 89 (with 89n15 and 97n33) on the ‘particularizing’ καί.

33. For Croesus as quasi-mythological, or ‘mythologized’, paradeigma, see also Pind. P. 1 (p. 251 below).
A god, let someone glorify a god. For that is the best of good fortunes. Since once, you know, the leader of horse-taming Lydia, when Zeus had accomplished the destined issue and Sardis was captured by the Persian army, Apollo of the golden lyre-strap guarded Croesus.

where the particle string ἐπεὶ ποτε καὶ follows on the gnomic introduction ὁ γὰρ ἀριστὸς ὀλβῶν. It is this regularity, this embedding of the discourse particles in the larger syntactic environment, that justifies a more interactional ‘translation’ rather than an unmarked ‘even’, ‘too’, or ‘also (in the case of)’. This might seem even harder to argue, but consistent syntax and word order is compelling in other Theognidean examples, too:

Τοιάδε καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσεν ἔργα καὶ ὑβρίς, οἷα τὰ νῦν ἱερὴν τήδε πόλιν κατέχει. (Theogn. 603–4)

Such things, too, the Magnesians—destroyed them, the deeds and the hubris did, just such as those that now possess this holy city.

ὑβρίς καὶ Μάγνητας ἀπώλεσε καὶ Κολοφῶνα καὶ Σύμφυνος. πάντως, Κύρνα, καὶ ὕμνῳ ἀπολεῖ. (Theogn. 1103–4)

Hubris, too, the Magnesians—it destroyed them—and Colophon and Smyrna. By all means, Cyrmus, you all, too, will it destroy.

οἶνος καὶ Κένταυρον, ἀγακλυτὸν Εὐρυτίωνα, ἄσσ’ ἐνὶ μεγάρῳ μεγαθύμου Πειριθόοιο, (Od. 21.295–6)

Wine, too, the centaur, glorious Eurytion—it drove him mad in the hall of great-hearted Peirithoos…

The Theognidean examples are not properly mythological paradeigmata; they deal with recent history. But compare them to the last, Odyssean example just above, and which

34. Through synecphonesis, ἀγλαϊζέθω γὰρ represents ἀγλαϊζέθω· ὁ γάρ.
35. See discussion at p. 60 above.
shows the same compressed syntax of subject + καὶ + object. In all three cases the sense of these first three words is clear and the verb which follows is practically unnecessary. The particle means something like ‘too’ in every case, but the syntax seems to be conventional enough that the particle’s ‘meaning’ is driven by the similarly conventionalized discourse context. Notice, too, the way that, in the second example (vv. 1103–4), the poet returns to the present with the phrase καὶ ὕμμ’ ἀπολεῖ (v. 1104), which ought to remind us of the κἀγὼ in v. 1349 of the Theognidea. Thus, while there is a great deal of flexibility in the marking of paradeigmata, there are also emerging patterns. In sections to come, we shall have still more reason to focus on the conventional ways of tying together the past and present with καὶ as a discourse marker.  

A.3  Zitatformeln and contrafactuality

Öhler remarks that, contrary to Archaic Greek hexameter, there do not seem to be well developed types of paradeigmata in lyric and elegy of the same period. And, indeed, we have just seen how varied the discourse markers can be, and even how minimal. It would be wrong to conclude, however, that there are no conventionalized features in the articulation of paradeigmata in lyric. On the contrary, as Öhler also points out, the use of Zitatformeln, or ‘quotation formulae’, is the most prominent formal characteristic of many lyric paradeigmata. Their use in Archaic Greek lyric, excluding Pindar, is sketched in Table 8 (just below).

Table 8: Zitatformeln in Archaic Greek lyric

36. See especially the discussion of Ibycus S151 (pp. 226–231).
37. Öhler (70): “Fest ausgebildete Exemplatypen, wie im Epos, lassen sich in der Lyrik nicht aufzeigen, doch fällt der Gebrauch von Zitatformeln als eine formelle Eigenart mancher lyrischer Exempla auf” (‘Strongly developed types of exempla, as in epic, do not show up in lyric, yet the use of quotation formulae comes as a formal characteristic of many lyric exempla’).
38. Note that I differ from Öhler in not listing here Alcaeus fr. 349b, Sappho fr. 166 V, or Simonides fr. 74 (579) PMG. It is not at all clear to me that these are paradeigmata.
39. I exclude Alcaeus 349(b) (ὁ δ’ Ἀρεὶς φαῖτι κεν Ἀφαίστον ἀγνῷ βίαι; “Ares says that he could bring Hephaestus by force”), which Öhler includes. That Ares is speaking in the present makes it too different.
This frequency is, by Öhler’s reading, in stark contrast to paradeigmata found in hexameter, where he notes only one such Zitatformel of Heracles in Iliad 5, “wo die Berufung auf die Sage erklärbar ist” (“where the appeal to legend can be explained”; 70). Although this general discourse strategy dominates, it is remarkable that, outside of Pindar, not one of these Zitatformeln are articulated identically.

Let us look at just one example among these, Alcaeus fr. 42 V, which uses the unparalleled Zitatformel of ως λόγος. I select it in particular because I think it has been misunderstood—or at least under-understood—and because I would like to suggest that our attention to the discourse characteristics surrounding paradeigmata allows us to better appreciate a subtlety of the poem. If indeed these four Sapphic stanzas represent a complete poem, it begins immediately with the semi-formulaic ως λόγος:41

ως λόγος κάκων ἄξως ἑννεκ' ἐργών
Περράμωι καὶ πατός ἰ ποτ’, ἦλεν, ἦλθεν
ἐκ σέθεν πίκρων, π’ ὕρι δ’ ὠλεσε Ζεύς
Ἱλιον ἱραν.

40. Possibly the egg from which Castor and Pollux were born, but not clearly a paradeigma.
41. The series of couplets comprising this Zitatformel, roughly vv. 1283–94, is controversially demarcated and may represent a hybridization of poems. A fine, recent summary at Edmunds 2009: 62n28.
42. Not clearly a paradeigma.
43. Strictly speaking, this is an allegory and should be excluded. The closest Archaic analogue of ἦλθεν τις λόγος is Pind. N. 9.6 (ἔστι δέ τις λόγος), which introduces a gnomic statement. For λόγος τις, see Aesch. Suppl. 295 and Eum. 4, where each instance refers to mythological material.
44. Il. 5.638–42. Fair enough, but see n.173 on p. 102 above. Note also the ὃς-πότε syntagm.
45. As Page (1979: 279) notes, see Fraenkel (ad Aesch. Ag. 264) on the ellipsis of the verb.
As the story goes, because of evil deeds bitter grief came once to Priam and his sons from you, Helen, and Zeus destroyed holy Ilium with fire. Not such was the delicate maiden whom the noble son of Aiakos, inviting all the blessed gods to the wedding, married, taking her from the halls of Nereus to the home of Cheiron; he loosened the pure maiden’s girdle, and the love of Peleus and the best of Nereus’ daughters flourished; and within the year she bore a son, the finest of demigods, blessed driver of chestnut horses. But they perished for Helen’s sake—the Phrygians and their city.

Of the poem’s treatment of the Trojan War, Kirkwood notes that it “is not a profound thought,” but we might instead focus on his apt description of the poem as a “vivid, dramatic confrontation” (1974: 90). The profundity does not need to lie in the irony of Achilles’ own destructiveness, but in the speaker’s addressing Helen, *paradeigma par excellence*. In this sense, the poem should not be seen as a simple *synkrisis*, but rather in dialogue with the very tradition of exemplarity, creating a mythological *paradeigma* within a mythological *paradeigma*, applying the past not to the present but the past.46 This is further complicated, however, by the fact that Thetis and her marriage are hardly exemplary,

46. I therefore disagree with Edmunds (2009: 60) that this fragment represents a “*synkrisis* without an applications of the myths,” for the application is to Helen herself and the address to Helen is certain. Use of the term *synkrisis* of this fragment goes at least as far back as Ohler 1925: 72, but he does not speak of application. Edmunds does suggest that “the ‘open’ conclusion…may be owing to its place in a sympotic chain” (64). We cannot rule out this sort of effect in performance, but the discourse features that might point to this phenomenon do not seem to be at all well defined. *Theogn.* 1283–94, with its final τέλος δ’ ἐγνω καὶ μάλ’ ἀναινεμένη (“and finally she recognized it, though she refused”), is as close as I have seen to a final *epimythion* that clearly reaches out of the narrative section at the close of a mythological *paradeigma*. On the other hand, verses like *Carm. Pop.* 869 *PMG*, as well as wisdom discourse, require no such coda, as we shall see.
as Burnett points out.\textsuperscript{47} In this sense, the fragment seems to even point up the malleability of mythological material in paradigmatic application.

This may seem a peculiar, self-conscious stance toward mythological material but it is one we may see as part of a more general attitude. Recall again the story of Meleager in Bacchylides 5, in which Meleager begins his story concessively, supposing his father Oeneus had checked the anger of Artemis. But we need not even look further than Alcaeus for this phenomenon. Indeed, an excellent example of this very ‘lyric contrafactuality’ is evident in \textit{fr. S262 SLG}, in which the speaker advises killing those who perform unjust deeds, presumably before the group at large suffers the consequences. Such a course, we are told, would have been preferable in the case of Lokrian Ajax (1–11):\textsuperscript{48}

\begin{verbatim}
δρά\textsuperscript{ι}σ\textsuperscript{αντας α\textsuperscript{ι}α\textsuperscript{ι}χ\textsuperscript{υ}ν[νον]}[τα τα μ\textsuperscript{η}νδικα, ...
\textit{Η μ\textsuperscript{α}ν κ’ Α\textsuperscript{χ}αι\textsuperscript{i}οις ὑς π\textsuperscript{ό}λυ β\textsuperscript{ε}λτερον}
a\textit{ί τον θεοβλ\textsuperscript{λ}άμμ\textsuperscript{ε}τα κατ\textsuperscript{έ}κτανον·}
ο\textit{ύτω κε π\textsuperscript{α}ρ\textsuperscript{π\textsuperscript{l}}\textsuperscript{λ\textsuperscript{ι}}\textsuperscript{ντες Α\textsuperscript{ϊ}γ\textsuperscript{α}ις}
\textit{β\textsuperscript{α\textsuperscript{ι\textsuperscript{τ\textsuperscript{έ}\textsuperscript{ρα}}\textsuperscript{ι}}\textsuperscript{ς} ἔ\textsuperscript{τ\textsuperscript{υ\textsuperscript{χ}}\textsuperscript{ο}}\textsuperscript{νθ\textsuperscript{ι}ς βαλάς\textsuperscript{σ\textsuperscript{ας}}·}
\textit{ἀλλ’ ἀ \textsuperscript{μ\textsuperscript{εν} \textit{ἐν να\textsuperscript{υ\textsuperscript{ωι Πριά\textsuperscript{μω πα\textsuperscript{ις}}
\textit{Ἀ\textsuperscript{γ}αλμ’}’ <Λθ>\textsuperscript{αν\textsuperscript{άς} πο\textsuperscript{λ\textsuperscript{λ\textsuperscript{ά\textsuperscript{δ\textsuperscript{ο}}}\textsuperscript{ος}}
\textit{ἀ\textsuperscript{μ\textsuperscript{π\textsuperscript{ή\textsuperscript{x}}}}’} \textsuperscript{επ\textsuperscript{α\textsuperscript{ππ\textsuperscript{έ}να γε\textsuperscript{ν\textsuperscript{ή\textsuperscript{ω}}}
δυμα\textsuperscript{β\textsuperscript{ε}νες δε πο\textsuperscript{λ\textsuperscript{i}}ν \textsuperscript{ἐ\textsuperscript{π\textsuperscript{π\textsuperscript{π\textsuperscript{ου}}}}}
... disgracing those who performed unjust deeds, and we must put (a noose?) on their
necks and (kill them?) by stoning. (Truly) it would have been far better for the Achaeans
if they had killed the man who did violence to the gods; then as they sailed past Aegae
they would have found the sea (more gentle); but in the temple the daughter of Priam was
embracing the statue of Athena, generous giver of booty, clasping its chin, while the ene-
my assailed the city … (trans. D. A. Campbell)
\end{verbatim}

The comparison of this manner of transition to ‘contrafactuality’ in a mythological \textit{p\textsuperscript{a\textsuperscript{r\textsuperscript{a\textsuperscript{d\textsuperscript{\v{e}}}\textsuperscript{γ\textsuperscript{a}}}\textsuperscript{m\textsuperscript{a}}} with the sort of ‘critical distance’ presented in Stesichorus’ ‘Helen palinode’
\textit{(fr. 92 PMG)} is inevitable. Yet I think that, in combination with our other observations

\textsuperscript{47}. Burnett 1983: 190–198.

\textsuperscript{48}. The text is far from certain, obviously. Regarding v. 4, the sense of the latter half of the verse is unavoidably “it would have been better for the Achaeans.” Of the first half, I print Kassel’s "\textit{Η μ\textsuperscript{α}ν κ’}" here (adopted in Merkelbach 1967 and D. A. Campbell) but note also Treu’s και γ\textsuperscript{άρ κ’} and Page’s και κ’ ὡς (reported in \textit{SLG}, which prints ‘…….’).
thus far, we may start to better see this ‘critical distance’ within the contours of the lyric
paradeigma. The Zitatformel, or ‘quotation formula’, may then be less of a ‘secondary
appeal’ to epic traditions—especially the Trojan War tradition in these cases—and better
seen as part of a ‘distancing’ or ‘declaration of independence’ from those traditions.

If mythological material is ‘up for grabs’ in these genres, then I suggest that the
use of discourse markers associated with them are another way in which we can observe
this being played out. We have seen in the case of Alcaeus fr. 38A PLF that lyric poets
were well aware of the discourse characteristics traditionally associated with mythologi-
cal paradeigmata. Yet we have also just seen in Alcaeus great variation—even great
artistry, perhaps—in their presentation. If Alcaeus demonstrates familiarity with the con-
ventions, then it is all the more pointed when the poet strays from them. Looking ahead,
let us instead consider the possibility that discourse markers such as καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ
γάρ were never solely a means to introduce mythological paradeigmata per se, but rather
to authority. We shall, in time, see that personae of Archaic Greek lyric are sufficiently
concerned with the appeal to, and creation of, authority that they tend to reserve such dis-
course markers for their own, specialized purposes.49

A.4 Καὶ γάρ, γάρ, and discourse units

Many of the shorter fragments above are presented in exactly the form in which
they are quoted in later authors. That is, Simonides fr. 523 PMG appears just as it did in
Stobaeus, and the two verses of Alcman fr. 80 PMG are just as they appear in the Homer-
ic scholion (Σ II. 16.236 T). As we discussed in Part One,50 this is, in part, a testament to
the discourse marker’s ability to form coherent discourse units. We have also seen that,
while a paradeigma tends to follow an imperatival statement in Homeric poetry, it will
very often follow a gnomic statement constructed with ἔστι, whether present or implicit.
In this section, I would like to look at how these units introduced by καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ

49. See Thomas 2000: 168–212 on this rhetorical strategy in Herodotus.
50. See esp. n.13 on p. 52 above.
γάρ fit into larger contexts within lyric, into the larger structure of discourse strategies—especially as compared to other discourse markers. Most importantly, however, we shall begin to investigate this phenomenon within wisdom discourse dated to the Archaic Period, looking not just at the discourse particles themselves, but how they structure syntax within short stretches of discourse.

In his *Moralia* of the first or second century CE, Plutarch recounts the dinner-table conversation of the Seven Sages, along with several other guests, at a symposium thrown by Periander.⁵¹ At one point in the evening the guests are speaking of household management and simplicity of life, when Plutarch’s Thales jokingly remarks that Epimenides showed good sense in not wishing to take the trouble of grinding his grain and cooking for himself, as was Pittacus’ way. The natural philosopher then recites three verses that he had overheard his hostess on Lesbos singing while she worked at the mill. The first comprises imperatives; the next two tell of Pittacus (157e3–5 = 869 PMG):⁵²

\[
\text{ἄλει, μύλα, ἄλει·} \\
\text{kαι γάρ Πιττακός ἄλει} \\
\text{μεγάλας Μυτιλάνας βασιλεύων.}
\]

Grind, mill, grind! You know, Pittacus used to grind (or, ‘grinds’), and he was (or, ‘is’) ruler of great Mytilene.⁵³

---

⁵¹ Plut. *Mor.* 146–64, for which the title Συμπόσιον τῶν ἑπτὰ σοφῶν derives from the ‘Catalogue of Lamprias’. Plato’s *Prt.* (343a–b) similarly mentions such a meeting of the Seven Sages at Delphi, where they “dedicated the first-fruits of their wisdom to Apollo by inscription” (ἄπαρχήν τὴς σοφίας ἀνέθεσαν τῷ Ἀπόλλωνι … γράψαντες, 343b). For Plutarch, the Seven includes Thales, Bias, Pittacus, Solon, Chilon, Cleobulus, and Anacharsis. Plato differs from Plutarch in his inclusion of Myson of Chenae rather than Anacharsis; on the canonicity of the Seven Sages, see Martin 1993b.

⁵² The three verses are often collected as *Carmina Popularia* (869 PMG [marg.] = 43 B. = 30 D. = 436 L-P). On these verses, cf. Aelian (2–3 c. CE) *VIH* 7.4: ‘Ὅτι Πιττακός πάνυ σφόδρα ἐπήμενε τὴν μύλην, τὸ ἐγκώμιον αὐτῆς ἐκεῖνο ἐπιλέγον, ὅτι ἐν μικρῷ τόπῳ διαφόρως ἔστι γυμνάσσομαι. ἤν δὲ τὶ φασίν ἐπιμύλον οὕτω καλοῦμεν. (“N.B. Pittacus praised the millstone exceedingly; on top of his encomium to it he added that it is exceptionally good for exercising in a small space. And there was a so-called ‘millstone song’.’”)

⁵³ Or “grinds,” for the ἄλει of the second verse could be either a present or an unaugmented imperfect, making the *paradeigma* timeless in the sense that it could be sung with equal aptness whether Pittacus still lived or whether the song was sung generations later—the only constraint
Presumably, as Eduard Fraenkel imagines, to these Aeolic choriambos “the women of Lesbos, while grinding corn, regulated the rhythm of their movements, and at the same time comforted themselves, by singing of the great ruler who was once engaged in the same dreary work” (Fraenkel 1957: 186). This may well be the case, but more interesting is this comment: “The root of this thought-pattern lay presumably in homely folk-songs … Songs of a similar type, referring to famous precedents (καί γάρ …) were probably at least as old as the Homeric age” (Fraenkel 1957: 186). We do not have sufficient evidence to support Fraenkel’s suggestion about “homely folk-songs,” but we can at least broaden our view of this thought-pattern in Archaic Greek discourse. This popular song, after all, reveals more than just the importance of the particle string καί γάρ to this speech genre; it also reveals a fundamental structure within and between the units of discourse. Note further that there are only two such units, that the performance does not require a third unit that returns to the present.

In order better to understand the syntax and to create a constellation of discourse features, let us turn to another passage from Plutarch’s *Moralia*, still at dinner with the Seven Sages. Neiloxenus has brought to Bias a letter from the Egyptian king Amasis. His letter describes a contest of wisdom (σοφίας ἄμιλλαν) between Amasis and the king of Ethiopia. Among other requests, Amasis’ letter asks for an evaluation of the Ethiopian’s attempt to name the oldest thing, the most beautiful, the greatest, the wisest, and the like. It is Thales who offers to Amasis responses to these questions, and he articulates each of his responses thus (153c11–d15):54

(1) Τί πρεσβύτατον; θεός· (ἐφη Θαλῆς) ἀγέννητον γάρ ἐστι. (2) Τί μέγιστον; τόπος· τάλλα μὲν γάρ ὁ κόσμος, τὸν δὲ κόσμον οὗτος περιέχει. (3) Τί κάλλιστον; κόσμος· πάν γάρ τὸ κατὰ τάξιν τούτον μέρος ἐστι. (4) Τί σοφότατον; χρόνος· τὰ μὲν γάρ εὕρισκεν οὗτος ἡδή, τὰ δὲ εὕρησει. (5) Τί κοινότατον; ἔλπις· καὶ γάρ οἰς ἄλλο μηθέν, αὕτη πάρεστι. (6) Τί ωφέλιμότατον; ἀρετή· καὶ γάρ τάλλα τῷ χρῆσθαι καλῶς ὡφέλιμα ποιεῖ. (7) Τί βλαβερώτατον; κακία· καὶ γάρ τὰ πλείστα βλάπτει.

would be the vowel quantity within the meter.

54. Thales famously seems to have left behind no writings of his own, but note that we are dealing with *Plutarch’s* Thales in both the present passage and 869 PMG above. If Plutarch is innovating in either case, he seems to be doing so in a consistent, coherent style.
(1) What is the oldest thing? A god. For it, said Thales, is unbegotten. (2) What is the greatest thing? Space. For everything else is the universe, but space surrounds the universe. (3) What is the most beautiful? The universe, for everything is part of it according to an order. (4) What is the wisest thing? Time. For some things time has already discovered, and others it will discover. (5) What is the most common? Hope. You know, for those who have nothing else, this remains. (6) What is the most useful? Virtue. You know, it makes everything else useful for the one who uses it well. (7) What is the most harmful thing? Cowardice. You know, it harms the most things by its presence. (8) What is the strongest thing? Necessity. For it alone is unconquerable. (9) What is the easiest thing? The natural thing, since people often take leave according to their pleasure.

What is especially helpful in this passage is the fact that καὶ γὰρ is not used in all instances of Thales’ illustration. This is important, for it allows us better to perceive the discourse context in which καὶ γὰρ may be deemed appropriate. And, indeed, we observe essentially four syntactic typologies in the way in which Thales illustrates his responses: in (1), (3), and (8), Thales justifies his answer with an explanation of the form γὰρ + predicating ἐστί (in [8] sc. ἐστί); in responses (2) and (4) Thales expands with a contrastive use of μὲν γὰρ ... δέ coupled with finite action verb(s); in (5), (6), and (7) Thales illustrates his response with καὶ γὰρ and a finite action verb;55 in (9) Thales explains with a combination of ἐπεὶ with a finite action verb (9). Most significant is the fact that, while γὰρ seems appropriate for simple predicating responses, Plutarch’s Thales uses καὶ γὰρ when illustrating his answer with brief narratives.56

This fact does not disprove that folk-songs are responsible for this discourse strategy but it does suggest two things. First, it opens the possibility that the syntax could just as well belong to a more general category of wisdom or authoritative discourse, rather than folk-song. Second, it confirms the markedness of καὶ γὰρ not just in the discourse context of its usage, but also in its syntactic environment. In contrast, the bare particle γὰρ is either unmarked, or deemed suitable only for the introduction of simpler statements. We shall return to the Seven Sages below.

55. Note πάρεστι is not predicating, as are the instances of ἐστί.
56. While (2) and (4) could also be described as brief narratives, the μὲν γὰρ ... δέ trumps.
A.5  Γάρ, particularly that in Sappho fr. 16 V

The need to understand καὶ γάρ with respect to γάρ is naturally important for a comparative understanding of γάρ’s introduction of mythological material in Pindar’s *epinikia,* but most urgent is its use in Sappho’s so-called Helen *paradeigma* of fr. 16 V. In this case, after all, Sappho focuses on her ability to explain the proposition that the most beautiful thing is that which one loves (vv. 1–8):

ο]ι μὲν ἵππις οὐ στρότον οἱ δὲ πέοδων
οὶ δὲ νάων φαῖσθ’ ἐπ’[ι] γὰν μέλαι[ν]
ἐ]μενει κάλλιστον, ἔγω δὲ κην’ ὀτ’
τω τις ἔραται:

πά]γχη δ’ εὐμαρεὶ σύνετον πόησαι
πάντι τ[ο]ὔτ’, α γάρ πόλυ περικέθοισα
κάλλος [ἀνθ]ρώπων Ἐλένα [τὸ]ν ἀνδρά
τὸν [    ],στον

Some say a host of cavalry, others of infantry, and others of ships, is the most beautiful thing on the black earth, but I say it is whatsoever a person loves. It is perfectly easy to make this understood by everyone: for she who far surpassed mankind in beauty, Helen, [left] her most beautiful husband… (trans. D. A. Campbell)

For all our emphasis on καὶ γάρ, it seems we must be able to explain what makes the α γάρ in v. 6 the appropriate way to transition to what seems to be a mythological *paradeigma.*

In order to understand Sappho 16 V and its constellation of discourse characteristics, it is important to see γάρ against the backdrop of convention. One way of understanding the difference between καὶ γάρ and γάρ might be that καὶ γάρ places more emphasis on the *interactive* level of language. Greek word order itself requires that this be the case, since καὶ γάρ is here always sentence-initial, but the post-positive γάρ must follow another word, which word is naturally the topic. In contrast, then, the use of γάρ is by nature less obtrusive: introducing a discourse unit with τὸ γάρ or α γάρ topicalizes the new referent as the subject of the explanation, while the discourse marker καὶ γάρ stresses interaction with its audience; we might even say that the very *interaction* is what is topicalized in the case of καὶ γάρ. The many cases in which καὶ γάρ follows an imper-

---

57. See n. 1 on p. 231 below.
ative add further support to this claim, and an apparent confirmation of this is the ease with which other particles or conventional devices can be added to καί γάρ: note the New Sappho’s καί γάρ πτ[ω]ντα ... ἔφαντο (v. 9) and Agamemnon’s καί γάρ δὴ νῦν ποτε (ll. 19.95).\(^\text{58}\)

To make a study of γάρ tractable, I suggest that we limit ourselves to instances of γάρ introducing a new referent as discourse topic and grammatical subject, such as the ἀ γάρ in fr. 16 V.\(^\text{59}\) Nor is this an arbitrary delineation, but rather one that seems operative in both Sappho and Alcaeus.\(^\text{60}\) Take, for example, the way in which Alcaeus begins his threshing song in fr. 347A PLF:

```
τέγγε πλεύμονας οἶνωι, τὸ γὰρ ἄστρον περιτέλλεται,
ἀ δὴ ὦρα χαλέπα, πάντα δὲ δίσαιού ὑπὰ καύματος,
ἀχεὶ δὲ ἐκ πετάλων ἀδεία τέττιξ ... ἀνθεὶ δὲ ἕκλυμος, νῦν δὲ γύναικες μιαρώταται
λέπτοι δὲ ἀνδρεῖς, ἐπεὶ ( ) κεφάλαν καὶ γόνα Σείριος οἴνωι
```

Wet your lungs with wine: the star is coming round, the season is harsh, everything is thirsty under the heat, the cicada sings sweetly from the leaves ... the artichoke is in flower; now are women most pestilent, but men are feeble, since Sirius parches their heads and knees ... So, too, Athenaeus records as belonging to Alcaeus the verse πώνωμεν, τὸ γὰρ ἄστρον περιτέλλεται (“Let us drink: the star is coming round”), which differs only in the imperative that introduces it.\(^\text{61}\) Though it has long been suggested that this passage is an adapta-
tion of *Works and Days* 582–96, we might also recognize this threshing song as equivalent in spirit to the Lesbian grinding song of fr. 869 PMG. Yet there are a few distinctions we may draw. First, the situation described following the imperative is ongoing, and described in the present tense; the case of Pittacus in fr. 869 PMG is unclear, but at least survived to a period when the imperfect was appropriate. Second, τὸ γὰρ ἀστρον περιτέλλεται is but the starting point of an explanation that returns to Sirius (v. 5) but goes well beyond the dog-star in its scene-setting. Might we already make some initial suggestion as to the different modes of interaction signified by καὶ γὰρ and τὸ γὰρ based on these two ‘folk-songs’? On the one hand, καὶ γὰρ introduces an illustration from the past (probably, but possibly originally the present), while τὸ γὰρ presents a situation in the present. As importantly, however, καὶ γὰρ is used to introduce an image of Pittacus at the mill, while τὸ γὰρ introduces a scene of summer shade, singing cicadas, flowering artichokes, and lusty women. In the case of the summer shade scene-setting, the speaker is as unobtrusive as possible. That is, the interactive level of communication is less important than the scene of the summer shade.

Before we evaluate this conclusion in a return to Sappho fr. 16 V, let us see whether it is borne out in the rest of the Sapphic fragments. Sappho fr. 98a V presents a case remarkable for its apparent combination with a *Zitatformel*. In this fragment the per-

---

62. It has been assumed that Alcaeus is remodeling the Hesiodic verses (e.g., Page 1979: 303–306; West *ad WD* 582; Kassel 1981) but see Nagy 1990b: 462–463 (on meter) and Petropoulos 1994: 79–82 (on the underlying folk tradition).

63. One might make the same argument about Alc. fr. 346 V, where the story about wine that is to justify their drinking it does not map onto the present: Dionysus gave wine to mortals; Alcaeus commands his friends to drink it. Accordingly, the story of the gift begins (vv. 3–4): οἶνον γὰρ Σεμέλας καὶ Δίος γίνει λαθικάδεον | ἀνθρώπωσιν ἔδωκ’ (“For the son of Zeus and Semele gave care-banishing wine to men”).

64. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1913: 2–63 does not view the scene so favorably, contrasting Alcaeus’ emphasis on thirst with what Sappho would have sensed instead.
*sona loquens* is doubtless reporting the speech of her mother, who spoke of her own youth and the fashion then:

\[
\text{θος} \cdot \alpha \gammaαρ με γεννα[τ’ ἔφα ποτά} \\
\sigma\phiασ επ’ ἀλικίας μεγ[αν} \\
κ’όσμον α’ τις ἕχη(ω) φόβα[ν} \\
\text{πορφυρωι κατελιξαμε[ν} \\
\text{ἔμμεναι μάλα τούτο} [. \\
\text{άλλα} ξανθοτέρα(ως) ἕχη[} \\
\text{τα(ω)ς κόμα(ως) δάίδος προ[} \\
\text{σ]τεφάνοισιν ἐπαρτια[} \\
\text{ἀνθέων ἔριθαλέων} [ \\
\text{μ]τράναν δ’ ἀρτίως κλ[} \\
\text{ποικίλαν ἀπ’ Σαρδίω[ν} \\
\text{...}.αινιασπολεις [}
\]

… for my mother (once said that) in her youth, if someone had her locks bound in a purple (headband), that was indeed a great adornment; but for the girl who has hair that is yellower than a torch (it is better to decorate it) with wreaths of flowers in bloom. Recently … a decorated headband from Sardis … (Ionian?) cities. (trans. D. A. Campbell)

Whatever precedes it, the temporal location of this stretch of discourse is made more clear by the return to the present in v. 10: μ]τράναν δ’ ἀρτίως. This recollection—this quasi-para-deigma, perhaps—of girls’ past fashion is even framed by a Zitatformel, but we must return to the fact that the discourse unit does not begin with a syntax that focuses on the interaction but rather the topic, her mother and her own recollection. And indeed, the mother’s recollection, not the mother’s recollecting, is the backdrop set for the headband that seems to have recently arrived from Sardis. As in the τὸ γὰρ ἀστρον of Alcaeus fr. 347A PLF, this ἀγάρ in this case is but one step in a longer explanation.

This distinction is especially important to a full understanding of the conventions in Sappho fr. 16 V. Again, following the priamel of vv. 1–4, the *persona loquens* draws attention to the ability to prove the summary proposition that κάλλιστον … κῆν’ ὀττω

---

65. The syntax of σ]φας (v. 2; on which Vogliano 1943) and έμμεναι (v. 5) makes it clear we need a verb of speaking. I print Vogliano’s [τ’ ἔφα ποτά. It is not clear to me how it comes that Page (1979: 99) reports [τ’ ἔφα ποτά as being from Snell’s ed. pr.

τις ἔραται (vv. 3–4). The speaker then tersely sketches Helen’s abandonment of Menelaos for Paris in Troy (vv. 5–22):

πάγχυ δ’ εὕμαρες σύνετον πόησαι 5
πάντι τὸ[ο]ύτ’, ἀ γάρ πόλυ περισκέπθοισα
κάλλος [ἀνθ]ρώπως Ἐλένα [τὸ]ν ἄνδρα
τὸν [ ἄρ]ιστον 10
κάλλ[ίποις] σ’ ἔβα’ ৎ Τρόιαν πλεο[σα]
πά[μπαν] ἐμνάσθη, ἄλλα παράγαγ’ ἀύταν
[ ]
[ ]σαν
[ ]αμπτον γάρ [ 15
[ ]..κούφως τ[ ]οη[.].]ν
 ..με νῦν Ἀνακτορίας[ς] ἀνείμηνι-
’ ο’ οὐ ] παρεοίσας,
[ ] τάξ (κέ) βολλοίμαν ἔρατόν τε βάμα 20
κάμαρχυμα λάμπρον ἰδην προσώπω
’ ἡ τὰ Λύδων ἀρματα κάν ὁπλοίοι
πεδομ[άχειντας].
[ ]
[ ]..με ν ὡδόκων γένεοθαί
[ ]..ν ἀνθρωπ[. . (.)] πεδέχην δ’ ἀραθθαί

It is perfectly easy to make this understood by everyone: for she who far surpassed mankind in beauty, Helen, left her most beautiful husband and went sailing off to Troy with no thought at all for her child or dear parents, but (love) led her astray … lightly … (and she?) has reminded me now of Anactoria who is not here; I would rather see her lovely walk and the bright sparkle of her face than the Lydians’ chariots and armed infantry … impossible to happen … mankind … but to pray to share … (trans. D. A. Campbell)

In the fourth strophe a νῦν (v. 15) ensures that we have returned to the present, and it all looks very much like a conventional paradeigma. Yet, if we are right to suppose that καὶ γάρ stresses interaction, it seems contradictory that we here find ἀ γάρ after a statement that even draws attention to the very process of making a proposition understandable.

How are we to square this? One explanation might be that the speaker’s statement πάγχυ δ’ εὕμαρες σύνετον πόησαι πάντι τοῦτο (vv. 5–6) already performs the sort of ‘work’ that the more interactive καὶ γάρ would normally perform. But it is also worth

---

67. The text is that of Voigt. Note that, although many arguments are based on interpretations of the first 5 four-line stanzas (cf. Burnett 1983: 279n1 with references), a coronis appears in the second column after a full 32 lines. (Cf. Howie 1977, with a recent overview at Bierl 2003: 121n112.) Most recently, see the remarks of Hutchinson (ad 32; pp. 167–8).
noting that the real proof of the proposition, the real paradeigma, is not Helen, so it is with good reason that the persona loquens does not here introduce Helen with a marker like καὶ γάρ. 68

Like Sirius in Alcaeus fr. 347a PLF or the speaker’s mother in Sappho fr. 98a, Helen’s story is but a step in the argumentation, an incomplete explanation in itself. 69 She is, indeed, described as the (πόλυ περσκέθοισα κάλλος [ἀνθ]ρώπων; vv. 6–7), but this is an abstract, objective beauty, not at all in keeping with the relativistic definition of ὅττω τίς ἔραται. Furthermore, we are barred from the perspective of Menelaos, who is not even named. Nor is Paris, who may be Helen’s κάλλιστον ὅττω τίς ἔραται, but is not even mentioned. This narrative, then, leaves us with only Helen, and, while Helen may be κάλλιστον, her action in the sparse narrative does not allow one to fit her into the larger framework of the phrase κῆν’ ὅττω τίς ἔραται; she is neither τίς nor ὅττω. The irrelevance of the action in narrative—so important to the use of καὶ γάρ described just above—is underscored by the description of Helen as moving lightly (κούφως, v. 14), and it is this that seems to make the speaker recall Anactoria. Might we then call Anactoria the true paradeigma? Following the relative pronoun in v. 17, we learn that it is her lovely walk and gleaming face that the speaker pits against chariots and foot-soldiers. 70 Moreover, Anactoria herself does not properly belong to the speaker’s present, rather only the act of remembering does (ἄ]ν̣έ̣µαισ̣’, 15–16); Anactoria is explicitly not present (οὐ ] παρεοίσας, 16). But even Anactoria is essentially analogous to

68. The reference to Helen as a mythological paradeigma is pervasive, but perhaps incorrect. Helen is a mythological analogue for Anactoria—both are those leaving others behind—but neither is explicit ‘proof’ of the gnome. By omitting any mention of Paris and hardly mentioning Menelaos (whose situation is that of the speaker), the speaker curbs the audience’s conclusions. Most (1981: 15) writes: “There can thus be no question of even an implicit identification of Anactoria with Helen … nor of the slightest criticism of Helen…”

69. Cf. Hutchinson (ad 6–7): “the account is developed with a stress on the argument. The tone throughout is, from the perspective of the thought, rhetorical and emphatic. There is no narrative with extension in time: a single moment is dwelt on from various angles, with emotional as well as argumentative force. One may contrast the narrative in Alc. 298, and even in Alc. 283.”

Helen here, and the real proof of the speaker’s initial assertion is her own memory of personal experience, the feeling of looking on the elegance and radiance of Anactoria. In that sense, proof and authority lie not in mythological material, but rather the persona’s own past.

We shall develop this idea further below—not just in Sappho, but in the context of Archaic Greek discourse in general—but a final Sapphic example will make the distinction still more clear, for it features use of the pronoun with γάρ alongside καί γάρ. In fr. 22 V the persona loquens bids Abanthis to sing of Gongyla, and, in so doing, recalls for Abanthis how Gongyla’s dress had once excited her (9–19):

I bid you, Abanthis, to take [your lyre] and sing of Gongyla, while desire of her once again circles about you, lovely as you are. For her dress excited you when you saw it, and I rejoice. You know, once the holy Cyprian herself once blamed me for praying … this … I wish … (tr. D. A. Campbell, slightly modified)

Following on a command as it does, the speaker’s recollection of the dress might seem to serve the same function as a mythological paradeigma does following on an imperative

71. Cf. Stehle 2009: 120.
72. In this case I think Lobel’s καί με in v. 15 may be worth reconsidering, for the καί would particularize the speaker’s με. Cf. Hutchinson (ad loc.). One might even suggest a full stop at the end of v. 14, if the subject of ἀνεύμνεσο can be understood to be Helen.
73. The text is that of Voigt but for the full stop at the end v. 14, which is my own. The poem may begin at v. 9, as Lobel and Page note (PLF). With Voigt I print δή πο[τ’] ἐμειφ[να] ὃς ἄραιμα[ι] τοῦτο τῶ[β] ὅλλομα[ι]

in Homeric poetry. But the mention of the way the dress made Abanthis feel is hardly paradigmatic; it is just part of the explanation, as the shift of focus in the follow-up ἔγω δὲ χαίρω (v. 14) suggests. With that shift, the καὶ γάρ…ποτατ’ in v. 15 introduces a brief narrative describing the persona’s own past in which Aphrodite found fault with her. That is, it is not in the recollection of the dress that that persona loquens topicalizes the interactional level of the language; instead, the persona loquens reserves this discourse strategy for the discourse marker καὶ γάρ in v. 15, where the persona’s past is brought to bear and made authoritative.74 We have seen, in the other examples from Sappho and Alcaeus, great care in the manner of marking discourse units, and we see here now in Sappho fr. 22 V precisely what we saw in the case of fr. 16 V: the persona’s own past is the paradeigma.75 Over the next few sections we shall sketch in more detail this attention to discourse markers, especially the careful application of καὶ γάρ to the persona’s authoritative past.

B Discourse units and authority

In Part One we noted that our view of the particle string καὶ γάρ was consistent, or compatible, with the language of allegory.76 Yet we did not find so many examples of what we might call allegorical language; instead, we focused on the example of the Litai in Phoenix’ speech of Iliad 9. Yet, even within the many authoritative speeches of Homeric poetry, we noticed in Part One that the distribution of paradeigmata and the discourse features of that speech genre are distributed among some of the more ‘authoritative’ speakers: Agamemnon, Phoenix, and especially Achilles. As we have started to see in non-hexameter discourse, too, there seems to be some link between the use of discourse markers and sounding authoritative. Authority took many forms in Archaic Greece, so we

74. Stehle (2009: 122) comes to a similar conclusion about this fragment based on its use of ποτατ’, but is somewhat less convincing on fr. 96 V (pp. 122–4).
75. We shall return to this discourse strategy involving καὶ γάρ in lyric poetry below (pp. 212–222).
76. See pp. 40–42 above.
shall have to expand our view to include Archaic wisdom discourse such as Aesopic fables or the *apophthegmata* of the Seven Sages. Now, the textual traditions of Aesop and the Seven Sages do not make for confidence-inspiring comparison, but I do not think it coincidence that we also find that these discourses exhibit many of the discourse markers and formulaic syntax that we have seen in our studies of Archaic Greek poetry.

Indeed, that there might be some underlying syntactic typology is suggested by the consistency with which discrete discourse units are observable, are introduced by certain discourse particles, and follow on certain forms of syntax. In the example of *Carm. Pop.* 869 *PMG* discussed above,\(^ {77} \) we noticed that there are two units of discourse, the imperative (v. 1) and the action, or narrative, introduced by καὶ γάρ (vv. 2–3). Fraenkel, probably rightly, thought this fragment a good comparandum for mythological *paradeigma* introduced by καὶ γάρ. Yet modern commentators have come to expect, in contexts such as the New Sappho,\(^ {78} \) that such a two-unit chunk of discourse is followed by a third, which returns to the present via ring-composition. That these units are of consequence to our interpretation is confirmed by modern commentators’ need to justify the ‘openness’ of the New Sappho if we do not count *fr.* 58.23–6 as an ever-present post-*paradeigma* coda. It shows that an audience’s need for predictable discourse units is at least as great as its need for a summarizing one.

For me to state above that authority took on “many forms” in Archaic Greece betrays a modern bias, one which this section shall attempt to counter. To call Aesop a ‘fabulist’, for example, but Archilochus as ‘poet’ too greatly privileges the metrical (and, by implication, the ‘generic’) aspects of their compositions; indeed, we know Archilochus, like Hesiod, was ‘versed’ in the σάινος speech genre.\(^ {79} \) Likewise, to Solon we have attributed not just verse but also laws and *apophthegmata*. Indeed, if there is a designation that is appropriate to all these figures—Hesiod and Archilochus, Solon and Aesop—it is like-

\(^ {77} \) See p. 187 above
\(^ {78} \) See summary above, with Edmunds 2009 especially.
ly σοφός. That Plutarch depicts Aesop alongside more traditional ‘sages’ such as Thales in the *Convivium septem sapientium*, then, may be an apt representation of the level of distinction that is actually productive in the discourses of Archaic Greece. In this section, then, we shall consider the fables of Aesop and the *apophthegmata* of the Seven Sages alongside the verses of Archilochus, Sappho, Alcaeus, and Theognis. In each we shall study the underlying syntactic typologies of illustration, exemplarity, and mythologization.

**B.1 Aesop**

While we face at least as much trouble with Aesop’s textual tradition as we do with ‘texts’ of Thales, there are significant shared and salient discourse typologies represented in each. Moreover, however troubled the textual transmission, the *independence* of these traditions is a compelling reason to map out and analyze their shared discourse features. In the case of Thales’ represented speech we noted an essential difference between the use of γάρ and καὶ γάρ: in wisdom discourse γάρ tends to introduce statements asserting existence or an attribute with ἐστί, while καὶ γάρ tends to introduce ‘kernel narratives’ comprising action verbs. This is precisely what we see in two of the three versions of Fab. 143 (Hausrath), “The Hares and the Frogs.” Version III γ is the only version of the fable that reports speech directly, and in its two speeches it abides by the γάρ and καὶ γάρ distinction.

οἱ λαγωοὶ συναχθέντες ἔαυτοὺς εἶπον· ἀβίωτός ἐστιν ἡ ὃν ὁ βίος, καὶ γάρ ἀετοῖ τε καὶ κύνες τε καὶ ἄνδρες ὡς οὐδὲν πάντες καταπονοῦσιν ἡμᾶς. Βέλτιον ἐστὶν ἡμᾶς βίωσιν ἐν τῇ λίμνῃ καὶ πυγήσῃ. “ταῦτ’ οὖν εἰπόντες ἀπῆκεν ἐν λίμνῃ, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ ταῖς ὀχθαῖς τῆς λίμνης βάτραχοι τούτους ἠδόντες ἔρριψαν αὐτοὺς ἐν λίμνῃ ἐκ τοῦ φόβου. εἰς δὲ τις γέρων λαγωὸς ἐρή πρὸς τοὺς ἐτέρους· „στῆτε, φίλοι, καὶ μὴ ἔστω ἄποπνιζωμεν. εἰς γάρ καὶ ἄλλα ζώα, ως ὁπάτε, δειλότερα ἡμῶν.‟”

The hares, grieving together, said to themselves: “Our life is unlivable. You know, eagles and dogs and men all maltreat us as if we are nothing. It is better for us to throw our-

---

80. Interestingly, all of the linguistic features I have analyzed occur in the direct speech of the fables.

81. Of the versions of this fable in Hausrath, that which does not feature this syntax (v3) lacks direct speech altogether.
selves into the lake and to drown.” Having said this, then, they headed off to the lake. And frogs on the banks of the lake saw them and threw themselves into the lake out of fear. One of older hares said to the others: “Stop, my friends! Don’t drown yourselves! For there are other animals, as you see, more cowardly than we are!

In the first speech, an illustration introduced by καὶ γάρ follows a simple ἐστί-assertion and governs the finite action verb καταπονοῦσιν. Its third sentence draws a conclusion as to the best course of action with the phrase βέλτιόν ἐστιν. In contrast, within the second of the two speeches, we see the simple existential statement εἰσὶ γὰρ καὶ ἄλλα ζῶα...τελότερα ἐμῶν follow on the old hare’s imperatives. We also see this attested in a speech within the dodecasyllabic version of this fable, in which the three discourse units are both logically and syntactically equivalent.

With this discourse-level syntax in mind, let us reconsider an aspect of our study of the certain episodes in the Hesiodic Theogony. There we studied καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ at the level of speech, but did not fully consider the syntax it followed upon. Now we can now recognize the proclivity of καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ to follow on ἐστὶ, especially those with a gnomic character:

82. In this second speech, the position of καὶ—following γάρ and modifying ἄλλα—makes the attention to the discourse marking all the more clear.

83. Fab. 192 aliter Chambry (vv. 1–7):
Οἱ λαγωοὶ δὲ ἅπαντες συνελθόντες ἐβόων ταῦτα πρὸς ἄλληλους θρηνοῦντες:
«Ἅνα τὶ δεινὸν ἐστίν ἡμῶν ὁ βίος;
καὶ γάρ ἄετοὶ ἀνθρώποι τε καὶ κύνες ἅπαντες ἡμᾶς πειρῶνται καταθύσαι.
Βέλτιον οὖν ἢν ἑαυτοὺς βανατώσαι καὶ μὴ κακίστως ζῆν οὐτως ἐν <τῷ> φόβῳ.»

84. In the first case, Th. 414–18, gnomic may not be the best term, but a statement regarding divine attributes seems equally apt. I suggest we can see the same phenomenon in Anacreon fr. 395 PMG. The last verses describe Hades, and a καὶ γάρ describes that the inability to return (vv. 9–12):

Αἴδεω γάρ ἐστὶ δεινὸς
μυχὸς, ἄργαλη δ’ ἐς αὐτόν
κάτοδος καὶ γάρ ἐτοίμοιν
καταβάντι μη ἀναβήναι.

It’s terrible that cave of Hades, and grievous the road down to it. You know, it is certain that
We may see this sort of syntactic environment against a backdrop of what is more common in Homeric poetry, the preceding imperative.

Yet we do encounter the imperative as the first element in a two-unit speech of a character in an Aesopic fable will often follow this very template of interaction. In the racy Fable 305 v1 Hausrath, “A Woman and Her Moronic Daughter,” the daughter asks a man to put some ‘sense’ (i.e., his penis) into her:

… ὅτι καθ’ ἑκάστην ἡ μήτηρ νοῦν αὐτῇ ἡχητο, παρεκάλει καὶ γὰρ τοῦτο πρὸς τοῦτο πολλά σοι εὐχαριστήσει.

… because her mother had prayed every day that she have some sense, she called out to the man, saying, “Put some sense into me, sir. For my mother will be very grateful to you for this.”

Compare, too, the dodecasyllabic Fab. 185 *aliter* Chambry, in which a dog convinces a wolf to devour him at some future date, once he has grown fatter (1–11):**

**This fable occurs only in Chambry’s ‘Cd’=Parisinus 105, 16th c., in his ‘second class’ (but of “maioris momenti”)."
While a dog was sleeping in the courtyard of his owner, a wolf saw him through the darkness and, running him down, tackled him by the neck. And the dog spoke to the wolf in this way: “Don’t eat me, master. For I am a beggar, as it stands now, and full of sinews; when it comes to dinner, I am the worst for the one feasting. Let me go—I’m small. You know, I expect that my owners plan a wedding, and when I’ve eaten very much food, I will grow fat, and then, when you eat me, I will please your palate.”

The wolf obliges and the dog sleeps safely on the roof from that point on. The dog’s safety is owed to his having spoken persuasively within the template of two-unit sequence of imperative and authoritative illustration.

In our first example, that of “The Hares and the Frogs” (143.III γ Hausrath), a hare speaks authoritatively of their plight, so much so that the other hares follow him to their would-be mass suicide. In this last example, the dog convinces the wolf not to eat him, on the grounds that he will be a better meal at some later point. In both cases, the speaker abides by one of two conventional command structures—gnomic statement with illustration or imperative with illustration—and is convincing. What, then, of the foolish virgin who tells the stranger to deflower her? That is, how does it fit with a claim that this discourse structure is linked to a particular kind of authoritative speech? Indeed, I think it makes the joke all the funnier: the foolish virgin fails even to use the speech genre properly, and by that convincing but misguided application loses her virginity in exchange for the ‘sense’ she lacked. The fable underscores this very lack of sense by means of the misuse of a discourse convention traditionally restricted to wisdom and authority.

The essential and conclusive authority of this type of discourse is also suggested by its use as the final speech of a fable. In Fab. 188v1 Hausrath, a traveller promises to
Hermes half of all he finds on his journey, but, when he comes across a stash of dates and almonds, he gives the god the pits of dates and the shells of the almonds:

Having completed a long journey, the traveller promises that he would dedicate half of whatever he finds to Hermes. And he happened upon a pouch, and in it there were almonds and dates, but he took it thinking it was money. Having emptied it out to find out what it was, he ate them and took the shells of the almonds and dates and placed these bones on an altar saying, “You have what was promised you, O Hermes. You know, I did save the outsides and the insides for you!”

This is, indeed, a common template for the fable-ending direct speech in Aesop, both with καὶ γάρ and οὔδὲ γάρ. Moreover, it underscores the perhaps surprising restriction of this way of speaking to the direct speech within the fable form; we may have expected the fable form as a whole to be articulated in a manner comparable to mythological paraeigmata. Yet the discourse particles are here closely linked not to any larger articulation of an ‘allegorical genre’ but to moments of authoritative speech that they may contain.

86. Cf. too Fab. 157v1 (= Perry 152):
   … ὡς δὲ συκάμινος ἔφη: „ἄλλʼ ἐγώ γε ὅν ἓχωμαι πρὸς τὸν σῶν θάνατον ὑπηρετοῦσα: καὶ γάρ, ὃν αὐτὸς φόνον ἀπειργάσω, τοῦτον εἰς ἐμὲ ἀπεμάττου.“
   … The mulberry-tree said: “I am not grieved by assisting in your execution. You know, the murder that you yourself committed, you tried to wipe off onto me.”
87. For οὔδὲ γάρ, cf. 68v1.7 (ΟΔΟΙΠΟΡΟΙ), 211v3.8 (ΟΦΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΚΑΡΚΙΝΟΣ), 253v1.10 (ΦΙΛΑΡΓΥΡΟΣ), 253v3.10.
88. Above we noted the use of καὶ γάρ for style-switching within similes in Homer, as a way of adding a ‘parenthesis’ at the interactional level. To that we might compare Aesop fab. 1v1 (18): καὶ διὰ τοῦτο καταφλεχθέντες οἱ νεωτοὶ—καὶ γάρ ἦσαν ἐπὶ ἀτελεῖς οἱ πτηνοὶ—ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν κατέπεσον. Cf. too fab. 1v2.19–20 and 81aliter.17 Chambry.
B.2 The Seven Sages

If we are really going to give the Archaic period a synchronic survey, we must not omit those figures from the seventh and sixth centuries commonly known as the ‘Seven Sages’.89 While these men are primarily thought of as ‘sages’ rather than ‘poets’, there are compelling reasons for thinking of them as ‘poets’ within their capacity as “performers of wisdom” (Martin 1993b). In the case of Solon, after all, we have poems in various meters, the bulk of what remains being in elegiacs.90 While we do not have verses from all of those who have been listed among the Seven Sages, we do have apophthegmata reported as originating with several of them. In this section I shall detail how discourse markers work in the pithy sayings attributed to these sages.

What is particularly compelling about the speaking style we find in these sayings is the manner in which a speaker expands a simile into an allegory, much in the way a gnome can be expanded into a paradeigma, as a kernel story into an elaborated narrative. Take, for example, this saying from Solon, reported in Diogenes Laertius (1.58):

Οἱ νόμοι τοῖς ἄραχνοις ὀμοιοὶ καὶ γὰρ ἐκεῖνα, ἐὰν μὲν ἐμπέσῃ τι κούφον καὶ ἀσθενές, στέγει, ἐὰν δὲ μεῖζον, διακόψαν σίχεται.

Laws are like spider webs. You see, if they encounter something slight and weak, they holds; but if that thing is somewhat larger, they vanish.

An initial analogy is presented in which abstract laws are compared to concrete spider webs, and, in the second discourse unit, καὶ γὰρ extends the analogy into a more allegor-

---

89. The ‘Sages’, or Σοφοί, were first explicit and first seven at Plato Prot. 343a: Thales of Miletus, Pittacus of Mytilene, Bias of Priene, Solon of Athens, Cleobulus of Lindus, Myson of Chen, and Chilon of Sparta. When that list was formed and how canonical it was even in Plato’s time is unclear: cf. Diog. Laert. 1.43.1–5, who lists Thales, Solon, Periander (of Corinth), Cleobulus, Chilon, Bias, Pittacus, then adds τούτοις προσαριθμοῦσιν Ανάχαρατον τὸν Σκύθην, Μύσωνα τὸν Χηνέα, Φερεκύδην τὸν Σύριον, Ἐπιμενίδην τὸν Κρήτα: ἐνιοὶ δὲ καὶ Πεισίστρατον τὸν τύραννον.

90. Elegy (1–30a+43 W²), iambic trimeter (36–40 W²), tetrameter (32–5 W²), and even one hexameter (31 W²).
ical illustration. In the first of these discourse units, we are to understand an ἐστὶ. This two-unit typology seems to be a favorite not only of Solon, but of Bias, too: 91

Οἱ παρὰ τοῖς τυράννοις δυνάμενοι παραπλησίοι εἶσι ταῖς ψήφοις ταῖς ἐπὶ τῶν λογισμῶν καὶ γάρ ἐκέινον ἐκάστη ποτὲ μὲν πλείους σημαίνει, ποτὲ δὲ ἄττω· καὶ τούτων οἱ τύραννοι ποτὲ μὲν ἐκαστον μέγαν ἄγουσι καὶ λαμπρόν, ποτὲ δὲ ἄτιμον. (2.15, Solon of Athens; Diog. Laert. 1.59)

Those who are powerful in the company of tyrants are like those voting-pebbles in tallies. You see, each of them signifies more sometimes, and sometimes less. Also of these, the tyrants sometimes consider each large and shining, and sometimes worthless.

Ἐοίκασι τοῖς ὀμμασὶ τῆς γλαυκῶς οἱ περὶ τὴν ματαιαν σοφίαν ἡσυχικότες· καὶ γάρ ἐκείνης αἱ ὀμμαί νυκτὸς μὲν ἔῤῥωνται, ἡλίου δὲ λάμμαντος ἀμαυρώσσονται· καὶ τούτων ἄξιοι διάνοια ὁδυτήται μὲν ἔστι πρὸς τὴν ματαιότητος θεώριαν, πρὸς δὲ τὴν ἀληθινοῦ φωτὸς κατακίνησιν ἐξαμαυρώσσονται. (6.8, Bias of Priene; Maximus Serm. περὶ φρονήσεως)

They are like eyes of an owl, those who have spent their time around empty wisdom. You know, its eyes are powerful at night, but when the sun is shining they are dimmed. But their mind is sharpest when applied to the contemplation of folly, and they are made dim before the excitement of a truthful man.

Ὄνειδιζόμενός ποτε, ὡτι δίκην ἔχων ἐμισθώσατο ρήτορα· καὶ γάρ, ἐφη, ὅταν δείπνον ἔχω, μάγειρου μισθοῦσαι. (2.59, Solon of Athens; Anton. Meliss. Serm. περὶ παιδείας)

Once he was reproached because when he had a case in court he hired a rhetor. You know, he said, whenever I have a meal, I hire a butcher.

There is some superficial variation in these examples, but the general typology is consistent. The first discourse units in all three are more similar than they appear: I count ἐοίκασι in the second example as clearly equivalent to the εἰσι in the first example; 92 a bit more opaque is the ἐστὶ implicit in the periphrastic syntax of ὀνειδιζόμενός ποτε. 93 Likewise, the second discourse units: in the first and second passage they explicate the initial likeness with narrative illustrations. The third example is a bit more complex, given the reported speech, but shows for that reason the essential ‘quotability’ of the illustrative

91. The texts are those of Mullach 1860.

92. In fact, rather like Solon’s ὀμοιοὶ (εἰσι) in Diog. Laert. 1.58 (p. 204 above). Cp. the combination of ἐοίκα with the nominative participle (Smyth §2133; K–G II.2.52.2 and 71.14), and the affinity with φαίνομαι.

discourse unit. Finally, in none of these examples is there a third discourse unit, no conclusion or ring-composition. We have observed this also in some of the speeches within Aesopic fables, but can sharpen the point now: a tradition very similar in typology does not require the same ring-composition that modern commentators tend to demand from paradeigmata. This could be thought a function of the length of the illustration but the Bias passage just above is, to within a couple words (depending on supplements to the papyrus), of the same length as the Tithonos paradeigma of the New Sappho. It is increasingly attractive to view mythological paradeigmata as closely connected to this way of speaking in wisdom discourse. In that case, we might easily soften our view of ring-composition as compulsory, and we might suggest that the lack of a closing coda in the interactional structure places more burden on the audience’s interpretation. We might see Alcaeus fr. 42 V as the extreme example of this.

B.3 The Theognidea

We have now seen that, in the wisdom discourse of Archaic Greece, discourse markers and units seem to operate within a system of syntactic constraints dictated by their larger discourse contexts. Of course, we should not separate the Theognidea from this rubric of ‘wisdom discourse’ simply for its being in verse form: in antiquity the term ὑποθήκη, or ‘precept’, was just as readily applied to parainetic verses from the Theognidea as to something Bias might say. Likewise, in our discussion the Theognidea ought to be an apt bridge between wisdom discourse of the Archaic period and the poetry of that time.

94. One might add that, in its original discourse context, the καὶ-γάρ discourse unit would have reasonably fit into an appropriate conversation structure, whether or not the previous statement was made by one speaker or the other.

95. Moreover, when there is ring-composition, the repetition of a command after an initial imperative is much more likely than the repetition of a gnomic statement.

96. For the ancient application of ὑποθήκη to the speech of Bias see, e.g., Arist. Rh. 1389b.23; in the case of Theognis, see the Suda Θ.136 (s.v. Ὑδογων) or Σ Thuc. ad 2.43.5. Cf. Friedländer 1913 and Kurke 1990.
This bridging is borne out by the systematic use of discourse markers in the verses. We had already seen that, in the Theognidea, the poet uses οὐδὲ γάρ especially to introduce illustrations having to do with Zeus, but we have not yet noted any uses of καὶ γάρ in the Theognidea. There are two primary ways in which the Theognidea uses the corresponding καὶ γάρ: the first of which is connected to illustrations of one of the central themes of the Theognidea. More than just simple emphasis of central themes, however, the Theognidea even systematically signals not only the paradigmatic past of an internally threatened Megara, but also the possible failure of paradigmatic reasoning in the στάσις it describes. Indeed, the verses mark out these themes with discourse markers in order to place—even retroject—them into the paradigmatic past, into the endangered tradition of aristocratic values and elite friendship. These values focus on the κακοί-ἀγαθοί (‘base-noble’) opposition and the πενίη (‘poverty’) that threatens its upheaval. In fact, the κακοί are already ‘above’ the ἀγαθοί. Wealth and possessions—πλοῦτος and χρήματα—are to blame, for they have “mixed up the blood” (πλοῦτος ἐμείξε γένος; v. 190) In an address to Wealth itself, the Theognidea is explicit about its inability to discriminate among its holders, and continues in the second couplet with the exemplification of the past state, where the ἀγαθοί had wealth and the κακοί did not (vv. 523–6):

οὐ σε μάτην, ὦ Πλοῦτε, βροτοὶ τιμῶσι μάλιστα:
η γάρ ῥηϊδίως τὴν κακότητα φέρεις.

97. The second we shall discuss below.
98. On the φίλοι ἑταῖροι (v. 643), see Donlan 1985.
100. Cf. vv. 717–18: ἀλλὰ χρὴ πάντας γυνῶν ταύτην καταθέσθαι, | ὡς πλοῦτος πλείστην πᾶσιν ἔχει δύσαμιν (“But everyone must store up this thought, that for everyone wealth has the greatest power”).
101. The underlining here draws attention to words essential to the sociocultural viewpoint of Theognidean poetry, making this almost a paradigmatic couplet (on the collocation of ἀγαθός and κακός in the corpus, see Greenberg 1985: 247). The two couplets are quoted separately in Stob. Flor. (4.31.1; 4.31.3a), and some editors separate them as well. But, as we have seen, while καὶ γάρ lends what follows it to excerption by scholars and anthologists, it is very unlikely to begin a ‘poem’ in performance.
Not in vain, o Wealth, do mortals esteem you the most, for you readily put up with baseness. You know, it suits the noble to have wealth, while poverty is appropriate for the base man to endure.

But for an ἀγαθός to be poor is not just a matter of wealth; it is a matter of social obligation and political efficacy, too. Likewise, the man overcome by poverty becomes a negative paradeigma for Cyrnus (vv. 173–8):

Ἄνδρ’ ἀγαθὸν πενίη πάντων δάμνησι μάλιστα, καὶ γήρως πολιοῦ, Κύρνε, καὶ ἡπιάλου. ἢν δὴ χρὴ φεύγοντα καὶ ἐξ βαθυκίτες πόντον ῥιπτεῖν καὶ πετρέων, Κύρνε, κατ’ ἡλιβάτων. καὶ γάρ ἄνηρ πενίη δεδημηνόνος οὔτε τι εἰπεῖν οὔθ’ ἔρξαι δύνασθαι, γλῶσσα δὲ ὡς δέδεται.

More than anything else, poverty overcomes a good man—more than grey old age and more than fever. Indeed, Cyrnus, in fleeing [poverty] it is necessary to cast yourself into the deep-yawning sea and from towering cliffs. You know, a man overcome by poverty is unable either to do or to say anything, and his tongue [speech] is shackled.

Not only, then, is the ἀγαθός nobly-born and wealthy, the κακός low-born and poor; the ἀγαθός is public, speaking in the assembly and defending the polis, while the κακός is private. 102

Again, this distinction—κακός, poor; ἀγαθός, wealthy—is central to the set of traditional aristocratic values, and is the very distinction at stake in the corpus. 103 Moreover, being traditional, the distinction is itself a paradeigma, albeit one in the process of being overturned in Megara. 104 The paradeigma, then, is likewise being upset, and this upheaval is emblematized in the following couplet (vv. 333–4):

μήποτε φεύγοντ’ ἄνδρα ἑπ’ ἑλπίδι, Κύρνε, φιλήσης· οὐδὲ γάρ οἶκαδε βᾶς γίνεται αὐτὸς ἔτι.

102. Alternately, the man overcome by poverty has ‘shackled tongue’ because he is unable to participate in the exchange system of elite symposia. The pairing οὔτε τι εἰπεῖν | οὔθ’ ἔρξαι δύνασθαι (v. 177–8) recalls Phoenix’ ὑθων τε ῥητῆρ | ἐµναὶ πρηκτῆρα τε ἔργων (Il. 9.443).

103. Cf., e.g., vv. 39–60.

104. Cf. also 511–22, 667–8, 1115–16.
Never befriend an exile with a view to the future, Cyrnus; you know, not even even when he goes home is he any longer the man he was.

Here the *Theognidea* is at its pithiest in expressing the anxiety about the mutability of a man’s character in a time of στάσις. Moreover, it articulates it in the manner one might expect of a mythological *paradeigma*. The point? The past—even what one knew an associate to have been only recently—is, for the Theognidean *persona*, unreliable. This is, of course, a point made clear in any number of couplets, but that the *persona* here expresses it with grammar, too, is striking.

A final example will make the importance of this connection between grammar and theme still more clear. Throughout the *Theognidea*, we find instruction to Cyrnus regarding the skill needed to make trial of a friend. In another passage addressed to Cyrnus, we find the culmination of various paradigmatic features in a longer statement of this situation (vv. 119–27):

> Θρυσοῦ κιβδήλωθι καὶ ἄργυρου ἀνοσχετὸς ἄτη, Κύρνε, καὶ ἐξευρεῖν πάθειον ἄνδρι σοφῶι, εἰ δὲ φίλου νόος ἄνδρός ἐνι στήθει καὶ λελήθη παιδρός ἐών, δόλιον δ’ ἐν φρέατι ἤτορ ἔχει, τούτοις κιβδηλότατου ποίησι βροτοῖν, καὶ γνώναι πάντων ταύτ’ ἀνιηρότατον. οὐδὲ γὰρ εἰδείης ἀνδρὸς νόον οὐδὲ γυναῖκος, πρὶν πειρηθεὶν ὥσπερ ὑποζυγίῳ, τοῦτο θεὸς κιβδηλότατον ποίησε βροτοῖσι, καὶ γνῶναι πάντων ταύτ’ ἀνιηρότατον.

---

105. For exile in the *Theogn.*, see also vv. 209–10, 1209–16.
106. Starting from as ‘early’ as vv. 52–7:
107. Cf., e.g., vv. 641–2, 963–70, 1219–20, and especially 415–18 (noting the βάσανος image).
108. Note that I do not mention this direct address to agree with the argument that only passages addressed to Cyrnus are ‘authentic’ (cf. West 1974), rather only because closely follows a direct address.
109. Cf. too p. 218 below on this theme linked to the *persona* in 963–70.
The ruin associated with counterfeit gold and silver can be endured, Cyrnus, and it is easy for a skilled man to find out. But if a friend’s intent is false and lies undetected in his breast and if he has a treacherous heart, this is the most counterfeit thing that the god has made for mortals and this is the most painful of all to recognize. You know, you cannot know a man’s or woman’s intent, until you make trial of it like a beast of burden, nor can you form an estimate of it by coming as it were at the right time, since appearances often deceive one’s judgement. (trans. modified from D. E. Gerber)

I draw attention especially to the familiar syntax leading up to the οὐδὲ γάρ, where we are to understand an ἐστί with ἀνιηρότατον in v. 123: γνῶναι πάντων τούτ’ ἀνιηρότατον. Here the emphasis is on present experience in the very moment (v. 127).  

For the persona of the Theognidea, past experience is no longer a reliable touchstone, a βάσανος, for judging a friend, or at least it is now in question whether a man’s character will remain unchanged in serious matters.

We could have made similar observations about discourse units and syntax of other passages quoted above: note the command μήποτε … φιλήσῃς in vv. 333–4 and the χρὴ in vv. 173–8—but it is more important move away from simple typology of syntagms to seeing how the corpus draws upon the conventional discourse context of the syntax to create its own mythological past for Megara. Against the backdrop of the Theognidea’s use of the particularizing καὶ above, it is fitting that the persona systematically employs its most authoritative discourse markers, καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ, in these distinctions so crucial to its stance.

B.4 Sappho

We have seen καὶ γάρ used in mythological paradeigmata in the New Sappho and Alcaeus fr. 38A V, but I further suggest that, even in Lesbian lyric poetry, we find support for the idea that discourse markers such as καὶ γάρ are, more generally, significant to authoritative illustration. In this way, I consider them alongside the instances just

100. The text is corrupt, but the thought must still be of the present.
111. On the βάσανος, see esp. vv. 417–18.
above from Aesop, the Seven Sages, and the *Theognidea*. Given the nature and number of our fragments, I find only one example in Sappho, but it is sufficiently marked, and completely in accord with the discourse features we have noticed in the construction of authority in the wisdom discourse of the Archaic period. The example occurs in *fr. 1 V*, where Sappho quotes Aphrodite’s response to her past prayer, reporting the goddess’ speech directly (vv. 18–24):

\[
\text{τίνα δηὖτε πείθω}
\]
\[
.\ ησάγυν ηές ησάν φιλότατα; τίς σ’, ὦ
\]
\[
Ψάμπρ’, ἱ ἄδικήσαι;
\]
\[
καὶ γιὰ ὑ αἰ φεύγει, ταχέως διώξει,
αἰ δὲ δώρα μη δέκετ’, ἀλλα δώσει,
αἰ δὲ μη φίλει, ταχέως φιλήσει
κούκ ἐthéλοισα.
\]

Who is it this time I am to persuade [to lead you] back to her love? Who is it who wrongs you, Sappho? You know, if she flees, soon she will pursue; and if she does not accept gifts, she will give them instead; and if she does not love, soon she will love, even if she is not willing.

The speech, introduced by a pair of related questions (vv. 18–20), is followed by Aphrodite’s pithy summary of the possible future outcomes. Substituting Aphrodite’s questions for the normal gnomic statement or command, the discourse typology well suits the two-unit speeches we have been studying above in Aesop, the Seven Sages, and the *Theognidea*. Nor does the fact that a goddess speaks these words oppose the connection between this discourse marker and an authority even more general than the *paradeigma*. But there is also a way in which Aphrodite’s prediction—Sappho’s beloved will give gifts and will love—is paradigmatic; note Aphrodite’s exhausted δηὖτε (“this time”). Aphrodite is drawing on the notional past of the *persona loquens*, and, as Page remarks, “It has all happened so often before, and the end has always been the same” (1979: 15). Aphrodite’s speech then blends the past, present and future by framing her terse conditio-

\[112\] The text is that of Voigt 1971. While the text remains suspect (e.g., v. 19) despite supplement from quotation in Dion. Hal. *Comp.* (23.53–80 Usener–Radermacher), the cruces are not directly relevant here.

\[113\] Cf. too Stehle 2009: 125: “There is no myth except the one she creates by using epic imagery of a god’s advent to recount her own past.”
nal statements in the speaker’s own past. What is remarkable, then, is not just the relationship of the two discourse units, or that, here again, the poet uses the discourse marker καὶ γάρ essentially to ‘mythologize’ the past of the persona loquens; all of this happens in the authoritative voice of Aphrodite.

I have worked hard to move away from the more traditional interpretation of discourse markers such as καὶ γάρ as, in some sense, restricted to mythological paradeigmata. Instead, I have argued for seeing it within a larger scheme of the construction of authority as found in Archaic Greek discourse of various sorts. Yet I hope I have not done so at the expense of the very real connection, especially in poetry, to the paradeigma. The Theognidea is a good example of the intersection of these uses: it employs the discourse markers for both references to Zeus and a sort of mythologization of an exemplary, pre-στάσις Megara. In Sappho fr. 1 V, too, Aphrodite’s speech is both an authoritative way of speaking and a paradigmatic articulation the persona’s past.

C Mythologizing discourse

If indeed such a strong link can be made between paradigmatic storytelling within Archaic Greek lyric poetry and authoritative exemplification or illustration within wisdom discourse representing the same period, we might also seek to develop further the connection between these discourse strategies. It would be natural to conclude that καὶ γάρ’s use in wisdom discourse makes it a very authoritative way for a speaker to signal to the audience the illustrative nature of a narrative. But note the emphasis on ‘narrative’, rather than ‘statement’. The connection is not trivial: after all, we noted that in wisdom discourse the marker καὶ γάρ is restricted the introduction of finite action verbs; a plain γάρ does not seem able to ‘handle’ any more than the simpler ἐστί statements in such a context. The link then is not simply one of καὶ’s intermittent amplification of γάρ, but rather a intersection of meaning within a restricted syntactic environment. We might begin by referring to this limited intersection as ‘authoritative narrative illustration’, which suits both, but we should take care not to jeopardize conveying the distinctly paradigm-
ic function that pervades its usage within poetry. There is, I suggest, still more at stake within Archaic Greek lyric poetry. In this section we shall discuss the remaining instances of καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ within lyric while pursuing the following question: If Sapphic poetry does carefully manage its use of καὶ γάρ (as in the New Sappho and fr. 1 V) and the simpler γάρ (as in fr. 16 V), what can we say about the instances in which it uses the more marked καὶ γάρ? More generally, beyond Sapphic poetry what can we say about the cases in which the speaker foregrounds the interactional level of language with a καὶ γάρ or οὐδὲ γάρ?²

C.1 Sappho

Above, we began to discuss Sappho fr. 22 V, in which the speaker addresses Abanthis, who longs for an absent companion, one perhaps named Gongyla.³ There we argued for a contrast between the speaker’s use of γάρ and καὶ γάρ within just a few verses. Let us now return to the fragment. The speaker encourages Abanthis to take up the lyre, recalling in vv. 13–14 how Gongyla’s appearance had made Abanthis feel, but in v. 15 goes on to tell a story of Aphrodite’s reaction to past prayers (vv. 9–19):

114. For a similar argument regarding Pindar’s Pythian 8, see Martin 2004b.

115. Cf. too Simonides fr. 26 W²: οὐδὲ γάρ ὅντι οὐδ’ εὕροις περ ἔων ξίκετο δεύρο (“You know, even though it was wide, it did not reach (me) here”). Note that this verse may be a remodeling of Il. 14.33: οὐδὲ γάρ οὐδ’ εὑρός περ ἔων ἐδυνήσατο πᾶσας | αἰγιαλός νής χαδέειν, στείνοντο δὲ λαοί (“You know, even though it was wide, the shore was not able to hold all of the ships, and the men were thronged”).

116. The reading is doubtful. The Suda Σ.107 (s.v. Σαπφώ) suggests that Gongyla is one of Sappho’s μαθήτριαι. For the name, see also frr. 95.4 and 213.6 V.

117. Translation at p. 196 above with notes on the text at n. 73 on p. 196 above.
We noticed previously that this recollection is paradigmatic; that, following the command of v. 9, the recollection serves the same function as a mythological *paradeigma* does following on an imperative in Homeric poetry. Furthermore, in v. 18 or 19 the speaker returns to the present, amounting to the tripartite structure so common in mythological *paradeigma*, and in this way the comparison to the *ά γάρ* of Sappho *fr*. 16 V still stands. More importantly we see that, just as in *fr*. 1 V, the discourse marker καὶ *γάρ* is applied to the *persona*’s authoritative connection with Aphrodite.

I now note the last remaining instances of καὶ *γάρ* in the extant Sapphic poetry, *fr*. 24a V. The fragment is too lacunose to analyze in detail, but we can at least confirm that καὶ *γάρ* is even more frequently applied to the *persona loquens* than to mythological material. In this fragment it is the *persona*’s youth that is recalled, but in the first-person plural:

... (you will?) remember ..., you know, we did these things in our ... youth: for many lovely ... we ... the city ... us ... sharp ... (trans. modified from that of D. A. Campbell)

118. We might compare the β]όλλομα[ of v. 19 to the post-*paradeigma* return of 16 V: τὰ]ς <κ>ε βολλοίμαι ερατόν τε βάμα (v. 17).


120. On which see, e.g., Page 1979: 126–128.

It is not clear whether the *persona loquens*—which may well be plural—is addressing itself or its audience with the imperative to remember in v. 3, but it is significant that the speaker uses καὶ γάρ to introduce a recollection from their own past youth. Previously I only hinted at the fact that the *persona loquens* reserves the discourse marker καὶ γάρ for past experience. Combined with the claim that a discourse marker like καὶ γάρ foregrounds the interactional level of language in the context of authoritative illustrations, including *paradeigmata*, the speaker seems to be foregrounding its own interaction with the audience in some illustrative way. For this reason, I now want to pursue further the way in which the *persona loquens* here presents itself as a mythological *paradeigma*, as a tradition on which the audience might draw. Such a claim can only be borne out through more examples from across Archaic Greek lyric poetry with examples drawn from Alcaeus, the *Theognidea*, Archilochus, and Simonides.

C.2 Alcaeus

If the mythologization of the speaker’s own persona is a means of creating authority—in Sappho’s case, say, an authoritative connection with Aphrodite—in Alcaeus a different sort of authority is being created. Indeed, it is this discourse strategy that we can discern in Alcaeus in *fr*. 119, where the speaker uses the discourse marker καὶ γάρ to mark his own past action. Nor does it lack in effect: here we see that it is a means of establishing authority in the context of advice in the present (vv. 5–6), such that it can be followed by a traditionally articulated command (vv. 6–7):  

122. Though none affect our argument here, we have a few options: a soloist addressing an audience included in the recollection; a chorus addressing an audience included in the recollection; or, perhaps, a chorus addressing itself.

123. I agree with many of the conclusions in Stehle 2009, but I see them not as specific to Sappho or accomplished primarily through temporal markers but as part of a larger mythologizing discourse in Archaic Greek poetry. I am troubled, however, by her comparison of these temporal markers to that in the kletic prayer of *fr*. 1 V (vv. 5–7; 2009: 121).

124. Regarding the καὶ γάρ of v. 5, I have inspected high-resolution images of *P. Oxy.* 1788 and feel that the letters and spacing of καὶ[..]ρ are certain, leaving no obvious alternative to καὶ γάρ. The gnomic introduction only makes this more plausible.
τίς τ’ ὁ πονῇ[
εἴπη[....][
pαρέσκεθ’ ὁ[ 
δαίμον’ ἀναίτιο[

δεύοντος οὐδὲν καὶ γάρ ἄνοι[ας
τὰς σᾶς ε[...]υ[...]ς ἀλλ’ ἔμεθεν [σ[ παυσάι, κάκων δε[....]ο[ντῶα[ν
αἱ τι δύναι κατε[...]ο.

τὸ κλάμμα δ’ ἐλπῶρα, κάλου γά[ρ]
ο[δ]ι [ν]γαίας σταφύλαις ἐνείκη[ν

Who [.....] your [.....], oh [.....], [.....] say [.....] provided [.....] (accusing?) a guiltless god,
when that was wrong; why, (I stopped you?) from your folly; come, pay attention to me
and stop, and from your evil [.....] (restrain?) [.....] if you can. For your time has now
passed by, and what fruit there was has been gathered, but there is hope that the shoot,
since it is a fine one, will bear clusters in plenty ...

The poem goes on, presenting further what seems to be an allegory involving vines and
grapes, their ripening and their harvest (vv. 9–20). It has been suggested that the allego-
ry’s target is Pittacus and that it is his time that has passed in v. 9,\textsuperscript{125} though others have
suggested that the theme is erotic.\textsuperscript{126} But, while scholarly discussion centered around the
nature of this allegory in vv. 10–16 has focused on those verses alone, we might do well
to look at the verses leading up to the allegory.

In particular, note the discourse structure leading up to the allegory, comparing
Alcaeus’ articulation of the \textit{paradeigma} in fr. 38A \textit{PLF}: καὶ γάρ Σίσυφος Αἰολίδαις
βασίλευς … μελαίνας χθόνος. ἀλλ’ ἄγι μὴ τα[ (vv. 5, 10). In our present fr. 119, the
καὶ γάρ is followed by the ἀλλ’ ἔμεθεν. Within this recognizable action structure, the
speaker’s own \textit{persona} is firmly placed in the space of the normally mythological \textit{pa-
rameigma}. Nor does he do so in a trivial way: he establishes a history of his good advice,
justifying his very \textit{persona}. Yet here, though the text is fragmentary, it is clearly an ad-
dress to a second person, essentially projecting the relationship between the \textit{persona lo-

\textsuperscript{125} Theander 1952 and Page 1979: 242 (with n3).

\textsuperscript{126} E.g., Treu 1952: 166–168 and Perotta 1936. On allegory in Alcaeus, cf. too Kirkwood 1974:
quens and the addressee into the mythological past. Though very brief, this quasi-mythological paradeigma—let us call it a ‘mythologized’ paradeigma—puts a single idea, ἄνοια, into focus for its audience about to hear the allegory. Can this discourse structure, which almost certainly foregrounds the fact that the speaker kept his addressee from ἄνοια, tell us anything about the allegory that follows? I think so. If we look to Alcaeus fr. 112 V, we find the word used in a decidedly political context, one which is even linked to Pittacus in particular.127 Here again, then, we get a glimpse of the system in place for the creation of an authoritative persona with a mythologized past. The persona is setting himself up as an authority, with a past to justify that authority.

C.3 Theognidea

Indeed, it is in the more ‘political’ realm, where the speaker is in the position of advising his audience, that this discourse strategy is best represented in extant Archaic Greek poetry, and where it may also seem to be especially effective. It should come as no surprise, then, that the tradition of the Theognidea—one known for its σφραγίς and “proud self-advertisement”128—employs this discourse marker. After all, the Theognidea is a collection of ύποθῆκαι probably best compared to the tradition of the Hesiodic Pre-

127. That, of course, does not require that our fr. 119 V also be of Pittacus and politics, but note a comparable stance taken in Theogn. 452–5:

"Ὡνθρωποτ", εἰ γνώμης ἔλαξες κέρυς ὡστερ ἄνοιας
καὶ σώφρων οὕτως ὡστερ ἄφρων ἐγένου,
pολλόυι᾽ ἀν ζηλωτός ἐφαίνεο τῷ τῆς πολιτῶν
οὕτως ὡσπερ νῦν οὐδενὸς ἀξίος εἰ.

O man, if you had a bit of judgment, as you did folly, and sense as nonsense, you might have seen yourself approved by many of these citizens, just as much as you are now deemed worth of nothing.


128. Griffith 1983: 40. Cf. too Griffith’s suggestion that “[b]y characterizing himself as the famous sage whose wisdom is admired throughout Greece yet neglected at home, and by addressing a young disciple and friend whose mind is also susceptible to the claims of rivals, Theognis provides a contextual background and human interest that add depth and warmth” (44; my italics).
cepts of Cheiron. Not merely, then, is the persona of Theognis establishing its authority; it is also trying to measure up to the mythological status of that centaur Cheiron who educated the young Achilles. Twice in the corpus, and using shared formulae, the persona foregrounds this advisory relationship:

σοὶ δ᾽ ἐγὼ εὖ φρονέων ὑποθήσομαι, οίᾳ περ αὐτός, Κύρν’, ἀπὸ τῶν ἄγαθῶν παις ἔτ’ ἐὼν ἐμαθον· 26–7
σοὶ δ᾽ ἐγὼ οίᾳ τε παιδὶ πατήρ ὑποθήσομαι αὐτός ἐσθλά· σὺ δ᾽ ἐν θυμωὶ καὶ φρεσὶ ταῦτα βάλει· 1048–9

In these cases we can see how, beyond the explicit semantics of the verses, the syntax points up the importance of this relationship and poetic interaction with its fronting of the initial σοὶ δ᾽ ἐγὼ.  

We are more concerned with the Theognidean persona’s attitude toward its past, however, for that is what justifies this didactic stance. We have already discussed how the Theognidean persona points up its own authority in support of its central tenets, all in the course of its mythologization of the Megarian past. One of those themes was the unreliability of one’s judgment when it comes to a man’s character, along with the need to observe a man over an extended period of time. What allows the Theognidean persona to argue this? He sets himself up as an example of having failed to do this very thing in vv. 963–70:

μήπτοτ’ ἐπαινήσῃς, πρὶν ἂν εἰδής ἄνδρα σαφηνῶς, ὀργὴν καὶ ρυθμὸν καὶ τρόπον ὡστὶς ἂν ἦ. πολλοὶ τοι κιβδήλου ἐπίκλοσσον ἦδος ἐχουντες κρύπτοσοι ἔνθεμενοι θυμον ἐφημερον. 965
τούτων δ’ ἐκφαινει πάντων χρόνος ἦδος ἐκάστου. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ γνώσις πολλὸν ἄρ’ ἐκτὸς ἐβην· ἐφθην αἰνήςας πρὶν σοῦ κατὰ πάντα διήναι ἦθεα· νῦν δ’ ἡδη νηὺς ἄθ’ ἐκας διέχω. 970

Never praise a man until you know clearly what he is in temperament, disposition, and way of life. Many indeed have a false, thievish, character and keep it hidden, taking on an

---

129. See esp. Friedländer 1913 (esp. 571–72); Schwartz 1960: 228–244.
130. On the advisory relationship expressed in these verses, see, e.g., the discussion of Kurke 1990: 90–91.
attitude appropriate to the day. But time reveals the character of each of these men. You know, I myself (once) transgressed greatly in my reasoning. I praised you too soon, before I knew all your ways; but now I keep a wide berth, like a ship. (trans. adapted from D. E. Gerber)

Likewise, he relates this piece of information, in v. 968, with a self-mythologizing καὶ γάρ. But the scope of the statement is even greater, covering the entire speaker-audience relationship. In effect, these verses are saying, “You and I are the very paradeigma of this advice, in that I misjudged you.”

I would further argue that this marked cultivation of persona extends even to the performance tradition itself. In fact, it is through the application of our findings thus far that I think we can explain an especially enigmatic passage in the Theognidea. The verses are 939–44, and its text, structure, and meaning have all been unclear. First, M. L. West’s text of the (two) passage(s), along with my translation (939–42; 943–4):

*Θανατός θεοίσιν ἐπευχόμενος.

I cannot sing with a clear voice, like the nightingale. You know, last night I went on a revel. No, I don’t blame my aulos-accompaniment. But my friend, who lacks not in skill, leaves me. (—) I will sing standing up here next to the aulos-player on his right, praying to the immortal gods.

T. W. Allen interprets the verses thus: “Theognis did not expect to sing, he took his friend’s place though he was not at his best” (1940: 214). This explanation may well suit a first performance of the verses, but it is important to look at these verses in the context of a corpus of verses that developed over the course of as many as two centuries. Considered from that perspective, these verses (very easily taken together, if occasion demand-

---

132 Allen (1940: 214) prints the six verses together, as does Young; West and Gerber both separate the last couplet. D. E. Gerber’s Loeb translation reads: “I cannot sing with the high, clear voice of a nightingale, for last night too I went on a revel. And I won’t give the piper as an excuse. But my companion, who’s not lacking in artistic ability, leaves me in the lurch. (—) I’ll stand here close to the piper on his right and sing, with prayers to immortal gods.”
ed) would form an apologetic prelude or mid-performance banter that one could perform with false humility before or within an ostensibly lackluster or impromptu performance. Yet these verses amount to far more than simple banter. In fact, they are deeply rooted in the conventions of elegiac performance and symposia, with their aulos accompaniment and post-symposium komos. The claim that the performer was out reveling last night and here performing again tonight creates a continuity in performance and the impression of a performer or persona central to the symposium and ever-prepared to fulfill his role. It is fitting, then, that report of this “komos last night” comes in v. 940, following a καὶ γάρ: καὶ γάρ τὴν προτέρην νύκτι ἐπὶ κῶμον ἔβην. The “komos last night” in anything but a first performance is as good as rhetorical; is part of this elegiac persona’s self-mythologizing stance.

C.4 Archilochus

As in the case of Theognis, the ego of Archilochus’ fragments is clearly traditional, a persona. And what a very convincing persona it is: from the statement in fr. 1 W² that he is a servant of both Ares and the Muses, to his statement that he drinks resting on his spear (πίνω δ’ ἐν δορὶ κεκλιμένος fr. 2.2 W²), Archilochus’ poetry long lent itself to a fixation on the historical circumstances of this persona. But, as Ewen Bowie (1986: 15) nicely expresses it,

… the ego tells us nothing about Archilochus that may not apply equally to the hetairoi who were his audience. Like him, Aesimides, Pericles and Glaucus were warrior-citizens: each could take up this song and identify with the ego who was a servant of the lord of war; any person who sang the couplet would thereby be validating the claim to be skilled in the gift of the Muses.

---

133. For this rhetorical stance, cf. Pl. Symp. (176a–e).
134. See also Theogn. 1123–8 on Odysseus.
135. Fr. 1 W²: εἰμὶ δ’ ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἑυσαλίοιο ἀνακτος | καὶ Μουσέων ἐρατόν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος (“I am a servant of lord Ares as well as of the Muses, in that I know their lovely gift”).
136. On Archilochus as cult hero on Paros, see Nagy 1999: 301–308 (but note Griffith 1983: 49n51 on Hesiod) and, more recently, Clay 2004 (esp. on the cult as predating the Mnesiepes inscription of the 3rd c. BCE) with Clay 1998.
What is especially significant here is Bowie’s move from the *ego* to the *hetairoi*, and I would modify it only in making explicit the diachronic validity of his claim. That is, the *ego’s hetairoi* are constantly changing not just from performer to performer within a group, but also from generation to generation. It is important, then, to mythologize a poetic persona not just for its authority, as we have discussed so much already, but for its longevity, its very survival between these generations of *hetairoi*. We have just seen a similar phenomenon in the *Theognidea*, but the Archilochean persona is even more inclusive in mythologizing his *hetairoi*. Moreover, in so doing, he preserves crucial aspects of the Archilochean persona. In the case of Archilochus fr. 4 W², that persona is the very one that drinks while leaning on his spear; only here he explicitly extends the stance to include his entire group of *hetairoi*, who will drink while on a watch.

---

My claim may be bold, but it is substantiated by the discourse features. In a command structure typical of hexameter mythological *paradeigmata*, and via formulae falling in

---


138. Actually, there is a subtle difference: in the *Theogn.*., the advisory relationship and performance tradition are mythologized; the process in Archilochus seems more inclusive.

139. Vv. 6–9 (supplied by quotation at Ath. 11.483d). The text is that of W².

140. Note the looseness of Edmonds’ translation in this last sentence (“for we no more than other men can stay sober on this watch”), which captures the latent *paradeigma* in the *ουδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς* of v. 8.
hexameters—notice especially the ἀλλ’ ἢγε (v. 6) and the ἢγρεῖ (v. 8)—Archilochus builds to the οὐδὲ γὰρ ἡμεῖς in v. 8: “You know, we will not be able to stay sober on this watch.” This watch, of course, is notional, and in this way the fragment forever frames the speaker and his hetairoi as paradigmatic symposiasts in a notional “symposium at sea.”

D Conclusions

At the start of this chapter, we rehearsed some of the recent, convincing arguments against a ‘personal’ authorial presence in Archaic Greek lyric, or at least against an emphasis upon such an autobiographical notion. Yet, in the course of this chapter, I have insisted upon a foregrounding of the poem’s speaker, or persona loquens. These two claims—that Archaic Greek lyric poetry is not ‘personal’ and that it systematically foregrounds its persona—might seem contradictory, but the reason that they are not is crucial. The distinction lies in, and the confusion arises from, the way in which the personae of lyric poetry mythologize themselves through the application of particular discourse features to statements about their own past. In Archilochus we can even see how the persona mythologizes the hetairoi as well.

141. E.g.: οἶνον ἐρυθρὸν (Od. 5.165); θοῆς … νηὸς (Il. 1.12 and Od. 1.260; Ionic gen. νηὸς).
142. Bowie (1993: 28–29) suggests this fragment is a candidate for his category of poems in which “the circumstances evoked are actually fictitious” (28); it is, rather, “a poem for performance in an ordinary symposium where familiar experiences of warfare are evoked” (29). In this way the φυλακὴ in v. 9 refers metaphorically to the political guard-duty being done by the men at symposia.
144. See, for example, the section ‘Personal Poetry’ at Gerber 1997: 133–220, which includes Alcaeus, Sappho, Ibycus, Anacreon, and Corinna. Gerber (1997: 6n23) has a selective bibliography on the debate.
145. We shall turn to similar cases within Homeric poetry in Part III. One case may be seen above in Hesiod’s statement about his father (n.100 on p. 83 above).
146. For a modern comparandum in blues, cf. Oliver 1972: 326–328 with Evans 1982: 26–27, who writes: “Often the singer will create a dramatic persona who speaks in the first person. The important thing is that the lyrics appeal emotionally to the singer and to his audience, not that
The *personae* of Archaic Greek lyric would not have been able to mythologize themselves using discourse markers traditionally associated with mythological *paradeigmata* had they not also used conventional syntax and discourse markers to actually introduce mythological *paradeigmata*. The rhetorical effect of this strategy, and our certainty of its presence, depends on this simultaneous and systematic use, on both *convention* and *divergence*. This allows us to conclude that, within Sapphic poetry, the New Sappho is actually anomalous in its being hyper-traditional, in its comparatively grotesque heaping of conventionally paradigmatic discourse characteristics. In fact, in *Sappho καὶ γάρ* is, but for one other instance, always used of the *persona*. 147

In the next section we shall turn to the poetry of Pindar, but we can perhaps already see how our conclusions thus far will form a basis for that discussion. After all, Pindaric scholarship in the last few decades has focused largely on two issues: the function of mythological material in them, and, more recently, the *persona loquens* within the poems. Of the latter issue, G. B. D’Alessio sums it up neatly (1994: 117):

In this context [of praise and prayer in Pindar] the image of the *persona loquens* is the result of a complex construction whose understanding involves the comprehension of the particular communicative strategy chosen each time by the poet. He is an authoritative voice speaking to and/or on behalf of a community to which he may or may not belong. Indeed, we have found in the poetry that preceded Pindar just such a phenomenon, accomplished through the creation of an authoritative voice; the communicative strategy in question has been the self-mythologization of the poetic *persona*. This, too, we might have anticipated: D’Alessio, again of Pindar, notes, “Praise, prayer and advice are all expressed in a highly exemplary and authoritative first person” (1994: 121).

We have spoken at some length by now about poetry where the speaker’s *persona* is of primary importance, but, we have also started to see, in the case of Archilochus *fr. 4* they reflect an actual event. The blues singer takes realistic, though not necessarily real, situations and treats them imaginatively. Although he appears to sing for himself, most of his lyrics are meant just as much for those around him.”

147. We shall look at the single exception to this statement just below.
W², that the *hetairoi* or group may also be included in this mythologizing process. This shift is important, as we shall be occupied increasingly with poetry in which the addressee or audience may be as prominently featured.

**D.1 Sappho fr. 27 V**

I suggest that this shift may help to explain poems such as that represented in Sappho *fr. 27 V*. This fragment in Sapphic stanzas survives from the first book of the Alexandrian edition of Sappho, but, despite its meter, seems to be one of the relatively few epithalamia attributed to Sappho and so also seemingly choral. Nevertheless, the relationship of the poem to a nuptial ritual is not at all clear; similarly unclear are the identities of the speaker and addressee. After three very scrappy lines, the *persona loquens* addresses a second person (vv. 4–13):

```
... [ καὶ γὰρ δὴ οὐ πάις ποτ[...
... ] ἵπτε μὲλπεσθ’ ἄγι ταύτα[...
... ] ζάλεξαι, καμµ’ ἀπ’ τὸ ἱδέκ[
[...]
[ ά]δρα χάρισσαι:
[ σ]πείραις γὰρ ἔς γάμον· ἐν δὲ[
[ ]εν ἕξοιεν
[ ] άδος μὲ[ν]γαν εἰς Ὀλυμποὺ[
[ ἀ]νθρωπω[π]σ[ικ.]...
[...]
```

... for you were once a (tender?) child … come and sing this, all of you … converse … and grant us … (generous?) favours; for we are going to a wedding; and you too (know?) this well; but send the maidens away as quickly as possible; and may the gods have … (There is no) road to great Olympus for mortals … (trans. D. A. Campbell)

---


149. Tognazzi 2009 with bibliography.

150. Aloni 1997 (*ad his fr. xx*): “Questa ha aperto la strada all’ipotesi che la destinataria del canto sia una qualche rivale di Saffo, che dovrebbe lasciare partecipare a un matrimonio le ragazze appartenenti alla sua cerchia. É tuttavia francamente difficile immaginare un contesto per una performance del genere.”

151. I disagree with the text and translation of Tognazzi (“... infatti anche tu una volta eri una
The first person is, on the face of it, plural (κἂµµ, 6; σ]τείχοµεν, 8); the second, singular (σpõe, 4+9); and there seems to be a separate group of maidens who are to be sent away by that second person (παρθένοις, 10). Interpretations include that the speaker must be addressing a rival, that the speaker is addressing the bride, or, most recently, that the speaker is addressing the mother of the bride. We need not consider the first position, but the second two are worth considering, even if resolution is beyond the scope of present argument.

That the addressee is the bride has been argued by Lasserre and Aloni; that it is the bride’s mother by Tognazzi. I suggest that the discourse features suit either interpretation, and at least refute Tognazzi’s objections to Aloni’s argument. Tognazzi’s primary objection is to the fact that, in Aloni’s interpretation, a bride would be addressed in v. 4 as having been a πάις long ago: καὶ γὰρ δὴ σὺ πάις ποτε (“you know, you [were] a child once”). Based on the fact that πάις seems to have been used of a bride in Sappho fr. 120 Ragazza e amavi cantare, su, queste cose dille a te stessa e a noi da questo ...

152 Aloni 1997: 57: “Nell’altro caso (‘noi’ comprendente io poetico, ‘tu’ e probabilmente anche l’auditorio), l’invito sarebbe rivolto a convincere la destinataria a lasciare, rinunciare alle compagne parthenoi, per avviarsi, non triste e cagione di gioia per le compagne, al matrimonio. La destinazione imenaica del canto, quasi certa, favorisce questa seconda ipotesi, dove la destinataria è con ogni verisimiglianza la sposa, invitata dalle sue stesse compagne ad avviarsi al corteo nuziale” (‘In the other case [‘we’ includes the poetic ego, ‘you’, and possibly the audience], the invitation was aimed at convincing the addressee to leave, abandon her virgin companions, to start her marriage, not sad but the cause of joy for her friends. The addressee of the hymenium song almost certainly favors this second hypothesis, where the recipient is in all probability the bride, invited by her own companions to start the wedding procession’).

153 E.g., Di Benedetto and Ferrari 1987: 51, but see Tognazzi 2009: 52n2.


155 This is the view of Tognazzi 2009.

156 Though at different points in the ritual: Lasserre when she was about to leave the thiasos; Aloni just before the pompe.

157 Tognazzi’s first objection is Aloni’s translation of ἀποπέπω, but it is of little importance here.
113 V,\textsuperscript{158} she concludes that the νύμφη addressee cannot have been a πάις long ago.\textsuperscript{159} But I draw attention to the fuller context of that word πάις, to the fact that the speaker uses καὶ γάρ (… ποτέ) to refer to the addressee’s childhood just before commanding a larger group to sing and dance in v. 5. If it is of the bride, it is a highly effective communicative strategy that marks not just the importance of the addressee, but also the significance of the initiatory transition in the imminent πομπή (and hymeneal).\textsuperscript{160}

\textbf{D.2 \ Ibycus \textit{fr. S151 SLG}}

Before turning to Pindaric poetry, it is worth seeing what our findings in this chapter can do for us in a discussion of Ibycus \textit{fr. S151 SLG}.\textsuperscript{161} This fragment, after all, comprises a great deal of mythological material in the course of praising one Polycrates. We shall not concern ourselves here with the identity or age of this Polycrates,\textsuperscript{162} nor even whether the poem is properly Anacreontic. Instead, we shall concern ourselves with matters of discourse and communicative strategy, beginning to deepen our discussion of the second person addressee. Indeed, we have focused thus far on third-person mythological

\textsuperscript{158} The reading of \textit{fr. 113 V} is highly suspect. In fact, reasonable conjectures make it seem likely that this may a good comparandum for referring to the bride in the past as a πάις.

\textsuperscript{159} Tognazzi writes: “… ποτέ sembra fare riferimento alla giovinezza della donna in questione come a un periodo remoto, che le si chiede di ricordare per disporre il suo animo a fare qualcosa. Un’apostrofe del genere si spiega meno facilmente in relazione ad una giovane νύμφη nel giorno delle sue nozze, tanto più se si considera che nel fr. 113 V. Saffo si riferisce alla sposa definendola πάις” (54).

\textsuperscript{160} Cf. Caciagli 2009: 76–79. If however, we do choose to follow Tognazzi and suppose that the addressee is the bride’s mother, our interpretation might well support her argument, which focuses on the relationship between the mother and daughter. In that case, the \textit{persona loquens} is addressing the mother as a \textit{paradeigma} for the daughter during the traumatic experience of the πομπή. The presence of the \textit{parthenoi} and their being sent away seems to highlight this transition in the bride’s life (even the ἄγωγη or “iter paradigmatico”). Her childhood is now distanced not just by their virginal presence but by discourse markers.

\textsuperscript{161} = 282a \textit{PMG}. The papyrus, \textit{P. Oxy. XV 1790}, dates from the first century BCE and was published by A. S. Hunt in 1922. It is not mentioned in Öhler 1925 but that is, I imagine, as likely due to the logistics of publication and distribution than to active omission on his part.

\textsuperscript{162} Debate normally centers on the identity of this Polycrates, whether it is the tyrant of Samos and how old he would have been.
material and first-person self-mythologization. Of course, we have already encountered explicit second-person address but only in cases where I have argued that the addressee has not been as important as the speaking persona. So, in Sappho fr. 22 V—where the persona frames the recollection of Abanthis’ past with γάρ, reserving καὶ γάρ for her own past—the speaker underscores the communicative priority: the persona’s past is far more important to the communicative strategy than Abanthis’. The second-person addressee in praise poetry, however, is arguably more important. Should we expect the self-mythologizing communicative strategy to change in order to accommodate the importance of an addressee? This is, again, a question we shall pursue in Pindaric poetry in the following chapter, but, for now, let us look to Ibycus.

We do not know how Ibycus fr. S151 SLG began or how much of the text has been lost, but in what remains we encounter a good number of mythological references related to the Trojan war. Indeed, the references essentially form a Catalogue of Ships transformed into a praeteritio. But, while we do not know how this mythological material was framed at the start, the presence of a coronis in the papyrus suggests that the following is its final antistrophe and epode (vv. 40–8):

```
αχρυσόστροφος
Τρώις ἐγήνατο, τῶι δ’ [ἄ]ρα Τρωίλουν ὥσει χρυσὸν ὄρει-
χάλκωι τρις ἀπεφθο[ν] ἡδῆ
Τρώες Δ[α]υισοί τ’ ἐρό[ε]σαν
μορφὰν μάλ’ ἐῖσκον ὁμοιον.
τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰέν
καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἀφθιτον ἔξεις
Φ ως κάτ’ ἀοιδάν καὶ ἐμὸν κλέος.
```

… (whom the Naiad,) golden-haired Hyllis, (conceived and) bore (to Phoebus); and to him Trojans and Greeks likened Troilus as gold already thrice-refined to orichalc, judging him very similar in loveliness of form. These have a share in beauty always. So too, you, Polycrates, will have unwithering fame, as according to song and my own fame. (trans. modified from D. A. Campbell)

However the poem began, then, it seems it finally (re)turns to Polycrates in the last two or three verses. But how it does so, and whether it does so in v. 46 or 47 is a matter, first of all, of text and syntax. The papyrus clearly shows a raised dot at the end of both vv. 45
and 46, but that in v. 46 has been generally disregarded, especially in recent years. I shall defend the papyrus’ punctuation in the course of an analysis of the discourse characteristics of this fragment and the way in which it deals with the past.

I think we are able to defend the papyrus’ punctuation—making v. 46 a separate clause and independent thought—by drawing on our study of the discourse characteristics of paradeigmata. First, notice that v. 46 has the syntactic shape of a gnomic statement: τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰὲν, one in which we are to understand ἐστί. This, of course, is a syntax familiar to us from our discussion above: it often introduces paradeigmata or

163. The punctuation is clearly visible in P. Oxy. XV 1790. I follow the convention of modern editors (e.g., Campbell, SLG) in printing a full-stop at the end of v. 45 rather than a colon.


165. Woodbury argues additionally that, by removing the punctuation, Polycrates is explicitly praised for his beauty; by retaining the stop, Polycrates is “at best set beside the everlasting beauty of the young heroes” (Woodbury 1985: 204). I find Woodbury’s insistence on Polycrates’ fame for beauty alone (κάλλεος…κλέος) a difficult reading. The genitive of specification (or explanatory genitive) hardly seems apt for a noun like κλέος. (For the infrequent but regular possessive genitive, cf. Il. 23.280, Pind. P. 4.125.) Hutchinson (ad 46–8) rightly cites Bacch. 13.65–6 (λείπεται | ἀθάνατον κλέος εὖ ἔρχθέντος ἀσφαλεῖ σὺν αἴσῃ) as a comparandum, but I still find the reading of κάλλεος…κλέος an extraordinary locution: Bacchylides’ “fame of a deed well done” is far closer to Homeric usage (cp. the plural κλέα ἀνδρῶν [“famous deeds of men”; e.g., Il. 9.189]) than “fame of/for beauty.”

166. Woodbury argues against the reading of πέδα as equivalent of μέτεστι with the genitive κάλλεος on the grounds that “this construction is unknown to choral lyric or to any other verse before the Persian wars” (1985: 203). In the form of μέτεστι, perhaps, but not so if we consider the use of the genitive and dative with μετέχω (and πεδέχω) in Pindar: οὐ οἱ μετέχω θράσεος (P. 2.83; “I do not have a share of his boldness”). Cf. πεδέχω at Pae. 4.37. Hutchinson (ad 46–8) compares the construction at, e.g., Aesch. Eum. 575, not finding the date an insurmountable objection. Woodbury (1985: 203n25) emphasizes the need for σῖν in the comparanda, but I do not see that it is critical. Both Woodbury and Hutchinson take issue with the idea of “having a share of beauty” as if it were an abstract Platonic ideal, but I think the Pindaric comparandum at P. 2.83 is a fine example of a person’s ‘participation in an attribute’ or ‘association with’ beauty or boldness. We might compare SEG 30:263 (11338a Peek): Ἐρμοτίων[σο], | [ὁς ποτε σωφ]ρ[νυνης κα]τι σ[οφίας] | μέτεχεν | [κάθανε δὲ] εὐ[τυχίαν ὀλέσα]ς πατρός.
illustrations in Archaic Greek poetry and wisdom discourses. But does this statement introduce a paradeigma? I suggest that it does. The καί of v. 47 is not the copulative conjunction but rather the use of καί as a discourse marker, which is especially common in combination with σύ. While the final verses of Homeric Hymns provide a number of examples of this ‘sentence’-initial καί σύ, the Odyssey provides a fine comparandum in Book 1 (298–302):

η οὐκ ἄεις οἶν κλέος ἔλλαμε δίος Ὁρέστης
πάντας ἐπ’ ἀνθρώπους, ἐπεὶ ἐκτενε πατροφονία,
Αἴγισθον δολόμητιν, ὃ οἱ πατέρα κλυτόν ἐκτα;
καὶ σὺ, φίλος, μάλα γὰρ α’ ὑρόω καλόν τε μέγαν τε,
ἄλκιμος ἐςο”, ἵνα τίς σε καὶ ὑμισύνων εὑ ἐπη.

Have you not heard what sort of kleos divine Orestes has won among all men, since he killed his father’s murderer, cunning Aegisthus, who had killed his famous father? So you, my friend—for I see clearly that you are handsome and great—be strong, someone of those to come should speak well of you.

Of the fact that this syntax occurs within the Orestes-Telemachus matrix of comparison that haunts the Odyssey and deals with κλέος, I make no claim at this point. For now it suffices to notice that καί σύ is a natural way to begin a new discourse unit, one that is even at home in the articulation of a paradeigma.

The καί of Ibycus fr. S151, then, is the particularizing discourse marker we saw in many paradeigmata within Archaic lyric. If this is right, however, the end of fr. S151 constitutes an ‘inverted’ paradeigma in the sense that Ibycus makes Polycrates the illustration of the gnomic statement in v. 46, as a particular example of what is first shown in the context of Trojan War heroes. This is not something we have noticed thus far, but neither have we dealt very much with praise poetry specifically. In fact, the source of the term, ‘particularizing’ καί, is in the context of an excellent illustration of how this dis-

---

167. For examples (e.g., παιδοφιλεῖν δέ τι τερπνόν; Theogn. 1345), see pp. 197–212 above.
168. For the hymn-final καί σύ μὲν οὖν ὑμισυ χαίρε..., see, e.g., h.Merc. 539 and h.Ap. 545, but that is a different articulation.
169. Both Ibycus’ Polycrates and the Odyssey’s Telemachus stand to gain κλέος in the comparison.
course strategy might work. In *Nemean 7* Pindar introduces the victor Sogenes as an illustration (vv. 1–8):

Ἐλείθυια, πάρεδρε Μοιρὰν βαθυφρόνων, παί μεγαλοσθενέος, ἄκουσον, Ἡρας, γενέτειρα τέκνων· ἄνευ σέθεν οὐ φάος, οὐ μέλαιναν δρακέντες εὔφροναν
tεσσ’ ἀδελφότον ἐλάχομεν ἀγλαόγυνου Ἡβαν.
ἀναπνεομεν δ’ οἰχ’ ἀπαντες ἐπὶ ἑαυτῇ:
εἴργει δὲ πότιμω ζυγένθ' ἐτερον ἐτερα, οὖν δὲ τίν καὶ παῖς ὁ Θεαρίωνος ἀρετα κριθείς
eὐδοξος αἴδηται Σωγένης μετὰ πενταέθλοις.

Eleithuia, enthroned beside the deep-thinking Fates, daughter of the mighty Hera, hear me, giver of birth to children. Without you we behold neither light nor the darkness of night, nor are we allotted your sister, splendid-limbed Hebe. Yet we do not all draw breath for equal ends, for different things constrain each man in destiny’s yoke. But by your grace Thearion’s son, Sogenes, is made famous in song because he was distinguished for his excellence among pentathletes. (trans. W. H. Race)

Following the gnomic statements of vv. 5–6 and the fronted σὺν δὲ τίν, with καὶ παῖς in v. 7 Pindar offers the victor as an exemplification of the sentiment that Sogenes’ excellence is as fated as destiny’s other constraints upon our lives.\(^{171}\) Compared to Ibycus *fr. S151*, then, the only element lacking in the *Nemean 7* comparandum is the idea that the patron’s κλέος is linked with the κλέος of the poet, such as is expressed in S151.47–8. But the linked fame of poet and patron, of authoritative *persona* and victorious patron, is explicit in enough other praise poetry, especially that of Pindar.\(^{172}\)


\(^{172}\) Cf., most famously, Pind. *O.* 1.115–16, but also *O.* 6.105 (ἐμῶν δ’ ὑμων ἰδε’ εὐτερπές ἀνθός), *I.* 2.44–8 (μὴ τ’ ἀρετάν ποτε σιγάτω πατρώαν, ἵππε δ’ τοῦθ’ ὑμων …), and Bacch. 3.95–6 (οὐ φέρει κόμπου σι’ ὕπτα· οὖν δ’ ἀλαθ[είσ] καλῶν | καὶ μελιγλώσου τις ὑμνήσει χάριν Κηίας ἀνδόνος).
Chapter 9 | Pindaric textures I: discourse units and markers

In Archaic Greek lyric poetry we have seen καὶ γάρ perform two interrelated roles: on the one hand the discourse marker can, as in hexameter verses, mark out a story as paradigmatic; on the other hand, the marker can be used to ‘mythologize’ the speaking persona or even the addressee in a praise context. In turning to Pindar, we might begin with the commonplace of mentioning Pindar’s use of a simple γάρ or a relative pronoun in the transition to mythological narrative.¹ Pindar does indeed use such means of transition, but in this section I shall make two related revisions to this commonplace. First, as important as the particles or pronoun employed in a transition is the relationship of the discourse units. That is, the communicative strategy surrounding the mythological material often depends less on which discourse particles are used to mark the transitions than on the relative characters of the two discourse units. This is made all the more clear by the fact that asyndeton is commonly found at the transition from gnomic statements to paradigmatic mythological material. Second, and against this backdrop, Pindar’s use of καὶ γάρ is marked and betrays the latent poetics of genealogical catalogue in select epinikia.²

1. The seminal work on the pronoun in Pindar is Des Places 1947; a more recent treatment is Bonifazi 2004. Both of these works acknowledge the use of γάρ, but a fuller treatment may be found in Slater 1983.

2. Other scenarios are possible, too, and we shall study these in turn. When a myth follows on a victory announcement or prayer, for example, we can normally expect a different syntax at the transition, namely the relative clause. Such a strategy, as I shall argue below, is one among those
That the Pindaric victory ode is essentially a complex, hybridized poetic genre has long been recognized. Moreover, even this hybridized genre is itself heterogeneous in the presence and extent of the various simpler genres it comprises: the extant *epinikia* range in length from less than twenty verses (*O*. 12) to nearly three hundred (*P*. 4), and from having no mythological material to having extended narrative featuring direct discourse. In that sense, to speak of Pindar as, at times, composing genealogical catalogue poetry does not seem remarkable, for he notably includes other ways of speaking such as *hypothêkai*, cult hymn, and *kallinikos* song. Yet what we shall see in Pindar is that he not only adopts the style of genealogical catalogue poetry in some of the *epinikia*, but that he does so in a manner that draws simultaneously on the association of this style with *paradeigmata* in Homeric poetry. In this way, he both creates catalogic histories of victor’s families that culminate in their paradigmatic, hereditary excellence, and also adopts the discourse markers of this speech genre to fashion and draw on ‘exemplary poetic performances’ in the manner of other Archaic Greek lyric *persona*. While the question of what mythological material in Pindar is properly paradigmatic cannot be fully addressed here,

---

3. Wells 2009, a study in the orchestration of simpler genres in the complex genre of Pindaric *epinikion*, nicely summarizes recent scholarship (181–2n82). *Epinikion*’s ‘hymnic elements’ are stressed especially in Bundy 1986 and Race 1990 (cf. further references in Kurke 1991: 259n8). Kurke (1991: 258) stresses the fact that this composite genre of *epinikion* is a “relative newcomer,” noting the suggestion of Σ Pind. *I*. 2.9a (iii p. 214.10–20 Drachmann) that Pindar’s elder contemporary Simonides had invented the genre.

4. There is no mythological material in, e.g., *O*. 5, 11, and 12; *P*. 7; *I*. 2 and 3 (on which short poems see Hamilton 1974). Direct discourse within mythological narrative is featured in, e.g., *O*. 6, 8, and 13; *P*. 3, 4, 5, 8, and 9, 12; *N*. 9 and 10; *I*. 6 and 8.


6. No summary of this old problem is possible, but its antiquity is attested by the remarks of Chairis recorded at Σ Pind. *N*. 1.49c (iii. p. 19.8–21.6 Drachmann). Modern approaches (similarly) tend to hinge upon historical and biographical speculation.
I shall sketch some of the ways in which attention to discourse units and markers in Pindar throws light on communicative strategies and interpretive problems in the *epinikia*.

### A Discourse units

We may begin with the initially troubling observation that Pindar maintains a bold, even harsh, directness in his language while simultaneously elaborating it with statements that otherwise draw attention to his reliance on other traditions. That is, on the one hand, Pindar often frames mythological material in his odes with *Zitatformeln* such as we saw in other Archaic Greek poetry above. Yet, on the other hand, Pindar does not use discourse markers as extensively as one might expect, and even more seldom does he use particles in combination. This seemingly paradoxical coincidence, however, the coincidence that the language should both be denuded (or remain comparatively free) of discourse markers and contain additional statements that self-consciously underscore elements of the ode, points to the effectiveness within the Pindaric *epinikion* of the conventional ordering of discourse units. These discourse units often follow the pattern observed in other Archaic Greek lyric poetry and wisdom discourse, as studied above, but are set off not by discourse markers but by their word order. Likewise, within a style that

---

7. On Pindaric poetry’s *harte Fugung*, or αὐστηρὸς ἁρμονία, Dornseiff (1921: 86) writes: “Die Sprache der Chorlyrik ist mehr dem einzelnen Wort als dem Satz zugewandt … das Wort [ist] die taktische Einheit.” In several respects my study will be at odds with this statement, but such a statement does describe a backdrop against which a stylistic consistency at a level greater than the word—on the level of discourse marker and syntax—will be all the more marked.

8. The use of ἀρα seems especially restricted in Pindar (see Slater, s.v.), and ῥά occurs just 6× (1× with a relative [*fr. 125.1*]). On his extensive use of ἕ in a variety of contexts, see n.30 on p. 239 below. We shall also discuss the effectiveness of asyndeton below, but any such study should be considered alongside compelling arguments for the importance of deixis and anaphora. On demonstratives in Pindar, see Felson 2004 (with the accompanying articles in that volume), and compare Sanskrit demonstratives as a means of coordination (see, again, n.30 on p. 239 below).

9. In support of Pindar’s attention to the boundaries of discourse units, one may fruitfully compare his alignment of their boundaries (and syntactic features) within the strophic structure, especially the beginning of a triad.
does not rely heavily on specialized discourse markers, when we come to the use of καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ below, we shall be able to argue strongly for their markedness.

A.1 Zitatformeln, discourse units, asyndeton, and gnomai

Pindar’s approach to the hybridized genre of epinikion often includes the explicit delineation of stretches of discourse. Most conspicuous is Pindar’s own use of the Zitatformel to mark his use of traditional material: throughout the odes one encounters the more familiar φαντί (= φασί), λέγοντ(α)μ/λέγεται, ἵστε μάν, as well as the more unusual such as τεκμιάρομαι or periphrastic constructions involving λόγος or λεγόμενον. While not meant to be comprehensive, this list gives some sense of the variety and prevalence of a discursive strategy that seems to draw attention to Pindar’s reliance on tradition if not also his “self-conscious traditionality.” Of course, these quotation formulae do not occur every time Pindar draws on mythological material, leaving us another way to view Pindar’s use of Zitatformeln, one that is essential to our discussion of discourse units and transitions below: Pindar tends to use quotation formulae such as φαντί at the less conventional transitions between the various types of discourse units found in Pindaric epinikia. That is, while it is Pindar’s usual habit to move from gnomic statements into

10. I have discerned no clear difference in the register among the various verbs of speaking. They can also introduce more generally ‘gnomic’ material: e.g., P. 4.287 (but note movement into Atlas) and P. 7.19. I am, of course, inclined to associate φαντί (= φασί) with traditionally Hesiodic material or style: e.g., O. 7.54 (Rhodes and Helios), P. 4.88 (Otos and Ephialtes), 6.21 (Cheiron), and even I. 8.46a (Peleus and Thetis [or the Cypria: see Gantz 1996: 228]).

11. E.g., O. 7.54; P. 1.52, 2.21, 4.88, 4.287, 6.21, 7.19; I. 8.46a.

12. E.g., O. 2.28, 9.49; P. 3.88; N. 9.39, 7.84; fr. 52m.9, 70a.15.

13. E.g., I. 3.15, 4.35.

14. For τεκμιάρομαι introducing an example, see fr. 169.6; for λόγος, see O. 2.22 (but of a simpler ‘saying’ at N. 9.6); for λεγόμενον, see N. 3.52 (but of the victor’s deeds at P. 5.108).

15. The quoted phrase is from Kurke 1991: 259, cited in relation to quotation formulae in Pavlou 2008: 534, which article features an interesting discussion of O. 9 in relation to other poetic traditions (including the Catalogue). Yet the presence of these Zitatformeln in other Archaic lyric (as well as hexameter [e.g., II. 4.375, 5.638]) speaks against seeing the use of such quotation formulae as innovatory.

16. The analysis of Wells 2009, for example, defines five principal types of epinikian ways of
paradigmatic myth, as we shall see in detail below, he tends to use *Zitatformeln* in order to handle less conventional transitions into myth. Thus, at *P.* 1.52 he may move from a statement about the victor into the tale of Philoctetes, or at *P.* 2.21 from Hieron to the example of Ixion.\(^{17}\)

Quotation formulae are one way that Pindar calls attention to the hybridization of speech genres within his poetry, but more often the boundaries within an ode are not so elaborately or explicitly designated. Indeed, very often the boundaries between discourse units or sentences in Pindaric poetry are so basic as to be asyndetic.\(^{18}\) In this respect Pindaric poetry differs greatly from Homeric poetry, which shows very little asyndeton.\(^{19}\) While it would not be expedient to fully describe here the variety of functions that asyndeton seems to perform in Pindaric poetry, we may briefly highlight just two features: (1) asyndeton, while probably best known from the Pindaric ‘break-off’, is not limited to that particular discourse boundary; (2) the use of discourse markers at the boundaries of discourse units is not compulsory, with an unmarked δέ very often sufficing.\(^{20}\) It is against

---

17. It is not unconventional to move from a statement about the victor into a myth, but in those cases the transition is normally effected by means of relative pronoun (thus folding the victor into mythological material). In these two cases the differences could be seen as not wishing to associate the victor with the figures of Philoctetes or Ixion, naturally enough.

18. I treat asyndeton here as a lack of connective particles, and emphasize that my term ‘basic’ does not mean ‘unmarked’. In fact, asyndeton may well be a ‘marked’ way of denoting boundaries of discourse units (cp., e.g., *Il.* 22.391–4, with Richardson *ad* 22.393–4 and Eust. 1275.17ff., on the asyndeton between vv. 392–3 as representing inset song or refrain).

19. What constitutes asyndeton in Homer, of course, is not a settled matter (cf., e.g., the considerations in Friedrich and Redfield 1978: 279n8) and discussion of the style occurs as early the Homeric scholia (e.g., Σ *Il.* 15.563a) and Ps.-Longinus (§19). Seymour 1895: 18–19 has a handy list of Homeric examples. On Greek’s tendency to use τε and δέ in structures normally asyndetic in Indo-Iranian, see Klein 1992; on the stylistic value in Sanskrit, cf. Gonda 1975: 362–364.

20. Classifications and characterizations of asyndeton have been attempted elsewhere, with mixed success. Dissen’s treatment (Dissen and Schneidewin 1843: 341–348) is seminal, but see the study of Hummel 1993: §§449–475 (esp. §§459–72) as well as Dornseiff 1921: 85–89 and K–G II 339–47. Much of the discussion takes place in commentaries: Braswell is particularly
this backdrop of, at times, ‘stripped-down’ discourse that the effectiveness of discourse units and markers may be most clearly seen.

This effectiveness, in fact, relies on recognizable conventions in their ordering, as well as the topicalization of certain grammatically essential words within them. In this sense, the recognizable discourse unit itself becomes the marker, and the interpretive signal is built into the expectations associated with the serial ordering of discourse units. The transition from gnome into mythological material in Pindaric poetry is, in fact, so conventional that there is no need even for a discourse marker. Notice how the paradigm of Typhos in Pythian 8 follows asyndetically on the gnome that precedes it (vv. 13–24):\(^{22}\)

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{κέρδος} & \text{ δὲ φιλτατον}, \\
\text{ἐκόντος} & \text{ εἲ τ} \text{ις ἐκ δόμων φέροι}. \\
\text{βία} & \text{ δὲ και} \text{ μεγάλαυχον ἐσφαλεν ἐν χρόνοι}. & 15 \\
\text{Τυφώς} & \text{ Κίλιξ} \text{ ἐκατόγκρανος οὔ} \text{ νιν ἀλυξεν}, \\
\text{οὐδὲ} & \text{ μᾶν} \text{ βασιλεὺς Γιγάντων} \text{· διὰθεν δὲ κεραυνῷ} \\
\text{τὸξοι} & \text{ τ’ Ἀπόλλωνος· ὃς εὔμενει νόω} \\
\text{Ξενάρκειον} & \text{ ἔδεικτο} \text{ Κίρραθεν ἐστεφανωμένον} \\
\text{τὸν} & \text{ ποία Παρνασσίδι Δωρεὶ τε κόμῳ}. & 20 \\
\text{ἐπεσε δ’} & \text{ οὔ} \text{ Χαρίτων ἡκάς} \\
\text{ἀ δικαιόπολις ἀρεταῖς} & \text{ κλειναίον Αἰακίδαν} \\
\text{διγοίσα νάσος}. & \\
\end{align*}
\]

thoughtful on asyndeton, usually in accordance with Dissen (‘summary’ [ad N. 1.18], ‘transitional’ [ad N. 1.31–2], and ‘emphatic’ [ad N. 9.34–7]). See especially his notes on N. 9.34–7 in response to Hummel, although I cannot fully agree with him that asyndeton “should be classified in terms of the logical relation not the formal relation to its context” (112). Race (1989b) studies asyndeton in the Pindaric ‘break-off’. Asyndeton may also be described as ‘explanatory’ in commentaries on Pindar, just as in those on Homer (cf., e.g., Janko ad Il. 15.445–51).

\(^{21}\) A similar approach has been taken by Wells (2009), but his emphasis is not on the audience’s recognition of the conventional arrangement of discourse units, but rather the large-scale structures (e.g., ring-composition) evident in the overall compositional structure of an ode.

\(^{22}\) Some cohesion is lent by the νιν in v. 16, but its postponement in the verse diminishes that contribution. The initial nominative subject also occurs, accompanied by δέ, at N. 3.43–52 (ξανθὸς δ’ Ἀχιλεὺς). Here and below, I have separated discourse units relevant to our discussion with ’][’.
Gain is most precious if one takes it from the home of a willing giver. But force brings down even the proud boaster in the end. [Hundred-headed Typhos from Cilicia did not escape it, nor indeed the king of the Giants, for they were overcome by a thunderbolt and the arrows of Apollo, who graciously welcomed the son of Xenarkes from Kirrha, crowned with Parnassian foliage and with a Doric victory revel. ][ Not far from the Graces has the lot of this just island city fallen, which has attained the renowned achievements of the Aiakidai. (trans. W. H. Race)

Here, I suggest, it is the conventional ordering of recognizable discourse units that facilitates Pindar’s omission of discourse markers. Conversely, when a gnome is not followed by mythological material, it is consistently marked otherwise, either by particles, syntax, or word order.

Of course, the frequency with which we have already observed transitions from gnome to paradeigma (and even back to gnome) in Archaic Greek lyric poetry and wisdom discourse makes it all the more clear how established this conventional discourse pattern must have been for Pindar and his audience. A succinct example of the complete gnome-paradeigma-gnome pattern occurs in Isthmian 7 (vv. 42–8):

... τὰ μακρὰ δ’ εἰ τὶς
παπταίνει, βραχὺς ἐξικέσθαι χαλκόπεδον θεῶν
ἐδραν· ὥτοι πτερόεις ἔρριψε Πάγασος
δεσπόταν ἐθέλοντ’ εἰς οὐρανοῦ σταθοὺς
ἔλθειν μεθ’ ὁμάγυρυν Βελλεροφόνταυ
Ζηνός. ][ τὸ δὲ πάρ δίκαν
γλυκύ πικροτάτα μείνε τελευτά.

If a man peers at distant things, he is too little to reach the gods’ bronze-paved dwelling. ][ Indeed, winged Pegasos threw his master, when Bellerophon desired to enter the habitations of heaven and the company of Zeus. ][ A most bitter end awaits that sweetness which is unjust.

---

23. Nor does it detract that the paradeigma begins with Τυφώς Κίλιξ ἐκατόγκρανος (v. 16).

24. Gnomai are also very often followed by prayers, but such transitions have their own discourse conventions that situate the speaker and audience: most common by far, and almost always initial, are personal pronouns (e.g., O. 1.111, 13.13; P. 2.57) and vocatives (e.g., O. 1.36; P. 5.5), as well as imperatives, first-person and optative verbs (e.g., O. 1.114, 11.11; closely related adverbs may precede). When this is not the case, an ἀλλά is common (e.g., O. 4.6, 8.9, 8.74; P. 1.85, 4.293; N. 9.20, 10.45). Different from gnome-to-paradeigma transitions, a gnome to a statement oriented in the hic et hunc can be handled by a simple δέ.
Neither the particle τοί nor the determiner ὅ are nearly as important in signaling the function of the myth as is the recognizability of this discourse pattern. While the effectiveness of the initial gnomic element is clearly an interpretive signal for the audience, we should not discount that of the final gnomic element either: in cases where a mythological paradeigma is not introduced by a gnome, a trailing gnome can even help shape interpretation retroactively.

Within this pattern, however, there is one especially interesting way in which Pindar often signals the transition from gnome to paradeigma. He accomplishes this not with any particular discourse marker, but by fronting a third-person finite verb. We can observe this in Pythian 3, in a transition that is itself part of a lengthy alternation of gnomai and paradeigmata (vv. 5–60). After a gnomic statement concerning the foolish man who chases vain hopes, Pindar resumes with an exemplification of this statement in the figure of Koronis (vv. 21–30):
headstrong Koronis of the beautiful robes fell victim to that great delusion, for she slept in the bed of a stranger, who came from Arcadia. But she did not elude the watching god, for although he was in flock-receiving Pytho as lord of this temple, Loxias perceived it, convinced by the surest confidant, his all-knowing mind. He does not deal in falsehoods, and neither god nor mortal deceives him by deeds or designs. (trans. W. H. Race)

These fronted verbs can be accompanied by particles (such as τοι above), but it is the fronting of a third-person finite verb within a conventional ordering of discourse units that is more clearly the communicative discourse feature. Observe this phenomenon in the following twelve cases of mythological material following a gnome, where the accompanying particles vary (and often a ‘simple’ δέ suffices):

... ἐπετει δὲ λόγος εὐθρόνοις
Κάδμιοι κούραις, ἔπαθαν αἱ μεγάλα πένθος δὲ πίτυνε βαρύ
kreosóvwn prois ágathóv.
μαντεύσατο δὲ εἰς θεόν ἐλθὼν.
τράπε δὲ Κύκνεια μᾶχα καὶ ύπέρβιον
'Hρακλέα: Ο. 2.22–4

οὐ φθίνει Κροίσου φιλόφρων ἀρετά.
τὸν δὲ ταύρῳ χαλκέῳ καυτῆρα νῆλεα νόν
ἐχθρά Φάλαριν κατέχει παυτά φάτις,
κελαδέοντι μὲν ἄμφι Κινύραν πολλάκις
φάμαι Κυπρίων, τὸν ὁ χρυσοχαῖτα
προφρόνως ἐφίλησ' Ἀπόλλων., Π. 1.94–6

30. I put ‘simple’ in scare-quotes because, as with asyndeton, commentators offer many distinctions among functions of δέ such as ‘apodotic’, ‘consecutive’, ‘inceptive’, ‘specifying’, and ‘motivating’ (see the Greek indices of Verdenius 1987 and 1988, with Verdenius 1974). I do not contest that we find δέ in all such contexts, but I do suggest that we at least attempt to shift some of the interpretive burden away from the δέ to the general discursive context, including word order. Compare the suggestions of Klein 1992, who calls the particle “the nexal device par excellence of the language” (28), as well as Bakker 1997b.

31. As in the case of P. 3, this example is part of a larger alternation of gnomai and paradeigmata. See further below.

32. One might question the extent to which the preceding statement (νέμει γὰρ Ἀτρέκεια πόλιν
Λοκρῶν Ζεφυρίων, | μελεί τὲ σφιο Καλλιότα | καὶ χάλκεος Ἀρης; vv. 13–15) is gnomic, but the timelessness of the intended stereotype (cf. Verdenius ad 13 s.v. Ἀτρέκεια) is compelling.
ἔγεντο καὶ πρότερον Ἀντίλοχος βιατὰς νόημα τούτο φέρουν, ὃς ύπερέφθιτο πατρός

ἔγνυν ποτὲ καὶ ἱόλαον οὐκ ἀτιμάσαντα ταῖς ἐπίταπουλοι Θῆβαιν.

θάνεν μὲν αὐτὸς ἔρως Άτρείδας ἱκὼν χρόνῳ κυριαῖς ἐν Αμύκλαισι.

ἔστα δὲ θάμβης δυσφόρῳ τερπνῷ τελπικείς τερπνῷ.

λέγοντι γὰρ Αἰακὸν νιν ὑπὸ ματροδόκοις γοναῖς φυτεύσατο

ὕπερέφθιτο πατρός.

λέγοντι γάρ άγνω τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος.

It is worth making this explicit: if a verb-fronted ‘sentence’ follows a gnome, it is almost always either another gnome or mythological material; if that verb is past tense, it is always mythological material; if that first-position verb is present tense, it is either part of another gnome or a Zitatformel (e.g., ὂ. 2.22, ὃ. 2.15, ὅ. 7.84, and ὅ. 9.39 above).

This is an interesting case, for the preceding gnome (pace Wells 2009: 213) is even a paraphrase or quotation of the centaur Cheiron. The hic et nunc resumes at vv. 43–4 with a coordinating καὶ: τά μὲν παρίκει | τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος.

Because punctuation in Pindaric texts is often contested, my analysis treats the Pindaric ‘sentence’ as any group of words that are enclosed by either a raised dot or full stop in the Teubner edition of Snell-Maehler.

The few deviations from this convention are significant, for they highlight the way in which Pindar programmatically folds the victor into a paradigmatic framework. Notice at ὅ. 6.8 how, following a gnome, Pindar introduces the victor Alkimidas as ‘proof’ of his hereditary nature: || τεκμαίρει {δὲ} καὶ νῦν Ἀλκιμίδας τὸ συγγενὲς ἰδεῖν (ο̣ν τεκμαίρω, cp. fr. 169.4 with p. 234 above).

In fact, regardless of what kind of discourse unit precedes the verb-fronted sentence, or of the tense or semantics of that verb, that sentence is most often mythological material (at least half of the time, in 77 of 144 instances). While that is not a very strong correlation, when one factors in even just tense, something immediately interpretable by the audience, that likelihood becomes far greater.
A.2  **Particles, verbs, and victors**

If these are some of the unmarked conventions in Pindar, we may now better discern ways in which Pindar adapts such conventions to the celebration of a victor. We shall deal with more pronounced examples below, but it is fitting here to note a rather striking remodeling of the *gnome-paradeigma-gnome* discourse unit progression that, following on a *gnome*, weaves myth and victor into the same syntax (*N*. 2.13–17):37

... ἐστὶ δ᾿ ἐοικός

ódreian ge Peleia diáw

μὴ τηλόθεν (Ωσ)ρίωνα νεῖσθαι.

cai māν a Salmonis ge θέρωμα φότα μαχατάν

dυνατός, ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν Ἐκτωρ Αἰαντος ἀκουσεν. ὡς Τιμόδημε, σὲ δ᾿ ἀλκά

παγκρατίου πλάθυς ἄξεις.

Ἀχάρναι δὲ παλαίφατον ἐνώνορες.

And it is probable that Orion travels not too far behind the mountain Peleiades. Moreover, Salamis certainly is able to raise a fighter. In Troy Hector heard Ajax. But you, O Timodemos, the pancration’s persevering strength exalts. Acharnae [is] long-famed for its good men.

The gnomic ἐστι-ἐοικός and δυνατός(-ἐστι) syntax of vv. 10–14 leads naturally into the *paradeigma* of Ajax with the mention of Salamis. The *gnome* and *paradeigma* discourse units are actually interlocked, then, just as the discourse units that follow: notice that the σὲ δ’ of the address to Timodemos (vv. 14–15) responds to the ἐν Τροίᾳ μὲν of the Ajax *paradeigma* (v. 14).38 Moreover, the mythologization of Timodemos’ victory in the pancration is heightened by the zero-copula *gnome* regarding Acharnae that follows it and the strophic boundary. Thus, while working within the traditional *gnome-paradeigma-gnome* discourse-unit framework, Pindar syntactically weaves the victor into the *paradeigma* of Ajax itself. Recognition of the paradigmatic function of the narrative relies less on discourse markers than the conventional ordering of discourse units, and the particles are present not so much to demarcate the conventional discourse units as they are to

37. Cf. the equivalent strategy at *O*. 2.3–5: (ἵτωι Πίσα μὲν Διός Ὄλυμπα δ’ ἐστασεν Ἡρακλέης | ἀκρόθια πολέμου | Θήρωνα δὲ τετρα(ο)ρίας ἑνεκα νικαφόρου) and *P*. 6.28–44 (ἔγεντο καὶ πρότερον Ἀντιλόχος [28]... τῶν νῦν δὲ καὶ Ἐρασύβουλος [44]).

38. That the vocative precedes the σὲ δ’ is normal (see n.24 on p. 237 above).
bind the mythologized address to the victor Timodemos together within the *gnome* and *paradeigma* framework.

I would further suggest that recognizing this strategy on the level of discourse units and particles even helps us understand a particularly vexed combination of mythological material and address of the victor in *Olympian* 10. In this *epinikion* for a victory of the Lokrian Hagesidamos, Pindar briefly refers to a narrative in which Kyknos defeats Heracles after referring to the strictness that rules over the Lokrians, as well as to their devotion to music and war (vv. 13–19):

```
νέμει γάρ Ἀτρέκεια πόλιν Λοκρῶν Ζευρίων,
μέλει τε ὀφιο Καλλιόπα
καὶ χάλκεος Ἀρης. τράπε δὲ Κύκνεια μάχα καὶ ύπέρβιον
'Ηρακλέα: πύκτας δ' ἐν Ὀλυμπιάδι νικῶν
'Ἰλα φερέτω χάριν
Ἀγησίδαμος, ὡς
Ἀχιλὲ Ἀχιλέως.
```

For strictness rules the city of the Western Lokrians, and dear to them are Kalliope and brazen Ares. The battle with Kyknos turned back even mighty Herakles, and as a victorious boxer at the Olympic games, let Hagesidamos offer gratitude to Ilas as Patroklos did to Achilles. (trans. W. H. Race)

Whatever the source of this strange narrative about Heracles and Kyknos, what *function* it serves has been much disputed: as Gilversleeve succinctly remarks, “[t]he nexus is not over-clear” (*ad* 17). Accordingly, Gildersleeve and others have sought to understand the Kyknos narrative as being a historical allusion, but have yet to do so convincingly. Working against that line of interpretation, Verdenius argues that the δέ in v. 15 is ‘inceptive’ rather than ‘explanatory’ or ‘adversative’ (*ad* 15–16). I would suggest, however, that we place less emphasis on the particle δέ than the fronting of the verb τράπε following a sentence that is gnomically expressed, with its balanced phrasing and abstract per-

---

39. Verdenius suggests that the δέ “[h]as consecutive force and marks the conclusion” (*ad* 16).
40. An allusion to, say, the strictness of the Lokrians (cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1922: 220) but see Hubbard 1985: 64 (with Hubbard 1989) and Verdenius (*ad* 15–16).
sonifications. Along these lines we can better discern that, more important than historical allusion, is the fact that Ares, as Kyknos’ father, presumably helped Kyknos in the battle in which he drove back Heracles. Likewise, the victorious boxer Hagesidamos owes thanks to his trainer Ila, a point Pindar then reiterates with a comparison to the thanks owed by Patroclus to his trainer Achilles. Again, Pindar folds the victor into the conventional paradeigma, and uses particles not to delineate discourse units but to join the victor with the traditional mythological material.

This Pindaric strategy of weaving the victor into myth even in the conventional gnome-paradeigma pairing may be viewed as a reflex more clearly articulated in another convention in Pindar, the transition from victory announcement or prayer to a paradeigma. This conventional transition is generally accomplished with a relative clause and is especially effective in temporally incorporating the victor within traditional mythological material. Moreover, as we have seen in Archaic Greek hexameter poetry, this convention has genealogical associations, just as the discourse markers καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ. These two discourse features coincide in Pindaric poetry too, and they are all the more marked when set against the background we have just sketched of a poetics in

---

42. I would add that the pro persona abstract noun Ἀτρέκεια (v. 13) is even (almost chiastically) arranged opposite the proper nouns, Καλλιόπα and Ἀρης, which, conversely, refer to abstract concepts.

43. Verdenius (ad loc.) notes that the δέ in v. 16 “has consecutive force.” He compares O. 7.31, but I note that there, too, one finds a verb (μαντεύσατο) fronted with δέ after a gnome (αἱ δέ φρενῶν ταραχαί | παρέπλαγξαν καὶ σοφόν, vv. 30–1).

44. Hubbard (1989) is certainly right to stress that the Cyncus narrative is “an illustration of Ares’ power and importance” and “a reflection of the crucial difference made by an advisor’s presence, thus paralleling Cyncus’ assistance by Ares to Hagesidamus’ assistance by his trainer Ila” (142).

45. This convention is evident even within O. 10, where Hagesidamos and his youthfulness are woven into a story of Ganymede: παῖδ’ ἐρατὸν Δ’ Ἀρχεστράτου | αἰνήσα, τὸν εἶδον κρατέοντα… ὡρα τε κεκραμένου, ἀ ποτέ | ἀναιδέα Γανυμήδει θάνατον ἄλκε σὺν Κυπρογενεί (vv. 99–105). On the relative clause with ποτέ in Pindar, see further below. Cf. too P. 3.74 (τοὺς ἀριστεύων Φερένικος ἐλευ Κίρρα ποτέ) and N. 10.24–8.
which asyndeton, verb-fronting, and the order of discourse units are as communicative as discourse markers.

**B Discourse units: καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ**

The frequent lack of discourse markers between discourse units in Pindaric poetry, and the effectiveness of communicative strategies lacking them, does not imply that we should disregard them. Instead, it makes instances of particle strings such as καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ all the more significant and marked. Yet, how, or for what, they are marked depends on one’s approach. W. J. Slater, in his magisterial *Lexicon to Pindar*, rightly treats καὶ γάρ in combination, even if his actual explanations of its meanings may privilege one particle over the other. His sub-entry under γάρ considers three main uses of καὶ γάρ:

46. Slater treats the single Pindaric instance of οὐδὲ γάρ s.v. γάρ 1.c (“1. not joined with other particles ... c. introduces narrative in elaboration of what precedes”).
This entry, which is organized around logical relation and the relative weight of either καὶ or γάρ as criteria for its sub-categories, is sensible and suitable to a lexicon.\textsuperscript{47} Yet it is too abstract to provide any discernible pattern for καὶ γάρ’s properties in larger discursive contexts. Instead, I would suggest that the use of this discourse marker (as well as οὐδὲ γάρ, but it only appears once) is better seen as a broader matter of register and style rather than local, logical function. After all, the particle γάρ in Pindar, when observed on that local level, behaves very similarly to καὶ γάρ.\textsuperscript{48} Moreover, given the frequency of mythological \textit{paradeigmata} in Pindar, if we are not to treat these occurrences as metrical-ly determined or even completely randomly selected, it is natural to consider these instances in light of their attendant discourse features.

Another condition of καὶ γάρ’s occurrence in an ode is that it tends to appear in combination with other discourse characteristics, even with other instances of καὶ γάρ. Of the 13 instances of the discourse marker,\textsuperscript{49} six of those instances occur alongside another καὶ γάρ, again suggesting as much a coherence of style as emphasis within logi-

\textsuperscript{47} Cf. too K–G II 330–9 (esp. 337–9) and Denniston (p. 28 above). Wüst (1967: 243–249) treats every Pindaric instance of καὶ γάρ in the context of \textit{I. 5}, under the heading “καὶ γάρ = ja auch.”

\textsuperscript{48} Cf. Slater 1969: 101–102 (s.v. γάρ): “1. c. introduces narrative in elaboration of what precedes … introducing argument, proof, example … You Graces are a source of pleasure to men. οὐδὲ γάρ θεοὶ σειμάν Χαρίτων ἄτερ κοιρανέουτι χοροὺς οὔτε δαίτας Ο. 14.8 μέγιστον δ’ αἰόλῳ ψεύδει γέρας ἀντέταται. κρυφίαισι γάρ ἐν ψάφοις Ὀδυσσῆ Δαναι θεράπευσαν Ν. 8.26. cf. Ν. 7.24.” I shall treat the instance of οὐδὲ γάρ (\textit{O. 14.8}) alongside καὶ γάρ below. Of Ν. 8.26, which introduces a narrative of the contest between Odysseus and Ajax in support of the \textit{gnome} in vv. 24–5, I would emphasize, in light of my discussion above, that the γάρ works in concert with the nature of the discourse units themselves. Moreover, were it a matter of logical connection rather than register and style, it is hard to see what would determine the choice between γάρ and καὶ γάρ other than meter.

\textsuperscript{49} Slater lists 14 occurrences, considering cases of ‘καὶ — γάρ’. I follow Slater in considering καὶ τοὶ γάρ of \textit{O. 7. 48}, encouraged by the instance of καὶ γάρ at \textit{O. 7.27} (on which more below). Of the καὶ Νεμέα γάρ at \textit{O. 8.56} (cf. also Wüst 1967: 244), I am inclined to treat the particles separately due to the significance of the intervening word and the tense and person of the verb that follows (ἐρέω, v. 57).
cal connection.\footnote{We shall study each of these below: \textit{O.} 7.27, 48; \textit{N.} 1. 50, 67; \textit{I.} 5. 4, 26. For a similar regularity with καί, see \textit{N}. 8. 6 (οἵοι καί), 18 (δόσει καί), 23 (καίνος καί).} In the studies below I shall not attempt to explain every occurrence,\footnote{I shall treat all the Pindaric examples but for \textit{P.} 4.181 and 10.59. The καί γάρ at \textit{P.} 10.59, which introduces a gnomic statement, Farnell calls “somewhat incoherent” (\textit{ad} 59–60); Wüst (1967: 248) would have preferred Pindar use a simple γάρ. As for \textit{P.} 4.181, only space constrains me: the καί γάρ marks narrative expansion within Pindar’s Catalogue of Argonauts (vv. 169–87). It is particularly intriguing that, as West (1985a: 87) details, \textit{P}. 4’s Euphemos, the Argonaut ancestor of the Battidae on Cyrene, is the son of Mekionike and a narrative of the Argonauts’ arrival on Libya was very probably handled in the \textit{Catalogue} or the \textit{Megalai Ehoi}ai (frr. 245, 253 M–W). On the Pindaric catalogue, see further Braswell (\textit{ad loc.}); his comments on καί γάρ (\textit{ad} 181[a]) seem less helpful.} but rather focus on 11 of the 14 instances of either καί γάρ or οὐδὲ γάρ. Among these instances I suggest we can discern essentially two classes of usage, each represented in other other types of Archaic Greek poetry above: the first is the use of the discourse marker to signify ‘exemplary performances’;\footnote{As we shall see, however, even these have connections to genealogical catalogue.} the second class proves to be part of a larger system of conventions related to genealogical catalogue poetry and to the codification of a family’s hereditary excellence.

**B.1 Exemplary performances: \textit{O.} 14, \textit{P.} 1, and \textit{I.} 5**

There are three instances in which the discourse markers we have been studying—καί γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ—seem to bear a special paradigmatic relationship to \textit{epinikion} poetics or performance. As such, these examples stand up to direct comparison to the more programmatic uses of the discourse marker in the lyrics of Sappho, Alcaeus, or Archilochus discussed above. One of these instances is the sole occurrence of the discourse marker οὐδὲ γάρ in Pindaric poetry. That it occurs but once is no doubt one reason it is not normally associated with its counterpart καή γάρ in the extant odes, yet I suggest that its use in \textit{Olympian} 14 nicely fits this model of the discourse marker’s pro-
This short ode of just twenty four verses, which does not mention the victor Asopikhos until v. 17, begins with a hymnal invocation of the Graces (vv. 5–17):

For with your help all things pleasant and sweet come about for mortals, whether a man be wise, handsome, or illustrious. 

The transition from the gnomic statement concerning mortals to the divine scene of choral performance with the οὐδὲ γὰρ in v. 8 precludes that the sentence be properly explanatory of a statement concerning mortals. As elsewhere, then, commentators suggest that a clause must be understood, such as “not only in the human world all enjoyable things are given by the Charites.” Yet perhaps we are to understand in the other direction. That is, if we instead view the discourse marker as looking forward, we can better understand...
understand the implications of this image of the Graces for the ode’s performance. The Graces, after all, seem to be central to Pindar’s poetics, to its charm and enjoyment.57 Thus, when Pindar describes a divine choral performance of the Graces, we must understand this chorus as serving, in turn, as a paradeigma to the lightly stepping komos of the present (κῶµον…κοὐφα βιβῶντα, vv. 16–17), as described in the prayer that follows in the second strophe (vv. 13–17). Pindar’s use of οὐδὲ γάρ, then, is not only a marked way of underscoring the exemplary nature of this divine chorus, but it also nicely handles the transition from prayer to paradigmatic performance, in the course of praying for such a performance among the komos.58 Considering, then, that the tendency in Pindaric epinikia is away from the use of more ponderous discourse markers for paradeigmata, the effect of this οὐδὲ γάρ must have been significant for an audience attuned to this conventional means of marking out paradigmatic mythological narratives.59

This approach throws some light even on the extended hymn that begins our Pythian 1.60 Indeed, I suggest that the discourse marker helps manage a series of paradeigmata both of the performance and of the audience’s response to that performance. After his surprising address not to Apollo himself but to Apollo’s χρυσέα φόρµιγξ (v.

57. See Verdenius 1987: 103–106. Wüst (1967: 244) may be right to compare v. 12 with the image of the Muses as Th. 36–7 (Μουσάων ἀρχώµιθαι, ταί Δίη πατρὶ | ὑµεύσαι τέρπουσι µέγαν νόον ἐντὸς Ὄλυµπου).
58. One might further wonder whether the command to Echo in v. 21 to (mimetically?) carry the message to the victor’s deceased father Kleodamos in Hades is not to be considered a further (re-)performance. Cp. ἰδοῖσα in both v. 16 (of Ἐκλία) and 22 (of Ἀχώ) with Verdenius ad 22.
59. Race (1990: 100) similarly notes that “the scene in heaven (there is a hint of ekphrasis) is paradigmatic of the present celebration on earth.” I do not feel ekphrasis is quite the right term, but find it remarkable that Race uses the term again of the description of Typhos in P. 1 (1990: 27), which I also discuss as a paradeigma of performance below. Rather than the term ekphrasis, we might follow Mezger (1880: 314): “Was von ihrem Walten im Olymp gesagt ist, vertritt gewissermassen die Stelle des Mythus (‘What is said of their sway on Olympus, to some extent takes the place of myth’).” We might also note the two scenes of choreia in the h.Ap. (vv. 149–64, 179–206).
60. On which see esp. Kollmann 1989.
1. Pindar quickly effects a typical transition via a ‘hymnic’ relative in the next verse (vv. 1–4):\(^{61}\)

Χρυσέα φόρη, Ἀπόλλωνος καὶ ἱππολόκαιμων σύνδικον Μοισάν κτέανον· τὰς ἄκοιμεν μὲν βάσις ἁγιαὶς ἀρχά, πειθοῦντι δ’ αὐτοίς σάμασιν ἀγησιχώρων ὁπόται προσομίων ἀμβολάς τεύχης ἐλελιζομένα.

Golden Lyre, rightful possession of Apollo and the violet-haired Muses, to you the footstep listens as it begins the splendid celebration, and the singers heed your signals, whenever with your vibrations you strike up the chorus-leading preludes. (trans. W. H. Race)

What is extraordinary here is that the relative clause does not lead to attributes of the lyre, as would be conventional, but instead focuses on the choral performance that is centered on the lyre: the footsteps listen to the lyre, and the singers pay close attention to the cues of its preludes. Meanwhile, the world relaxes, even the lightning and the eagle (vv. 5–10). Pindar then turns with a καὶ γὰρ to detail the lyre’s effect on the divine audience of this performance (vv. 10–20):\(^{62}\)

You know, even powerful Ares puts aside his sharp-pointed spears and delights his heart in sleep; and your shafts enchant the minds of the deities as well, through the skill of Leto’s son and of the deep-breasted Muses. But those creatures for whom Zeus has no

---

61. On the ‘hymnic’ relative in Pindar, see esp. n.44 on p. 288 below.

62. This discourse marker, then, is especially important for the fact that it marks the boundary between prayer (rather than gnome) and paradigmatic discourse.

63. On vv. 16–17 note that a scholiast to Aesch. PV even attributes this verse to Hesiod (Σ Aesch. PV 351 = fr. 388 M–W): Ἰστέον δὲ ὅτι ὁ Τυφώς ἐν Κιλίκίᾳ ἐγεννήθη, ἑκλάσθη δὲ ἐν Σικελίᾳ. καὶ Ἡσίοδος· «τὸν ποτὲ Κιλίκιον θρέψαι πολυώνυμον ἄντρον». This scholiast’s confusion speaks to the fact that this combination of register and syntax was associated in antiquity with Hesiod.
love are terrified when they hear the song of the Pierians, those on land and in the overpowering sea, and the one who lies in dread Tartaros, enemy of the gods, Typhos the hundred-headed, whom the famous Cilician cave once reared: now, however, the sea-fencing cliffs above Kyme as well as Sicily weigh upon his shaggy chest, and a skyward column constrains him, snowy Aitna, nurse of biting snow all year round... (trans. modified from W. H. Race)

Ares, like the other gods, is enchanted by the music; it is only those unloved by Zeus, such as Typhos, who fear the sounds of the Muses. In this way, Pindar sets up both a positive and negative model of aesthetic response in that space opened up by the discourse marker καὶ γάρ. The narrative is not of the past, as often in paradeigmata, but rather, just as in Olympian 14, it describes a timeless divine performance.

This negative paradeigma of an audience of a musical performance also gives Pindar the opportunity to expand on the figure of Typhos, who in turn provides a geographical link to the local Mount Aetna. After describing Typhos for some fifteen lines, Pindar returns in v. 29 to his prayer to Zeus (vv. 29–32):

εἴη, Ζεῦ, τίν εἴη ἀνδάνειν,
δός τούτ’ ἔφετεις ὄρος, εὐκάρποιο γαῖας μέτωπον, τοῦ μὲν ἐπωνυμίαν κλεινὸς οἰκιστὴρ ἐκύδανεν πόλιν
γείτονα, ...

Would that, O Zeus, would that I please you, who rule that mountain, the brow of an abundant earth, the eponymous neighboring city of which a famous founder lent prestige, ...

The prayer is in asyndeton with the previous sentence, but to call the transition a ‘break-off’ may not be that illuminating. Pindar does not, as one scholion suggests, pray to Zeus out of fear of his own narration. Pindar’s prayer is that Zeus be the sort of audience that is pleased by Pindar’s music: like Ares, and unlike Typhos. Thus, the asyndeton is less a break-off than a familiar transition between discourse units emphasizing their correlation, and Pindar has rather boldly set up both positive and negative paradeigmata for his own audience, an audience which even includes Zeus. This interpretation is further sup-

64. The scholion, Σ Pind. P. 1.56a (ii. p. 15.17–23 Drachmann), is quoted and endorsed at Race 1990: 42.
65. A similar opposition is created at Race 1990: 42, though by a different means and with a different emphasis.
ported by the fact that Pindar repeats this pairing of paradigmatic audiences in the very last lines of the ode, when he sets the audiences of Croesus and Phalaris against one another in another compound paradigmata, just as he had Ares and Typhos (vv. 92–100).66

The paradigmatic figures are not mythological, strictly speaking, but the λογίοις καὶ οἰσιδῖσις (v. 94) amounts to a Zitatformel, and the asyndetic οὐ φθίνει suffices to situate the two historical figures in the second element of the conventional gnome-paradigma-gnome complex.

For a final example of Pindar’s association of the discourse marker with the authority of the poet or performance, I turn to Isthmian 5. There, in a passage teeming with meta-poetic statements, Pindar speaks of mixing a κόμπος into song in return for the toils of the family’s ancestors. What is more, he does so in the introduction of a catalogue that culminates in the Aiakidai (vv. 19–29):

... τὸ δ’ ἐμον,
οὐκ ἀτερ Αἰακίδαι, κέαρ ὠμον γεύεται·

[F]or the posthumous acclaim of fame along reveals the life of men who are dead and gone to both chroniclers and poets. [[The kindly excellence of Croesus does not perish, but universal execration overwhelms Phalaris, that man of pitiless spirit who burned men in his bronze bull, and no lyres in banquet halls welcome him in gentle fellowship with boys’ voices. [[Success is the first of prizes; and renown the second portion; but the man who meets with both and gains them has won the highest crown. (trans. W. H. Race)

κιρνάμεν ἀντὶ πόνων.
καὶ γάρ ἡρώων ἀγαθοὶ πολεμοῦσαι
λόγου ἐκέρδαν· κλέονται δ' ἐν τε φορμίγ-
γεσσιν ἐν αὐλῶν τε παμφώνοις οἰμοκλαῖς
μυρίων χρόνων· μελέταν δء σοφιστάις
Δίος ἐκατι πρόσβαλον σεβιζόμενοι.

But my heart tastes no hymns without including the Aiakidai, for I have come with the
Graces at the bidding of Lampon’s sons to this law-abiding city. If someone has entered
into the clear road of divinely granted deeds, do not grudge to blend into your song a fit-
ting vaunt in return for toils. You know, among the heroes brave warriors also gained
praise and are celebrated on lyres and in the full range of pipes’ harmonies for time be-
yond measure, and, thanks to Zeus, reverence for them has provided a wise theme for po-
etts. (trans. modified from W. H. Race)

The function of καὶ γάρ—or the extent to which its sentence might ‘justify’ the preced-
ing sentence—is not at all clear; indeed, it is this instance that prompted Wüst’s survey of
the particle string across Pindar. Yet I do think we can make sense of its occurrence
here, especially if we recognize that καὶ γάρ marks the transition from the gnomic, self-
directed imperative of vv. 22–5 and the transition into the mythological priamel that cul-
minates in the tale of the Aiakidai’s two successful campaigns at Troy and of Aiginetan
Achilles (vv. 34–44). One must not downplay the significance of that reflection for the
poetics of Pindar’s praise: having come accompanied by the Graces, Pindar blends song
(ἀοιδά) and praise (κόµπος) in return for toils. These toils are not unlike the deeds of
past heroes, and each deserve their fame. Pindar, then, represents himself as putting the
sons of Lampon on the same plane as the heroes of the past.

Begründung für den vorausgehenden allgemeinen Satz gibt (εἰ δὲ τέτραπται … μὴ φθόνει..),
sondern als Beleg den Einzelfall (die Heroen)” (248).
mito … γάρ conferma ciò che è stato affermato, καὶ aggiunge l’esempio.”
69. For the Graces and charis in Pindaric poetry, see Deichgräber 1971 and MacLachlan 1993
with further references in Kurke 1991: 103n63.
70. Cf. N. 8.49, I. 1.43–6. With the θεοδότων ἔργων κέλευθον ἄν καθαράν (v. 23), compare the
chariot as metaphor for poetry at v. 38 (with, e.g., Simpson 1969 and Hubbard 1985: 152–153).
71. On the economic imagery implicit in ἐκέρδαν, see Kurke 1991: 232. Regarding κλέονται,
the verb κλέω otherwise appears in Pindar only at fr. 70d.(c).7 S-M.
As we look at more examples below, specifically those odes in which καὶ γάρ occurs more than once,\(^{73}\) we shall see that the larger discursive strategy to which this discourse marker belongs is related specifically to Pindar’s task of essentially writing genealogical catalogue poetry for his elite patrons. Having studied just three instances of the καὶ γάρ and οὐδὲ γάρ discourse markers in Pindar, we might first observe that, just as we saw the particles largely reserved for statements connected to the Archaic Greek lyric persona’s authority above, we ought to heed the fact that οὐδὲ γάρ’s use in Olympian 14 and καὶ γάρ’s use in at Isthmian 5 and Pythian 1 are linked to metapoetic statements, whether to musical performance, its reception, or to the praise of heroes and victors in that celebration. Set against the seemingly conventional gnome–paradeigma(–gnome) pattern among discourse units, it is here significant that in all three of these instances—O. 14.8, I. 5.4, and I. 5.26—the discourse markers connect the paradeigma to a preceding prayer and relate directly to the performance of the ode.\(^{74}\) Thus, not only do the discourse markers help define the poetic or performance persona, they seem to do necessary work in a less conventional transition between discourse units.

B.2 Register and multiple occurrences: O. 7 and N. 1

Such a technique as we have seen above in Pythian 1, moving asyndetically from negative paradeigma into a prayer to Zeus, is not unique to that epinikion. Indeed, Ne-

---

\(^{72}\) Cf. vv. 54–58: μαρνάσθω {δὲ} τις ἔρθων | ἀμφ’ ἀέθλοισιν γενεὰν Κλεονίκου | ἐκ μαθῶν· οὔτοι τετύφλωται μακρὸς | μόχθεος ἀνδρῶν οὔδ’ ὑπόσαι διαπάναι | ἐλπίδ’ ἐκνίξαν ὅπιν.

\(^{73}\) Strictly speaking, καὶ γάρ occurs twice in I. 5, once more at v. 4. Of this instance, Farnell (ad loc.) describes it as “[giving] the reason why Theia is invoked.” (Cf. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff 1922: 201n1 on the “begründend” γάρ as being part of the address from the outset. In this sense I would compare the ‘Hymn to Hecate’ of the Th. (vv. 411–52, esp. 414–20), which describes the manner of her honor among men (see p. 122 above). Interesting, then, that Farnell describes Theia’s invocation as being “drawn from Hesiod, Th. 371–374” (ad 1–6, with references). Of course, the particle string does not stand in the same relation to the preceding prayer—the καὶ of the καὶ γάρ (v. 4) is coordinated with another καὶ (v. 5) and a τε (v. 7)—but this would not be immediately apparent to an audience, given the serial nature of language processing.

\(^{74}\) On I. 5.26, see n.# on p. 251 above.
mean 8 (vv. 32–7) exhibits the same formal structure. Yet there is no καὶ γάρ to introduce the paradeigma in Nemean 8, so it may be worth dwelling on what drives Pindar’s choice of the discourse marker καὶ γάρ for this complex of positive and negative performance paradeigmata in Pythian 1. I suggest that, as in Part One above, register plays a large part. In Nemean 8 the negative paradeigma is related to the evil of deceptive speech, specifically that of Ajax’ loss to Odysseus in the contest for Achilles’ armor. Thus, the narrative belongs to the Trojan material from the ‘Homeric’ or ‘Cyclic’ tradition. The story of Typhos in Pythian 1, on the other hand, is undeniably Hesiodic. While the Hesiodic Theogony is not the only place Typhos’ story would have been recounted, in Pythian 1 the singling out of Typhos in v. 15 introduces the syntax and register of genealogical discourse, especially the τόν ποτε (v. 16) and θρέψειν (v. 17). And, indeed, our other extant treatments of Typhos also bear a distinctly genealogical register. I suggest, therefore, that we begin to view the discourse marker as participating in a larger stylistic pattern, as part of a register. That register, again, is that of genealogical catalogue poetry, and, as we turn to odes where the discourse marker seems to cluster in multiple occurrences, we shall further question whether ‘logical relation’ is indeed the best criterion for study of these particle strings within Pindar.

It is the odes with multiple instances of καὶ γάρ that most clearly display the connection between register and syntax. One such ode is Olympian 7, which celebrates

76. Of course, Typhos was also traditionally associated with Sicilian Mt. Aetna, which would probably have erupted recently (479 BCE). Cf. Kirkwood 1982: 125.
77. See esp. pp. 289–293 below.
78. The only other substantial extant Archaic version occurs in h.Ap. 305–55, but that deals only with his youth (though note the genealogical register and syntax at vv. 305–7). On the style of Typhos’ passing mention at Il. 2.782–3, specifically δθι φασὶ Τυφωέος ἐμεναι εὐνάς, see n.173 on p. 102 above. Within Pindar, P. 1 is by far the most extensive description of Typhos; other brief references occur at O. 4.6–7, P. 8.16, and frr. 91–3). If the tradition of the Hesiodic Theogony were not the canonical treatment in the early fifth century, the most likely alternative would have been Stesichorus’ treatment (239 PMG). Kirkwood (ad 16) suggests Pindar’s version is from an “earlier tradition” than that of the Theogony; I cannot discern on what grounds.
the Rhodian victor Diagoras and seeks to give a definitive account of the Rhodians’ lineage from Heracles. Different from those instances above, in which καὶ γὰρ and οὐδὲ γὰρ may in part be seen as doing the work that the conventional gnome–paradeigma discourse-unit transition does, in this ode the two instances of καὶ γὰρ fit neatly into a very regular sequence of gnomai and mythological material. Thus the discourse marker must be serving some other purpose, and here we can better see how its presence fits into the register and syntax of genealogical catalogue poetry. I cite the ode at length to give a sense of that structure and style, doubly underlining gnomic statements and singly underlining various transitions within the interstitial mythological material (vv. 25–77):

... τούτῳ δ’ ἀμάχαναν εὔρειν, 25
ότι γὰρ ἐν καὶ τελεύτα φέρτατον ἄνδρι τιυχεῖν,
καὶ γὰρ Ἀλκιμήνας κασίγυμνον νόθον

σκάπτωθεν θενών

σκηληρός ἐλαῖος ἐκτανεύν Τύρωνθι Λικύμνιον ἐλθόντ’ ἐκ θαλάμων Μιδέας
tάσσει τὸν χθονὸν οἰκοστῆρ χολωθεῖς, αἱ δὲ φρενών ταραχαὶ

παρέπληγαν καὶ σοφών, μαντεύσατο δ’ ἐς θεον ἐλθῶν.

τῷ μὲν ὁ χρυσοκόλως εὐώδεος ἐς ἀδύτου ναών πλόον
eπε Λευναίας ἀν’ ἀκτάς εὐθὺν ἐς ἀμφιθάλασσον νομίμον,

Ἐνθα ποτὲ βρέχε χεῖς βασιλεῖς ὁ μέγας χρυσόχιος νυμφάδεσσο πόλιν, ἀνίχ’ Ἄραιστον τέχναιον

χαλκελάτῳ πελέκει πατέρος Λαμπαία κορυφάν κατ’ ἀκραν

ἀνορύσασ’ ἀλάλαξεν ἀντεύσει βοᾶ.

Οὐρασός δ’ ἐφριζέ ὕμνου καὶ Γαῖα μάτηρ.

τότε καὶ φαυσιμβροτός δαίμων Ὄπιρισονίδας

μέλλουν ἐντειλεὶν φιλάξασθαι χρέος

παιδίων φίλοις,

ὡς ἄν θεά πρῶτοι κτίσαις βωμόν ἐναργέα, καὶ σεμνὰν θυσίαν θέμενοι

πατρὶ τε υἱὸν ἵππαν κόρα τ’ ἐγχειρήμων. ἐν δ’ ἄρεταν

ἐβάλεν καὶ χάριταν’ ἀνθρώποις προμαθεῖς αἴδως:

ἐπὶ μὲν βαίνει τι καὶ λάθας ἀτέκμαρτα νέφος,

καὶ παρέλκει πραγμάτων ὑράν ὁδόν

ἐξ ὁφερν. 45

καὶ τοι γὰρ αἰθίοισας ἐχούντες σπέρματ’ ἀνέβαι φλογός ὄο. τεῦξαν δ’ ἀπύρως ἑροῖς

ἄλος ἐν ἀρρητοῖς. κείνοι μὲν ἡμᾶθαν ἀγαγῶν νεφέλαν {Ζεὺς}

πολὺν ὑσε χρυσόν’ αὐτὰ δ’ ὁφρίαν ὠπασσέ τέχναν

πάσαν ἐπιχειροῦσιν Γλαυκῶπις ἀριστοτόπονοι χεροὶ κρατεῖν.

ἐργα δέ ἐξωσίοι σερπόντεσσι θ’ ὁμοία κέλευθοι φέρον·

79. Strictly speaking one instance is καὶ τοι γὰρ (v. 48), but I agree with Slater that it is here equivalent. I would add the equivalence within Pindar between καὶ ποτ’ (N. 9.18) and καὶ τοι ποτ’ (I. 4.70).
it is impossible to discover what now and also in the end is best to happen to a man. You know, the founder of this land once struck Alkmene’s bastard brother Likymnios with a staff of hard olive in Tiryns when he came from Midea’s chambers and killed him in a fit of anger. Disturbances of the mind lead astray even a wise man. He went to the god for an oracle, and from the fragrant inner sanctum of his temple the golden-haired god told him to sail from the shore of Lerna straight to the seagirt pasture, where once the great king of the gods showered the city with snows of gold, when, by the skills of Hephastos with the stroke of a bronze-forged axe, Athena sprang forth on the top of her father’s head and shouted a prodigious battle cry, and Heaven shuddered at her, and mother Earth. At that time, Hyperion’s son, diving bringer of light to mortals, charged his dear children to observe the obligation that was to come, they they might be the first to build for the goddess an altar in full view, and by making a sacred sacrifice might cheer the hearts of the father and his daughter of the thundering spear. Reverence for one who has foresight plants excellence and its joys in humans, but without warning some cloud of forgetfulness comes upon them and wrests the straight path of affairs from their minds. You know, they made their ascent without taking the seed of blazing flame, and with fireless sacrifices they made a sanctuary on the acropolis. [Zeus] brought a yellow cloud and upon them rained gold in abundance; but the Gray-eyed Goddess herself gave them every kind of skill to surpass mortals with their superlative handiwork. Their streets bore works of art in the likeness of beings that lived and moved, and great was their fame. When one is expert, even native talent becomes greater. The ancient reports of men tell that when Zeus and the immortals were appointing the earth … There he once lay with Rhodes and fathered [seven sons] … There, in sweet recompense for the lamentable mishap, [is established] for Tlapolemos … (trans. modified from W. H. Race)

The discourse particles introduce retrospective narrative segments in a regular pattern following interstitial gnōmai. Thus, as we have seen, they might be easily omitted in Pindar, and we must seek another explanation. What is immediately intriguing is that, alongside this occurrence of καὶ γάρ and καὶ τοῖς γάρ in a regular pattern directly following gnōmai, there is a simultaneous consistency of the three relative pronouns and adverbs each paired with ποτέ (vv. 30, 34, 71). We shall discuss more fully the stylistic implications of this syntactic feature in Pindar below, but this consistency both within Olympian 7

80. I should note that v. 77 belongs not to a mythological section but to a victory announcement.
and in comparison with Pythian 1 is suggestive of these features belonging to a particular register or style.

A look at the broader context of this passage within Olympian 7 corroborates the advantage of this approach. After all, the ode is a hymn to Rhodes, the child of Aphrodite and the bride of Helios,\(^{81}\) but Pindar is primarily concerned with giving a corrected account of the Rhodians’ history, which includes their having descended from Tlapolemos and, by extension, Heracles (vv. 20–4):\(^{82}\)

\[
\begin{aligned}
\text{ἐθελήσω τοῖσιν ἐξ ἀρχὰς ἀπὸ Τλαπολέμου} & \quad 20 \\
\text{ἐξών ἁγγέλλων διορθώσαι λόγου}, & \\
\text{Ἡρακλέος} & \\
\text{εὐρυσθεὶς γέννῃ, τὸ μὲν γὰρ πατρόθεν ἐκ Διὸς εὐχοταῖ: τὸ δ’ Ἀμυντορίδαι} & \\
\text{ματρόθεν Ἀστυδαμείας.}
\end{aligned}
\]

I intend, in proclaiming my message, to set forth truly for them from its origin, beginning with Tlapolemos, the history they share as members of Herakles’ mighty race, for they claim descent from Zeus on their father’s side, while on their mother’s they are Amynantor’s descendants through Astydameia. (trans. W. H. Race)

In this sense, Pindar is writing genealogical poetry, and, as the tripartite structure of the subsequent tale suggests, it is even genealogical *catalogue* poetry.\(^{83}\) But what is the common story (ἐξών...λόγου) that Pindar is correcting? The most probable suggestion is that it is the version transmitted in the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships.\(^{84}\) As for the account from which Pindar is taking his revisionist cue, Pindar’s derivation of their lineage from

---

I include it in order to illustrate how the ἐνθὰ Ρόδῳ ποτὲ (71) and τόθι (77) mirror victor-to-myth transition via relative pronoun/adverb. On the use of the relative pronoun or adverb with ποτὲ, see pp. 281–289 below.

\(^{81}\) Cf. v. 14: ὑμνόν, παῖδ’ Αφροδίτας Ἀελίοι τε νύμφαν, Ρόδου.

\(^{82}\) On διορθώσαι as ‘corrected’ see the discussion of Verdenius (ad 21 s.v. διορθώσαι) and Willcock (ad 20–1).

\(^{83}\) Vv. 27–38 (Tlapolemos), 39–53 (Helios and the Heliadai), 54–76 (Rhodes and Helios). With a different emphasis, Dougherty (1993: 120–125) usefully discusses this “three-part narrative section.” On the complementary focus of her study, see, e.g., n.104 on p. 306 below. On the importance of nymphs to genealogical discourse, see p. 137 above and the example Cyrene in P. 9 (Chapter 10).

\(^{84}\) Discussions and comparisons at Farnell (ad 19), Verdenius (ad 21), Willcock 1995: 167–168 (and ad 20–33), and Dougherty 1993: 123–124.
Astydameia seems to place it in the Hesiodic tradition as it survives to us.\(^{85}\) No matter which of these views is correct, however, Pindar seems to be working with and against a genealogical catalogue tradition.

Not without interpretive significance, then, does Pindar begin his corrective genealogical narrative with καὶ γὰρ Ἀλκμήνας κασίγνητον νόθον (v. 27),\(^{86}\) but, by now, it is more interesting to consider what this does rhetorically for the victor and his family. After all, in Olympian 7 we have another epinikion that incorporates family members into victory catalogues from the start (vv. 15–17). Yet notice how, following the description of Tlapolemos’ colony and Rhodes’ local athletic games (vv. 77–81), Pindar appends a catalogue of Diagoras’ various victories leading up to his most recent at Olympia (vv. 81–90).\(^{87}\) This, in turn, leads to a description of Diagoras’ hereditary excellence and culminates in a description not only of his athletic success, but of his paradigmatic disposition (vv. 90–4):

... ἐπεὶ ὕβρις ἔχθρὰν ὁδὸν εὐθυπορεῖ, σάφα δαεὶς ἄ τε οἱ πατέρων ὁρθαὶ φρένες ἐξ ἀγαθῶν ἔχει τιθαλίας καὶ πόλις... \(^{90}\)

... for he travels straight down a road that abhors insolence, having clearly learned what an upright mind inherited from noble forebears declared to him. Keep not in obscurity the lineage they share from the times of Kallianax, for at the celebrations of the Eratidai the city too holds festivals. (trans. W. H. Race)

\(^{85}\) See Σ Pind. O. 7.42b (i. p. 210.24–211.5 Drachmann): Ἀστυδαμείας: ὁ Ομήρος ταύτην Ἀστυδάμην φησίν, οὐκ Ἀστυδαμείαν. εἰκός δὲ τὸν Πίνδαρον ἀπαντῆσαι ταύτῃ τῇ γραφῇ (Β 658) ὃν τέκεν Ἀστυδαμεία βίη Ἡρακλείη, καὶ Ἡσίοδος δὲ (fr. 134 Rz.) Ἀστυδαμεῖαν αὐτὴν φησὶ, Φερεκύδης δὲ (FHG I, 82) Ἀστυγένειαν. ἐν δὲ Φύλαντος θυγάτηρ· τινες δὲ εἰς Ἀντιγόνης ἀυτῶν θυγάτερον φασίν· ἐνταῦθα δὲ Ληστόλιον ἀυτὴν φησιν ὁ Πίνδαρος, Ἡσίοδος δὲ (l. l.) καὶ Σιμωνίδης Ὁρμένου. εἰκός δὲ ὅτι οἱ Πίνδαρος παρὰ τῶν κατὰ τὴν πόλιν λογίων ἦκουσεν Ἀμιντορίδας εἶναι Ροδίους μητρόθεν.

\(^{86}\) It does, of course, serve to exemplify the gnome (cf. Willcock [ad 27–30]), but the point is that such an exemplification did not have to begin καὶ γάρ.

In this way, the genealogical catalogue that runs throughout the entire ode culminates in Pindar’s final prayer in vv. 92–4.\footnote{88}

The combination of discourse markers and syntax in \textit{Nemean} 1 supports these findings on both the stylistic and rhetorical level.\footnote{89} The mythological portion, which in fact continues to the last verse of the ode, tells two episodes from the life of Heracles. The first portion (vv. 33–59) recounts Heracles’ strangling of the serpents upon his birth; the second narrative portion (vv. 60–72) is included within Teiresias’ subsequent prophecy of Heracles’ future battle with the Giants, his apotheosis, and his eventual marriage to Hebe.\footnote{90} The story is presumably paradigmatic for the victor Chromios of Aetna, although the nature and extent to which its various elements are paradigmatic is disputed.\footnote{91} In fact, any recoverable details of Chromios’ rise from solider to aristocrat (and guardian of Hieron’s and Gelon’s sons)\footnote{92} are secondary to the strong formal parallel between the final depiction of Heracles’ feasting beside Zeus and the celebration of athletic victory.\footnote{93} Moreover, according to Bundy, the formal parallel between Heracles and the laudandus Chromios is developed by the opening gnome (vv. 32–3), which is explicated in the following narrative of Heracles’ reward following his many toils (vv. 32–8; 48–72):\footnote{94}

\[
... κοιναὶ γὰρ ἔρχοντ' ἐλπίδες πολυπόνων ἄνδρων. [ēγὼ δ' Ἡρακλέος ἀντέχομαι προφρόνως ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετῶν μεγάλαις, ἀρχαῖον ὀτ' ῥύσω τι λόγον.]
\]

\footnote{88} Kallianax and Era(s)t(e)ides, the scholia (170c, 172b, 172c) suggest, are ancestors of Diagoras.

\footnote{89} Interestingly, Kurke (1991: 113–114) also finds reason to consider these two poems together, reasoning that both “establish … a chain of recompense linking up with the ancestors or with the divine plane” (114).

\footnote{90} Prophecy as a narrative device in Pindar is, of course, not uncommon. See Führer 1967: 109–111 and the discussion of P. 9 (Chapter 10).

\footnote{91} Bundy 1986: 87 and Braswell (\textit{ad} 33–72; esp. p. 56, with pp. 30–2) for a summary. See the details of Radt 1966.


\footnote{93} See esp. Slater 1984: 249–253, who at p. 242 argues that Heracles is inherently exemplary in the Greek imagination, along with Gundert 1935.

\footnote{94} Cf. Bundy 1986: 87.
... because to all alike come the hopes of much-toiling men. For my part, I gladly embrace Herakles, when my theme is achievements’ great heights, and rouse up the old tale, how, as soon as Zeus’ son came down from his mother’s womb into the wondrous brightness of day, fleeing her birth pains with his twin brother, he did not escape the notice of Hera on her golden throne when he lay down in his yellow swaddling clothes … Unbearable fear struck all the women who at the time were attending Alkmene’s bed. You know, she herself sprang from her couch to her feet without any robe and began warding off the beasts’ attack. And swiftly the Kadmeian chieftains cam running in a group with their bronze arms, and Amphitryon arrived brandishing his unsheathed sword in his hand, stricken with piercing anguish (for one’s own sorrow oppresses every man alike, whereas the heart is soon free from pain at someone else’s trouble). He stood there, stunned with wonder both painful and joyous, for he saw the extraordinary determination and power of his son, since the immortal gods had reversed the messengers’ report to him. He summoned his neighbor, the foremost prophet of highest Zeus, the straight-speaking seer Teiresias, who declared to him and to all the people what fortunes he would encounter:
all the lawless beasts he would slay on land, and all those in the sea; and to many a man
who traveled in crooked excess he said that he [Herakles] would give the most hateful
doom. You know, when the gods would meet the Giants in battle on the plain of Phlegra,
he said that beneath a volley of his arrows their bright hair would be fouled with earth,
but that he himself in continual peace for all time would be allotted tranquility as the
choicest recompense for his great labors in a blissful home, and, after receiving flourish-
ing Hebe as his wife and celebrating his wedding feats with Kronos’ son Zeus, would
praise his hallowed rule. (trans. modified from W. H. Race)

Pindar begins the narrative with a Zitatformel in “rousing an old story of Heracles,” and,
unsurprisingly, the details of this large-scale narrative begin with ὡς…ὡς (vv. 35, 37).95
The segments of the narrative are largely connected by a simple δέ with a few exceptions,
including καὶ γάρ in both v. 50 and v. 67. The first instance of καὶ γάρ depicts
Alkmene’s reaction to the arrival of the snakes,96 and Carey suggests that “[t]he use of καὶ
γάρ in exempla is similar” (ad 50).97 Indeed, that Alkmene reacts in such a way testifies
to the danger,98 but it also serves to properly resume the narrative after the δ’ ἄρ’ of v. 48,
the effect of which is appropriate to the verb ἐκ…πλῆξε (vv. 48–9).99 The second in-
stance of καὶ γάρ, which introduces Heracles’ defeat of the Giants at v. 67, properly re-
lates a narrative instance of the generality in vv. 64–6: that Heracles would “grant a most
hateful doom to any man marching with crooked excess” (καὶ τινα σὺν πλαγίῳ | ἄνδρῶν κόρῳ στείχοντα τὸν ἔχθρότατον | φᾶ ἐ διαώσειν μόρον).100 Far more impor-

95. See above esp. p. 89 above.
96. Notice that the discourse marker introduces Alkmene at O. 7.27, too.
97. Cp. Braswell (ad 50): “‘for even’, i.e. the terror was so great that even Alkmene herself leapt up … καὶ γάρ is always explanatory except in answers to questions.” Carey (ad 50) summarizes the views of Radt (‘begründend’, foundational), Mezger, and Illig (‘steigernd’, accretive). See also Wüst 1967: 243–244.
98. One might add that Alkmene’s composure in thwarting the snakes’ attack is, in comparison to her attendants, exemplary. Cf. Kirkwood (ad 50): καὶ γάρ “adds and differentiates. Alcmena, like her maids, is alarmed, but her response is different.”
99. This particle string, while exceedingly common in Homeric and Hesiodic narrative, occurs rather infrequently in Pindar (12X). See further Braswell ad P. 4.121(b) and n.8 on p. 233 above.
100. The Giants of v. 67 are the mortals of v. 65, of course, and καὶ γάρ simply marks a transition into related narrative. In this respect Race’s Loeb translation of καὶ γάρ as “and furthermore” and Braswell’s “for also” (ad 67) make less sense to me. Cf. too Mezger 1880.
tant than justifying each individual use of καὶ γάρ, however, is the accumulation of the discourse marker within the narrative that points up its paradigmatic nature.

If the very nature of the style is paradigmatic, it seems also to draw on the sort of mythological material and register that we came to associate with paradeigmata in Part One above. That is, in “rousing an old story of Heracles” Pindar also adopts a particular register that points stylistically to genealogical catalogue poetry, especially towards the end of the ode. Indeed, there Pindar tells of Heracles’ apotheosis and marriage to Hebe, which may indeed be the very epitome of his exemplarity for Greeks. Yet, the goddess Hebe does not seem to be married in the Iliad, much less to Heracles, who is instead a paradeigma of Achilles’ inevitable death in Book 19. It is worth noting, then, that Hebe is married to Heracles in the Odyssean Nekyia and in Hesiodic poetry, and we may wonder whether the battle in which Heracles fought the Giants is also owed to the tradition of the Hesiodic Theogony (vv. 950–5):¹⁰⁵

```
'Ἡβην δ' Ἀλκμήνης καλλισφύρου ἄλκιμος υἱός,
ἰς Ἡρακλῆος, τελέσας στοιβέντας ἀέθλους,
παῖδα Δίος μεγάλοιο καὶ Ἡρης χρυσοπεδίλου,
αἰδοῖνθέτ' ἀκοίτς ἐν Οὐλύπῳ νιφάειν·
ὁλβίος, ὃς μέγα ἔργον ἐν αθανάτοιοι άνύσας
ναίει ἀπήμιαντος καὶ ἀγήραος ἰματα πάντα.
950
```

The strong son of beautiful-ankled Alkmene, Heracles’ strength, made Hebe, the daughter of great Zeus and of golden-sandaled Hera, his reverend wife on snowy Olympus, af-

---

¹⁰¹. For Slater 1984 it is the end of the ode (e.g., the symposium) that matters most.
¹⁰³. Il. 18.117–19.
¹⁰⁴. Cf. Od. 11.601–4, Th. 950–5, frr. 25.26–33, 229.6–13 M–W. West (1985a: 130) even goes so far as to say that “the divinity of Herakles is a firm article of the Catalogue poet’s belief (F 1.22, 25.26–33. 229.6–13),” which the fragments make clear; West’s claim that this divinity points to a date after 600 BCE may be seen as a separate claim (but compare discussion of Heracles within Sophocles at March 1987: 71–77). On the authenticity of the Odyssean verses, including the possible interpolation by Onomacritus, see Heubeck (in Heubeck et al. 1988) ad 11.601–27.
¹⁰⁵. See West (ad Th. 954) on this μέγα ἔργον being Heracles’ aid in the Gigantomachy. Still more, Braswell (ad 60) notes the appearance of Teiresias as Διὸς ὑψίστου προφάταν (v. 60), which matches in detail Apollodorus’ report of the source of Teiresias’ gift of prophecy (fr. 265 M–W; cf. fr. 276).
ter he had completed his painful tasks—happy he, for after having accomplished his great work among the immortals he dwells unharmed and ageless for all his days. (trans. G. W. Most)

Furthermore, such a generic association seems to be reflected in the register of the Pindaric scene: note especially θαλερὰν Ἡβαν ἄκοιτιν of v. 71, of which even the adjective θαλερὰν is a hapax in Pindaric poetry. Yet, in Hesiodic poetry, the phrase θαλερήν ποιήσατ’ ἄκοιτιν is an exceedingly common verse-end formula. It seems that Pindar has skillfully adapted not only a Hesiodic strain of Heracles myth, but also adopted the register of that strain.

The concern, as ever, is to what end, to what rhetorical advantage, Pindar adopts this Hesiodic style. For, again, I do not wish to show that Pindar was drawing on Hesiodic poetry so much as I wish to show that his style is Hesiodic. This distinction is important, for, more specifically, I am suggesting that this style is such as we saw in the paradeigmata of Homeric poetry. My analysis, then, bears directly on the question of how marked the connections are between the victor Chromios and the mythological narratives of Heracles. I propose that it is, in part, through the discourse marker καὶ γάρ that Pindar achieves this effect. Recall again how the final image of Heracles’ marriage and feasting by the side of Zeus begins with καὶ γάρ (vv. 67–72):

106. In the Iliad, cf. 3.53 (θαλερήν παράκοιτιν), 6.430 (θαλερός παρακοίτης, but see p. 44 above), and 8.156 (θαλερός παρακοίτης); in the Hymns, h.Dem. 79 (θαλερήν κεκλῆσθαι ἄκοιτιν). Within Hesiodic poetry, see Th. 921, 946, 948, 999; frr. 10a.59, 10a.71, 17a.12, 23a.31, 26.24 (θαλερήν κεκλῆσθαι ἄκοιτιν), 33a.7, 190.6, 251a.8 M–W.

107. On μιχθεῖς (N. 1.18) and μιχθείς (N. 1.56)—even metaphorically—cf. O. 7.71 (ἔνθα Ῥόδῳ ποτὲ μιχθεῖς τέκεν) with pp. 289–293. The frequent use of the verb in relation to the victor, then, may make the victory both erotic and genealogical.


109. More than just “introduc[ing] an explanatory example of those punished by Heracles” (Kirkwood ad 67), I suggest that the καὶ γάρ introduces the discourse unit as a whole, including the exemplary, blessed life of Heracles in vv. 69–72.
καὶ γάρ ὅταν θεοὶ ἐν πεδίῳ Φλέγρας Γιγάντεσσιν ἀντιάζωσι, βελέων ὑπὸ ρι-παίσι κεῖνον φαιδίμαν γαίᾳ πεφύρσεθαι κόμαν ἐνεπεν. αὐτὸν μᾶν ἐν εἰρήνα τὸν ἀπαντα χρόνον ἕνεπεν· αὐτῶν καμάτων μεγάλων ποινὰν λαχόντ’ ἔξαίρετον ὀλβίοις ἐν δώμασι, δεξάμενον θαλεράν Ἦβαν ἀκοίτιν καὶ γάμου δαίσαντα πάρ Δί Κρονίδα, σεμνὸν αἰνήσειν νόμον.

You know, he said that, when on the plain of Phlegra the gods clashing with the Giants in battle, beneath a shower of missiles the shining hair of the Giants would be fouled with earth. But Heracles himself, in lasting peace for all time, would get tranquility in a blessed home as the choicest repayment for his wearying toils, having received buxom Hebe as a wife and celebrating his marriage by the side of Zeus, Heracles would praise Zeus’ august rule.

These last verses of the ode even evoke the ode’s description of the performance and the fitting feast at Chromios’ home (vv. 19–24). On a rhetorical level, then, this argument serves to corroborate historically oriented claims that the Heracles myth in Nemean 1 is paradigmatic, but it also suggests a stylistic consistency in the broader communicative strategy. That is, Pindar may not make Heracles’ story paradigmatic in points of plot detail, but the style indicates that it is to be understood as such. It is, in fact, the same communicative strategy as in Olympian 7, and we shall look at this process in greater detail in the case of Telesicrates in Pythian 9 below.

B.3 Genealogical patterns: N. 6 and I. 2

It is against this backdrop that we can begin to appreciate more of the isolated instances of καὶ γάρ in Pindaric poetry. While these instances work on a smaller scale, they still participate in the same complex of register and syntax associated with genealogical catalogue poetry. More importantly, they demonstrate the extent to which Pindar at times conceives of his poetic project as writing genealogical catalogue poetry for the victor. In Nemean 6, performed for Alcimidas of Aegina, Pindar uses the generic associa-

111. If, then, the Heracles myth is a zētēma for the σύνετοι, as Slater suggests (1984: 252–253), we might say that the σύνετοι are those who recognize the discourse conventions of paradeigmata.
112. In his discussion of N. 6, Gerber (1999: 33–34) appropriately reports the comments of
tions of this register and syntax to create a genealogical catalogue of victories for the Bassidai, who have been preeminently successful in athletics. After the catalogues of victories at vv. 11–22 and 25–6, Pindar sends a breeze of verses to their house, thereby preserving the deeds of this lineage, famed of old (vv. 28–44):116

Come, Muse, direct to that house a glorious wind of verses, because when men are dead and gone, songs and words preserve for them their noble deeds, and of these the Bassidai have no lack; a family famed of old, they carry their own shipload of victory songs and can supply the Pierian’s plowmen much to sing about because of their proud accomplishments. You know, once in holy Pytho Kallias, a blood relative of that clan, bound his hands with thongs and was victorious, having found favor with the offspring of golden-

---

113. As Burnett (2005: 157) notes, this ode “is performed to honour, not just one victor or even a pair, but five generations of Bassids who have assembled, in all, twenty-five victories taken in the four major contests.” In the process, the family is traced back to Hagesimakhos.

114. Kurke (1991: 20n14) gives a comprehensive list of instances across the *epinikia* that emphasizes the importance of this strategy.

115. On the verb ἐκόμισαν (v. 30), see Kurke 1991: 42–44.

116. For parallels for the idea of preserving noble deeds in song, see Gerber 1999 (ad 30, esp. s.v. τὰ καλὰ σφιν ἔργ’). On the preservation of material from ‘family chronicles’, see the discussion in Chapter 10.
spindled Leto, and in the evening by the Kastalian spring he was ablaze with the clamor of the Graces; and the bridge of the unwearied sea honored Kreontidas at the biennial sacrifice of oxen by the neighboring peoples in the precinct of Poseidon; and the lion’s herb once crowned him when he was victorious beneath the ancient shadowy hills of Phleious. (trans. W. H. Race, modified)

The καὶ γάρ interests us here, of course, but so too Pindar’s emphasis on the victor’s family and its lineage in vv. 28–32.117 That emphasis is so strongly felt, in fact, that Norwood has suggested that Pindar must have written the ode under duress, saddled with a family chronicle from a member of the victor’s family.118 Gerber, in one of the few detailed treatments of this ode, responds to this suggestion, denying that its style is discernibly different from others (1999: 34):

“Norwood seems to be critical of the manner in which Pindar composed his praise of the clan, but I see nothing different from similar praise elsewhere. The language retains the vigor and brilliance we are accustomed to find in his other odes. Transitions from one topic to another and the imagery can all be paralleled from other odes.”

Neither critic is wrong: Norwood is clearly right to highlight the prominence of the victor’s lineage in the ode, and Gerber is right that the transitions all have parallels. I would add, however, that a transition such as καὶ γάρ finds its best parallels in odes similarly articulated in the genealogical catalogue style that Norwood sensed. The discourse marker καὶ γάρ, then, does not introduce a justification of the statement that the Bassidai pro-

117. As Gerber notes, these verses describe “an important part of Pindar’s encomiastic repertoire” (ad 29–30; see also his comments (ad 30) comparing παροιχομένων γάρ ἀνέρων, | ἀοιδαὶ καὶ λόγοι τὰ καλὰ σφιν ἔργα ἐκόμισαν (vv. 29–30) to the final verses of P. 1—note especially the ἀποιχομένων ἀνδρῶν …| … λογίοις καὶ ἀοιδοῖς (P. 1.93–4)—as discussed just above. On the “‘dead’ metaphor” of the verb σίχομαι and its compounds, see Kurke 1991: 44–45. To this I would add comparanda from the genealogical register in inscriptions: SEG 26:56 (Att.? c. 535–525 BCE): ἐ μά[λ’ ὀδυρόμενοι, ἡτε ὀπόιχεο, ἂ]ριστε, [πρὶν ἡόρας], | νῦν [θάψαν σε φίλοι καὶ μνείμα τόδ’ ἔστέσαντο]. Here, with the preverb, the verb is absolute (cf. also IG I³ 76.15–16 [422 BCE]: τὸ[ν παρ]οιχομένου ἔ[βει]κα.) That I have sought inscriptive evidence on this point I owe to a suggestion in the margin of (what I understand to be) the late Michael Jameson’s copy of Kurke 1991. On the relationship between the genealogical register and inscriptive style, see below in Chapter 10

118. Norwood 1956: 261n44. The same suggestion has been made variously for P. 9, on which see Chapter 10 below.
vide a poet with a great deal of material for song. Instead, it singles out one glorious deed from among those that are preserved for the lineage of the Bassidai, and it does in the style of genealogical catalogue, as one would expect. Pindar is not saddled by family chronicles; it is very much a part of his poetic program.

Even more explicit in the conventions of genealogical catalogue may be the list of victories of the Emmenidai in *Isthmian* 2. This ode, in fact, seems to have been categorized by the Alexandrians as an *Isthmian* solely on the grounds that it is the late Xenocrates’ *Isthmian* victory that is the first mentioned within this memorial catalogue of victories commissioned by his son Thrasyboulos. After the troubling statement in which Pindar describes his “mercenary Muse” (vv. 1–12), Pindar goes on to list Xenokrates’ success at the Isthmian and Pythian games (vv. 12–17; 18–19), his chariot victory at the Panathenaia (vv. 19–22), and that of Xenokrates’ brother Theron at Olympia (vv. 23–9). It is not at all difficult, Pindar suggests, to bring honor to the homes of the Emmenidai of Akragas (vv. 25–34).

\[
\text{ἂδυπνόῳ τε ὑν ἀσπάζοντο φωνῇ}
\]

\[
χρυσέας ἐν γούνασιν πίτνοντα Νίκας
\]

\[
γαῖαν ἀνὰ σφετέραν, τὰν δὴ καλέοισιν Ὄλυμπιον Διός
\]

\[
ἀλσος· ἤν’ ἀθανάτοις Ἀἰνησίδαιμου παῖδες ἐν τιμαῖς ἔμιχθεν.
\]

\[
καὶ γὰρ οὐκ ἁγιώτες ὑμῖν ἱεραὶ ἐντὶ δόμοι
\]

\[
οὔτε κόμων, ὥ Θρασύβουλ’, ἐρατῶν,
\]

\[
oὔτε μελικόμπων ἀοίδαν.
\]

119. Thus also Gerber (*ad* 34), who understands the particles independently.

120. In the context of genealogical catalogue, it is hard not to notice the ode’s opening: "Ἐν ἀνδρῶν, ἐν θεῶν γένος· ἐκ μιᾶς δὲ πνεόμεν | ματρός ἀμφότεροι (vv. 1–2). On the various interpretations of this verse—whether it indicates one or two races—see Burnett 2005: 158n8.

121. I explain this point in greater detail in Chapter 10 below.


123. The term is Woodbury’s (1968). See also Pavese 1966.

124. On the register of παῖδες and ἐμιχθεν in v. 29, see esp. pp. 289–293 below, even in a metaphorical sense (on which, see Rose 1974 with Verdenius *ad* 29). The importance of register is even more clear in the use of παῖδες, because, strictly speaking, only Theron was victor at Olympia.
... and they welcomed him with a sweetly breathing voice, when he fell on the knees of
golden Victory in their land, the one men call Olympian Zeus’ sanctuary. There the sons
of Ainesidamos were joined to immortal honors. And so, your family’s houses are not un-
familiar with delightful victory revels, O Thrasyboulos, nor with songs of honey-sweet
acclaim. For there is no hill, nor is the road steep, when one brings the honors of the He-
likonian maidens to the homes of famous men. (trans. W. H. Race)

What role, then, does καὶ γάρ play here? No two commentators are in full agreement.
Verdenius notes that this particle string “[d]oes not have explanatory force,” taking it in-
stead as having affirmative sense.\textsuperscript{125} But, again we might think less about the very local
meaning than the role the discourse marker may play in the ode more broadly.\textsuperscript{126} A first
step is recognizing, with Nisetich, “that as soon as Pindar has modulated from the partic-
ular Xenokrates to the more inclusive ‘sons of Ainesidamos’ [vv. 28–29], he is able to
address Thrasyboulos, who is one of them, without breaking up the flow of his song”
(1977: 144). In this sense, the subsequent καὶ γάρ serves to fold Thrasyboulos into the
lineage of the Emmenidai as a specific, living instance within that ancestry. On a still
larger scale, however, the discourse marker underscores Pindar’s transition from the an-
cestral victory catalogue—again, capped at vv. 28–9\textsuperscript{127}—to the specific exemplary deeds
of his addressee’s father Xenokrates in vv. 35–42: in these verses Pindar singles out
Xenokrates as a \textit{paradeigma}.\textsuperscript{128} This, as Pindar makes explicit in the first verses of the fi-
nal epode, is the very reason Thrasyboulos commissioned the ode in the first place, to
praise ancestral excellence (vv. 43–6):

\textsuperscript{125} Verdenius (\textit{ad} 30) provides an overview of the history of this καὶ γάρ’s interpretation; his
‘affirmative sense’ is in agreement with Thummer (1968 and Privitera (1982).

\textsuperscript{126} But see also the contrary views of Wüst (1967: 247) and Mezger (1880).

\textsuperscript{127} As Kurke (1991: 248) notes, the οὐκ ἀγνωτες at v. 30 echoes οὐκ ἀγνωτ’ at v. 12, “framing
the victory catalog.”

\textsuperscript{128} Significant to the idea of exemplarity, Kurke (1991: 223) notes that these lines “portray
Xenokrates as a model private citizen.” See also her emphasis on the paideutic function of this
particular narrative (255; with references) and the παίδειοι ὤμοι of v. 3 (252; with references in
n33).
μη νυν, ὅτι φθονεραὶ θνατῶν φρένας ἀμφικρέμανται ἐλπίδες,
µητ' ἀρετὰν ποτὲ σιγάτω πατρώαν,
µηδὲ τούδος ὑμνοὺς· ἐπεὶ τοι
οὐκ ἐλινύσουτας αὐτοὺς ἐργασάμαν.

Therefore, since envious hopes hang about the minds of mortals, let the son never keep silent his ancestral excellence nor these hymns, for I truly did not fashion them to remain stationary. (trans. modified from W. H. Race)

That an ancestral excellence must not be kept silent is a *topos* in Pindaric poetry, but not one so common as to be bleached of specific import.\(^\text{129}\) One of its parallels, in fact, occurs at the end of *Olympian* 7, as we have already discussed above;\(^{\text{130}}\) another occurs at the close of *Pythian* 9, which we shall study in detail below for its articulation of genealogical discourse and family chronicles.\(^{\text{131}}\) In each of these odes Pindar is overtly drawing on the style of genealogical catalogue, drawing on the latent connection between genealogical and paradigmatic discourse.

We may finally ask to what end Pindar adopts this style, and what it means for Pindar to precede this victory catalogue and paradigmatic praise of Xenokrates with the proem’s negative view of the “mercenary Muse.”\(^\text{132}\) It is, after all, hard to imagine that the proem is designed to undermine the rest of the ode. Indeed, I suggest that Pindar’s stylistic choices within the ode underscores one way in which this apparent contradiction can be resolved, and which fit well with Kurke’s detailed analysis of the new aristocratic ethos of *megaloprepeia* represented in this ode.\(^{\text{133}}\) Where Kurke emphasizes that the victory catalogue presents an aristocratic family known for its expenditure within the community, on athletic competition and choral performance, I would add that the active, organizing role of the gods in this catalogue is suggestive of genealogical catalogue in which gods’ encounters with mortals are listed: Poseidon granted the Isthmian victory to

---

129. On πατρώαν as ‘ancestral’ see Nisetich 1977: 147, pace Verdenius ad 44. To limit the meaning of ἀρετὰν … πατρώαν to the excellence of Xenokrates, I feel, misses the point.

130. See on p. 258 above.

131. See Chapter 10 below. Verdenius (ad 44) also lists Ν. 9.6–7.


133. See the whole of Kurke 1991: 240–256.
Xenokrates (vv. 13–14); in Krisa Apollo saw him and provided him splendor. In this new aristocratic ethos, however, one’s claim to prominence is not through divine descent as codified in the *Catalogue*, but through the codification of divine favor in the context of one’s expenditure on the polis. Of this, we learn in vv. 30–42, Xenokrates was a *paradeigma*, whether through horse-breeding or generously entertaining at religious feasts, and Thrasyboulos, in his expenditure on public celebration and the preservation in song of his father’s paradigmatic *megaloprepeia*, acts in the manner of his father. Thus does Pindar employ καὶ γάρ and catalogue.

Before continuing, it is worth reflecting for a moment on the sociocultural implications of incorporating the style of genealogical catalogue into the rhetorical strategies of *epinikion*. After all, the social function of genealogical literature seems clear enough (West 1985a: 8–9).

Genealogies put things in their place. Late Geometric and Archaic Greece was a loose network of aristocratic communities in which rival clans and families competed for wealth and influence … A family’s status was not fixed once and for all by some prehistoric conferment or denial of nobility. It could rise and sink with the long-term fortunes of the house. Access of wealth did not immediately transform a nobody into a ‘man of quality’ (ἀγαθός, ἐσθλός), but if he could sustain it and hand it on to his sons and grandsons, they became persons of account. The system naturally led to tensions between the up-and-coming and the previously established houses upon whose status they were encroaching … In an age entranced by heroic poetry about the great kings, warriors and seers of the late Mycenaean period, it was only to be expected that some families should

---

134. It seems absolutely essential to me that, with Burton (1962: 49), we see this as related to the victories of Diagoras at *O. 7* 7.83–90 and of Teleseolcrates at *P. 9* 9.76–9. As for the language outside of Pindar, I would compare Hecate’s actions at *Th. 430–8* (esp. νικήσας δὲ βῆς καὶ κάρτει, καλὸν ἄθλον | ὑιὰ δὲ Κλέαναδον τε, τοκεῦσι δὲ κύδος ὀπάζει [438–9]). Of the god Apollo’s ‘beholding’ (εἴδ’) the mortal Xenokrates at Krisa (v. 18), I am inclined to think not just of Apollo and Cyrene in *P. 9* (cf. below), but of divine-mortal interaction in genealogical verses such as Hes. *fr. 145.13 M–W* (τῆς δὲ ἄρ’ [ἐν ὠρθᾶλμοισίν ἱδῶν ἱπασσοτο] and *II. 16.181–2* (τῆς δὲ κρατὺς ἀργεῖοντις | ἱπασσοτ’. ὠρθᾶλμοισίν ἱδῶν μετὰ μελπομένησιν; see p. 81 above). (The presence of the verb ἱπασσοτο may invite further comparison to the god-mortal interaction upon which the start of the Pelops and Poseidon myth turns in *O. 1* [τοῦ … ἱπασσοτο].)

135. One might also wonder whether Pindar opposes hiring out the Muse to *unworthy* individuals or families, to which the Emmenidai would stand in contrast.

136. Cf. too Irwin 2005. At p. 51 she even compares the negotiation of various, simultaneous audiences of the *Catalogue* to the “spectrum of audiences” of Pindaric poetry.
seek to trace themselves back to the heroic age and attach their line to some figure mentioned in that poetry.

Seen in this light, it seems it would also be right to expect that, when Pindar seeks to give a corrected account of the Rhodians’ descent from Heracles in *Olympian* 7, he would draw on the style of genealogical catalogue. Moreover, it fits well with the climate that Kurke suggests motivates epinikian performance: “It may be that the impetus behind epinikian performance represents a kind of counterrevolution on the part of the aristocracy. Constrained by sumptuary legislation, the aristocracy uses *epinikion* as a new outlet for prestige displays, a sort of ceremonial in competition with the new bolstered civic rituals” (1991: 258–259). I suggest that Pindar’s articulation of his patrons’ victories and magnanimous deeds on the stylistic level make Kurke’s suggestion all the more attractive.137

C Concluding remarks

Pindaric poetry, true to its hybridized form, displays the use of the καὶ γὰρ and οὐδὲ γὰρ discourse markers in both the typical manner of Archaic Greek lyric poetry—to mythologize the performing persona—and in the manner of hexameter poetry—to mark narrative transition in *paradeigmata* and genealogical catalogue poetry. On the other hand, it does so true to its virtuosity; that is, it uses them sparingly in a poetry that deploys its various speech genres according to conventions to such an extent that discourse markers are hardly compulsory. The use of discourse markers is all the more communicative, and, in the larger view, exhibits consistency with the traditional register and style of genealogical catalogue.138 While I have not underscored all instances of this above, this

137. I cite further Kurke 1991: 259n7, for its corroborating recognition of the ancestor cult latent in Pindaric imagery: “In support of this thesis [that the aristocracy uses epinikion as a new outlet for prestige displays], I would note that one sphere of imagery within the epinikia, that of ancestor cult and funeral libations, is a mode of aristocratic display that is specifically legislated against in the sixth century. Thus its inclusion in the epinikia can be seen as a way of smuggling this form of aristocratic display into the public sphere.”

138. It is reasonable to ask why we do not encounter the discourse marker in *O. 9* or *P. 3*, both of
register and style (including syntax) will be of increasing concern below. In conclusion, I briefly note two more cases of καὶ γάρ in order to introduce these ideas before we turn to a comprehensive study of Pythian 9. One instance comes in Paean 9; the other in Pythian 9 itself.

I have argued that Pindar uses the style of genealogical discourse to articulate the way in which his victory odes serve as a kind of genealogical catalogue poetry, and the efficacy of this communicative strategy depends on and is highlighted by the fact that Pindar continues to employ this style in a more traditional manner outside of victory odes. Indeed, in the second extant triad of Paean 9 (= fr. 52k), Pindar uses the discourse marker καὶ γάρ to embed mythological narrative in a cult hymn to Apollo Ismenios. He does so in the course of describing how Melia once bore the seer Tenerus to Apollo in the shrine at Thebes (vv. 38–49): 139

I beseech you, far-shooter, dedicating your oracle to the arts of the Muses … in which Oceanus’ daughter Melia, joined with you in your bed, god of Pytho, once (?) bore Tenerus, broad in force, distinguished interpreter of oracles. To him, father with unshorn hair, you entrusted Cadmus’ folk in the city of Zeathos on account of his temperate courage. For once the sea god who shakes the trident honored him above all other men and directed [his chariot] towards the ground of Euripos. (trans. modified from I. Rutherford)

Whatever followed v. 49 has been lost, but the narrative begun at v. 47 must have explained in full how Teneros came to be the hero-seer associated with Thebes, perhaps by

which have connection to Hesiodic genealogical catalogue otherwise.

139. The text is that of Rutherford (A1).
some service he performed for Poseidon. \[140\] More important, however, is that we here see the discourse marker associated with the genealogical register, especially ἔτεκεν (v. 42) and μεγεῖσ’ (v. 43). This diction, as I show in greater detail below, is best associated with the tradition of the Hesiodic Catalogue. But what of this myth in particular, of Oceanus’ daughter Melia, Apollo, and Teneros? While it is not a union specifically mentioned in extant Hesiodic genealogical catalogue, it is certainly the stuff of it: at the ‘Catalogue-ic’ end of our Theogony the Oceanid Perseis bears Aietes and Aloios to Helios, and Aietes in turn marries Idyia. \[141\] What is more intriguing still is that the scene described here—Melia bearing Teneros in the shrine at Delphi—is just such as one would find in genealogical prophecy, \[142\] a typical scene that seems also to be represented in the fragmentary last lines of Pindar’s Paeon 10 (vv. 20–1): ζευχθεῖσα προβωμίοσ | μνὸν ἔτι τέξεις | τὸν αὐτ[ (“… having been yoked before the altar she (or you) will bear a son; whom …”). \[143\] Here the future tense of the verb τίκτω may be as important as the adjective προβωμίοσ, as its only comparandum in Pindar occurs in Pythian 9. \[144\]

We shall turn in the next section to a fuller treatment of register and syntax in Pythian 9, but let us conclude the current treatment of discourse markers in Pindar with

---

140. Rutherford (2001: 197) speculates that the narrative may have contained an etiology for the name ‘Teneric’.

141. Th. 956–62. (Cf. Th. 507–8 [Klymene and Iapetos]; 288, 981 [Kallirhoe and Khrysaor]; more generally, 346–70). That Hesiodic poetry must have treated still more such unions is supported by Σ Pind. N. 10.150a (= Hes. fr. 24 M–W; iii. p. 182.18–26 Drachmann), which reports that in Hesiodic poetry Helen is born of an Oceanid and Zeus.


the final instance of καὶ γάρ. It happens to fall in the genealogical prophecy of Cheiron to Apollo of Pythian 9 (vv. 39–49):145

Concealed are the keys to sacred love-making that belong to wise Persuasion, Phoebus, and both gods and humans alike shy from engaging openly for the first time in sweet love. You know, your amorous impulse prompted you, for whom it is not right to touch upon a lie, to make that misleading speech. Do you ask from where the girl’s lineage comes, O lord? And yet you know the appointed end of all things and all the ways to them, and how many leaves the earth puts forth in spring, and how many grains of sand in the sea and rivers are beaten by the waves and blasts of wind, and what will happen and whence it will come—all this you discern clearly. (trans. modified from W. H. Race)

On the one hand the discourse marker follows on a pair of gnomic statements: the first emphatic in its expressed ἐντὶ (v. 39), the second a zero-copula infinitival construction (v. 41). It is not unusual, then, that these statements should be followed by a καὶ γάρ. Yet this discourse marker, which occurs at the beginning of the following epode, need not look back to the gnomai; it, again, can as easily look forward, marking the transition into narrative.146 Whether it looks forward to a paradeigma, however has been unclear. Carey seems to be alone in having suggested that this is the case: “It is fitting that a phrase [καὶ γάρ (σέ)] which often introduces exempla … should be used here to introduce the supreme example, Apollo himself … Chiron’s point is that Apollo has come as near to ly-

145. The actual future tense verb (τέξεται) of this prophecy occurs in v. 59, and will be dealt with at pp. 300–311 below.

ing as the oracular god may, under the influence of desire” (*ad* 43 f.). I think this must be the proper interpretation, and I would add that Cheiron’s terse relative clause τὸν οὐ θεμιτὸν μευδεῖ θιγεῖν, which follows the καὶ γάρ σέ, also fits well with the discourse conventions of *paradeigmata*: in this sense Cheiron sets Apollo’s present behavior and request against the god’s customary authority and reputation. In the next section we shall study the context of this speech in a more general study of *Pythian* 9, focussing on the register and syntax of these relative clauses.

147. Cf., e.g., *Il.* 19.95–6 (καὶ γάρ δὴ νῦ ποτε…τὸν περ) and 24.602–3 (καὶ γάρ… τῇ περ) with p. 72 above.

148. I would not rule out that, even if this speaking style fell short of ‘paradigmatic’ for Pindar’s audience, it would still well suit their stylistic expectations of Cheiron’s genealogical prophecy, which style we saw in *Paean* 9.
Chapter 10 | Pindaric textures II: *paradeigma*, catalogue, and genealogy

A Introduction

In the course of celebrating the victory of one Telesicrates in the hoplite-armor race of the Pythian games in 474 BCE, Pindar tells the story of Cyrene: both Cyrene, the North African home city of the recent victor; and Cyrene, the eponymous nymph of that city. In a scholion on this victory ode—our *Pythian* 9—an ancient commentator records that Pindar has taken this story of Cyrene from the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, quoting two lines of hexameter verse that presumably introduced Cyrene’s *ehoiê*. It is not impossible that the Hesiodic poem was indeed a ‘source’ for Pindar’s version of the story, nor is this the only ode for which the *Catalogue* has been suggested as a source for a Pindaric myth, but it is also naïve to assume that Pindar felt bound to follow a Hesiodic version in every mythological detail. More detailed testimony to Pindar’s treatment of Hesiodic versions of myths in *Olympian* 9 and *Pythian* 3 are enough to warn us against expecting too close, or straightforward, a mapping.\(^1\)

With Cyrene’s story we do not have sufficient textual evidence to discern how closely Pindar did or did not follow a Hesiodic example, or what mythological details he owes to one source or another. Still, modern commentators do not shy away from suggesting that parts of the ode are even raw appropriations of epic material. Such conclusions are probably unwarranted, yet I do think that there are fruitful ways of talking about

---

Pindar’s engagement with the tradition of genealogical catalogue poetry. In this paper I propose that, while we may not be able to approach this engagement at the level of mythological detail, we may be able to better understand the way in which Pindar draws on a conventional syntax and style best associated with the tradition of which the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* was part. In turn, we shall also discuss the place of this tradition in Pindar’s victory odes.

**B The ode**

Before we continue to a more detailed analysis, we must first sketch a few of the major features of the ode. *Pythian 9* comprises five triads, the first three of which contain the mythical narrative of the nymph Cyrene and the god Apollo, including a dialogue between Apollo and the centaur Cheiron. In the fourth triad Pindar turns to the victor Telesicrates, along with a list of his previous victories, and for these Pindar bids Telesicrates’ neighbors praise him. In the fifth and final triad Pindar adds that he has been expressly asked to tell the story of Telesicrates’ ancestor Alexidamos, who came to Libya to compete in an elaborate bride-winning footrace. Structurally speaking, then, the ode forms a sort of disproportionate triptych in which myths flank a description of the victory; the more usual schema is one in which Pindar’s description of the present victory brackets a myth. Such a departure may be part of the reason commentators feel that the ode is structurally complete after the victory-list of the fourth triad, and that the final tale, taken from Telesicrates’ family history, is appended on commission.

What then of *Pythian 9*’s myths? Pindar moves very quickly from praising Telesicrates and his home city Cyrene to the story of its eponymous nymph, whom Apollo once abducted. Pindar first summarizes the narrative, recounting how Apollo took

---

3 The ode, then, is largely a foundation tale, as found elsewhere in Pindar (e.g., *P.* 4.1–63 of *Libya*). Further instances are listed at Instone 1996: 119, with relevant discussion in Kurke 1991: 200–201 and Dougherty 1993.
Cyrene from her home in Thessaly to Libya, where Aphrodite saw to their courtship, then
tells of her descent from Oceanus via the river Peneios and Lapith father Hypseos. He
then turns to her qualities as tireless huntress and lion-wrestler, the very qualities that first
attract Apollo to her when he sees her. In direct speech Apollo then calls the centaur Che-
iron from his cave and asks him who this nymph is, of whom she was born, and whether
he might be allowed to have sex with her. Cheiron responds good-humoredly, mocking
Apollo for asking such a question, but proceeds to predict their union, Cyrene’s reign in
Libya, and the birth of her son Aristaios. That is how, Pindar tells us, Cyrene came to be
the wealthy city that now welcomes home a victorious Telesicrates. Additionally, the cata-
logue of Telesicrates’ past victories in the fourth triad, including one at Thebes, gives
Pindar occasion to abbreviate a narrative of Theban heroes and their genealogy. Lastly,
within the story of Telesicrates’ ancestor Alexidamos, we learn of a footrace betrothal de-
vised by the bride’s father Antaios, who had once heard of a tale of the Danaids’ be-
trothal by similar means, which Pindar briefly narrates.

Finally, the metrical schema of *Pythian* 9 is dactylic in a way that no other Pindar-
ic ode is: its dactylic metra are even arranged such that the fourth line of each strophe
and antistrophe is a perfect dactylic hexameter. This results, metrically speaking, in a de-
cidedly ‘epic’ feel, something which Pindar avoids in other odes.

---

4. Of the 44 Pindaric odes (or more, depending on how one tallies the *Isthmians*), 23 are
dactylo-epitrite, the others loosely termed the ‘logaoedic’ or ‘aeolic’.
5. ‘Perfect’ but for some irregularity in caesurae and word boundaries, that is. Line 79 has its
strongest sense-pause at the trochaic caesura, and line 104 has both trochaic and bucolic caesurae,
but generally the hephemimeral caesura is irregularly frequent. At line 37 the epic correption in
the first hemiepes is actually not unusual in Pindar’s dactyloepitrites (on which see Braswell *ad*
*P.* 4.5[c] with references).
lists *P.* 9 as an exception. (On the apparent exception of *P.* 1.92, see Gentili and Giannini 1977:
17.)
C Testimonia and impressions

With even metrical details seeming to betray some hexameter underpinnings, it is little wonder that ancient and modern commentators alike have sought an epic source for the Cyrene myth of Pythian 9. Indeed, as we noted above, an ancient scholiast tells us that Pindar has taken the account from the Hesiodic Catalogue of Women (Σ 6a = fr. 215 M–W):

τὰν ὁ χαιτάεις: εἰς τὴν ἠρώιδα, ἀφ’ ἡ τοῦ νηματηματική· ἐλαβεν ἡ πόλις Κυρήνη, μετάγει τὸν λόγον. ἀπὸ δὲ Ἡσίοδος Ἡσιόδου τὴν ἱστορίαν ἐλαβεν ὁ Πίνδαρος. ἡς ἢ ἄρχη: ἤ σεὶ Ἐβίης Χαρίτων ἄπο κάλλος ἔχουσα Πηνειοῦ παρ’ ὑδάρῳ καλὴ ναίσκει Κυρήνη.

‘She whom the long-haired one’: [Pindar] shifts the story (λόγον) to the heroine from whom the city Cyrene took its name. Pindar took the account (ἱστορίαν) from the Ehoiai of Hesiod, the beginning of which is:

Or such as she who, possessing beauty from the Graces, dwelt in Phthia beside the water of Peneus—beautiful Cyrene.

That Cyrene was Apollo’s lover somewhere in the Hesiodic corpus seems also to be suggested by a fragment of the fourth book of Philodemus’ De pietate, a passage which lists the numerous women with whom Apollo slept, many of whom figure in extant fragments of the Hesiodic Catalogue.

Another bit of evidence comes from Servius’ commentary on Vergil’s Georgics, in which he reports that Hesiod somewhere refers to Aristaios, the son of Apollo and Cyrene, as ‘Apollo Pastoralis’ (1.14; fr. 216 M–W): Aristaeum invocat, id est Apollinis et Cyrenes filium, quem Hesiodus dicit Apollinem pastoralem. It has generally been sup-

---

7. Drachmann ii. p. 221.12–16. The placement of the scholion is at the first verse of the Cyrene myth (verse 5 Boeckhii [as used in modern editions]; verse 6a Heinii [as used in Drachmann, preserving ancient colometry]). The noun ἱστορία occurs dozens of times in the Pindaric scholia where it seems to consistently denote the most general sense of ‘account’ or ‘story’ (cf., e.g., Σ O. 9.121d; P. 1.31c, 3.48d, 4.88b, 4.124b, 4.414a). On the pedigree of the exegetical scholia to Pindar, see Dickey 2006: 39: “[T]hey preserve the remains of commentaries by Aristarchus and several of his successors, incorporated into a comprehensive work by Didymus and then epitomized in the second century AD” (39).

posed that, when Pindar lists Aristaios’ cult titles in *Pythian* 9—Ἀγρεύς, Νόµιος, and Ἀρισταῖος—he is staying true to a Hesiodic version.⁹ The name Aristaios, after all, does occur in Hesiod *fr. 217 M–W*,¹⁰ and Apollonius Rhodius seems to look to both Pindar and Hesiod for his treatment of Cyrene and Aristaios in the *Argonautica*.¹¹

Such testimonia and correspondences are compelling, but we should be wary of some of the conclusions that modern scholars have drawn in response. Wilamowitz, following the ancient critical tradition, suggests that Pindar simply breathed a little life into a genealogy that was otherwise wholly reproduced from Hesiod.¹² R. W. B. Burton, too, feels that both the genealogy of Cyrene and Aristaios’ list of cult titles in the ode “give the impression of undigested epic material” (1962: 38).¹³ Yet Burton’s choice of the phrase “epic material” is a good example of a critical trend: while ancient commentators focus on Hesiodic sources, modern commentators have become reluctant to be any more specific than hedges such as, “The vocabulary of the two speeches and the symbols of countlessness in lines 46–48 are on the whole conventional enough and were no doubt used by the epic poet whose work Pindar is adapting” (1962: 43). Given the nature of the

---

⁹. Lines 64–5. Robbins 1978: 100 suggests that “Pastoralem is in all likelihood a translation of Νόµιον.”

¹⁰. Cf. also Anon. P. Michigan inv. 1447 ii 1–6 (*fr. 217a M–W*) with Philodemus *De pietate* B 6552–55 Obbink, which specifically name either the *Catalogue* or *Ehoiai*. On his name and epithets, see also Diod. Sic. 4.81–2 and Nonnum *Dion*. 5.215.


¹³. Note, too, Burton 1962: 39: “It is, however, surprising that Pindar included this genealogy in his story without apparently shortening it or modifying it in any way, while leaving out so much else that must have been in the original” (my emphasis).
evidence, some skepticism is healthy, but one cause for concern in not better defining the terms “epic material” or “conventional enough” is the increased prevalence of Homeric comparanda—let alone conclusions about Pindar’s mood—in studies of this ode.\textsuperscript{14} Pindar is more than just “in a spring mood” and his register more than just “conventional enough” for epic poetry. Pindar is conventional in a particular manner, and, contrary to the negative connotations of calling verses ‘conventional’, Pindar’s application of convention is pointed, pointing us, in fact, to Hesiodic catalogue poetry.

\textit{D Syntax and register}

\textit{D.1 The relative pronoun with ποτέ}

Pindar wastes no time in getting to the myth of Cyrene in \textit{Pythian} 9; only in \textit{Pythian} 4 does he sooner effect the transition to mythological narrative. In both cases, as often, he does this by means of a relative adverb or relative pronoun:

\begin{enumerate}
\item Α´ Σάμερον μὲν χρή σε παρ’ ἀνδρὶ φίλῳ
στᾶμεν, εὐίππου βασιλῇ Κυράνας, ὁφρα κωμάζοντι σὺν Ἀρκεῖλα.
Μοίσα, Λατοίδαςιν ὁφειλόμενον Πυθώνι τ’ αὔξης οὔρον ὑμνῶν,
ἐνθα ποτέ χρυσέων Διὸς αἰετῶν πάρεδρος …
\textit{P. 4.1–4}
\item Α´ Ἐθέλω χαλκάσπια Πυθιονίκαν
σὺν βαθυζώνοις ἀγγέλωι
Τελεσικράτη Χαρίτεσσι γεγωνεῖν
ὁ τὰν … ποτε χαῖταίς ἀνεμοφαράγων ἐκ Παλίου κόλπων ποτέ Λατοίδας
\textit{P. 9.1–5}
\end{enumerate}

In both cases, too, he combines this relative pronoun with the adverb ποτέ: note the syntactic formula τὰν … ποτε in \textit{Pythian} 9.\textsuperscript{15} Commentators on the ode consistently note

\textsuperscript{14} On the \textit{Dios apatê} of \textit{Iliad} 14 as a backdrop see n.86 on p. 301 below. On Pindar’s “spring mood,” see Carey (\textit{ad} 31–67) with p. 301 below.

\textsuperscript{15} The transition from heroine to city, then, hinges on the ambiguity of the feminine relative pronoun, as many commentators have noted (Norwood 1956: 35–36 being a particularly charming description of the phenomenon). Carey (\textit{ad} 5) proposes that “[t]he relative not only secures cohesion but also gives an appearance of irrelevance. Such casual transitions … preserve the illusion of extempore composition, avoiding rhetorical rigidity.” Pfeijffer (1999: 37–41)
that this use of the relative pronoun is traditional, but, at their most specific, call the use “as old as Homer,” whatever one now takes that to mean. Yet that is not to say that it is Homeric, and we can better define the convention to which this syntax belongs.

Elroy Bundy suggests that the use of the relative in transitions is owed to the conventions of cult and rhapsodic hymns, marking the transition to descriptions or narratives of a god’s powers (1986: 8–9n27). W. J. Slater studies this convention in two articles on the narrative ‘flashback’ in Pindar. In his 1983 article on lyric narrative, in which he gives due space to Homeric usage, he concludes that “both lyric narrative and its more complex form [of ‘complex lyric’] were themselves independent forms of folk narrative before they became absorbed into the structure of epic narrative” (120). Unfortunately, he also concedes that “the exact relationship … among lyric, epic, and folk exemplum must remain unknown” (127). Yet Bundy did not take account of the relative pronoun’s com-

expresses a similar idea (irrespective of ποτέ), but neither seems to me a particularly fruitful way of describing the convention.

16. Cf. Illig 1932: 32n4; Des Places 1947; Monteil 1963: 385; West 1966 ad Th. 22; Köhnken 1971: 132–133; Norden 1974: 168–176; Carey 1981: 8; Braswell 1988 ad P. 4.4; Hummel 1993: §404; Race 1990: 18. Bonifazi (2004: 42–43) provides a similar summary within a fresh approach, but also seems to take its “hymnal origin” for granted (43) and concludes that the “authoritative models of these relative clauses are in Homeric poetry” (48; cf. 63). While commentators do not consistently note which particles or adverbs appear with the relative, I treat the syntagm ὅς-ποτε as distinct from the more common bare transitional relative—19 of des Places’ 37 instances—as in O. 1.24–26:

Πέλοπος ἀποικίᾳ | τοῦ µεγασθενῆς ἔρασατο Γαίαοχος | Ποσειδάν.

17. Carey ad 5. In his introduction Carey calls Pindar’s use of the relative pronoun “an elaboration of an established technique,” the difference being that Pindar “eschews explicit moralizing” and “allows the myths to speak for themselves” (8).


19. Slater defines ‘complex lyric’ thus: “Unlike lyric narrative which begins and ends at the same point, complex lyric begins in mediis rebus, moves backward, then forward (a procedure which may involve ‘concentric’ rings of the RC³ type), passing through the point at which it began (RC³), proceeds to a narration of terminal exploits, and finally rejoins the main narrative at the point at which it left (RC1)” (120). The story of Odysseus’ scar (Od. 19.393–467), Slater notes (118–119), is the most revealing example.
bination with the adverb ποτέ, and Slater, though he does note the adverb’s presence, does not draw a distinction between cases in which it is present, and cases in which it is not. David Young drew attention to Pindar’s use of the “inscriptional ποτέ” in Pythians 2 and 3, but he largely passes over its frequent combination with the relative pronoun, despite its prominence in the many examples of epitaphs and victory inscriptions he

---

20. Slater (1983: 127) remarks that the “relative + ποτέ + aorist + participle (or temporal clause) is characteristic.”

21. See also Hurst 1985 (esp. 160–176) for a treatment of the problem in Pindar within a spectrum of attitudes toward chronological gaps and transgressions. Hurst treats the bare relative (e.g., O. 1.25) as “l’attitude minimale” (160), where Pindar tries to bring different layers of time into communication by masking the chronological gap; on the other hand, the τόν ποτέ at O. 3.13–14, for Hurst, represents “la possibilité de distinguer des couches du temps par l’emploi de divers indices lexicaux dans le même segment de l’ode” (163). Cingano’s response to this essay (1990: 156–159) is skeptical that the ancient audience would have noticed: “Non credo … che sia sempre possibile motivare razionalmente il ricorso a un dato accorgimento, ne che i vari segnali temporali avessero nella maggioranza dei casi una funzione di demarcazione, di cambio di registro tematico così chiara da poter essere effettivamente percepita dall’uditorio” (157). He argues for a more general interpretation of the syntax, one “con una funzione non dissimile da quella della consuetà espressione ‘C’era una volta’ che introduce (seppure con effetto più marcato e chiaro) i racconti di fiaba” (157). My own view falls somewhere between: while variations in the syntax may not have very different meanings, they may belong to different ‘modes of discourse’ or ‘performance habits’—ones I do think the audience would have recognized—in which case they can mean differently. That is, instead of differences in attitude toward time, as Hurst describes, I would emphasize a difference in speech genre, which Cingano gets at with his recourse to the genre-specific ‘C’era una volta’.

22. Young (1983), responding primarily to Wade-Gery (1933: 71–82), describes this use of the adverb as the “inscriptional ποτέ,” by which he means it is connected to funerary inscriptions. Suggesting that “even Homer probably knew of the inscriptional pote” (38), Young finds good support in the apparent epitaph prophesied by Hector at Il. 7.90, but less in his example of the spoliorum titulum at Il. 8.108 (39n24). On Il. 7.90 and ‘epigraphic style’ see Scodel 1992 (esp. 58–60), yet note that the occurrence of this ὅς-ποτέ syntagm in genealogical contexts throughout Homeric poetry may detract from its inscriptive specificity.
Young’s argument is compelling, but, when one considers that this syntax was used not only for victory commemoration but also narrative flashback, it seems we have not arrived at the underlying convention. Pascale Hummel, in her extensive analysis of Pindaric syntax, finds this intersection of narrative flashback and commemoration attractive but unsatisfactory, because the inscriptions themselves do not exhibit the same narrative movement. Christos Tsagalis, following Joseph Day on the “laudatory relative” in Pindar and inscriptions, describes this syntax as a narrative expansion device traditional to encomiastic poetry. He finds, however, that, in his study of fourth-century inscriptions use of the ὅς-ποτε syntax is not limited to encomiastic contexts—it also occurs in threnodic contexts.

While Tsagalis’ description of the syntax as one of narrative expansion seems a reasonable resolution to the problem Hummel noticed, we might think of the non-encomiastic use of the syntax not as an aberration from the encomiastic norm, but as a different manifestation of an underlying convention. The convention is more tractable if one sees this manner of narrative transition as, in essence, a syntax best associated with genealogical poetry, in particular the narrative expansion within genealogical catalogues.

---

23. See especially Young’s examples at 36–37. He does briefly note that “a relative clause, although not mandatory, is the conventional habit of insessional pote (probably under the influence of epic [e.g., Iliad 2.547] and hymnal [e.g., h.Ap. 307] style)” (41n30). (Hummel [1993: 327], too, emphasizes the epic and hymnal convention.) I would like to note that I do not disagree with Young’s connection between ποτε in Pindar and in inscriptions, but rather aim to show that both of these two modes of discourse very naturally draw on the ‘genealogical’ mode.

24. And not incompatible with my own; see p. 310 below.

25. Hummel 1993: 327: “Si le rapprochement est certes séduisant, il n’est pas entièrement satisfaisant, dans la mesure où pour les inscriptions la relative avec ποτε n’amorce pas de mouvement narrative rétrospective, mais un simple résumé historique ou mythologique.”


27. Tsagalis 2008: 232 on CEG 576, but see my n.31 on p. 286 below.

28. This was, it seems, first recognized by Beye 1964 in the context of his study of the Catalogue of Ships, where he even suggests that the Hesiodic Catalogue might be a good comparandum (352, 372n26). Slater acknowledges Beye’s article, but dismisses it thus: “of the forty-three examples I have counted in the Iliad, almost all are associated with the production of pathos” (1983: 117n2).
A few examples from across Archaic Greek poetry may serve to summarize those findings:

Οἱ δ’ ἀρ’ Ἀθήνας εἶχον ἐυκτίμενον πτολείθρον δήμον Ἑρεχθῖος μεγαλήτορος, ὅν ποτ’ Ἀθήνη ἔρρενε Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζειδώς ἄρουρα,
   *Il.* 2.546–548 (Catalogue of Ships)

Φυλείδῆς, ὃν τίκτε Διὶ φιλοτ ἵππότα Φυλείς,
   *Il.* 2.628–630 (Catalogue of Ships)

Δρήσον δ’ Εὐρύαλος καὶ Ὀφέλτιον ἔξεναριξε·
   *Od.* 11.283–285 (Nekyia)

When we take into consideration the contexts of these passages—note especially the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, the Catalogue of Ships, and the *Nekyia*—it is not at all surprising that

---

29. For an analysis, see Appendix A (p. 350). I here omit discussion of the ἥ/ὁς-ῥα syntagm—found only at Pind. *fr.* 125.1, but important in Hesiodic and Homeric poetry—as well as their combination: e.g., ἐκ ποταμοῦ φεύγοντι Λυκάον, τόν ῥά ποτ’ αὐτὸς (*Il.* 21.35), an example which Slater calls “an intended tour de force of its type” (1983: 118).

we also find in these examples that this syntax is often preceded by either a patronymic or a form of the noun υἱός, and followed by a form of the verb τίκτω.31

“The parallels establish the convention; the convention establishes the sense,” advises Slater (1983: 129). This confluence of syntax and lexical items is a suggestive indication of the genealogical underpinnings, and one with which Pindar shows his familiarity in a number of odes.32 But it is remarkable that Pindar chooses to use this syntactic structure a second time in Pythian 9, and just a few verses later (13–18):

```
Ὑψέος … ὃς Λαπιθᾶν ὑπερόπλων τοινάκις ἤν βασιλεύς,
εξ Ὡκεανοῦ γένος ἠρώς
δεύτερος. ὃς τοι ἔρωτε ὁ Πινδοῦ κλεενναῖς ἐν πτυχαῖς,
Ναῖς εὐφρανθείσα Πηνειοῦ λέχει Κρέοισ’ ἔτικτεν,
Γαίας θυγάτηρ, ὥ δὲ τὰν εὐώλενον
θρέψατο παῖδα Κυράναν.33
```

…Hypseus, who at that time was king of the overbearing Lapithai, a hero, second in descent from Okeanos, whom once in the famous glens of Pindos Kreousa, the Naiad daughter of Gaia, bore after finding joy in the bed of Peneios. He raised his fair-armed child Kyrene. (trans. W. H. Race)

We can even reasonably add to this inventory the beginning of the next strophe—a point at which Pindar commonly effects narrative transition via the relative pronoun34—in which case he does so with the catch-all pronoun νυν (26–28):

```
31. With or instead of τίκτω, see θρέψ- (as at Il. 2.546–548 [p. 285 above] and n.119 on p. 310 below). With less frequency, one also encounters πατήρ (e.g., Od. 2.46) or even παῖς (e.g., CEG 12, on which see p. 310 below). Compare now Tsagalis’ example of CEG 576, which he describes as threnodic aberration of a normally encomiastic device:

   παῖδα τοι ἱφθίαν Δαμαινέτου ἄδε Κρατίσταν
   Ἀρχεμάχου δέ φιλαν εὔνιν ἐδεκτο κόινη:
   ὁ ποθ’ ὑπ’ ὀδίνων στονόεντι κατέφθιτο πότιμω,
   ὀρφανοῦ ἐμ μεγάροις παῖδα λιποῦσα πόσεi.

32. Cf. especially Medea’s speech in Pythian 4: υἱός ἵππαρχοι Ποσειδάρωνος ἄναξ, | τὸν ποτ’ Εὐρώπα Τίτυονθυγάτηρ τίκτε Ἰαφίσκου παρ’ ἄχθαις … (45–46). The syntax occurs in O. 3, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13; P. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6, 8, 9, 10, 12; N. 4, 5, 8, 9; I. 1, 6, 8; as well as Πα. 4, 8a (supp.), 18, 22b; Δ. 2; frr. 125, 333a. For an analysis, see Table 10 on p. 355 below.

33. On this θρέψατο (18) as bound up in the genealogical register, see n.119 on p. 310 below.


35. Slater (1969, s.v. ποτέ) includes this instance, I think rightly, under his heading “c. in quasi rel. cl., c. part., simm.” For the competing syntax at P. 9.26, one governed primarily by a verb-
Upon her once came Apollo, the far-shooting god with the broad quiver, as she was wrestling alone with a mighty lion, without weapons.

In light of the discussion above, it may be objected in this case that the ὅς-ποτε syntactic formula, or ‘syntagm’, is not in this case found along with a υἱός or a verb such as ἐτικτεν. Yet the genealogical context is established, and the need for such words eased. It is all the more remarkable, then, that Pindar continues to use this syntax, not unlike the periodic repetition in successive narrative sections in the Odyssey’s Nekyia.  

Again, while it is not unusual to find this syntax in Pindar’s odes, it is unusual to find more than one instance in a single ode. In fact, most of the poems that have multiple instances of the syntagm, are those with special Hesiodic, or genealogical, connections:

---

first matrix and Wackernagel’s Law, see also lines 79 (ἐγνυν ποτὲ καὶ ἱόλασσον) and 84 (τέκε οἱ καὶ Ζηνὶ μυγείςα δαήρων). The pronoun νιν (far more common than μιν, though MSS differ) occurs over 100X in the odes and fragments—Des Places 1947: 22 is partial—and that Pindar uses it freely is clear by its equivalence to the plural αὐτοῦς at N. 4.3.

36. Cf. Od. 11.281, 284 (quoted in text above), 322.

37. Here, again, I draw a distinction between bare relatives—not uncommon in Pindar (e.g., τοῦ at O. 1.25)—and the more marked use of the relative with ποτὲ.
My suggestion, then, is that we can be more specific than commentators have been about the conventions of this syntax, especially when we observe the diction surrounding it. Not simply “as old as Homer,” nor precisely the same as the hymnic relative clause, this syntactic convention is

38. At *O.* 3.13 the syntax expands a reference to the olive wreath that Heracles brought back from among the Hyperboreans; at line 29 this syntagm introduces an abbreviated version of the story of the Pleiad Taygeta, who was transformed into a doe in her escape from Zeus (a fitting story for the *Catalogue*, if not directly attested; see Gantz 1996: 216,386).

39. *O.* 7 is an excellent example of the aptness of this syntax: note how two of the three instances (30, 34) follow on Pindar’s wish to correct a genealogy: ἐθελήσω τοῖσιν ἀπὸ Τλαπολέου | Ἑρακλέος | ἐξ ἀρχᾶς ἀνδρῶν παραδεξαμένους | Ἁρακλέος | ἀνδρῶν ἑπτὰ σοφώτατα νοήματ' ἐπὶ προτέρων ἀνδρῶν παραδεξαμένους | παῖδας … On the combination of this syntax and register, see pp. 289–293 below.

40. Lines 5, 74. On the Hesiodic context of *P.* 3, see n.1 on p. 276 above.

41. Lines 4, 10, 20, 46, 107, 152, 161, [258]. Note esp. lines 45–46: ὅποτ' ἑυρωπά τίκτε, as well as line 107, which describes the succession of power among Aiolos and his sons. At line 258, I am inclined to follow Chaeris’ ἐν ποτε rather than Boeckh’s τάν ποτε or the ἅν ποτε of the codd.

42. Line 25 concerns Herakles, but I can make no more of it here. The syntagm only exists at lines 89–90 through the conjectures of Hermann and Boeckh, whereas the codices have the phrase ὅ σὸς άείσεται, παῖ. But notice the genealogical nature of the statement following: ἀλλὰ τίς ἰσίως τανύσφυρον ἣν Ἀϊδωνεύς; ὅν τε θεοὶ κατὰ δῶμα Διὸς τρομέουσιν ἱόντα; Ἡ.Ven. 2: Κύπριδος, ἃ τε θεοῖσιν ἐπὶ γλυκὸν ἔρησιν ὄρσε. Nor do Braswell’s lyric examples (Alc. 34a.5, 308b.2, 325.2 L-P) have ποτέ. If anything, one might wonder whether the τε (in 2 of the 4 examples) is part of the convention (cf. the ἃν τε of
markedly genealogical, even markedly Hesiodic. Pindar is adept at adhering to this genealogical style in his odes, and, in the case of *Pythian 9*, even actively fostering the impression of creating a catalogue himself by using this syntactic formula three times in the first thirty lines of the ode.

**D.2 Register and genealogy**

Integral to this conclusion has been close attention to the presence of certain lexical items from a decidedly genealogical register, namely the verb τίκτω and either a patronymic or the noun υἱός. It is worth investigating further, then, what constitutes a genealogical register, for it may shed light on otherwise subjective notions of Pindaric moods and imagery in *Pythian 9*, as well as some of his more obscure choices of words or extensions of their meanings. Let us begin with Pindar’s genealogy of Cyrene, one of the passages described as “giv[ing] the impression of undigested epic material,” and which has inspired far more Homeric comparisons than Hesiodic (12–17):

---

*WD 3*, which asks the Muses not of Zeus’ *genealogy* but to hymn his *powers* [and his νόον: cf. 661–662]). See also the first example from the oft-cited Norden 1974: 168–176, *h. I. 3.7*: κλέος μου ἀργυρότοξος, ὃς Χρύσην ἀμφιβεβηκας. For an extended discussion of τέ, see Ruijgh 1971: §296–§394. A succinct example of the distinction is clear in the comparison of two passages from *h.Hom. 32*: ἢς ἀπο αἰγυλη γαίαν ἐλίσσεται οὐρανόδεικτος | κρατὸς ἀπ' ἀθανάτοι (3–4); τῇ ῥάποτε Κρονίδης ἐς ἔσται ἐμὲ ψυκτήριον, ἢ δ' ὑποκυσαμένη Πανδείην γείνατο κούρην (14–15).

45. Consider also the following verses: *Th. 22*: αἵνυ ποθ’ Ἡσίοδον καλὴν ἐδίδαξαν ἀοιδήν; *Th. 409*: γεινατε δ' Ἀστερήν εὐώνυμον, ἢν ποτε Πέροις; *WD 635*: ὃς ποτε καὶ τείδ' ἠλθε πολύν διὰ πόνον ἀνύσσας; *WD 651*: εἰ μὴ ἐς Εὔβοιαν ἐς Αὐλίδος, ἡ ποτ’ Ἀχαιοι; *fr. 17a.4 M–W*: [ ]ἰερον, ὦι ποτ[ε] νῦφη; 27.7: τ[ά]ς ποτε [Λ]αο[θ])η κρείουσ' 'Υπερηφάνης ἁ[μύ]μων; 161.2: ὃν ποτε τίκτε Πελασγός; 171.7: [ ]πότε τήν ψυκτήριον, ὅρχαλα, 177.9: ὃς ποτε Δ[ήμιτρος πολυφόρβης ἔς λέχος ἠλθε; 234.2: τοὺς ρά ποτε Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἀφύτα μῆδα ἔδω; 301.1: ἐυθὰ ποτ' ἐσται ἐμὸν ψυκτήριον, ὅρχαμε λαών (Ἡσιόδου ἤ Κέρκως). Notice that, while the *WD* is not itself genealogical, the poet is describing the life of this father.

46. Burton 1962: 38, a comment he applies also to lines 64–65 concerning Aristaios. So, too, Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1922: 267), who finds Cyrene’s genealogy all too excessive (“Man spürt den Anschluss an das Katalogepos wohl in der allzuausgedehnten Genealogie 13–17 und in der Aufzählung der für uns überraschenden Zahl der Kultnamen des Aristaos 64”). Carey is probably right to respond that “[t]his would be unusual in Pindar” (*ad* 14–17).
καὶ σφιν ἐπὶ γλυκεῖς ἐφὼν αἰδῶ, εὐναῖς ἐρατὰν βάλεν αἰδῶ, ἐφὼν ἀρμόζοισα δέω τε γάμων μυχεντα κοῦρα θ' Ὀμός εὐφρεῖοι δός Λαπιθάν ὑπέρπλων τουτάκις ἔντι βασιλεύς, ἔξ Ὡκεανοῦ γένος ἱρῶς, δεύτερος ὁ τοτε Πινδοῦ κλευναῖς ἐν πτυχαῖς Ἡρώς.

The first verse of this passage is a perfect dactylic hexameter, a meter for which Kirkwood (ad loc.) remarks the Homeric language is apt. While Kirkwood does not specify what language he means, he follows with glosses of the words ἐρατὰν and αἰδῶ, and we may start with these, for they are treated as *Stichwörter* in studies of this ode that emphasize Homeric parallels.

47. See n.86 on p. 301 below.

48. Cf. Hes. fr. 204.82 M–W: αὐτὸς ἔλοιτο βίηι, νείμεσίν τ' ἀπ[ο]θεῖτο καὶ αἰδῶ. It is perhaps worth noting that the previous verse contains the epithet εὐφρεῖος (fr. 204.81: ἄμφι γάμων κοῦρας εὐφρεῖοι λέενοις ὅς δὲ κεν ἄνδρῳ), which appears nowhere else until Eur. *Hipp.* 605. (Carey [ad 17f.] and Giannini in Bernardini et al. 1995 [ad 17] on the adj. as referring to her strength or masculinity but, based on the description of Cyrene’s beauty in fr. 9.26–27 with ἀνάληψεν παρθένον οὐσαν [Hes. fr. 204.91 M–W, Achilles’s potential discovery of Helen]?)

49. In *Il.* and *Od.*: 1X ἐρατ- (déōr' ἐρατα ... χρυσεὶς Ἀφροδίτης, *Il.* 3.64) versus 22X ἐρατειν- (20X ἐρατειν-#). In *H.Hom.*: 8X ἐρατ- versus 8X ἐρατειν-.

50. In *Th.* and Hes. *frr.: 5X ἐρατειν-# versus 11X ἐρατ- (7X in *formula* μυγεῖο' ἐρατ' φιλότητι). Yet we should not discount the fact that in lyric and elegy, where ἐρατειν- seems
More than half of these instances in Hesiodic poetry occur in the formulaic phrase \( \mu\iota\gamma\epsilon \iota\zeta \varepsilon\rho\alpha\tau\eta \tau\mu\iota, \) so its combination with the participle \( \mu\iota\chi\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha \) in *Pythian 9* becomes significant.\(^{51}\) The prominence of this particular nexus of lexical items has led to such varied conclusions as that the victor Telesicrates was soon to be married,\(^ {52}\) or that this scene is part of a larger scheme of parallels associating this ode closely with Homeric poetry. But even words used to create that Homeric connection are better suited to the formulae of genealogical poetry: considering the proximity of the participle \( \mu\iota\chi\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha \) (13) and the noun \( \epsilon\upsilon\nu\alpha\zeta\iota \) (12), there is no better comparandum that fragments of the *Catalogue*: \( \mu\iota\gamma\eta \ \phi\iota\lambda\omicron[\tau\iota]\tau\iota \kappa\iota \epsilon[\upsilon\nu\eta] \) (fr. 17a.5, 177.12, 195.36 M–W).\(^ {53}\)

If the tradition of genealogical catalogue poetry lies behind this passage on a conventional, stylistic level, might we also speak of that tradition as the *Catalogue of Women* in particular?\(^ {54}\) A further problem of Pindaric word choice in this passage may suggest we never to occur, \( \varepsilon\rho\alpha\tau\zeta\) - is practically programmatic: e.g., Pind. fr. 124a-b.1 (\( \varepsilon\rho\alpha\tau\zeta \ldots \alpha\omicron\iota\delta\alpha\nu \)), 140b.17 (\( \varepsilon\rho\alpha\tau\zeta \ \mu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\omicron \)); Alcm. fr. 27.1.2 (\( \alpha\omicron\chi' \ \varepsilon\rho\alpha\tau\zeta\omicron \ \eta\omicron\pi\epsilon\omicron\omicron\omega \)); Archil. 1.2 (\( \alpha\omicron\nu\omicron\sigma\omicron\epsilon\omicron\omicron \ \varepsilon\rho\alpha\tau\zeta\omicron \ \delta\omega\rho\omicron\omicron \)); Sappho 16.4, 17 V. Although this may well influence the choice of \( \varepsilon\rho\alpha\tau\zeta\omicron \) in particular, the broader view of this diction is not paralleled in lyric or elegy.

\(^{51}\) Forms of \( \mu\epsilon\iota\gamma\nu\omicron\omicron \) occur also at lines 68 (again, of sexual intercourse) and 72 (of victory). For the crowning of a victor, see also *N*. 1.18, *N*. 2.22, and Slater (s.v. 1.c.a.). On the shared imagery of marriage and victory, see Carson 1982.

\(^{52}\) This historicizing approach—e.g., Mezger 1880—has rightly fallen out of favor; see Gildersleeve 1885: 338 for an early refutation. Erotic language and themes, of course, are inherent in the chosen myths (see Burton 1962: 59, Carey 1981: 66), if not also the very tradition on which I suggest Pindar may be drawing.

\(^{53}\) Regarding the note of Giannini in Bernardini et al. 1995 on \( \epsilon\upsilon\nu\alpha\zeta\iota \) in line 12, “usato spesso (in Omero in associazione con \( \phi\iota\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\zeta \)) per indicare il «letto d’amore>>,” one might better look to Hesiod rather than Homer: the full, half-verse formula -\( \mu\iota\gamma\eta\- \phi\iota\lambda\omicron\tau\omicron\zeta\kappa\iota \epsilon\upsilon\nu\eta\) (and its mirror image) belongs to the style of Hesiod catalogue poetry (e.g., fr. 17a.5 M–W, 177.12, 195.36 [=Sc. 36]), even when in Homer (*Il*. 3.445, 6.25; *Od*. 5.126, 23.219) or the Hymns (*h.Hom*. 32.14). (Cf. too Schwartz 1960: 514–516.) Such formulae from a genealogical register well explain, in fact, what Kirkwood (*ad 33*) otherwise describes as a “prevalence of metaphors of the senses: \( \mu\iota\chi\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha \) (13), \( \mu\iota\gamma\epsilon\nu \) (68), \( \sigma\nu\nu\epsilon\iota\omicron\epsilon\epsilon\) (72), \( \mu\iota\gamma\epsilon\iota\sigma\alpha \) (84).” While Giannini in Bernardini et al. 1995 (*ad 13*) call the participle \( \mu\iota\chi\theta\epsilon\nu\tau\alpha \) ambiguous, we might better call it conventional.

\(^{54}\) There were, of course, genealogical poets other than Hesiod, including Asius of Samos and Cinaethon of Lacedaemon, and anonymous genealogical poems such as the *Naupactica* and...
can. Past scholars have previously drawn attention to the pleonasm and remarkable emphasis on the harmony of Apollo and Cyrene’s union with the phrase ξυνὸν ἀρμόζοισα... γάμον μιχθέντα (13). Focusing on the difficulty of the adjective ξυνὸν, commentators most often compare a similar expression at P. 4.222–223: καταίνησάν τε κοινὸν γάμον... γλυκὺν ἐν ἀλλάλοισι μεἰξσι (“and they agreed to join with one another in a sweet marriage of mutual consent”), where the γάμος is κοινὸς. But the ‘mutual consent’ of Jason and Medea’s marriage in Pythian 4 is not necessarily the same as what we have in Pythian 9, where the γάμος is ξυνὸς. In Pythian 9 the emphasis is not on mutual consent among mortals but on a marriage which bridges the gap between god and woman (θεῷ... κούρᾳ θ’, 13). In this light, I further suggest that Pindar’s word choice here might specifically recall the opening of our Catalogue of Women (fr. 1.1–7 M–W):

Νῦν δὲ γυναικῶν ἔφυλον ἀείσατε, ἡδυέπειαι Μούσαι Ὀλυμπιάδεις, κοῦραι Διός αἰγιόχοι,
αἱ τότε ἀρίσται ἔσαν[
μίτρας τ’ ἀλλύσαντο .[ μισγόμενα θεοῦς[
ξυναὶ γὰρ τὸτε δαῖτες ἔσαν, ξυνοὶ δὲ θόωκοι ἀθανάτοις τε θεῖοὶ καταθνητοῖς τ’ ἀνθρώποις.

And now sing of the tribe of women, sweet-voiced Olympian Muses, daughters of aegis-bearing Zeus, those women who at that time were best [...] and who loosened their girdles [...] having sex with gods [...]. For at that time the feasts were shared and the councils were shared between the immortal gods and mortal human beings.

Though fragmentary, this opening passage, setting out the thematic basis of the entire Catalogue, may neatly explain Pindar’s difficult locution. For, while there must have

---

Phoroneis. See further West 1985a: 3–7.

55. Cf. each of Gildersleeve 1885 (ad 10), Schroeder 1922 (ad 7, on pleonasm), Illig 1932: 33, Carey 1981 (ad 13), and Kirkwood 1982 (ad 13).


57. On this sense of bridging gaps, compare the use of ξυνὸς to describe Panhellenic festivals at I. 4.28 (παναγυρίων ξυνὰν), or Pindar’s song at O. 7.21 (ξυνὸν... λόγον), which unites the strands of the ancestry of the Rhodians (see n.39 on p. 288 above).

58. It does seem to me more apt than the comparison to Archilochus fr. 174 West: αἴνος τις ἀνθρώπων ὡς, ὡς ἀρ’ ἀλώπηξ καιτες ξυνεωνίνη | ἐμείξαν (e.g., Giannini in Bernardini et al.
been a full-stop separating μισγόμεναι (5) and ξυναι (6), line 6 is an explanation (γὰρ τότε) of the line 5; that is, the fact that the banquets and councils were shared, or ξυνοί, was part of the same set of circumstances in which this intercourse between mortal women and gods was also shared, or ξυνός. If, despite this theme’s prominence in the proem, this seems a small point to make, we need only look to the reconstructed end of the Catalogue for confirmation of its importance (fr. 204.96–103 M–W):

For high-thundering Zeus was devising wondrous deeds then, to stir up trouble on the boundless earth; for he was already eager to annihilate most of the race of speech-endowed human beings, a pretext to destroy the lives of the semi-gods, [     ] to mortals children of the gods [     ] seeing with eyes, but that the ones blessed [     ] as before apart from human beings should have [life and] habitations. (trans. G. W. Most)

Here all those customs, which had started out for the gods ξυνοί with mortals in the space of the Catalogue, were to return to their previous, divided state: ως το πάρος περ χωρίς ἀπ’ ἀν[θ]αρωπών (102–103; “as before apart from human beings”).

D.3 Οἰος and the making of catalogue

We may say, therefore, that Pindar is narrating in a distinctly genealogical, if not specifically Hesiodic, style. We may even say he is syntagmatically arranging his narrative in catalogue form: stacking narratives upon, or embedding them within, one another

1995).

59. One might further add, with Dougherty (1993: 150), that Pindar “nods briefly to his Hesiodic source” later on with the phrase καλλιγύναικι πάτρᾳ (74). One might also compare Cheiron’s καὶ ἐν τῇ θεοῖς τούτῳ κάθρωποις ὁμώς | αἰδέοντ’, ἀμφανδὼν ἀδείας τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον εὐνάσ (40–41; “and both gods and humans alike shy from engaging openly for the first time in sweet love,” trans. W. H. Race), which again stresses sexual commonality of gods and mortals.

using a syntax characteristic of genealogical catalogue poetry. But this is not the only way in which he is engaging with the syntax of the tradition of the Hesiodic *Catalogue*. A distinctive feature of the *Catalogue* is, of course, the disjunctive use of the qualitative relative: this characteristic ἥ’ οἷη at some point came to structure transitions between various heroines featured in the poem,⁶¹ and ancients and moderns alike have referred to the *Catalogue of Women* as the *Ehoiai*, literally the “or such as shes.”

Pindar uses this qualitative relative pronoun three times in this ode.⁶² To put that number into perspective, this pronoun occurs only twenty-three times in his forty-plus victory odes. Five of those instances are in *Pythian* 3, where we have already noted a complex relationship to the *Catalogue*.⁶³ After these two, the only other two odes with more than one instance of the pronoun are *Pythian* 1 (4x) and 2 (2x).⁶⁴ Let’s begin with *Pythian* 9’s most straightforward instance, when in the ode’s final triad Pindar relates how Telesicrates’ ancestor Alexidamos emigrated to Libya and won the hand of Antaios’ daughter in a footrace (101–125). In a verse following directly on the dactylic hexameter of line 104,⁶⁵ Pindar starts in on the story thus (103–108):

---

⁶¹ On diachrony and the importance of this structuring element, compare West 1985a: 167 (“the ἥ’ οἷη device probably came from a post-Hesiodic or para-Hesiodic tradition … The *Catalogue*, however, reveals a clever combination of the Ehoie principle with the Hesiodic style”) and Rutherford 2000: 92 (“Originally the formula would have had a dominant functional role, introducing paradigms of female excellence; but at a later stage, marked by the canonical *Catalogue*, it would have become less important and would have been reduced to a merely formal device”). Cf. too Hirschberger 2004: 30–31.

⁶² Slater classifies the Pindaric uses of this pronoun into the relative, exclamatory, and indirect interrogative, but the syntax of οἷς is often troublesome. See, e.g., *N.* 4.93 (οἶον αἰνέων κε Μελησίαν ἔριδα στρέφοι, where Aristarchus read οἶον) with Schroeder (*ad loc.*), Bury 1965b (*ad* 93–96), and Farnell (*ad* 92 with appendix at pp. 232–234). For a similar awkwardness of the pronoun at *Il.* 5.601, see n.76 on p. 298 below.

⁶³ See n.1 on p. 276 above.

⁶⁴ At *P.* 1.27 the pronoun participates in the θαῦμα syntagm (on which see below); at line 47 it performs a paradigmatic function after ή κεν ἀμφότερον, quickly followed by an instance at line 49; at 73 it introduces a narrative. In *P.* 2, the two instances (72, 75) are part of *gnomai*.

⁶⁵ This might seem unremarkable were it not the case also for the οἶον of line 113, on which see below. See Farnell (*ad loc.*) for Pindar’s ‘epic’ quotation at *O.* 6.17 (ἅμφισεν μάντιν τ’
But as I slake my thirst for songs, someone exacts a debt from me to reawaken as well the ancient glory of his ancestors, such as they were when they came for the sake of a Libyan woman to the city of Irasa, as suitors for the hand of Antaios’ famous fair-haired daughter, whom so many of her noblest kinsmen were wooing, and many foreigners as well …

It is remarkable that Pindar uses the pronoun οἷοι to introduce this story, so remarkable, in fact, that commentators provide some periphrasis for the pronoun, calling it an emphatic equivalent of the more usual ὁς. Given, however, that Pindar is introducing a tale that pertains to “the ancient glory of [Telesicrates’] ancestors,” a tale in which Alexidamos wins the hand of Antaios’ daughter, we might fruitfully consider the suggestion that this manner of beginning a myth in Pindar is owed to the Hesiodic Catalogue.

After all, Pindar’s story of the deeds of Telesicrates’ ancestors, in turn, contains a story of how Antaios came to devise the betrothal contest: he heard of the marriage Danaos had once conducted in Argos for his scores of daughters by means of a footrace …

άγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάρνασθαι), where the cretic (δουρὶ μάρν-) is all that distinguishes the phrase from the Cyclic hexameter of fr. 10.1 PEG, presumably of the Thebaid (Pind. Σ ad 26): ἀμφότερον μάυτιν τ’ ἄγαθὸν καὶ δουρὶ μάχεσθαι.

66. See Giannini in Bernardini et al. 1995 (ad loc.) on a proposed “equivalente (enfatico) di ὁς”: “οἷοι: ‘quali’, ma col senso di ‘quelli che’, con valore limitativo: ‘quelli che’ furono pretendenti della donna libica (non ‘tutti’ gli antenati di Telesicrate).” Emphasis is, however, lent the οἷοι by the extreme hyperbaton of μναστήρες (106a), on which see below.


On this passage, which similarly situates the union of Zeus and Aegina, Hummel notes (following Horváth), “l’emploi du relatif qualitatif rappelle les structures comparatives épiques” (1993: §400).
betrothal (111–116). In this case, again, the pronoun follows directly on a dactylic-hexameter verse (111–114a):

... πατήρ δὲ θυγατρὶ φυτεύων
κλεινότερον γάμον, ἄκουσεν Δαναόν ποτ’ ἐν Ἀργεί
οἷον εὗρεν τεσσαράκοντα καὶ ὀκτὼ παρθένοις, πρὶν µέσον ἄµαρ ἑλθεῖν, 113
ὡκύτατον γάμου: ἔστασεν γάρ ἀπαντα χορόν
ἐν τέρµαισιν αὐτίκ’ ἄγώνος:

But her father, planning a more glorious marriage for his daughter, had heard about Danaos in Argos: such a very swift marriage he once found for his forty-eight unwed daughters, before it reached mid-day. At once he stood the entire chorus at the finish line of the contest.

Slater cites this use of οἷον as one of four instances in Pindar “introducing an indirect question” (s.v. 3). That, indeed, makes for easy English translation, and makes decent sense of other manuscript readings of these verses, but accepting Gentili’s text above, we must certainly draw a distinction between it and the adverbial sense of “how” required

68. Cf. too Des Places 1947: 74. We may be tempted to compare Homeric examples such as Il. 2.194 (ἔν βουλῇ δ’ οὐ πάντες ἀκούσας οἷον ἔειπε) or 2.320 (ἡµεῖς δ’ ἐσταότες θαυµάζοµεν οἷον ἑτύχθη). In these cases, respectively, the ἀκούσας and θαυµάζοµεν actually govern the οἷον; at P. 9.112–113, the ἀκούσεν governs Δαναόν, leaving the οἷον free to begin a story and ultimately modify ὡκύτατον γάµον (114). At Il. 6.166 (ὡς φάτο, τὸν δὲ ἀνακτὰ χόλος λάβεν οἷον ἄκουσε), the pronoun refers cataphorically to the story just told, but to nothing in its own sentence.

69. I print Gentili’s text here for the sake of his reading at line 113, where he follows the majority of the MSS. In fewer MSS, but adopted by (e.g.) Bergk 1900 and Snell and Maehler 1980 is ἑλεῖν for ἑλθεῖν, with the addition of a comma preceding. (Cf. too Puech 1922: ‘... , πρὶν µέσον ἄµαρ, ἑλεῖν ... ’; Turyn 1952, Duchemin 1967, and Dissen and Schneidewin 1843: ‘... , πρὶν µέσον ἄµαρ ἑλεῖν, ... ’.) In defense of Gentili’s text: (1) nowhere in Pindar does εὑρίσκω take an infinitive (εὑρόντι τρόπον ... ἐνάρµοξαι at O. 3.4–5 is revealingly distinct); (2) for πρὶν c. acc. et inf., cp. N. 7.73 (ἄλιῳ πρὶν ἄλιῳ γυῖον ἐμπεσεῖν); (3) for the sense required of ἑλθεῖν, cp. P. 3.16 (οὐκ ἐµεῖν’ ἑλθεῖν τράπεζαν νυμφίαν).
by most modern editions. It is not adverbial, but rather in extreme hyperbaton with όκύτατον γάμον at the end of the sentence in the next verse.

A couple of stylistic considerations support the association of this syntax with that of an ehoiê in the Hesiodic Catalogue. First, we must not forget that the context in the ode is one of a tale from a family’s history being recited, and that Pindar underscores his obligation to include this ancestral glory in the ode (103–105). Second, the syntax and hyperbaton very much resemble those ehoiai in the Catalogue that begin with the accusative pronoun:

\[ \text{Ἀστερόδειαν} \]

Cf. too N. 1.35–37: ἀρχαῖοι ὄτρύνων λόγον, ὡς, ἐπεὶ ... μόλεν, ὡς τ’ ὦ λαθὼν χρυσόθρονον Ἡραν κροκωτόν σπάργανον ἐγκατέβα. On ὡς, see Hummel 1993: §415.

71. See also οἷοι ... μναστήρες at lines 105–106a (with p. 295 below).

72. An ehoiê in the Catalogue did not necessarily start with a nominative pronoun; of the nine instances we have of this narrative incipit, two begin with the accusative case.

73. Lobel’s supplements to this papyrus (P. Oxy. 2495 fr. 16 col. ii) are certainly reasonable. For his ἵπποισι καὶ ἀρμασι κολλητοῖσι in line 7, compare II. 4.366, 11.198 and frr. 70.31, 193.10, 251a.11 (set against the freedom in II. 16.684, 23.8, 23.319, 24.442, Od. 4.8; h.Merc. 69). On the placement of Ἀστερόδειαν, a heroine’s name does tend to occupy last place in either the first (Ἀμφιτρύσων#, Sc. 2. (= fr. 195.2 M–W); Κυρίη#, fr. 215.2) or second verse (Μηκιονίκη#, fr. 253.1) of the ehoiê. Most adopts Merkelbach’s supplement to line 8: δόμου ἧγραυετ’ Ἀστερόδειαν.
Though hyperbaton in Pindar is not something that tends to require justification, it is noteworthy that in these and other examples in the Catalogue the noun modified is always similarly postponed, and that this is not the case in Pindar’s use of the homomorphic interrogative pronoun.

This brings us finally to the third instance of this pronoun in Pythian 9, to its very first occurrence in the ode. After calling Cheiron from his cave, Apollo begins his speech thus (29–37):

αὐτίκα δ' ἐκ μεγάρων Χίρωνα προσήνεπε φωνᾷ·  
'σευμόν ἁντρὸν, Φιλυρίδᾳ προλιτῶν δυμῶν γυναικὸς καὶ μεγάλαν δύνασιν  
θαύμασον, οἶον ἄταρβήτει νείκος ἀγεί κεφαλά, 31  
μύχθου καθύπερθε νεύς, 31a  
ήτορ ἔχοσα· φόβῳ δ' οὐ κεχείμανται φρένες.  
τὶς τινι ἄνθρωποι τέκεν; ποίας δ' ἀποσπασθείσα φύτλας  
ὁρέων κευθῶν ἑξεί αἰχμήνων,  
γεύσεται δ' ἀλκάς ἀπειράτου; 35  
οὐκ ἀλπταν χέρα οἱ προσενεγκεῖν  
ήρα καὶ ἐκ λεγέουν κείραι μελιάδεα ποίαν;'  

At once [Apollo] called Cheiron from his halls and said, “Come forth from your sacred cave, son of Philyra, and marvel at this woman’s courage and great power—such a fight she is waging with unflinching head—a girl whose heart is superior to toil and whose mind remains unshaken by storms of fear. What mortal bore her? From what stock has she been severed that she lives in the glens of the shadowy mountains and puts to the test her unbounded valor? Is it right to lay my famous hand upon her and indeed to reap the honey-sweet flower from the bed of love?” (trans. modified from that of W. H. Race)

It seems straightforward to categorize this use of οἶον as exclamatory: in agreement with νείκος, the phrase translates easily as “what a fight.” But we might also consider the convention connecting the preceding verb θαύμασον to a following pronoun such as οἶον:

---

74. Cf., e.g., Σ O. 2.153 (Drachmann I p. 98): οἴδε γάρ ὅτι πολλῇ ἱστορίᾳ κέχρηται καὶ σχίμασιν ἐξηλλαγένοις καὶ φράσει ποικίλῃ: ἑχει γάρ ὑπερβατὰ πολλά. Hyperbaton is discussed some 18X in the Pindaric scholia vetera.

75. Clear cases of the indirect question show no such hyperbaton; cf. οἵαις ἐν πολέμισι μάχαις (P. 1.47), οἵαις εἰμὲν σάσας (P. 3.60), and οἵαν Βροίου [τελε]τάν (Δ. 2.6).

76. See further II. 2.320 (ἡμεῖς δ’ ἐστατέσθαι θαυμάζομεν οἰον ἐπιχθήν) and 5.601 (ὡς φιλοὶ οἰον δὴ θαυμάζομεν Ἐκτορά δίον | σíciaμητῆν τ’ ἔμεναι καὶ θαρσαλέον πολεμιστήν). On 5.601, Kirk (ad 601–602) refers to the syntax as “awkward” and the οἶον as “presumably exclamatory,” but, given the comparanda, it seems “We marveled at what sort of man glorious Hector is …” might
Priam, son of Dardanos, marveled at Achilles, so great was he, and of such a sort. For he was like the gods to look at.

Il. 24.629–630

τέρας µὲν θαυµάσιον προσιδέσθαι, θαύµα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι, οἷον Αἴτνας ἐν µελαμφύλλοις δεδεται κορυφαῖς καὶ πέδῳ …

[Hephaistos’ fire]—a portent wondrous to behold, a wonder even to hear of from those present—such a one is confined within Aitna’s dark and leafy peaks and the plain; (trans. W. H. Race)

P. 1.26–28

These and other Archaic examples seem to suggest that convention regularly calls for a qualitative relative after some form of θαύµα or θαυµάξω. Moreover, exclamatory or not, the syntax even without θαύµα is a marked way for Pindar to begin a story. Note especially how he begins to recount the victory of Epharmostos in Olympian 9, an ode that, again, has demonstrable affinities to the Hesiodic Catalogue (86–94):

ἄλλαι δὲ δῦ’ ἐν Κορίνθου πύλαις ἐγένοντ’, ἐπεὶτα χάραι, ταὶ δὲ καὶ Νεμέας Ἐφαρμόστῳ κατὰ κόλπον.

be a faithful translation of this syntax. Less straightforward are Il. 15.286 (ὦ πότοι ἡ µέγα θαύµα τὸ δ’ ὀφθαλμοῖον ὄρµαι, ὥσ ὦ δ’ αὖτ’ ἐξαὐτὶς ἀνέστη κήρας ἀλύξας; “how”) and 18.467 (ὦσ οἱ τεύχεα καλὰ παρέσσεται, οἷά τις αὖτε | ἀνθρώπων πολέων θαυµάσσεται, ὡς κεν ἴδηται).

77. On the θαύµα motif in Pindar generally, see further Illig 1932: 92 and Köhnken 1971: 176–177; on this ode in particular, see the connection to erotic desire in Myers 2007.

78. On the use of οἷον to introduce a story, Horváth (1976: 8) compares Od. 4.242–271 for its ἀλλ’ οἷον τὸ δ’ ἐρέξε καὶ ἐτλη καρπερός ἀνήρ | δήµω ἐνι Τρώων, δὴ πάσχετε πήµατ’ Ἀχαιοί (242–243). As for Slater’s five examples of the ‘exclamatory’ use of οἶος in the singular, one might easily question a few. The οἶος of P. 1.27 is more resumptive than exclamatory (if emphatic) after the pronoun κεῖνος. On N. 4.93, see n.62 on p. 294 above. It could easily be thought too much to suggest that the use of οἶον at I. 6.62 is conditioned by its referring to the portion of hymns celebrating victories for the sons of Lampon, and that Pindar goes on to mention Hesiod by name at line 67; but, then again, compare this ‘awakening’ (ἀνὰ δ’ ἄγαγον) of the house of Lampon with song to our instance of οἵος in P. 9.103–106, the glory of which ancestors (προγόνων) Pindar ‘rouses’ (ἐγεῖραι). See Kurke 1991: 79–81 and 70, respectively, on this aspect of I. 6 and P. 9.

79. On which see n.1 on p. 276 above.
There were two more occasions for joy afterwards at the gates of Corinth, and others for Epharmostos in the valley of Nemea; at Argos he won glory among men and as a boy at Athens. And such a contest he endured at Marathon against older men for the silver cups, when wrested from the beardless class: with deftly shifting feints he subdued the men without falling once, and passed through the ring of spectators to such great shouting, being young and fair and performing the fairest deeds. (trans. W. H. Race)

Here the syntax even seems linked to the catalogic discourse of the victory list, and is used to single out the victory at Marathon for narrative expansion.

E  The dialogue of Cheiron and Apollo

In the case of Pythian 9, this syntax leads directly into Apollo’s asking Cheiron to recount Cyrene’s genealogy, an exchange that has been the ode’s central interpretive problem. I suggest that attention to genealogical style and convention points us toward not just an interpretation of the dialogue itself, but also toward coherence of the ode’s various triads and discrepancies in interpretation of the relative pronoun with ποτέ.

E.1 Problems

The dialogue of Apollo and Cheiron was once assumed to be transferred directly from Hesiodic poetry, simply by virtue of its seeming to some commentators to be a pointless incorporation in Pindar’s ode. Other critics have supposed that in a Hesiodic original Cheiron would have also recited Cyrene’s genealogy in response to Apollo’s question. This would have been conventional enough, but it is no doubt right to con-
cede, as most now would, that we have no way of knowing whether this dialogue existed in some Hesiodic original. What makes this dialogue so troublesome in the context of Pythian 9? A first problem is that it is Apollo, the omniscient god of prophecy, who asks Cheiron for Cyrene’s genealogy and whether it is ὡσίᾳ that he, Apollo, sleep with her. Again, his questions follow closely on the οἶνον syntax (30–37):

31a ἔσμον ἄντρον, Φιλλυρίδα προλίπὼν γυναικός καὶ μεγάλαν δύνασιν
θεόμασον, οἶνον ἀπαρβεῖ νείκος ἄγει κεφαλά,
μόχθου καθύπερθε νεάνις
ητορ ἔχοισσα· φόβῳ δ’ οὐ κεχείμανται φρένες.
τίς νυν ἀνθρώποι τέκεν; ποίας δ’ ἀποσπασθείσα φύτλας
ὀρέων κευμίσας ἔχει σκιοέντων,
κεῖ τε ἐκλεχέων κεῖραι ἐλιαδέα ποίας;

Interpretations of this situation in which omniscient Apollo asks such questions are hardly less numerous than the ode’s commentators: Welcker supposes that Apollo is here simply feigning ignorance; Gildersleeve, Bowra, and Illig each suggest that Apollo is teasing Cheiron in some way; Carey, who nicely surveys all previous views, proposes simply that “Pindar is in a spring-mood, and wishes to give a charming picture of Apollo as a shy young lover” (ad 31–67).

Burton is no doubt right to advise that such positions are “subjective and equally incapable of proof”; he urges instead that the dialogue’s humor “resides as much in the situation as in the language” (1962: 40). To understand the situation, however, we must first recognize the conventions on which the situation is based. Naturally, scholars have turned to Homer, and several commentators have sketched parallels between Apollo’s and Cheiron’s dialogue and the dialogue of Zeus and Hera in the Dios apatê of Iliad 14.

83. For a translation, see p. 298 above.
85. Gildersleeve 1885 (ad 47); Bowra 1964: 60–61; and Illig 1932: 39.
86. Cf. Illig 1932: 37 and Köhnken 1985: 86–94. Carey (ad 42) disagrees with Illig on the point of αἰδώς, but finds the comparison “illuminating” for the way in which “Pindar has caught the sensual sparkle of that passage.” It may just as easily be suggested that the Dios apatê itself draws
Others suggest that it would be in accord with normal, epic use for Apollo to ask a question (and for Cheiron to recite the requested information), even though Apollo already knows the answer: Schroeder, Burton, and Woodbury all cite *Iliad* 1.362–412 as a comparandum,\(^{87}\) where Thetis asks Achilles why he is weeping even though she knows the answer. While this is a troublesome comparison,\(^{88}\) I do think that Homeric poetry provides us solid comparanda in its articulation of conventions associated with genealogical recitations. Most famous among these are those of Glaukos to Diomedes (6.145–211) and Aeneas to Achilles (20.203–243) in the *Iliad*, and in each of these cases the speaker states that his audience should know the information already.\(^{89}\) Yet the genealogical recitation need not only be a form of battlefield rebuke.\(^{90}\) In *Iliad* 7 Nestor tells Agamemnon of once being a guest of Peleus, and of how Peleus took great pleasure in hearing him recite the genealogies of the Argives (127–128):\(^{91}\)

\[ Ὅς ποτὲ μ’ εἰρόμενος μέγ’ ἐγήθεεν ζῷ ἐν οἴκῳ πάντων Ἀργείων ἐρέουν γενεήν τε τόκου τε. \]

[Peleus]... who once, as he was questioning me in his house, was very pleased as he listened to the generation and offspring of all of the Argives.

---

on the tradition of the genealogical catalogue; see, e.g., Janko in Kirk et al. 1985, with references: “The many parallels with the *Odyssey*, Hesiod, and the *Hymns* prove that, far from being interpolated from a ‘mainland’ school of catalogue poetry, this passage derives from the same ancient oral traditions of genealogical verse” (*ad* 14.313–328).


88. Achilles does here expand upon what has been said (366–369 with Kirk et al. 1985 *ad* 366–392), and the narratological constraints are more complicated (note *Σ* 366b–c). It may be worth considering that Aristarchus athetized this Iliadic passage—ὅτι παλιλλογεῖν παρῄτηται ἅλλοτροι ἃρα οἱ ἐπιφέρομενοι στίχοι ἐκκοι ἐπτά (*Σ* 365a)—not because Thetis knows the answer already, but because the *Iliad*’s audience does (372–379 = 13–16, 22–25).

89. *Il. 6.150–151*: εἴ δ’ ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαθμέναι δοφ’ ἐν εἰδῆς ἢμετέρην γενεήν, πολλοὶ δὲ μὲν ἀνδρεῖς ἱσσαίαν; *Il. 20.203*: ἰδμεν δ’ ἄλληλων γενεήν, ἰδμεν δὲ τοκής | πρόκλυτ’ ἄκούοντες ἐπει θυμων ἀνθρώπων.


91. It is remarkable, too, that Nestor here uses the genealogical syntagm Ὅς ποτὲ to describe Peleus listening to actual genealogical performance.
It is, indeed, a commonplace that Archaic Greeks enjoyed listening to genealogies. The very image of the Muses in the *Theogony* proem is of their entertaining Zeus with genealogies of gods and men alike, and the survival of the Catalogue of Ships in our *Iliad* bears witness to such a catalogue being entertaining. Famous and fitting, too, is the comment in Plato’s *Hippias Maior* that Spartans especially like to listen to genealogies of heroes. Along these lines I suggest we shift the emphasis from Apollo wishing to learn of Cyrene’s lineage to, instead, Apollo wishing to hear her genealogy recited.

E.2 Listening to genealogies

This seems at first an oversimplifying analysis, that Apollo simply wishes to hear Cheiron recite a genealogy. After all, Cheiron gives a lengthy and complex response, one which complicates Apollo’s rather ordinary request and which has been the source of considerable trouble for commentators. While I cannot here address every aspect of Cheiron’s response nor survey all past interpretations, I shall focus on Cheiron’s re-

---


94. On the desire to hear a genealogy being attendant upon one’s amazement, see also Bacch. 5.86–88, with Maehler (*ad loc.*), who cites P. 9 as a comparandum.

95. After a moralizing statement (39–41; κρυπτά κλαίδες), Cheiron charges Apollo with falsehood (42–43; φεύδει θηγεῖν, μείλιχος ὀργά, παρφάμεν). Between his description of Apollo’s omniscience (43–49) and Aristaios’ genealogy (59–65), Cheiron responds to Apollo’s question regarding ὀσία (51–58). (On the order of Cheiron’s answers to Apollo’s two questions—first dealing with ὀσία, then with Aristaios’ genealogy—compare perhaps the application of ‘adjacency pairs’ to Homeric questions in Minchin 2007.) Many have considered that Cheiron does not answer Apollo’s first question (cf. Woodbury 1972: 563 with his n8; again, I suggest Aristaios’ future genealogy is to suffice.

96. Carey (*ad loc.* 31–67) notes that the “long account of Apollo’s omniscience is necessary to bring out the irony of the situation.” On the scene’s irony, see more at p. 306 below.

sponse to Apollo’s request to recite Cyrene’s genealogy. In it he underscores again Apollo’s own adherence to the tradition of listening to genealogies (43–49):

κούρας δ’ ὅπόθεν γενεάν ἐξερωτᾷς, ὦ ἄνα; κύριον ὃς πάντων τέλος οἶσθα καὶ πάσας κελεύθους:

Do you ask from where the girl’s lineage comes, O lord? And yet you know the appointed end of all things and all the ways to them, and how many leaves the earth puts forth in spring, and how many grains of sand in the sea and rivers are beaten by the waves and blasts of wind, and what will happen and whence it will come—all this you discern clearly.

It is neither coincidence nor simple courtesy that Cheiron begins his description of Apollo’s omniscience in terms of spring leaves, for this is the norm in genealogical discourse. Compare, again, Glaukos’ speech at *Iliad* 6.145–149:


Apollo’s second question, as Dougherty (1993: 147–149) explains, seems to put him in the strange situation of being the one seeking a colonization oracle.

Pace most commentators (e.g., Carey and Schroeder *ad loc.*), the description of leaves is more specific than simply expressing number; it is expressly related to catalogues or generations of men. Compare the descriptions in Homeric poetry where the context is either catalogic (*Il.* 2.468, 2.800) or deals with the generations, not just the current number, of men (*Il.* 21.464). The case of the soldiers at *Od.* 9.51 (Giannini in Bernardini et al. 1995 [ad 46–47]) does speak more to number than to generations, but notice especially Bacch. 5, where the souls of previous generations of mortals are compared to leaves (63–67) just before Heracles asks Meleager for his genealogy in the conventional manner (*Τίς ἀθανάτων ἢ βροτῶν τοιοῦτον ἐρνος ἠθέπη ἐν ποίᾳ χθονί;*, lines 86–88; on θέπη, see n.119 on p. 310 below; cf. Verg. *Aen.* 6.309–312). Cf. too Simon. *frr.* 19–20 and Mimn. 2 W² (West 1989), where men’s lifetimes are compared to leaves (on Simon., see most recently Sider 2001, and generally the essays in Boedeker and Sider 2001; on Mimn., see Griffith 1975, who similarly downplays [75–76] examples such as *Od.* 9.51 noted above.) Instone (*ad* 44–49) is right to question the emphasis of Heyne et al. 1787 and Carey in their comparison to the oracular response at Hdt. 1.47.12, which is of sand and sea (σίδα δ’ ἐγὼ ψάμμου τ’ ἀριθμῶν καὶ μέτρα ταλάσσης). (On the usual restriction of grains of sand to the question of non-human number, see *Il.* 9.385 [gifts] and Pind. *O.* 2.108–110 [good deeds] with McCartney 1960: 81.) Cheiron’s oracular language is significant for the fact that he tells Cyrene’s
Though Glaukos speaks to the futility of doing so, he does go on to recite a genealogy to Diomedes. Cheiron, however, does not; at least, he does not tell Cyrene’s genealogy in any usual way.

Instead, Cheiron insists that he will match wits with wise Apollo, and, in his one-upsmanship, he recites a genealogy in the form of a prophecy. Starting with the union of Apollo and Cyrene, Cheiron recites Cyrene’s son’s genealogy in the future tense (59–65):

There [Cyrene] will give birth to a son, whom famous Hermes will take from under his mother and bear to the fair-throned Horai and to Gaia. And when they behold the infant on their knees, they shall drip nectar and ambrosia on his lips and shall make him im-

(and Aristaios’) genealogy in the form of a prophecy to the god of prophecy himself, but I here insist on the recognition (if not priority) of the leaves in the first part of Cheiron’s description of Apollo’s omniscience.

100. Lines 50–51: εἰ δὲ χρὴ καὶ πάρ σοφὸν ἀντιφερίξαι, ἐρέω.

101. On appropriateness of its child-rearing details to a god-mortal genealogy, cp. h.Ven. 256–263, which has the register of the Catalogue (e.g., νῦμφας, line 257; αἱ ῥ’, line 259; µίσγοντ’ ἐν φιλότητι, line 263).
mortal, a Zeus or a holy Apollo, a delight to men dear to him and ever-near guardian of flocks, called Agreus and Nomios by some, Aristaos by others. (trans. W. H. Race)

In our survey above, we saw that ancient testimonia support this genealogy’s and these cult titles’ origins in Hesiodic poetry. That the genealogy is here expressed as a prophecy seems to be a distinctly Pindaric move, but we must remember that this part of the genealogy, which could have been significant in a Hesiodic version, has not yet happened within *Pythian* 9: Pindar’s Cheiron has to tell the genealogy as a prophecy, even if he simultaneously spins it as a means of trumping the god of prophecy. The peculiar situation that Pindar creates is not without irony, but the irony is not, say, in the depiction of Apollo as a witless young lover. The situation’s irony, I suggest, is that Pindar’s Cheiron is playing with these performance conventions by morphing the genealogical recitation into a prophetic *certamen*. Still, we must also remember that the exchange is, at its core, in line with Greek practice. In that sense, it is a reflection of the ode’s own perfor-

102. West suggests that, as with the foundation tale of Cyrene in *P. 4*, articulating the tale as a prophecy “was certainly Pindar’s own idea” (1985a: 86).

103. Carey (*ad* 66–67): “However, Pindar has a reason for retaining the list [from the ‘Eoeae’]; Aristaeus’ honours redound to the credit of Cyrene.”

104. This avenue is, of course, opened by Apollo’s second question (36–7): ὧσιά κλυτὰν χέρα οἱ προσενεγκεῖν | ἦρα καὶ ἐκ λεχέων κεῖραι µελιαδέα ποίαν; (see n.98 on p. 304 above). Dougherty (1993: 149) notes that in Cheiron’s response Pindar “blends two different traditions—the Hesiodic tradition about a nymph Cyrene and the colonial legend of Cyrene’s foundation—into a kind of narrative pun that appropriates a Libyan city’s name and reinterprets it within a Greek poetic tradition of rape.” Thus, while she emphasizes the colonial aspect, I here focus complementarily on the genealogical.

105. Cheiron’s µείλιχος ὑγρά (43) does not mean “amorous impulse” (as, e.g., Race) so much as “favorably gentle (=restrained) disposition,” which better suits the emphasis on αἰδώς in the ode (αἱδῶ, 12; αἰδέοντ, 41); the καὶ γάρ (42), of course, connects the two ideas closely. (For a similar argument, see Woodbury 1972: 570–573; Carey [*ad* 42] offers a helpful overview of other interpretations alongside his own.) Nor is Apollo being ‘shy’ so much as ‘respectfully reserved’, just as Odysseus is in the presence of Nausicaa at *Od.* 6.221.

106. As for the tradition of a *certamen* of prophets (including enumeration), compare the similar situation at Hes. *fr.* 278 M–W (presumably from a Hesiodic *Melampodia*), in which Calchas challenges the seer Mopsus to guess the number of figs in a fig-tree. Mopsus correctly guesses the number, and Calchas dies. See further Schwartz 1960: 210–228 (esp. 220–224).
E.3 Entertainment and instruction

If both Apollo and Pindar’s ancient audience were to have taken pleasure in the recitation of Cyrene’s genealogy in *Pythian* 9, Pindar’s modern audience certainly has: Kirkwood sets it beside *Pythian* 4 for “a very high rank in poetic excellence” (1982: 215); for Robbins, “there breathes a special grace” in the ode (1978: 91). Indeed, in contrasting *Pythian* 3 and *Pythian* 9, Burton notes that, while the myths in each have features in common, “the function of the story in *Pythian* 9 is to entertain, of that in *Pythian* 3 to exhort and instruct” (1962: 81). While I have argued that entertainment—uncontroversially that of Pindar’s audience, but also that of Apollo as audience within the ode—is essential to the myth of *Pythian* 9, I hasten to disagree with Burton’s distinction between the two odes on the basis of entertainment versus instruction. On the contrary, Pindar even articulates the relationship between entertainment and instruction in the ode’s final triad, when Pindar turns to the story taken from Telesicrates’ family history. Indeed, while commentators tend to consider the final myth—that of Danaos’ betrothal of his daughters—a tacked-on tale added only at the behest of the victor or his family,107 we have already seen how coherent Pindar’s syntax and style is in this myth and that of Cyrene.

That attention to syntax, in turn, elucidates the structure of the final triad. Burton rightly notes that the final myth “consist[s] of two scenes, one set within the other, an

---

107. Burton (1962: 59) suggests that the ode is “structurally complete at the end of the victory-list,” while Kirkwood (1982: 215) counts the looseness of structure in the latter part of the poem as one of the two main interpretative problems. The feeling that “[i]the first three triads seem to form a complete poem” is shared by Robbins (1978: 91). Among those who have sought connections between the odes’ myths, Winnington-Ingram (1969: 13) suggests that association underscores the moral of Pindar’s poem, namely that “the sexual relations of men and women should not be based upon force, upon *bia.*” For a structuralist defense of the final triad’s relevance, see Felson Rubin 1978.
original and its copy,"108 and to this I would add that the syntax of οἷοι (105) and οἷον (113) underscores this structure. Recall again how Pindar, in the course of recounting the “ancient glory of Telesicrates’ ancestors,”109 embeds the story of Antaios listening to a story about the marriage of the Danaids (112–118):110

It is from having listened to a story about Danaos that Antaios got the idea about how to marry off his own daughters. The syntax of οἷον at line 113 underscores the relationship with the ode’s earlier triads, as well as the framing story of Telesicrates’ ancestors, also marked by οἷοι at line 105. This scene in the ode’s final triad, by embedding the story of the Danaids in the story of Telescrates’ own ancestors, uses the pleasurable recitation of family lore to frame an instance of the instructive aspect of listening to what was presumably poetry from the genealogical tradition.111 The tale’s instructiveness is even emphasized by the οὕτω δ’ in line 117, a resumptive syntax long familiar from instructional speech genres such as exempla and fables.112 In sum, the fifth triad and its story of Telesicrates’ ancestors may have been requested by the victor or his family,113 but to call it an

108. Indeed, the strophe describes the present, the antistrophe (but for the first few verses) deals with Danaos, and the beginning of epode (with οὕτω δ’) marks the return to the present.
110. For a translation, see p. 296 above.
111. While we have no direct evidence of Danaos in the Catalogue—much less this particular version of the story—it is all but certain that he must have appeared alongside his daughters and Aigyptos’ fifty sons (cf. fr. 127–129 M–W). The Catalogue, however, would not have been the only possible source for such a narrative: the cyclic epic Danais may have been as likely as a source for the content.
113. The language and imagery of lines 103–104 (ἐµὲ δ’ οὖν τὶς ἀοίδαν | δίψαιν ἀκειόμενον
appendage misses the point. Whatever the triad’s notional priority in the composition of the ode, Pindar has effectively integrated the family archive into the larger view of the *Catalogue* tradition and of his own praise of athletic victory.

**E.4 Catalogue and commemoration**

This structural and syntactic relationship between the narrative of the Danaids’ betrothal and the ancient glory of the victor’s own ancestors brings us back to the syntactic convention of the relative pronoun with ποτέ. Although we studied this syntax in terms of its register and genealogical conventions, we did not fully resolve the intersection of genealogical narrative and the epitaphs and victory inscriptions in connection with Pindar.\(^{114}\) We might reconsider now what conventions or traditions the Greeks might have used within, or as a basis for, this commemoration, and in this respect our analysis of *Pythian* 9 suggests some resolution.

The syntax is doubtless apt in commemorative, encomiastic inscriptions, and it would be misguided to argue against built-in posteriority in Pindar’s poetry: the perpetuation of a victor’s κλέος is clearly central to its poetics.\(^{115}\) I do not think, however, that we ought to trace the commemoration originally to victory inscriptions and epitaphs.\(^{116}\) In-
stead, I would suggest that these inscriptions similarly employ a syntactic convention established within genealogical narrative. The difference between the inherent reperformance of inscriptions and victory ode and the syntax of genealogical narrative is evident in the following fifth-century public epitaph of a Rhegine envoy named Silenos, who died and was buried at Athens (CEG 12):\(^{117}\)

εὐρύχοροί ποτ’ ἔθαψαν Ἀθῆναι τόνδε τὸν ἄνδρα ἐλθόντ’ ἐκ πάτρας δεῦρ’ ἐπὶ συμμαχίαν· ἔστι δὲ Σιληνὸς παῖς Φῶκε τόμ ποτ’ ἔθρεψεν Ῥήγιον εὐδαιμονίᾳ δι[κ]αιότατον.

Athens, with its wide dancing-places, once buried this man who came here from his fatherland on account of alliance. And here is Silênos, son of Phokos, whom blessed Rhegion once raised to become a most just man.

The adverb ποτέ occurs twice in these four verses, each instance serving a different function. The ποτέ in the first verse gives the entire inscription an instantaneously retrospective view, and surely speaks to the fact that it is, like Pindar’s odes, intended for future reperformance.\(^{118}\) But the second instance, coupled with παῖς and the relative pronoun in line 3, is distinctly of the genealogical narrative syntax in its description of the man’s upbringing.\(^{119}\) That this syntax appears in funerary and victory inscriptions is a natural reflex

---

Hesiodic instances in n.45 on p. 289 above).

117. On CEG 12 (433/2 BCE, Hansen 1983; = ML 63 = IG\(^3\) i.1178 = Peek 1960 46), note what trouble this conventional ποτέ can cause for dating in Bradeen and Lewis 1979: 243–244.


119. This is clear even in the verb ἔθρεψεν following τόμ ποτ’ in the third verse. In Pindar, note P. 9.18 (ὦ δὲ τὰν εὐώλενον θρέψατο παῖδα Κυράναν), P. 9.88 (Διρκαίων ὑδάτων τὰ νιν θρέψαντο καὶ Ἰφικλέα), P. 1.17 (τὸν ποτὲ Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυ ἄντρον), and P. 3.5 (ὁίς ἔων θρέψεν ποτὲ Ἀσκλαπιόν). The gloss of Giannini in Bernardini et al. 1995 (ad P. 9.88), which explains the verb’s “senso metaforico,” speaks to the need to recognize the convention. While it is one thing to call Hector’s speech at \(Ili\). 7.90 ‘inscriptional’, it would be quite another to call \(Ili\). 2.547–548 (&oacute; ποτ’ Ἀθήνη | ἔθρεψε Δίος θυγάτηρ), 2.766 (τὰς ἐν Πηρείῃ θρέψεν Ἀκοντισταὶ Αἰκίσωδάρου, ὃς ἐς Χίαιραν | ἔθρεψεν ἀμωμακέττων πολέσιν κακὸν ἄνθρώπωσιν), and \(Od\). 11.309 (_WORLD\’ T’ ἀντίθεον πτελεκλείτων τ’ Ἐφιάλτην, | ὃς δὴ μηκόστους θρέψεν ξείδορος ἄρουρα) anything but ‘genealogical’. On ὃς ἐς in 16.329, see n.29 on p. 285 above. On the lack of ποτέ in the second Catalogue of Ships and the \(Nekyia\) passages, there exists often ‘conjunction reduction’ in catalogic passages in which the syntagm has already occurred (\(Od\). 11.281, 284, 322).
of the impulse to record the ancient glory of ancestors, so that a Pindar may reawaken it. And nowhere is this connection between genealogical catalogue poetry (such as the myth of Cyrene) and a family’s archive of narratives (such as that of Alexidamos, Antaios, and Danaos) more clear than in *Pythian* 9.

**Conclusion**

The simple fact is that in praising the victor Pindar is composing genealogical narrative: in praising the victor’s home city, he is composing genealogical narrative by singing of Apollo’s union with Cyrene and the birth of Aristaios; in praising the victor’s family, he is composing genealogical narrative by reawakening the glory of Telesicrates’ ancestors with family lore; lastly, he is even composing genealogical narrative by telling of Telesicrates’ recent victory. Though we cannot tell which mythological details Pindar does or does not take from a Cyrene *ehoiê* in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* in particular, he is clearly pointing to its tradition by means of his syntactic and stylistic conventions, even down to the level of meter. Yet what is unique in *Pythian* 9 is that he not only points to this fact with the conventions of genealogical catalogue, but also depicts genealogical performance in two ways, ways which also speak to the role his praise poetry is to play in the family archives of his victors. Athletic victory has its place in a family’s genealogical chronicles, and for that the conventions of genealogical poetry are ready-made.

---

120. Cf. ἐγεῖραι of line 104. The victory catalogue of Lampon at *I. 6.62–66* describes a similar reawakening by song (ἀν' δ' ἄγαγον ἐς φάος οἶαν μονοῖς θυμοίν, 62), on which see Kurke 1991: 79–80. That οἶαν appears here is curious (but see n.78 on p. 299 above), especially since this share of hymns is being brought to light by Lampon’s sons (cf. εὐαέθλου γενεᾶς, 3).

121. Kurke (1991) nicely lays out the importance of “*oikos*, rather than its individual members” in Pindaric poetry (20), noting how, far more often than not, victory catalogues include victories of other family members (19–20). Young (1983: 40) makes the same point: “Pindar’s poems were not intended for the stone-cutter. Yet, we cannot doubt that he intended them for future rehearsal … Pindar’s epinician odes seek to commemorate the events of his own day for future generations …” Cf. too Currie 2004 on the reperformance of odes on birthdays.

122. Pindar’s use of the genealogical mode of commemoration for prizes and athletic victory is clear even in his application of the conventions to the victory-list in *P. 3.73–74* and the prizes of
PART III:
SYNTAX AND SUFFERING IN HOMERIC POETRY

Písa,

δέξαι τε οἱ στεφάνων ἐγκώμιον τεθμών, τὸν ἀγεὶ πεδίων ἐκ Πίσας,
πεντάεθλῳ ἅμα σταδίου νικῶν δρόμου: ἀντεβόλησεν
τῶν ἀνήρ θνατὸς οὔπω τις πρότερον.

Pindar, Olympian 13.29–31

Chapter 11 | 
Self-mythologization and suffering in the Odyssey

This chapter and the next are paired as one might describe the halves of Vergil’s \textit{Aeneid}: the first is Odyssean; the second Iliadic. In the first we shall focus on the figure of Odysseus, specifically on how he manages to draw on his own acts of storytelling for the purpose of self-mythologizing \textit{paradigmata} on Ithaca. The second chapter will focus on the meeting of Priam and Achilles in Book 24 of the \textit{Iliad}. Both Odysseus and Priam suffer greatly, but my interest is not simply in their suffering, nor even simply in the formulae that the motif of suffering comprises in Homeric poetry. The focus of my discussion will be on how syntactic formulae related to the motif of suffering relate to those associated with \textit{paradigmata}. The case is different for Odysseus and Priam, but in each poem I suggest that the way the syntax of exemplarity is situated with respect to singularity and suffering has interpretive power for the poems on a larger scale.

The \textit{Odyssey} is nothing if not a song of endurance. Its hero is \textit{πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς}, who spends a full ten years making his way home from a long campaign at Troy, and this hero even describes himself as ‘enduring’ in the narration of adventures from his prolonged \textit{nostos}. As he recounts to the Phaeacians one of his many misfortunes, he tells of how his companions opened the bag of winds from Aiolos, and, in so doing, he distinguishes himself from his comrades specifically for his endurance (10.49–55):

\begin{quote}
... αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ γε
ἐγρόµενος κατὰ θυµόν ἀµῦµον ἀµεµήριζα,
ηὲ πεσὼν ἐκ νηὸς ἀποφθίην ἐνὶ πόνῳ,
ἡ ἀκέων τλαίην καὶ ἔτι ζωοίς μετεῖν.
ἀλλ’ ἐτλὴν καὶ ἔµεινα, καλυψάµενος δ’ ἐνὶ νηὶ
κείµην: αἱ δ’ ἐφέροντο κακὴ ἀνέµοιο θυέλλη
αὐτίς ἐπ’ Αἰολίην νῆσον, στενάχοντο δ’ ἐταῖροι.
\end{quote}

But I woke and considered in my blameless heart whether I should fall from the ship and perish in the sea or silently endure and be among the living still. But I endured and re-
mained, and covering myself lay in the ship. And the ships were tossed by an evil gust of wind back to the Aeolian island, and my companions groaned.

Odysseus does endure, of course, and he arrives at last on Ithaca to find his palace overrun by suitors. In Book 20, as Odysseus is steeling himself to fight these suitors, he recalls again one of the same adventures he told on Scheria, specifically having survived his encounter with the Cyclops Polyphemus. We might even say this Ithacan Odysseus remembers the Odysseus whose exploits he narrated to the Phaeacians in Books 8–12. He reproaches himself for not feeling such a man as that, telling himself to endure as he did once before (20.17–24):

And just as a dog stands over tender puppies and barks when she fails to recognize a man, and is eager to fight, so too did his heart inside growl, in his wrath at the evil deeds He pounded his chest and rebuked his heart with a speech: “Endure now, my heart. You once endured another even worse thing, on that day when the Cyclops, irresistible in fury, ate my mighty comrades. You endured it, until cunning led you from the cave, though you thought you’d die.” Thus he spoke, upbraiding the heart in his chest. And in obedience to him his heart remained constantly enduring. But he himself turned this way and that.

This scene is, in some sense, a familiar one, in that it is a type scene. Just as in the scene in which he describes the bag of Aeolian winds being opened, here we find Odysseus deliberating with himself about various courses of action. Such scenes of reflection have been commented on extensively, but this scene is a departure even from those. Russo describes the contemplation of alternatives as “unique in the entire Homeric corpus, be-

---

cause it ends not in resolution or any decision but in the odd metaphor of Odysseus’ heart barking” (1992, ad 10–35).

Rutherford suggests that “the passage is clearly an extension of the battlefield monologues in which a warrior contemplates retreat but rejects the idea with a formulaic line” (ad 18–22). In fact, there are enough differences that such type scenes may not be the most useful comparison.

Rather than viewing this passage as anomalous among typical scenes of reflection, I suggest that it is more productive to see this scene within the framework of the paradeigma. Indeed, the τλα- motif, the motif of ‘enduring’ or ‘suffering’, is significant to the poetics of the paradeigma more broadly in Homeric poetry, and the first line of Odysseus’ speech in Book 20 is even a variation on the formulae found in paradeigmata of the Iliad. Returning to two Iliadic paradeigmata that we studied above, notice again their formulaic openings. In Book 1 Hephaistos consoles his mother Hera with a paradigmatic recollection that encourages her to endure (II. 1.586–94):

Endure, my mother, and bear up, though you are hurt, for fear that, although you are dear to me, I see you beaten before my eyes, and then, although grieving, I shall not be able to help you at all. For an Olympian is tough to fight against. For, another time before this, when I was eager to rescue you, he caught me by the foot and threw me from the heavenly threshold. And I was carried all day until I landed in Lemnos at sunset, when there was a just a little life left in me.

The other example—much longer but here abbreviated—comes in Book 5 of the Iliad, when Dione consoles Aphrodite for having been wounded by Diomedes. In telling her to

---

5. Russo (ad 10–35) remarks also on its being of “a sequence of such length, deliberately extended by the juxtaposition of so many distinct units […] to be […] totally different from Homer’s usual practice.”

'endure’ she provides a catalogue of gods who have suffered at the hands of mortals in the past (Il. 5.382–415):'

τέτλαθι τέκνον ἐμόν, καὶ ἀνάσχεο κηδομένη περ’ πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλῆμεν Ὄλυμπια δῶματ’ ἔχοντες εξ ἄνδρων χαλέπ’ ἀλγε’ ἐπ’ ἀλλήλοις τιθέντες. τλῆ μὲν Ἁρης ὅτε μιν ὤτος κρατερός τ’ Ἐφιάλτης παιδείς Ἀλωῆος, δῆσαν κρατερῷ ὡς’ χαλκέῳ δ’ ἐν κεράῳ δέδετο τρισκάιδεκα. καί νῦ κεν ἔνθ’ ἀπόλοιτο Ἀρης ἰντος πολέμιοι, εἰ μὴ μητριὴ περικαλλῆ Ἡρίβοια Ἐρμέα εξηγειλεν’ ὃ δ’ εξέκλεψεν Ἁρησ ἰδὴ τειρόμενοι, χαλεπὸς δὲ δεσμὸς ἐδάμνη. τλῆ δ’ Ἡρη, ὅτε μιν κρατερός πάις Ἀμφιτρύώνος δεξιτερὸν κατὰ μαζὸν ὀίστῳ τριγλώχινι βεβλῆκεν τότε καὶ μιν ἀνήκεστον λάβεν ἄλγος.

In all, she cites the stories of Ares, Hera, and Hades as precedents. They endured, Dione tells Aphrodite, and so should she.

It is against this backdrop of the exemplary tale that I suggest we view the scene from Odyssey 20. That is, we should view it less as a scene of reflection than as Odysseus invoking the idea of his former self in the manner of a mythological paradeigma. In telling himself to “Be the man that you were when you deceived the Cyclops,” Odysseus even refers to his own μητίς, that cunning which famously led him from the cave of Polyphemus, an echo that signals he is referring to the narrative version of himself, the one he told among the Phaeacians on Scheria. Note, too, the repetition of words based on the τλα- root four times—τέτλαθι (v. 18), ἔτλης (v. 18), ἐτόλας (v. 20), τετληυῖα (v. 23)—which insists upon his status as the much-suffering hero of the Odyssey, as πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς. Still more, with the unusual αὐτός of v. 24 the narrative even draws attention to the division between the man and the idea of the man, between

---

7. Translation printed on p. 105 above.
8. See Rutherford 1986: 149 on Odysseus as an outward paradeigma (e.g., for his piety).
9. Cf. Rutherford on this μητίς (ad 20.20): “Here, as Odysseus recalls that triumph, his language echoes the witty wording of these passages in Book 9 [v. 414].” Similarly, Russo ad loc. See further Podlecki 1961.
Odysseus and the version of himself now mythologized in the story he told in Book 9. Given the way in which Odysseus in the *Odyssey* represents the creation of the sort of oral tradition from which *paradeigmata* might be drawn, that he does so in Book 20 while drawing on the features of more conventional *paradeigmata* is striking.

The notion of exemplarity is an explicit preoccupation of the *Odyssey* from as early as its proem, when the tradition of the *Nostoi*, or ‘Returns of the Heroes’, is activated with Zeus’ mention of Agamemnon’s fate upon his return home (1.29–43). There the *Odyssey* establishes the composite *paradeigma* of Agamemnon’s return to Clytemnestra, Orestes, and Aegisthus for Odysseus’ own return to Penelope, Telemachus, and the Suitors. This scheme is further elaborated by Agamemnon himself in the *Nekyia* of Book 11, when he recounts his own *nostos* to Odysseus in the course of telling him not to trust Penelope for fear she is a Clytemnestra. But, while much has been written on song and storytelling in the *Odyssey*, this particular feature—Odysseus’ drawing on his own past for *paradeigmata*—seems to have gone unnoticed. Moreover, I propose that the notion of exemplarity in the *Odyssey*, specifically Odysseus’s self-mythologization in *paradeigmata*, happens on the level of discourse marker as well. In this way the combinations of discourse characteristics can import a paradigmatic tone to what is not explicitly traditional material. This becomes especially interesting in deviations like that in *Odyssey*

---


13. Note especially the Orestes *paradeigma* of vv. 29–30: μνήσατο γάρ κατὰ θυμὸν ἀμύλονος Αἰγίσθοιο, | τῶν ῥ’ Ἀγαμεμνόνιδης τηλεκλυτὸς ἔκταν’ Ὄρέστης.

14. Nagler 1990: 347n35: “The paradigmatic story of Aegisthus and the return of Agamemnon, with which Zeus opens the curtain on the narrative, stands in very much the same oblique relationship to this poem’s central return story as the Adventures.”

15. See also Dodds 1951: 31–33.

20 above, underscore Odysseus’ complex relationship with his past, and his mythologizing self-presentation.

Of the several instances of Odysseus’ mythologizing self-presentation, all but one instance occur once he has returned to Ithaca. The exception occurs in Book 7: as Odysseus is on his way to Alcinous’ palace shrouded in mist, he encounters Athena disguised as a maiden. He asks her for help finding his way there (vv. 22–6):

ου τέκος, οὐκ ἂν μοι δόμον ἄνέρος ἡγήσαι Ἀλκινόου, ὡς τούδε μετ’ ἀνθρώπωσιν ἀνάσσει; καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ ξεῖνος ταλαπείριος ἐνθάδ’ ἰκάνω τηλθέν ἐξ ἀπίθανης γαίης; τῷ οὖ τίνα οἴδα ἄνθρωπωσι, οἳ τήνδε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἔχουσι. 25

Child, won’t you guide me to the house of the man Alcinous, who rules among these people? You know, I’ve come here as a much-suffering stranger from afar, from a distant land. I therefore don’t know any of the people who inhabit this city and land.

The καὶ-γὰρ statement follows on an politely imperatival request, and it is not easy at first to see in what way Odysseus’ presentation here is self-mythologizing. He does not refer to the past in any way that is supposed to present himself as exemplary to Athena as maiden. But to Athena as goddess—and it is reasonable to assume that, here as elsewhere, Odysseus does not rule out that he is speaking to a goddess—to Athena as goddess he presents himself as a much-suffering stranger, who, like a suppliant (note the ικ- of ικάνω in v. 24), is under the protection of Zeus. Odysseus the suppliant, then, here sets himself apart from those who will be punished for injustice as part of the system of justice and ethics represented in Book 1 of the Odyssey. The effect created is also on the level of the Odyssey’s audience, and this too is clear from the choice of epithets:

Odysseus is ξεῖνος ταλαπείριος. This pairing occurs only three times, but significantly

18. Elsewhere, I have shown how this works with the use of verbal tense markers, esp. -(ε)σκ-.
19. Cf., e.g., Od. 8.546.
21. On the Odyssey’s strategic use of epithets, see Martin 1993a. The adjective ταλαπείριος occurs with ξεῖνος (Od. 17.84, 19.379) and ικέτης (6.193, 14.511). Oddly, the only other occurrence is the ξεῖνος ταλαπείριος who asks the Deliades who is ἠδιστὸς ἄουιδων (h.Ap. 168).
each time: a second instance occurs in Book 17 (v. 84), when the narrator describes Odysseus during his return to his house; the third instance comes in Book 19 (v. 379), in the famous recognition scene with Eurycleia. In this way Odysseus’ καὶ γὰρ ἐγώ of Book 7 represents something like a preface in the process of his mythologizing self-representation within the poem, as effective on the level of the poem’s audience as the internal audience.

There is, however, a discernible difference in this rhetorical strategy after Odysseus has become a proper storyteller within the Odyssey. By the time Odysseus arrives at his Ithacan palace in Book 17, he has created a narrative tradition that extends beyond his deception of the Cyclops. By this time he has also created the elaborate and detailed Cretan fiction which he tells to Eumaeus in Book 14 (vv. 192–359). This story, too, becomes one on which Odysseus can draw for paradigmatic narratives in the later books of the Odyssey, though these narratives are also bound up in his disguise, deception, and revelation. Compare the way in which, upon arriving at his palace, the beggar Odysseus asks Antinoos for some food (vv. 415–426):

```
“δός, φίλοι· οὐ μὲν μοι δοκεῖς ὃ κάκιστος Ἀχαιῶν ἔμμεναι, ἀλλ’ ὕριστος, ἔπει βασιλῇ ἐοικας. τῶ σε χρή δομεναι καὶ λῶιν ἴν περ ἄλλοι σίτοι· ἐγὼ δὲ κέ σε κλείως κατ’ ἀπείρονα γαῖαν. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ποτε ὅικον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἔναιον ἄλβιος ἀφνειόν καὶ πολλάκι δόσκον ἀλήπτη τοῖο, ὡποῖος ἐσι καὶ ὅτε κεχρῆσθεν ἐπεὶ βασιλῆϊ ἔοικας, οἵσιν τ’ εὐ ἐξωσι καὶ ἀφειοί καλέονται. ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἀλάπαξε Κρονίων· — ἦθελε γὰρ ποι· — ὃς μ’ ἀμα ληιστήριοι πολυπλάγκτοισιν ἀνήκεν Ἀλγυπτόνδ’ ἑναι, δολιχήν ὅδον, ὄφρ’ ἀπολοίμην.
```

The instance of ξεῖνος ταλαπείριος at 17.84 is perhaps significant to the reading of 17.415–426 just below, for the narrator uses it of Odysseus first as he enters his house.


23. One might also see it as drawing on Odysseus’ supplication (ικ-) of Nausicaa (6.175–7): ἀλλά, ἀνασσ’, ἐλέαιρε· σὲ γὰρ κακὰ πολλὰ μογῆσας | ἐς πρῶτην ἱκόμην, τῶν δ’ ἄλλων οὐ τινα οἴδα | ἀνθρώπων, οἰ τίνδε πόλιν καὶ γαῖαν ἔχουσιν. Cf. too 7.83, 141.
Give me some gift, my friend. You do no seem to me to be the worst of the Achaeans, rather the best, since you look like a king. Therefore, you must give me even better food than others did, and I’ll sing your fame throughout the boundless earth. You know, I once lived in a house among men, blessed with wealth, and I often gave to such a wanderer, whatever sort he was and with whatever need he came. I had slaves, rather countless, and many other things with which men live well and are called wealthy. But Kronion Zeus ruined me, since he wished to, I suppose, who sent me out with wandering pirates to Egypt, a long road, so that I might die.

In support of the imperative to give him some food, Odysseus provides a brief narrative explaining why Antinoos should: because, in the past, even this beggar had. The story Odysseus tells to Antinoos here presents a fictitious past life in which Odysseus was a wealthy man until Zeus ruined him and sent him to Egypt. In that sense it is not unlike those fictitious tales told to Athena in Book 13, to Eumaeus in Book 14, to Penelope in Book 19, or to Laertes in Book 24. But it draws especially on the Cretan fiction he creates in Book 14, where he details for Eumaeus his fall from fortune in a narrative that also takes him to Egypt. Yet this tale sits somewhat obliquely with respect to that told to Eumaeus, adding how in this past life he would often give gifts to a traveler in need. This aspect of the story is no doubt true of Odysseus’ life in Ithaca before Troy, but it is also an apt adaptation of the Cretan fiction in support Odysseus’ request for food. The discourse marker καὶ γὰρ, especially in combination with the ποτέ, serves to mythologize both Odysseus’ real and fictitious pasts but it also plays a role in the “complex irony of disguise and revelation that characterizes the whole poem and these latter books especially” (Russo ad 17.415–44). The same is true of Odysseus’ similarly articulated speech to Melantho in Book 19 (vv. 71–84):  

“δαιμονίη, τί μοι ὡδ’ ἐπέχεις κεκοτηότι θυμώ; ἢ ὤτι δῆ ρυπόω, κακὰ δὲ χρῷ εἴμαι, πτωχεύω δ’ ἀνὰ δήμουν; ἀναγκαίῃ γὰρ ἐπείγει. τοιοῦτοι πτωχοὶ καὶ ἀλήμονες ἄνδρες ἔσοι. καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ποτὲ οίκον ἐν ἀνθρώποις ἐναιοῦν


Possessed woman, why are you so hard on me in this way with a resentful spirit? Is it because I am dirty and wear dirty clothes on my body, and beg throughout the land? Necessity compels me, you know. Of such a sort are beggars and wanderers. You know, I once lived in a house among men … But Zeus Kronion ruined me, since he wished to, I suppose. So take care now, woman, that you don’t lose all the splendor with which you are now preeminent among the handmaids; take care that your mistress does not become disgusted and grow angry with you or Odysseus comes home. For there is still a measure of hope.

The speech differs from that to Antinoos in that the story of Odysseus’ past is provided in support of its gnomic introduction on the beggar’s lot (v. 74), but otherwise the story continues to serve as an authoritative exemplification that is literally true, even if part of a broader fiction. As Bernard Fenik notes on this passage, “what Odysseus says to Melantho is a shorter version of [the Cretan lie told to Eumaeus], stripped of all detail, but far more explicit in its moral” (1974: 176). In this sense, these two passages marked as paradigmatic by καὶ γάρ seem to well represent the very process of adapting traditional material in performing paradeigmata. Adding to the complexity of paradigmatic performance, this particular speech to Melantho not only expresses central moral principles of the Odyssey as a whole but also “has considerable force in context” in that the speech is intended as much for Penelope as it is for Melantho. Moreover, Odysseus “is introducing himself with a glimpse of his character and earlier status” (Fenik 1974: 179). Not only, then, does the ability to perform such an authoritative speech convince Penelope that the beggar is wise and a good speaker, but the speech acts almost as a self-mythologizing cipher.

26. See p. 319 above.
27. The quotation is from Rutherford ad 71–88.
28. Penelope tells Eumaeus as much when she agrees that she should talk with the beggar alone (vv. 580–8).
29. Of course, it is just such ciphers that Penelope is seeking, ἐπεὶ οὐ τοῖοι σημάντορες εἰσ’ ἐνι
The last instance within the *Odyssey* is no doubt the most famous. This speech of Odysseus comes in Book 18 as he attempts to warn the well-meaning, even decent, suitor Amphinomos that soon there will be bloodshed and that he should leave before it begins (vv. 130–150):

The earth breeds nothing more frail than mankind, of all the things that breathe and move upon it. For man never thinks that he will suffer evil in the future, so long as the gods give him courage and he can move his legs. But when the blessed gods bring about miseries, these things, too, he bears with a steadfast heart, though unwillingly. For such is the mind of men upon the earth, just as the day the father of men and gods brings upon them. You know, I once was on the way to being prosperous among men, but I gave in to force and strength and did many wicked things, trusting in my father and my brothers. So, let no one ever be completely lawless, rather let him keep gods' gifts in silence, whatever they may give him. Such wicked deeds do I see the suitors devising, ravaging the possessions and dishonoring the wife of a man, whom I no longer think will be absent from his loved ones and his fatherland for a long time. He's very near. But may a god lead you home safely, and may you not meet that man, whenever he returns to his own fatherland. For I think not without bloodshed will that man and the suitors be distinguished from one another, once he arrives in his hall.

οἴκῳ, | οἷς Ὅδυσσεὺς ἔσκε (“since there are no such sign-givers in this house, such as Odysseus was”; 19.314–15). Cf. Winkler 1990: 129–161 (esp. pp. 152–6).
Again, there is fiction here and it sounds very much like Odysseus’ other fabrications, but there is also some truth in the description of his past. Similarly, the description begins with καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ ποτ’ at v. 138, when Odysseus turns to his own case in support of the preceding gnomic verses. As before, Odysseus describes himself as formerly ὀλβιός among men, but an interesting addition comes at v. 139 when Odysseus attributes ἀτάσθαλα to his past self. Now, the charge of ἀτάσθαλα or ἀτασθαλίαι is of course normally attributed to Odysseus’ companions, to Aegisthus, or to the suitors. Indeed, the repetition of ἀτάσθαλα in v. 143 equates the suitors’ violations with those the beggar Odysseus tells us led to his own downfall. In this way, Odysseus’ speech connects firmly with concerns of the Odyssean narrative as a whole, but we should add that it also betrays a certain self-consciousness in Odysseus with respect to the representation of himself in his storytelling. For, we cannot forget that Odysseus himself was once accused of ἀτασθαλίαι by his kinsman and companion Eurylokhos, as we know from Odysseus’ narration of the Circe episode to the Phaeacians in Book 10. Odysseus reports Eurylokhos’ speech directly (vv. 431–7):

‘ἄδειοι, πόα’ ἱµεν; τί κακῶν ἢµεῖτε τούτων; Κίρκης ἦς μέγαρον καταβήµεναι, ἢ κεν ἀπαντᾷς ἢ σὺς ἡ λύκους ποιήσται ἡ λέοντας, οἶ κέν οἰ µέγα δῶµα φυλάσσοµεν καὶ ἀνάγκη, οὐς περ Κύκλων ἔρε’, ὡς οἱ µέσαυλον ἱκόντο ἡµέτεροι ἐταροί, σὺν δ’ ὁ βρασῖος εἶπετ· Ὅδυσσεύς· τούτου γὰρ καὶ κεῖνοι ἀτασθαλίσιοι ὀλοντο.’

31. See also Rutherford 1986: 156: “There is falsehood here, and the story bears affinities to Odysseus’ large-scale lies; but like them it contains elements of truth about his travels and his past; and it also involves moral truths and warnings which draw on the basic ethical framework of the Odyssey…” (156).
32. This verse-final phrase τετληότι θυµῶ# occurs 9X in the Od., and 0X in the Il. (but see Achilles’ verse-initial τέτληκας θυµῶ at 1.228).
33. To his companions (1.7, e.g.); to Aegisthus (1.34). Cf. Od. 8.166 (Odysseus to the Phaeacian Euryalos); further, Hooker 1988 and Nagler 1990.
34. Cf. Od. 1.6–8: ἀλλ’ οὐδ’ ὡς ἐτάρους ἔρρυσατο, Ἰέµενος περ’ αὐτῶν γὰρ σφετέρησιν ἀτασθαλίσιον ὀλοντο, νηπίοι, οἳ κατὰ βούς Ὕπεριόνος Ἡλίοιο.
'Ah, wretched men, where are we going? Why do you desire these troubles? To go down into the house of Circe, who will change us all to pigs or wolves or lions, to guard her great house by necessity? Just so did the Cyclops, when our companions went into his cave, and with them followed bold Odysseus. For it’s by this man’s recklessness that those men also died.
hut as the creation of a tradition on which he can draw in paradigmatic discourse. After he has told of his trials to the Phaeacians they become, even within the *Odyssey* itself, a corpus or tradition on which he can draw for paradigmatic reasoning whether he is telling himself to ‘endure’ as in Book 20 or advising the suitor Amphinomos about the dangers of ἀτάσθαλα. In all of these cases he uses discourse features best associated with *paradeigmata*, and that these examples refer directly to episodes narrated to the Phaeacians or to Eumaeus calls attention to the process of self-mythologization that takes place in that narration. Thus, while Rutherford 1986: 154–155 emphasizes that “Phaeacia provides a suitable environment for Odysseus to recover from his adventures beyond the known world,” I would shift the emphasis from ‘recovery’ to the creation of his own paradigmatic tradition. *This*, I suggest, is how Odysseus becomes not “a passive figure who merely endures, [but] the active strategist and avenger” (157). No less than Odysseus’ weeping at Demodocus’ song in Book 9, this aspect of the *Odyssey* testifies to the power of song and to the adaptation of it in the performance of *paradeigmata*.

---

38. We may now even appreciate the various verbal tenses of τλα- verbs centered around Odysseus’ stay on Scheria. Compare the later, retrospective view with the future-tense τλῆσομαι at *Od*. 5.221–4:

εἰ δ’ αὖ τις ῥαῖσαι θεῶν ἐνὶ οἴνωπι πόντῳ,
τλῆσομαι ἐν στήθεσιν ἐξών ταλαπενθέα δυμόν·
ἦδη γάρ μάλα πολλά πάθον καὶ πολλὰ μόγησα
κύμασι καὶ πολέμῳ μετά καὶ τόδε τοῖσι γενέσθω.

Chapter 12 | Syntax, singularity, and suffering in the *Iliad*

The two elements I have emphasized in my reading of Odysseus’ speeches in the *Odyssey*—the exemplary mythologization of the self and the topos of suffering in *paradigmata*—also coalesce in the *Iliad*, but in a different way. In this chapter I offer a reading of the *Iliad* through the same lens of exemplarity and suffering, focusing it on the ransoming of Hector’s body in *Iliad* 24. Of course, to study this scene is to study the whole of the *Iliad*, for it involves dealing with the question of whether the character of Achilles develops intellectually and ethically over the course of the poem.¹ Moreover, this already thorny issue is compounded when viewed in combination with the inextricable problem of the language of Achilles, a debate begun by Adam Parry in 1956 with the suggestion that Achilles misuses traditional formulae and language as a result of, or in order to express, his disillusionment.²

In that the last book of the *Iliad* centers around Priam’s supplication of Achilles, most interpretations of *Iliad* 24 or the poem as a whole somehow account for the fact that

---


the poem comprises fairly evenly spaced scenes of supplication: in Book 1 Chryses appeals to Agamemnon for the return of his daughter Chryseis; in Book 9 Phoenix entreats Achilles to return to battle; in Book 16 Patroclus pleads with Achilles to let him use his armor; and in Book 24 Priam beseeches Achilles for Hector’s body. While I think my argument remains complementary to the spirit of these interpretations, I shall instead argue completely from the language of the speakers within the poem. Part of my reasoning in shifting the emphasis from, say, the efficacy of a shared meal or a ceremonial supplication to the language of the speakers is the prevalence of the formulae and conventions of paradeigmata. Central to my reading of Iliad 24, then, is the fact that Achilles tells the paradeigma of Niobe; that is, among all possible ‘changes’ in Achilles that we may perceive, I would like to focus on the fact that, for the first time in the Iliad, Achilles tells a conventional paradeigma. For, while Achilles is a masterful speaker with a terrific memory, the Niobe paradeigma represents the first time in the poem that Achilles tells a paradeigma properly. Moreover, we must study this final scene alongside, or in the context of, the concomitant idea of singularity, the idea that to some heroes paradeigmata do not

---

3. To this scheme of fairly evenly spaced scenes of supplication Held (1987: 246) adds the reconciliation of Achilles and Agamemnon in Book 19, although it is not properly a scene of supplication. Redfield (1994: 219) restricts the importance of these “purely formal” echoes to the aesthetic level.

4. By careful attention to the language of the speakers in Iliad 24, I seek, in some sense to resolve Crotty’s disagreement with Martin 1989: “I find myself in disagreement with one of the central points of Martin, Language of Heroes. Martin argues that a poetic of the Iliad can usefully be based on the formal speech-acts of the poem’s heroes … Martin’s approach cannot do justice to Priam’s suppliant speech and Achilles’ emotional reply, which, in my reading, truly climax and resolve the action of the poem … The Iliad ultimately stands outside the heroic society, and does not view the warriors in the shame-based way they have been trained to think of themselves” (1994: 99n21).

5. I would add that it seems to me a too often neglected or downplayed fact that, before Priam even arrives, Achilles indicates that he would return the body to whomever brings a ransom (24.139–140): τῇδ’ εἴη ὃς ἀποικα φέροι καὶ νεκρὸν ἄγοιτο, | εἰ δὴ πρόφρονι θύμω Ολύμπιος αὐτὸς ἀνώγει. (“So let it be. Whoever brings the ransom, let him also take the corpse, if indeed the Olympian himself commands wholeheartedly.”)
apply. I aim to show that the Niobe *paradeigma* must be seen against Achilles’ corrupt view of paradigmatic speech, which view is founded on his own sense of singularity.

Of course, Achilles is not the only singularity in this scene. Priam’s supplication of Achilles is a meeting of two singularities, and, despite structural parallels in Books 1, 9, and 16, Priam’s supplication in Achilles’ tent is a *singular event*: never has a king done such a thing as this, never has a warrior experienced the like. Indeed, Priam himself draws attention to the singularity of this event—to the fact that this scene has no precedent—just after he asks Achilles to remember his own father (vv. 503–6):

> ἀλλ’ αἰδεῖο θεοὺς Ἀχιλεῦ, αὐτὸν τ’ ἐλέησον
> μηδὲν οὖν πατρός· ἐγὼ δ’ ἐλεεινότερός περ,
> ἐτλην δ’ οἶ νά καί ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιχθόνιος βροτὸς ἄλλος,
> ἀνδρὸς παιδοφόνιοι ποτὶ στόμα χείρ ὑφέσθαι.

Honor the gods, Achilles, and pity me, taking thought of your father. Yet I am more pitiful; I have endured what no other mortal on earth has: to bring the hand of the man who has killed my children to my lips.

We shall not overlook Priam’s comparison of himself to Achilles’ father Peleus, but I want first to address the last two verses, vv. 505–6. Here Priam sets himself up as having no precedent in saying, ἐτλην δ’ οἶ νά καί ἐπὶ τῆς ἐπιχθόνιος βροτὸς ἄλλος. For a poem that, throughout its many books, is itself obsessed with authoritative recollections, precedents, and *paradeigmata*, it is remarkable for the poem’s conclusion to be framed as such a singularity. What is more remarkable, however, is how Priam draws attention to this

---

6. Where Crotty writes that “[t]he *Iliad* could be understood, then, as a poem in which the hero attains finally an understanding of the poetics implicit in it, for these poetics have to do with the memory of grief” (99), I might simply substitute “singularity and exemplarity” for his “memory of grief.”


8. On the difficulty of v. 506—whose hand(s) to whose mouth—see Richardson *ad* 503–6.

9. Achilles responds to this statement twice in turn: *Il*. 24.519 (πῶς ἐτλης ἐπὶ νῆς Ἀχαιῶν ἐλθεῖν οἶος; “How could you dare to come alone to the ships of the Achaeans?”) and 24.565 (οὐ γὰρ κε τάλατι βροτὸς ἐλθεῖν, οὐδὲ μάλ’ ἱβῶν; “For no mortal would dare come to our encampment, not even rather youthful in vigor”). Redfield (1994: 215), too, recognizes this this scene “a kind of impossible act.”

10. Macleod (1983: 13) describes τάλα- as “what, in Homer, heroes characteristically do in war,” and with this we are to contrast its use in *Iliad* 24. This book, with its moralizing, Hesiodic
fact through his choice among various syntactic conventions in these verses. That is, while we have seen that there are syntactic formulae that help define the “way of speaking” associated with paradeigmata, I shall show that there seems also to be a conventional syntax for the lack of any exempla. This formulaic syntax, however, is restricted to just three instances in Homeric poetry, significant though they are. And it is against the backdrop of this syntactic conventions that we may better understand how the resolution in the supplication scene of Iliad 24 draws particular attention to the role of paradeigmata in the poem.

When Priam says that he has suffered what no other mortal has—again, ἔτλην δ’ οἶ’ ὀὗ πῶ τις—he uses a restricted but conventionalized syntax that is used once in the Odyssey. In the Ithacan assembly of the second book, in response to Telemachus’ emotional speech blaming the suitors for consuming all his house’s oxen and wine, Antinoos describes Penelope’s unwillingness to choose among the suitors. Antinoos highlights Penelope’s good standing in a rather conspicuous comparison of her to women of old (vv. 115–22):

εἰ δ’ ἐτ’ ἀνήσει γε πολὺν χρόνον ύιας Λαχαιῶν, 115
τὰ φρονέουσ’ ἀνὰ θυμόν, ἃ οἱ περὶ δῶκεν Αὐτήν, ἐργα τ’ ἐπιστασθαι περικαλλέα καὶ φρένας ἐσθλὰς κέρδεα θ’, οἶ’ ὀὗ πῶ τιν’ ἀκόυομεν οὐδὲ παλαιῶν,
tάσων αἱ πάρος ἡσαν ἐυπλοκαμίδες Αχαιαί, 120
Τυρώ τ’ Ἀλκμήνῃ τε ἑστέφανος τε Μυκήνης· τάσων οὖ τις ὅμοια νοήματα Πινελοπείῇ ἡδή· ἀτάρ μὲν τοῦτο γ’ ἐναίσιμον οὐκ ἐνόησε.

But if [your mother] continues to annoy the son of the Achaeans for much longer, although she knows in her heart the gifts Athena has given her especially—making gorg-

---

11. Priam speaks very little in the Iliad: his speeches in Books 3, 7, 22, and 24 comprise far fewer than 200 verses. But note his self-mythologizing καὶ γὰρ ἔγὼ in describing his own martial exploits to Helen at 3.182–90, as well as how he pitifully uses the presumably lost Lykaon and Polydoros (καὶ γὰρ νῦν δῶν παιδε) as paradeigmata in trying to persuade Hector not to do battle with Achilles (22.38–76). Neither Helen nor Hector answers.
geous works, a good disposition, and shrewdness—such as no one we have ever heard of, not even of the ancients, those women before who were fair-haired Achaean—Tyro, Alkmene, and nicely-crowned Mykene—not one of whom knew plans like those of Penelope. But this, at least, she has not properly thought out.

Like Priam, Penelope has no precedent. Yet the formulaic articulation of this statement does: the syntagm is the same—οἷ’ οὐ πώ τιν’—and it falls in the same metrical sedes as in Priam’s statement just above. The explicit points of comparison among Achaean women of the past—Tyro, Alkmene, and Mykene—are not necessarily significant thematically, but here we must remember that Clytemnestra is ever in the background of the Odyssey. In this respect we can discern how Antinoos stresses on the level of syntax how Penelope defies even the precedent of Clytemnestra that is developed from as early as the council of the gods in Book 1, again in the Nekyia, and a last time in Book 24, when Agamemnon tells Odysseus that her excellence’s fame will never perish and will be a subject of song.

The third and final instance of this formulaic syntax occurs in the Iliad, and, being a convention of singularity and of the inapplicability of precedents, it is naturally applied

---

12. On the particular women chosen for the comparison, see S. West (in Heubeck et al. 1988) ad 2.120: “Antinous selects three great names from the past, but there is no reason to regard any of these heroines as particularly clever; the antiquarian note is slightly strange, but the comparison undeniably flattering.” Given our findings in Part One above, these three women certainly seem significant compositionally: they are familiar to use from the Nekyia (Tyro, vv. 235–59; Alkmene, vv. 266–70) and Hes. fr. 30.24ff. M–W (Tyro); fr. 193.19–20, 195, and 248 M–W (Alkmene); and fr. 246 M–W (Mykene). I would suggest that choice of women familiar from the Catalogue-tradition (as evidenced by the Nekyia, too) underscores Penelope’s status as a singularity, or first-order paradeigma. Winkler (1990: 151) makes the best argument for their thematic relevance: “[Penelope’s] superiority lies precisely in her unwillingness to be taken in by what might be merely a convincing replica, whether mortal or immortal, of her husband.”

13. Od. 1.28–43.

14. As we noted in our study of the Odyssey above, Agamemnon also makes this comparison in the Nekyia (11.441–53) when he warns Odysseus of the return he suffered at the hands of Κλυταιμνήστρῃ δολόμητις (v. 422), yet he goes on to tell Odysseus that Penelope is prudent and has a good and understanding heart. Even within a catalogue of exemplary women, Penelope is exempt. Cf. Wender 1978: 38–44 and Winkler 1990: 138–139.

to Achilles. Once Hephaestus has made new armor for Achilles in Book 18, Thetis carries this armor to him at the start of Book 19. When Thetis arrives, Achilles is still mourning the death of Patroclus among his comrades (vv. 6–11):

>`τέκνου ἐμὸν τοῦτον μὲν ἐάσωμεν ἄχρηστοι περικείσθαι, ἔπει δὲ πρῶτα θεῶν ἱείτης δαιμόθην·
>`τύνη δ’ Ἑρμήστοιο πάρα κλυτὰ τεύχεα δέξο καλά μάλ’, οἶ’ σο γὰρ τὶς ἀνήρ ωμοίοι φόρμησεν.’

And Thetis, shining among divinities, stood there among them, and she clung to Achilles’ hand and called him by name and spoke: “My child, although we grieve, we must let this man lie dead, since he has been slain first of all through the will of the gods. But you accept the glorious arms of Hephaistos, quite beautiful, such as no mortal has ever worn on his shoulders.”

While it is Achilles’ armor here that has no precedent, Thetis’ comment speaks less to the armor than to Achilles’ battle prowess and special connection to the gods through his divine mother. The armor is singular, but it also represents Achilles’ singularity.

It is crucial then, that this syntagm is used just twice within the *Iliad*, once of Priam and once of Achilles, and that these two men should meet in a *singular* scene in its final book. Yet to fully appreciate this fact, we must also view it against a fuller backdrop of the relationship between Achilles and exemplarity within the *Iliad*. Specifically, what does it mean that a poem which features *paradeigmata* performed throughout it ends in a scene for which there is no precedent, and that the two characters involved, Achilles and Priam, realize this? After all, soon after Priam declares his singularity to Achilles, Achilles responds not just with the Parable of the Two Jars but also with the *paradeigma* of Niobe (vv. 524–551; 599–620). While scholars now generally think of Achilles as a talented speaker and emphasize his ability to perform feats of memory, there remains a way in which we must qualify our praise of his speaking prowess: Achilles’ authoritative

---

16. Cp. the reaction of the Myrmidons, who do not dare look on the armor (19.14–15): οὐδὲ τὶς ἑτλη | ἁντην εἰοδέευεν. We should probably not make too much of the verse-end adonean οὐδὲ τὶς ἑτλη, for it is somewhat common (6× *Il.; 3×* *Od*.).

recollections are often limited to his own experience. Simultaneously, there is the suggestion that the story of Niobe in *Iliad* 24 is the only *paradeigma* that Achilles ever tells.\(^{18}\) This, too, is in some sense true, but I would revise this claim to state that it is the only *paradeigma* that Achilles tells *properly*, and that our analysis must include some description of how Achilles’ view of *exemplarity* is bound up with his sense of *singularity* until Book 24. That is, to flesh this out, first we need to quickly sketch the contours of Achilles’ singularity alongside his relationship to and view of *paradeigmata* in the poem.

It is, of course, uncontroversial to suggest that Achilles is the singularity *par excellence.*\(^{19}\) Not only does Achilles do in *Iliad* 24 the thing that no warrior has ever done, but he also conceives of himself throughout the poem as being a singularity.\(^{20}\) In his own words, in fact, Achilles is not just the best of the Achaeans, he is τοῖος ἐὼν σῶς ὦ τίς Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτῶνων (“such as no other of the bronze-armored Achaeans”; *Il.* 18.105). This view of his own singularity is especially conspicuous through his inability to interpret mythological *paradeigmata* as convincing precedents: of this Phoenix’ Meleager story in Book 9’s Embassy is the principal example.\(^{21}\) But consider, too, the fact

\[^{18}\] Held (1987: 254–256) discounts all but the Niobe *paradeigma* and the Parable of the Two Jars.

\[^{19}\] I cite the complementary argument of Redfield (1994: 211), who, in fact, calls the end of the *Iliad* “a ceremonial recognition of the monstrous singularity of Achilles.” Cf. Hera at 24.56–63 and Achilles at 18.79–82 (with, say, Crotty 1994: 59). I cite further the manner in which Achilles prays to Zeus in *Iliad* 16 (237–8). In short, Achilles says, rather unusually: “You’ve listened to my wishes before. Grant me this one, too.” Compare Chryseis’ prayer to Apollo at 1.39–41, which more closely conforms to the *do ut des* form. Achilles’ is instead *dabas ut des*, expressing the same disposition as his recollection to Thetis in Book 1.

\[^{20}\] I would even suggest, based on findings in Part One that Achilles may engage in self-mythologization in the way that he comes to describe Briseis to Patroclus with the ὅς-ῥα syntagm at *Il.* 16.55–9:

\[\begin{align*}
\text{αἰὼν ἄχος τὸ μοι ἐστιν, ἔπει πάθον ἄλγεα θυμῷ.} & \quad 55 \\
\text{κούρην ἄν ἄρα μοι γέρας ἐξελον υῖες Ἀχαιῶν,} & \\
\text{> δουρὶ δέ' ἐμῷ κτέατισα πόλιν εὐτείρας πέρσας,} & \\
\text{> τὴν ἄν ἐκ χεῖριν ἐλετο κρείσων ἀγαμέμνον} & \\
\text{> Ἀτρείδης ὃς εἰ τιν' ἀτίμητον μετανάστην.} &
\end{align*}\]

\[^{21}\] Of course, it is not that Achilles does not recognize the *paradeigma*, but that he views it as a positive *paradeigma*. 
that in Book 11 Nestor tells a story from his youth that is meant to be paradigmatic for Achilles, yet instead he sends Patroclus into battle; \textsuperscript{22} although Achilles is not present when Nestor tells the tale, this variation on the situation in Book 9 puts yet another spin on Achilles’ depiction as, in some sense, ‘exempt’ from precedents.

As important, however, is the distorted way in which Achilles draws on precedents, due in part to his parentage. With his mortal father at home in Phthia, but his divine mother present with him at Troy, it is the divine aspect of Achilles’ parentage that is emphasized within the poem. \textsuperscript{23} Thetis is singular too, of course, and not only for being the only Nereid to endure marriage to a mortal. \textsuperscript{24} As Achilles himself reminds her in \textit{Iliad} 1, she is anomalous in being the lone immortal who saved Zeus from Briareos (vv. 393–412):

\begin{verbatim}
\begin{verbatim}
állà oú ei dúnavasai ge periáchei paiëdos éphps'
élboús' Oúlmipon dé Días líasai, ei potte dé ti
ëi épeti ónnesas kradình Ëìos hé kái érgw.
polláki gári seo patròs éni megároisín ákousa
euçoménìs òt' érfhsa kelaìnìfèi Kroiówni
oùi èn áðhánátoisín ñeikéa lògyòn ámùnas,
òppòte mîn ëxunìhsa Òlýmîpîoí ñthélìon állloi
'Ìrë t' ñáde Pòseîdíaòw kai Palmás Æìình:
állà oú tòn g' élboúsìa òthe ùpelùsas deùmòw,
> Íôç' ékátoçgeîron kaléssa' ës makróù Òlúmpîon,
* òn Briaíreòw kaléouşı òtheí, ãndres dé te pántes
* Æìgàiîon', ò gári ñútë bình òu patròs ãmeînwos:
* òz òra parà Kroiówni kathèsteo kûdei gáîwos:
tòn kai ùpèdeîasun màkàres òtheî ñúò' ët' ëdhsan.
tòw ñúw mîn mnìhàsa parézeo kai labë gòùnìwos
ai kën pòw ñèìhsun épi Tòùs ñéìsou ñróìsai,
tòw dé kàta prùmìnas te kài ìmì' ãlà ëlòùai Æìgâiûs
kteinoméwnos, ïna pántes épàúrwvontai bàsìlhòs,
\end{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}
\end{verbatim}

\textsuperscript{22} See Pedrick 1983 and Martin 2000b.

\textsuperscript{23} At least in the \textit{early parts} of the poem. On the whole, the poem moves from emphasis on his divine mother to emphasis on his mortal father.

\textsuperscript{24} Cf. \textit{Il.} 18.432–4: \textit{ek mên ì' álllásôn allíásôn éndri dàmàsasen} | Æìákìdh Ììlì, kai ëtình
ánéròs ëùnìh | pollá maîl' òuì ñèìhsas ("Of all the other Nereids, it was me who [Zeus]
subordinated to a man, to Peleus son of Aiakos, and I endured the bed of a man, although I was
γνῷ δὲ καὶ Ἀτρείδης εὐρύ κρείων Ἀγαµέµνων
> ἣν ἅτην, ὅ τ᾿ ἀριστὸν Ἀχαιῶν οὐδὲν ἐτίασεν.

But you, if you have the power, protect your own child. Go to Olympus and supplicate Zeus, if ever at all you either comforted Zeus’ heart with word or action. For often in my father’s halls I have heard you boasting, when you said you alone among the immortals warded off shameful destruction from Cronus’ son of the dark clouds, when all the other Olympians wished to bind him, Hera and Poseidon and Pallas Athena. You were the one, goddess, who came and loosed him from his bonds, having immediately called to tall Olympus the hundred-hander, the one whom the gods call Briareos but all men call Aigaion (for he is mightier than his father), who sat next to Zeus exulting in his glory. Him the blessed gods feared and did not bind Zeus. Remind him of these things, now as you sit beside him and take his knees, if somehow he might be willing to help the Trojans, and drive the Achaeans back against the ships and the sea to their death, so that they may all profit from their king, and Atreus’ son, wide-ruling Agamemnon, may recognize his delusion, that he did not honor the best of the Achaeans.

We see that on these grounds Achilles assumes privileged access to the will of the gods, but the better reason to include this passage is that it is a fine example of Achilles’ distorted performance of a paradeigma. This speech comprises a mythological recollection, to be sure, yet the actual application of the recollection has nothing to do with the story itself—that of Zeus and Briareos—but of Thetis’ own boast of having Zeus’ ear. We might say that Achilles’ memory is fine, but he does not properly apply the story; instead, he uses the frame of the story—Thetis’ boasting of the deed—as a means of arguing that a sort of precedent exists for the request he is asking her to make. If we wished to call it an paradeigma, as some do, it strikes me as being a sufficiently oblique paradeigma that it even underscores its deviation from convention. It is fitting, perhaps, that this speech ends with Achilles’ description of himself as “the best of Achaeans” (v. 412).

Still more instructive are the few cases in which Achilles does attempt to perform paradeigmata, and the way in which even there he deviates from convention. Again, while commentators have argued that the Niobe paradeigma of Book 24 is Achilles’ only mythological paradeigma, I again emphasize that it is instead his only paradeigma con-
ventionally told. In Book 18, Achilles compares himself to Heracles in a speech to his mother (vv. 117–21):

> κῆρα δ’ ἐγὼ τότε δέξομαι ὡπότε κεν δή
> Ζεὺς ἐθέλῃ τελέσαι ἤδ’ ἀθάνατοι θεοὶ ἄλλοι.
> οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίη Ἡρακλῆος φύγε κῆρα,
> ὃς περὶ φιλτάτος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίωνὶ ἀνακτή,
> ἀλλὰ ἑμῖν δάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλέος χόλος Ἡρῆς.
> ὡς καί ἐγών, εἰ δή μοι ὁμοία μοῖρα τέτυκται,
> κείσομ’ ἐπεὶ κε θάνω.

I will accept my own death, at whatever time Zeus wishes to bring it about, and the other immortals. You know, not even the strength of Herakles fled destruction, although he was dearest of all to lord Zeus, son of Kronos, but his fate beat him under, and the wearisome anger of Hera. So too I, if such is the fate which has been wrought for me, shall lie still when I am dead.

While here Achilles draws on the traditional stories surrounding Heracles, he does not apply the paradigmatic narrative outwardly in the usual manner. It is instead, as Mark Edwards notes, “a consolatio as much directed toward himself as to his mother Thetis.”

Still, Achilles’ comparison of himself to the similarly semi-divine Heracles is as close as he comes to thinking beyond himself. Rightly, then, does Edwards specifically compare this passage to the sort of consolation Achilles provides Lykaon in their encounter of Book 21. What I would add is that the points of comparison remain centered on Achilles’ rather restricted worldview, as Achilles offers Patroclus and himself as paradeigmata for Lykaon (vv. 103–13):

> νῦν δ’ οὐκ ἐσθ’ ὃς τις θάνατον φύγῃ ὃν κε θεός γε
> Ίλιον προσπάροιθεν ἐμὴς ἐν χερσὶ βάλησι
> καὶ πάντων Τρώων, περὶ δ’ αὖ Πριάμοιο γε παίδων.
> ἀλλὰ φίλος θάνε καὶ σύ· τί ἢ ὀλοφύρει οὐτως;

The claim of Held 1987 is that “there is no other instance in the Iliad of Achilleus’ employing a paradeigma besides the two instances [of the Parable of Two Jars and the Niobe tale] in Book 24” (256). He does not discuss this Heracles paradeigma in Book 18, but it would meet his criterion for being “drawn…from a communal fund of traditional stories,” which criterion, Held argues, is seldom met (254); it would certainly not meet his criterion of being addressed to another person in exhortation (256).

See Macleod 1982: 25–26 for sensitive comments on this passage as marking Achilles’ move from isolation to participation.

Edwards ad Il. 18.117–19.
κάτθανε καὶ Πάτροκλος, ὃ περ σέο πολλὸν ἀμείνων.
οὐχ ὡρὰς ὃς καὶ ἐγὼ καλὸς τε μέγας τε;
πατρὸς δὲ ἐμ!’ ἀγαθοῖο, θεά δὲ με γείναι το μὴ τρὶς
ἀλλ’ ἐπὶ τοι καὶ ἐμὶ δέανατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή;

But now there is no one who will escape death, whomever a god should deliver into my hands before the walls of Ilium: even of all the Trojans, and especially the sons of Priam. So, friend, even you die. Why are you wailing in this way? Even Patroklos died, who was far better than you. Do you not see what sort of a man I am, how big, how beautiful? I am born of a noble father, and an immortal mother bore me. Yet even for me is there death and overpowering fate. There will be a dawn or an afternoon or a midday when some man will take the life from me in battle, aiming either with a spear or an arrow from a bowstring.

“If Patroclus died, why shouldn’t you?” Achilles says in effect, but notice the poignant brevity of verse 107. The verb-fronted asyndetic sentence, with its ‘exemplifying’ καὶ and a relative clause following, represents a way of telling paradeigmata more familiar from lyric poets such as Pindar. Note also the striking way in which Achilles then frames himself as a still living, proleptic paradeigma: “Do you not see how big and beautiful I am? I am the son of a noble man and a divine mother. But even I shall die.” His speech is selfish and pitiless, to be sure, and it is eminently immediate in its emphasis on Achilles’ physical appearance opposite Lykaon. This physical, personal exemplarity, we might add, is even owed to his partially divine parentage, a move that plays upon the centrality of genealogy to exemplarity in the Iliad.

All of this paints a picture of an Achilles who has, at best, accepted his own death. Only in the consolatory paradeigma of Heracles in Book 18 does Achilles seem to view anything of the past that is actually external to himself as at all relevant to his own actions. He is the pitiless Achilles who, in Book 22 refuses to take the oath with Hector that

30. Cf. the discussion of Achilles and Asteropaios in Book 21 in the section on genealogy and paradeigma at pp. 99–103 above.
the victor will return the body of the vanquished. Remarkably, there is to Achilles’ mind a precedent for this, but we must note that it comes not from a paradeigma, or even a recollection, but from nature. In his refusal of the oath, Achilles constructs a simile involving lions and men, wolves and lambs (22.262–9):

> ὡς οὐκ ἔστι λέουσι καὶ ἀνδράσιν ὁρκία πιστά,
    οὐδὲ λύκοι τε καὶ ἄρνες ὁμόφρονα θυμόν ἔχουσιν,
    ἀλλὰ κακὰ φρονέουσι διαμπερὲς ἀλληλοισιν,
    ὡς οὐκ ἔστ’ ἐμὲ καὶ σὲ φιλήμεναι, οὐδὲ τι νοϊ

Just as between lions and men there are no trusty oaths, nor do wolves and lambs have agreeable spirits, but rather constantly contrive evils for the other, so too is it impossible for you and me to be friends, nor will there be any oaths among us, until one of us has fallen and sated with his blood Ares, the shield-enduring warrior. Remember your valor, all of it: now you must be a spearman and a brave warrior.

Now, it is well known that “Achilles utters more similes than any character in the poem,” and this may well be “a fully intended aspect of his characterization.” But, again, whatever speaking prowess Achilles demonstrates, he does not properly perform a paradeigma until he tells the story of Niobe in Book 24; previous to this he consistently diverges from the norms of this speech genre.

Returning finally to Book 24 and the discussion of ethical or intellectual change within Achilles, I would like to shift the scholarly focus from the actual ceremony of the supplication to what clearly does change during the supplication scene of Book 24: the language of Achilles, particularly a language that displays his ability simultaneously to recognize Priam’s singularity and understand it in terms of exemplarity. I have already stressed the singularity of both Priam and Achilles, and their meeting in Book 24 is, from the start, framed as a meeting of two singularities. Yet note also that Achilles and Priam

31. Moulton 1977: 100, with Richardson ad 22.262–7. Moulton connects this fact to Achilles’ depiction in Book 9 playing the phorminx.
are struck with wonder at one another, and Priam’s epithet θεοειδέα, or ‘god-like’, is matched when Priam, in turn, addresses Achilles by his own equivalent epithet θεοῖς ἐπιείκελος (v. 486). Similarly, when Priam refers to himself as παναώριον (v. 540), and their mutual wonder is repeated again later (vv. 629–32). As much as feeling pity for Priam and his own father, then, I suggest that this scene hinges upon Achilles’ recognition that he has an equal, that he is not, in fact, a singularity. Moreover, with Priam as a piteous stand-in for Achilles’ father Peleus, the scene further presents an elaborate negotiation of Priam’s own singularity. After all, Priam’s claim is to singularity, but in mentioning Achilles’ father Peleus, he gives Achilles the terms in which to understand that.

Priam’s standing before Achilles amounts to the same kind of real-world exemplarity that we saw on display in Achilles’ speech to Asteropaios, where Achilles mocks Asteropaios with a corruption of paradigmatic speech. Here, however, in the meeting between Priam and Achilles, Achilles recognizes the singularity—or, the first-order exemplarity—of Priam in marveling at how Priam endured to come to his tent alone (vv. 518–23):

ά δείλ’, ἦ δὴ πολλὰ κάκ’ ἀνύχεο σὸν κατὰ θυμῷ.
πῶς ἔτλης ἐπὶ νῆας Αχαιῶν ἐλθένοις σιδήρειον ὕιες ἐξενάριξα; σιδήρειον νῦ τοι ἠτορ.

33. The epithet is not unique to Priam—note its use 10× with Ἀλέξανδρος in the *Iliad* (e.g., 3.16)—but Macleod (ad 483) regards the epithet as “more than a generic and decorative one.” (Cf. too Richardson ad 482–4 on its being “more than just formular.”) It is, at least, used 8× of Priam in *Il.* 24 and only here in the accusative.
34. Cf. αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ παναώριον (v. 493) and ἐνα παιδα...παναώριον (v. 540).
35. In telling Achilles to “remember [his] father,” Priam not only reminds Achilles of his father, but reminds Achilles of the *mortal* lineage of his father; the emphasis in the narrative has generally been on the divine aspect of his genealogy, on his mother and Zeus.
ἀλλ’ ἄγε δὴ κατ’ ἄρ’ ἔξευ ἐπὶ θρόνου, ἄλγεα δ’ ἐμπὶς ἐν θυμῷ κατακεῖσθαι ἐάσομεν ἀχνύμενοι περ.

Ah, unhappy man, many evils indeed have you suffered in your heart. How did you endure to come alone to the ships of the Achaeans, to meet the eyes of the man who has slain your sons many and noble? It must be iron, your heart. But come, sit down in a chair, and let us allow our troubles to settle down in our hearts, although we are grieving.

What is significant is that Achilles uses the diction of paradigmatic speech to describe Priam’s singular action.37 Compare the collocation of ἀνάσχεο in v. 518 and ἔτλης in v. 519 to the only other instances in the Iliad, the two τλα- paradeigmata we discussed in the context of the Odyssey above:38

τέτλαθι μὴπερ ἐμὴ, καὶ ἄνάσχεο κηδομένη περ.

II. 1.586

tέτλαθι τέκνον ἐμὸν, καὶ ἄνάσχεο κηδομένη περ.

Πολλοὶ γὰρ δὴ τλήμεν Ὀλύμπια δώματ’ ἔχοντες ἐξ άνδρῶν χαλέπ’ ἄλγε’ ἐπ’ ἀλλήλοισι τιθέντες.

II. 5.382–4

What is as striking, however, is that Achilles here also echoes the very speech in which Thetis confers upon Achilles the singular armor that Hephaestus made. Note in Achilles’ words the collocation of the verse end formula ἐάσομεν ἀχνύμενοι περ and the infinitive κατακεῖσθαι.39 The only other instance of such language and syntax occurs when Thetis

37. On the one hand Achilles here confirms the singularity of the scene with the οἶος of v. 519, but in these words we might also see a recognition of Priam’s claim to a singular suffering: Priam has both come ‘alone’, and is the ‘sole’ person to have dared to do such a thing.

38. Discussions and translations of these passages at p. 315 and p. 104 above. In the case of Priam, Achilles’ language emphasizes his recognition of the singular Priam as being a paradeigma of the sort we find in the exemplary tales told in these passages. This simultaneously subsumes Priam into that very tradition, even if that tradition is of gods, and so on that level denies him singularity. Within the Od., we could compare Athena’s advisory speech to Odysseus at 13.306–8 (εἶπο ὶ ὧ ὁ ὅσα τοί αἴσα δόμοι ο’ ἐν ποιητῷ | κηδε’ ἄνασχεσθαι | σὺ δε τετλάμεναι καὶ ἀνάγκη, | μὴ τῷ ἐκφάσθαι μὴτ’ ἀνδρῶν μὴτ’ γυναικῶν) and the reciprocity in Alcinoos telling Odysseus that he could listen to him perform all night (καὶ κεν ἐς ἴδιον ἀνασχοίμην, ὅτε μοι σὺ | πλαίς ἐν μεγάρῳ τὰ σὰ κηδεα μυθήσασθαι; 11.375–6); in each case we might see a connection to the argument of Chapter 11, “Self-mythologization and suffering in the Odyssey.” The idea of an ‘enduring’ audience in the Od. manifests also in Telemachus’ censure of Penelope in at Od. 1.353: σοὶ δ’ ἐπιταλαμάτῳ κραδὶ καὶ θυμὸς ἄκουειν (“Let your heart and soul endure to listen to it”).

39. For ἐάσομεν ἀχνύμενοι περ elsewhere within the II., cf. 18.112 (Achilles, preceding the Heracles paradeigma), 19.8 (Thetis, just before granting Achilles his singular armor), and 19.65
tells Achilles to let Patroclus’ body lie as she gives him his new armor. As we saw above (vv. 19.8–11):^40

> τέκνον ἐμὸν τούτον μὲν ἐάσωμεν ἀχνύμενοι περ<br>κεῖσθαι, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρῶτα θεῶν ἰότητι δαμάσθη·<br>τύνη δ’ Ἡφαίστοιο πάρα κλυτὰ τεῦχεα δέξο
καλὰ μάλ’, οἱ’ οὗ πῶ τις ἀνὴρ ὀμοίοι φόρησεν.

These are not exceedingly common formulae, and their combination is even unique to this restricted context, so it seems that in this way Achilles transforms his mother’s statement of his own singularity in Book 19 into a recognition of Priam’s singularity in Book 24. But, in so doing, he melds the singularity of situation with the language of exemplarity. For Achilles, the recognition of Priam’s singularity is a understood in terms of exemplarity, and thus Achilles and Priam both cease to be singularities.

This, I suggest, is the crucial step in Achilles’ ability to then tell the Parable of the Two Jars,^41 within the framework of which he is able to echo Priam’s comparison of himself to Peleus. Still more, Achilles then follows that with the paradeigma of Niobe. And, with this, Phoenix’ speech in Book 9—the speech which tells the parable of the Litai and the paradeigma of Meleager, the speech which Achilles seems to have misinterpreted—is no longer the only time a parable and a paradeigma are performed by the same speaker.^42

While it is common to state that the Niobe paradeigma is the only paradeigma that Achilles performs, I’ve suggested that, more accurately, it is the first paradeigma that Achilles performs according to the speech genre’s conventions. Following on Achilles’ corruptions of paradigmatic speech, the Niobe paradeigma caps a negotiation of singularities, and the action of Book 24 is the conclusion of a systematic dissection of

^40. Translation on p. 331 above.
singularity and exemplarity throughout the *Iliad*, a dissection which ultimately comments on the ability to recognize and comprehend *paradeigmate*. What is marvelous is that this happens even at the level of syntactic conventions and formulae, and that the use and abuse of the conventions of traditional speech genres by Homeric heroes is so nuanced as even to allow broader interpretation of both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. And, indeed, conventions shared by the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have shed light on each of the poems in turn. Yet the fact that *Iliad* 24, on which we have focused especially, has often been called the most ‘Odyssean’ book of the *Iliad* does not entail that *Iliad* 24 is later addition or that a historical ‘Homer’ was already beginning to compose the *Odyssey*. I am instead inclined to consider the two poems as complementary oral traditions, but one might simply, and neutrally, consider it in this way: if the last book of the *Iliad* caps the story of Achilles learning to negotiate between singularity and exemplarity in suffering, then the *Odyssey* offers, in part, a meditation on a single man who learns to draw on his own tradition of exemplarity in suffering.

43. For Macleod, the *Iliad* is “if not didactic in form, profoundly ethical in spirit” (1983: 14).
44. Cf. Richardson 1993: 21–24 for a survey and the view that the *Odyssey* was taking shape in a Homer’s mind as he was finishing the *Iliad*; the view of Rutherford 1993 is that “the composer of the concluding scenes of the *Odyssey*, whether or not he was also the composer of the earlier part of the poem, had the *Iliad* in his mind” (45).
In the three verses of iambic trimeter above, Aeschylus has composed a most fitting and validating conclusion to the present study. Clytemnestra’s speech to Cassandra, comprising a two-verse paradeigma following the imperatives of v. 1039, features the discourse marker καὶ γάρ combined with ποτὲ, the Zitatformel φασί, and the noun παῖδα drawn from the genealogical register, all within the context of the Hesiodic tradition of Alkmene and Heracles. It is even traditional in its application of the τλά- topos. Only with the addition of a ὅς- or ἥ-ῥα relative clause could Clytemnestra have demonstrated more clearly to the newly arrived Cassandra her mastery of speech and her authority. In fact, this instance of a paradeigma is the most densely packed and overdetermined we have encountered: Clytemnestra covers all her bases. Of course, I am not the first to notice these features of her speech: Eduard Fraenkel characteristically details them in his commentary, laying out its traditional elements in such a way as to refute a previous claim that this Aeschylean passage must have its ‘source’ in the passage of Panyassis’

1. Translation: “Step down from this wagon and don’t be proud. You know, they say that Alkmene’s son endured to be sold [and eat the bread of slavery].”
2. Cf. too Fraenkel ad 1040. Denniston and Page (ad 1040) note also the τοι.
3. On Clytemnestra’s deft manipulation of language, see Goldhill 1984: 66–79. I write “have demonstrated more clearly” rather than “have communicated more clearly” because the lack of communication is precisely the issue in the scene to come (again, see Goldhill 1984: 81–95).
Heracleia that we studied above. Sixty years ago Fraenkel was right to stress the traditionality of these discourse characteristics, and I hope to have demonstrated in this study the extent to which they were communicative by virtue of their conventionality in Archaic Greece—in hexameter, lyric, and wisdom discourse alike.

We might wonder why Clytemnestra has selected in particular the paradeigma of Heracles, and again Fraenkel would have anticipated us in considering the possibilities (ad 1040; my emphasis):

Perhaps the passage is to be interpreted as meaning that the queen wishes to make some friendly remark and conceal her true feelings, and as she has no genuine comfort to offer, resorts to the conventional phrases which are ready at hand. The audience may feel that the exhortation is somewhat stale. However, I would certainly not like to exclude the possibility that what is intended here is a suitable reference to a dignified heroic example.

The concern for ‘suitability’ is essentially one of καιρός, the Archaic Greek concept with which we began, and which is indeed as essential to paradeigmata as it is to Archaic Greek poetics as a whole. Yet it has been of little explicit concern in this study: instead of focusing on Achilles’ choice of the Niobe story for his paradeigma in Iliad 24, I have focused on the fact that he seems to have drawn from the content and style of the Hesiodic Catalogue tradition. To put it another way, I have emphasized καιριός style as much as I have καιριός material. That style, that way of speaking, I suggest, shapes an audience’s interpretation as much as the way in which individual plot details in a paradigmatic tale fit with the framing narrative. Moreover, the association of that style with Hesiodic poetry even seems to be efficacious at the interaction level. In the Aeschylean example above, Heracles may not seem the most καιριός paradeigma for Cassandra at the level of mythological detail, but it is καιριός at the level of mythos.

Indeed, I have stressed the importance of Hesiodic genealogical discourse above all, specifically the Hesiodic Theogony and Catalogue of Women, to the paradigmatic way of speaking. I had no intention of doing so as I began my research; this was to be a

---

5. Recall, e.g., Eustathius’ comment on Phoenix’ speech in the Embassy of Iliad 9 (p. 1 above).
study primarily of Homeric poetry within a broader survey of exemplary tales in Archaic Greek discourse. Yet the set of discourse characteristics that proved most consistent and significant in the articulation of Homeric paradeigmata—the use of discourse particles, the syntagms centered on the relative clauses, and their register and themes—consistently led to the language of genealogical catalogues. Nor had I any intention of writing about Pindar to so great an extent as I have; in fact, I had hoped that the constraints of space and time would leave me with only enough pages to make superficial gestures to a future study that some other researcher might undertake. Yet the grandeur of Pindaric poetry—what makes it μουσικάς άωτος—is that it is not only encyclopedic in its poetic conventions but it is able to employ each convention so effectively. To ignore what Pindar has done with the discourse characteristics of genealogical catalogue in his own version of paradigmatic discourse would have been, if not impossible, utterly ill-advised.

In fact, my findings in the two ‘Pindaric Textures’ chapters strike me as those that may best measure up to the sociolinguistic inspiration of the present work. At its outset I proposed that we might make sociocultural claims based on the discourse features of paradeigmata in the poetic and wisdom discourses of Archaic Greece. Specifically, I suggested that “stylistics is sociological, and style is socially symbolic.” In turn, I argued that several of Pindar’s epinikia exhibit discourse characteristics that highlight these epinikia’s sociocultural equivalence to the traditional genealogical catalogue poetry of Archaic Greece: just as genealogical catalogues codified elite lineages in early and Archaic Greece, so too did Pindaric epinikia codify the athletic achievements and magnanimity of victor’s families. Moreover, as I suggested for Clytemnestra’s Heracles paradeigma above, what makes these exemplary tales communicative as paradeigmata seems to be, in many cases, as much their Hesiodic style as the alignment of mythological detail with biographical details or historical context. Given the apparent paradigmatic

---

import of the ‘Catalogue’ style, we may wish, in turn, to consider more seriously the paradigmatic nature of the Catalogue in its original performance context.  

Part Three, which comprises two studies of singularity and suffering in the Iliad and Odyssey, is prefaced by a passage from Pindar’s Olympian 13 that I have not yet discussed. It states simply that the victor Xenophon has attained what no other mortal has before him: ἀντεβόλησεν τῶν ἀνὴρ θνατὸς οὔπω τις πρότερον.  

In a genre like epinikion, where one’s victories are so often catalogued along with the victories of one’s relatives—Olympian 13 included—this is a remarkable statement. It shows that, for all their concern with precedents, Archaic Greeks were also fascinated by those who had no precedents.  

My study of the Iliad elaborates this idea in an investigation into both the syntactic formulae of paradeigma and the formulae of singularity. Like Penelope in the Odyssey, Achilles and Priam in the Iliad are formulaically designated as having no precedents. Achilles, moreover, is singular in his unwillingness to tell a paradeigma properly until Book 24; in all the preceding books he only underscores his singularity by this unwillingness to draw on the past according to the conventions of paradeigmata.

Such long range thematic resonances may appear to point to a single creative genius, but it has not been my goal to argue either for or against such a position. Foremost I have endeavored to provide a corpus-linguistic foundation for evaluating those studies which either bring as evidence of a single ‘Homer’ the rich and resonant paradeigmata of Homeric poetry alongside those studies which condemn these inset narratives as interpolations rife with illogic and late linguistic features. I have not offered, and do not now offer, a solution, but I am compelled to highlight again the way in which Homeric poetry articulates its broadest themes of exemplarity, singularity, and suffering at the level of syntax, discourse markers, and the lexical items of restricted registers. I cannot prove that the interpretations of Part Three, built as they are on conventional patterns of formulae

---

7. Several possible performance scenarios of the Catalogue tradition fit with its being paradigmatic or aretological. See Rutherford 2000: 83, 91–83, 93 with n.56 on p. 128 above.
8. See p. 312 above.
9. This is indeed a topos in agonistic descriptions.
and syntax, ‘bubbled up’ within an oral tradition over centuries; nor that they were adeptly deployed by a single poet raised in that tradition. Yet I hope that this pair of studies attests to some of the subtlety with which even the most sweeping themes of the Homeric epics are articulated at the most minute level of discourse conventions associated with the paradigmatic way of speaking. To my mind, that subtlety does much to imperil the very possibility of viewing an oral traditional Homeric poetry as “a corpus vile of lays or motifs or formulae.”

My reading of the Odyssey, too, hopes to deliver studies of traditional elements and discourse conventions from such an underestimation of their elegant application. There I have suggested that the way in which Odysseus draws on the tales he has himself told, either in self-exhortation or in crafting paradeigmata for others, is a sort of self-mythologization. This interpretation was founded on patterns of discourse markers and syntax, and even touches on the theme of storytelling in the Odyssey and the troubling way in which Odysseus himself might be charged with ἀτασθαλίαι. This Odyssean pattern of self-mythologization, however, is something we also observed in Archaic Greek lyric. I have suggested that we can see this very phenomenon in Sappho, Alcaeus, Archilochus, and Theognis, each of whom uses the discourse marker καὶ γάρ to create, and mythologize, an authoritative poetic persona. Those discourse characteristics elsewhere associated with an authoritative exemplary narrative seem to have been appropriated by those poetic traditions to construct authoritative personae.

I began these closing remarks with Aeschylus, who, as a younger contemporary of Pindar, stands at the cusp of the Archaic and the Classical periods. Yet his style is decidedly that of the Archaic period, and it is no surprise that he should continue to draw on the conventional discourse features of Archaic paradeigmata. Nevertheless, the markedness of these various discourse features did fade with time, and the particle string καὶ γάρ comes to be used without any special significance other than added emphasis: for

---

10. Macleod 1983: 1: “So in 1981 we can expect more and more scholars, for good or ill, to consider Homer as a poet rather than a corpus vile of lays or motifs or formulae.”
example, the pair of particles is often used throughout the Homeric scholia as a means of introducing explanations even without exemplification. But that does not mean that in the fourth century a prose stylist such as Plato could not continue to use this aspect of traditional *paradeigma*-telling to great effect. In fact, when in Book 10 of the Republic Plato refers to a suspiciously 'ancient quarrel' between poetry and philosophy, he does so in a way we can now clearly recognize as distinctly 'mythologizing' (607b1–c3):

Let that, then, be our defense to recalling our discussion of poetry, that at the time we were right to banish her from the city, being such as she is. For argument constrained us. And let’s tell her, lest she charges us with austerity and boorishness, that there is an ancient quarrel between philosophy and poetry. You know, that “dog yelping at its master” and “mighty in the empty chatter of fools” and the “mob of very wise critics” and the “subtle thinkers” who “are beggars,” and all the other many indications of their ancient opposition.

The quotations that Plato uses to testify to this quarrel are very likely fragments from Old Comedy. ‘Old’ Comedy, of course, does not suggest a particularly ‘ancient’ quarrel, and, for this reason, it is all the more effective that Plato’s Socrates here introduces these snippets of verse with the discourse marker καὶ γάρ; nor does the deictic ἐκείνη detract

---

11. Cf., e.g., Σ II. 1.30a, which contains one of Nicanor’s notes on the expressive pronunciation of a hexameter verse: καθ’ ἑαυτὸ τοῦτο προφερόμεθα: καὶ γάρ ἐμφαντικῶτερον (“We pronounce this all by itself. For it is more vivid”). On the Homeric scholia’s preservation of Alexandrian performance practices of the Homeric poems, see the excellent analysis of Mitchell 2006.

12. The antiquity of the quarrel was first suspected in 1897 by Adam 1963. See further Nightingale 1995: 60–92; Murray 1996: 18 (and ad 607a2–3, b5–6).

13. On the attribution of each of these fragments to Old Comedy, I follow here the convincing suggestion of Glenn Most (Seminar, Harvard University, 2 April 2010). In current collections, they may be found not in PCG, but among the *fragmenta adespota* of PMG (987). The text of the Platonic passage is that of Burnet’s 1902 OCT but for the reading of κριτῶν for κρατῶν at 607c1, also with Most.
from his mythologization of the decades-old fragments into an properly ‘ancient’ past. Notice too that Socrates’ statement preceding the καὶ γάρ discourse marker—παλαιά μὲν τὶς διαφορὰ φιλοσοφία τε καὶ ποιητικῇ—resembles the sort of zero-copula, generalizing statement that is familiar from the gnomai of Archaic Greek poetry, which we so often observed to precede paradeigmata. The discursive strategy is familiar from narrative exemplification in the poetic and wisdom discourses of Archaic Greece: Plato raises the ancient quarrel to the level of gnome, and he exemplifies it with quotations that, while likely relatively recent, are retrojected into the distant past in the manner of a mythological paradeigmata. Of course, Plato is no stranger to argument from myth: after positing this ancient quarrel between poetry and philosophy Plato turns to the Myth of Er (614b2–8):  

Αλλ᾽ οὐ μὲντοι σοι … Ἀλκίνου γε ἀπόλογον ἐρῶ, ἀλλ᾽ ἀλκίμου μὲν ἄνδρός, Ἡρός τοῦ Ἀρμενίου, τὸ γένος Παμφύλου· ὥς ποτε ἐν πολέμῳ τελευτήσας, ἀναιρεθέντων δεκαταίων τῶν νεκρῶν ἣδη διεφθαράμενων, ὑγίες μὲν ἀναβεβή, κομίθευς δὲ οἴκαδε μέλλων θάπτεσθαι δωδεκαταῖος ἐπὶ τῇ πυρᾷ κείμενος ἀνεβυθὼ, ἀναβιοὺς δ᾽ ἐλεγεν ἃ ἐκεῖ ἴδοι.

Well, I am not going to tell you an apologos of Alcinous, but one of a brave man, Er, the son of Armenias, Pamphylian by race, who once died in battle. When the ten-day-old corpses were picked up they were already decaying, but his was healthy. He was taken home and about to be buried on the twelfth day, but lying on the pyre he revived. Having come back to life he related what he saw there.

The ‘apologos of Alcinous’ refers to Books 9–12 of the Odyssey, but Socrates almost certainly means the Nekyia in particular, for Er recounts the journey of his soul into death. Yet beyond the Catalogue-ic context of the Nekyia, we might also notice how Socrates opens this paradigmatic tale: with the genealogical register of τὸ γένος Παμφύλου and

---

14. No summary of the interpretive issues is possible here, but see Halliwell 2007 for a helpful discussion with a succinct, recent bibliography. On myth as both “foil and method” in philosophical discourse, see Morgan 2000.

15. On the term Ἀλκίνου ἀπόλογος, cf. Ael. VH 13.14. As to Socrates’ reference to the Nekyia in particular here, notice even the phrase ἃ ἐκεῖ ἴδοι: at p. 80 above we saw the Book 11’s catalogue of heroines built upon the repetition of the verb εἶδον.
the syntagm ὃς ποτε. It is, I think, no accident that Plato articulates the myth’s beginning in this way. For some, this style endured.

16. For ὃς ποτε in Plato, cf. only, and fittingly perhaps, Phdr. 249b4.
Appendix A | Reorganizing the data of des Places and Bonifazi

In her 2004 article, Bonifazi usefully re-presents 37 occurrences from des Places’ treatment of relative pronouns introducing myths, adding another 8 instances that, while they do not introduce myths, “demarcate internal narrative sequences of a myth” (48). In her analysis, Bonifazi reorganizes des Places’ presentation; I shall now reorganize this data once more, in Table 1, to situate my own argument with respect to theirs. Moreover, I hope to make my argument easily verifiable, if not immediately transparent. In particular, my presentation will show that in Pindar the particular pronominal syntagm ὅς-ποτε is, while not a fail-safe marker, sufficiently marked. My own table will omit some information available in previous such tables, where it is not directly relevant to my present argument. Table 1 is that which re-presents the information of des Places and Bonifazi. Table 2 is supplementary to the first in that it looks at all instances of ὅς-ποτε, not just those judged by des Places and Bonifazi to have narrative significance. Following each table I explicate individual instances and comment on the findings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Bonifazi</th>
<th>Pindar</th>
<th>Pronoun syntagm</th>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Genealogical diction</th>
<th>Additional context or sense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Strong genealogical context</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>P. 1.16</td>
<td>τόν ποτε</td>
<td>Τυφώς (16)</td>
<td>θρέψεν (17)</td>
<td>Typhos³</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


2. Bonifazi’s reorganization is largely, but not entirely, based on gender and grammatical case.

3. It is difficult not to think of Typhos as a Theogonic figure. It is natural that he is surrounded by genealogical diction in the Theogony (306, 821) but see also h.Ap. (305–307): καὶ ποτε
2) 17 *P*. 4.10 τό ποτε γενεά (10) παῖς (11) *Catalogue context*

3) 14 *P*. 9.5 τάν … ποτέ⁴ Κυράνας (4) ἔτικτεν (16) *Catalogue context*

4) 42 *P*. 9.15 ὃν ποτε Υψέος (13) ἔτικτεν *Catalogue context*

5) 1 *O*. 13.63 ὃς … ποτέ⁵ σφετέρου πατρός υἱόν (63) Glaukos and *Il*. 6, ἔξειδετ’ (61)⁶

6) 34 *I*. 1.13 τόν ποτε παῖδα (13) παῖδα (13)

7) 43 *I*. 1.12 ἐν δὲ καὶ πατρίδι παῖδα (12) τέκεν παῖδα (12–13) πατρίδι

8) 11 *P*. 8.39 τόν ὄνπερ ποτέ’ λόγου (38) παῖς (39), υἱός (40) αὐξόμεν … πάτραν (38)

9) 30 *P*. 4.20 τόν ποτέ κεῖνος ὃνπερ λόγον (38) παῖς (39), υἱὸς (40) ἐξεύχετ’ *Catalogue context*

10) 35 *N*. 5.9 τάν ποτ’ ματρόπολιν Αἰακίδας (8), τίκτε’ (13) ἐγέραιρεν µατρόπολιν (9)

11) 45 *O*. 10.104 ἄ ποτε ὃς … τὸν παῖδα (99–100) Youthfulness also of victor

---

| 12) 19 | *N*. 4.25 σὺν ὃν µατρόπολιν Ἡρακλέος — Heracles |
| 13) 15 | *O*. 3.13 τόν ποτ` ἐλαίας (13) — Heracles, festival action, µνάσι (15) |
| 14) 23 | *P*. 10.31 παρ’ οἷς ποτε τεχνα (6) — Perseus, έφευρε (7) |
| 15) 16 | *P*. 12.6 ὃν … ποτ’ αίνος (12) οἰκλείδαν (12) Amphiaraos and Adrastos (13) |
| 16) 29 | *O*. 6.12 τελείας (6) — Perseus, ἐρείπε (7) |

---

| 17) 40 | *O*. 3.31 τόν ἐλαμφον (29) — τόν ποτε (13), ἐν ποτε (29), Heracles |
| 18) 41 | *O*. 3.36 τοῖς γάρ διδύμως παισί (35) — τόν ποτε (13), ἐν ποτε (29), Heracles |

---

δεξαμένη χρυσοθρόνου ἐτρέφειν Ἡρης | δεινόν τ’ ἄργαλέου τε Τυφάονα πῆμα βροτόσιν, | ὃν ποτ’ ἄρ’ Ἡρη ἔτικτε χολωσαµένη Διί πατρί… ("Once [the spring] even accepted from gold-throned Hera the terrible and vexing Typhos, bane to mortals, and nurtured him, whom Hera once bore in anger at father Zeus…"). (On the Hesiodic nature of this "Pythian" half of the hymn, see Martin 2000a.) Typhos also appears in the simile at *Il*. 2.781–5, lacking anything from the genealogical register. Within Pindar, see also *O*. 4.7, *P*. 8.16, and ἱ. 93.

⁴ While there occur 3 words between the ὃς and the ποτέ, I am surprised to differ from des Places and Bonifazi in considering them part of a syntagm. See also my 1.A.5 (*O*. 13.63) below. Both instances are treated by Slater alongside clearer instances of the syntagm, if more loosely described as “within rel. cl.” (s.v. ποτέ 1.b). Nevertheless, the diction supports its treatment as the ὃς-ποτέ syntagm.

⁵ See n.4 on p. 351 just above.


⁷ Cp. τελέω at *P*. 3.9, *I*. 6.46 (c. παῖδα), and *Πα*. 7b.52 (c. γόνον).
19) 5 I. 4.55 ὃς υἱὸς (55) υἱὸς (55) καὶ τοί ποτ’ (52), Heracles
20) 31 P. 9.80 τόν Ἰόλαου (79) — ἐγγον ποτὲ καὶ (79), Catalogue context
21) 8 P. 3.8 τόν μὲν Ἀσκλαπιών (6) θρέψεν ποτὲ (5), τελέσσαι (9) Catalogue context
22) 33 O. 9.70 τοῦ Μενοίτιον (70) ὑόν (69), παῖς (70) Catalogue context
23) 32 P. 9.107 τάν κούραν (106a) σύγγονοι (108) Catalogue context
24) 22 O. 6.29 ἂ τοι Πιτάναυ (28) παῖδα ... τεκέν (28), γένος (25) Nymph Pitana and Poseidon, λέγεται (29)
25) 21 I. 5.35 τοῖ καὶ Αἰακοῦ παιδών τε (35) Priamel of sacrifices
26) 13 I. 6.27 τόν πατρός (27) Άιαντος Τελανιάδα, πατρός (26–7) Heracles’ labors
27) 26 P. 1.54 ὃς Ποίαντος υἱόν (53)
28) 38 O. 7.32 τῷ μὲν Πλατολέομου — τάσδέ ποτε (30), ἐνδαποτέ (34)

D. Unmarked by genealogical register or context

29) 25 O. 2.81 ὃς Ἀχιλλέα (79) —
30) 2 P. 6.30 ὃς Αὐτίλοχος (28) πατρός (30) ἐγεντο καὶ πρότερον (28)
31) 27 I. 8.19 ὃ Ζηνί (18) —
32) 18 O. 1.25 τοῦ Πέλοπος (24) —
33) 37 P. 5.69 τῷ μυχόν (68) —
34) 6 O. 10.24 ὃν ἀγώνα (24) — Heracles, ἀρχαῖων σάματι πάρ Πέλοπος (24), ἔκτισσατο (25)
35) 7 O. 8.31 τόν Άιακοῦ (30) παῖς ὁ Λατοῦς (31)
36) 39 P. 12.9 τόν χρήνου (8) —
37) 36 I. 4.36b τάν Άιαντος ἀλκάν (35b)
38) 24 N. 3.22 ὃς κιόνων (21) —
39) 10 N. 10.60 τόν γάρ Κάστορος (59)
40) 20 N. 7.33 τοῖ γάρ ὁ βοσθων —
41) 9 P. 11.17 τόν δή Ὀρέστα (16) —
42) 3 N. 3.34 ὃς καὶ Πηλεὺς (33) — καὶ ποτε (38), ποτε (39)
43) 28 I. 8.49 ὃ καὶ Ἀχιλλέας (48) —
44) 4 N. 9.11 ὃς τότε μὲν Ἀδραστος (9) — keith (11), γάρ ἀμφιμαρηνοτε (13)

8. See Bonifazi 45n15.
Section 1.A represents those cases of the syntagm with a strong genealogical context. 1.A.1–7 represent to me incontrovertible cases; certainly when 1.A.6–7 are taken together, in which case a kind of conjunction-reduction is clear. I list 1.A.8 next as a root-conscious hinge upon which we can see Pindar turn the ideas of individual lineage and kinship community in the words πάτραν, παῖς, and υἱοὺς. This is evident, too, in 1.A.9–10 with the focus on the ματρόπολις (the object of ἐγέραιρεν in 1.A.8 as πάτραν is αὔξων in 1.A.8). I include 1.A.11 in consideration of its slightly broader context of the victor’s genealogy and Pindar’s mythologization of recent victory.

In §1.B I list instances that cluster around a nexus of aetiology, genealogy, and the monster-slaying heroes Heracles and Perseus, who were proper sons of god and woman. As such they may have had especially prominent roles in Hesiodic poetry, even the Catalogue in particular, although these figures no doubt appeared elsewhere. In the case of Amphiaraos and Adrastos, it is much more likely that the Thebaid would have been the most extended account of this lineage, but he does appear in the Catalogue, and, as a son of Melampous, must have appeared in a Hesiodic Melampodia.
In §1.C I have listed instances of the relative without ποτέ, though I have indicated diction that could endanger my claim that ὅς-ποτε—as against other syntagms involving ὅς—is marked for a genealogical register. I do not, however, consider these cases to be valid counter-examples. In cases such as 1.C.19–21, I cite linguistic conjunction-reduction as the reason for a differently articulated relative pronoun: note in each case a slightly preceding ποτέ, as indicated in the rightmost column. So, too, in the cases of 1.C.17–18, where I would not expect ὅς-ποτε syntagm in isolation, but neither would I expect it here given the previous τάν ποτέ (13) and ἄν ποτέ (29). Though there exists slight genealogical diction in 1.C.25–27, I do not consider these examples sufficiently marked. On 1.C.28 (O. 7.32), see especially n.39 on p. 288 above. It would be reasonable to expect that 1.C.22–24 would exhibit the ὅς-ποτε syntagm, but we do not find it. In the cases of 1.C.22–23 (O. 9.70 and P. 9.107) we are dealing with odes that already have a strong genealogical context and register, and economy are likely at play. As for 1.C.24 (O. 6.29), it is very marked in diction and in theme, so I can only suggest competing compositional concerns: setting aside meter and all else, the potentially popping plosive combination *ἄ ποτε Ποσειδάωνι may be enough.¹⁴ In all, I do not find these instances in §1.C to be compelling counter-examples to my argument.

Section D represents those instances of the relative pronoun that function in a relatively unmarked way, or at least in a way unmarked for genealogical narrative. I do supply instances of genealogical diction or extended contexts that would be used in an argument for these instances’ significance to my argument, but I consider them to be all so unmarked that they underscore the combination of ὅς-ποτε and genealogical register above. If pressed, only the aetiological context of 1.D.33 (O. 10.24) seems ripe for the syntagm.

son Amphilokhos appears in fr. 278 M–W. Interestingly, Σ Il. 23.679 (Hes. fr. 192 M–W) glosses the description of Euryalos—ὁς ποτε Θήβας δ’ ἠλθε δεδουπότος Οἰδιπόδαο—with Ἡσίοδος δὲ φησιν ἐν Θήβαις αὐτοῦ ἀποθανόντος Ἀργείαν τὴν Ἀδράστου σὺν ἄλλοις ἐλθεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν κηδείαν αὐτοῦ {οἰδίπόδαο}. ¹⁴ The closest comparandum would perhaps be the τῷ ποτ’ ἐκ πόντου σαώθη of P. 4.161.
Again, Table 1 above, comprising those sections A-D, shows only those 37 instances of the relative clause that introduce a central myth along with Bonifazi’s 8 additions to those. But, in order to fully represent the conventions of ὅς-ποτε syntagm in §§A-B, we must also consider the following instances in Table 2, which do not appear in Bonifazi’s list, as reorganized above.

**Table 10: The ὅς-ποτε syntagm beyond des Places and Bonifazi**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Pindar</th>
<th>Pronoun syntagm</th>
<th>Antecedent</th>
<th>Genealogical diction</th>
<th>Extended context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1   | P. 4.46 | τόν ποτ’ | υίός (45) | τίκτε (46)           | Euphamos, born of Europa and Poseidon  
|     |        |                 |            |                      |                  |
| 2   | P. 3.5  | σίος … ποτέ | Χήρωνα (1) | γόνου (4), θρέμευ (5) | Catalogue context |
| 3   | O. 7.71 | ἔθα … ποτέ | νάσος (71) | μικρείς τέκνες … παιδᾶς | Nymph Rhodes with Helios  
| 4   | O. 9.9  | τὸ δῆ ποτε | ἀκρωτήριου (7) | ἐδου Ίπποδαμείας (10) | Catalogue context  
| 5   | I. 6.48 | ὅν … ποτ’ | θηρο (48) |                      | ME context, Heracles  
| 6   | P. 4.107 | τάν ποτε | βασιλεομέναν (106) | πατρό (106), εἰπὲ γέννα (100) | inherited rule, Jason (o.o.)  
| 7   | P. 4.152 | ὁ ποτε | θρόνος (152) | Κρηθείδας | inherited rule, Jason (o.o.)  
|     |        |                 |            |                      |                  |
| B.  |        |                 |            |                      |                  |
| 8   | O. 6.75 | σίος ποτε | τοις | — | victors  
| 9   | P. 3.74 | τούς … ποτε | στεφάνοις | — | victor  
| 10  | N. 9.52 | ἄς ποθ’ | φιάλαις | —; οΙ Λατοίδα (53) | victor  
|     |        |                 |            |                      |                  |
| C.  |        |                 |            |                      |                  |
| 11  | I. 8.52 | ταί … ποτε | ἵνας (52) | — | List of Trojans (54–55)  
| 12  | P. 6.21 | τά ποτ’ | ἐφισμούσαν (20) | υίόν (22) | Cheiron, Hesiodic context  
| 13  | O. 3.29 | ἄν ποτε | ἐλαφον (29) | — | Heracles, festival action  
| 14  | P. 4.161 | τῷ ποτ’ | κριου (161) | — | θαυμαστός (163), Pelias (o.o.)  
| 15  | N. 8.18 | ὁσπερ και … ποτε | ὄλβος (17) | — | Kinyras’ wealth  
| D.  |        |                 |            |                      |                  |
| 16  | O. 7.30 | ταδέ ποτε | —; ης χονος | — | οἰκιστήρ, Tlapolemos  
| 17  | P. 9.26 | νιν … ποτ’ | —; Κυράναν (18) | — | Catalogue context  

---

15. Hes. fr. 253 M–W (=ΣΣ Pind. P. 4.36c, 15b, 79b) reports the ehoï of Mekionike from the ME, according to Asclepidaides, who there bore Euphemus by Poseidon.  
Section 2.A comprises untroubling instances of a strong genealogical context for slight variations on the ὅς-ποτε syntagm, even if the relative be οἷος or ἐνθα. Of 2.A.6–7 I note that this pair of instances is brought on by Pelias’ questioning Jason of his lineage (97–100):

‘Ποίαν γαῖαν, ὦ ξεῖν’, εὔχεαι πατρίδι ἐμεν; καὶ τίς ἄνθρωποι σε χαμαιγενέων πολιᾶς ἐξανῆκεν γαστρός; ἐχθιστοῖς μὴ ψεύδεσιν καταμιάναις εἰπὲ γένναν.’

After describing his upbringing by Cheiron (102–105), Jason declares that he has come to reclaim the ancestral kingship of his father. We may then consider that Jason uses the syntagm at 107 (2.D.6) to emphasize the genealogical basis of his claim to rule within an answer to Pelias’ inquiry of his lineage. Jason repeats the syntagm at line 152 (2.D.7), speaking again of ancestral rule.

In §2.B I list three instances that are directly related to what I have called the mythologization of the victor, not unlike 1.A.11 just above (q.v.).

At first glance, the instances in §2.C seem troubling, but they are not all so far from explanation. In the case of 2.C.11 (I. 8.52) the relative has the peculiar antecedent of ἴνας but it is remarkable that these ‘sinews’ are then listed as those who worked to defend Troy: Memnon, Hector, and other great chiefs (ἄλλους ἀριστέας). In 2.C.12 (P. 6.21) the relative clause expands the noun ἐφημοσύνας, which, at first glance, bears no genealogical relation; the surprising thing here, however, is that there is indeed a Hesiodic context through Cheiron. In fact, a scholion on this passage suggests that Pindar here draws on the Hesiodic Precepts of Cheiron. That Pindar may associate the ὅς-ποτε syntagm not just with the genealogical catalogue such as the Megalai Ehoiai or Catalogue, but with Hesiod in general may be suggested by this instance, especially when considered

17. For ἐνθα ποτε, cp. O. 7.33 and P. 4.4.
within the more general trend. In 2.C.13 (O. 3.29) the syntagm is used for an action of the Olympic games, as founded by Heracles. While one may find the syntagm used of aetia in Homeric poetry, too, it may be significant that the context here has to do with Heracles.\footnote{On Heracles in Hesiodic poetry, see n.12 on p. 353 above. For the use of this syntax in apparent aitia within Homeric poetry, cf. perhaps Od. 17.340 for the ash threshold of Odysseus’ home. But that appears as much a genealogy when one considers the syntactic similarity to Il. 4.474, which is both genealogy and aetiology.} I am inclined to take 2.C.14 (P. 4.161) in conjunction with 2.A.6–7, since it is part of Pelias’ response to Jason’s speeches. Lastly in this section, I include 2.C.15 (N. 8.18), though the syntagm is at its weakest here: \(\text{ὅσπερ καὶ Κινύραν ἔβρισε πλούτῳ ποντίῳ ἐν ποτὲ Κύπρῳ} \) (“which [happiness] made Kinyras heavy with wealth once on sea-girt Cyprus”). This brief narrative, which follows on a gnome, leads only into a poetic statement, making it a very brief parenthesis and probably unmarked. On the whole, I do not find these instances, which I label “Less clear instances,” very troubling at all.

I separately categorize two instances in §2.D, instances which Slater considers “in quasi rel. cl., c. part., simm.”\footnote{S.v. ποτὲ 1.c. As above (n.41 on p. 288), I omit P. 4.258.} The second instance, 2.D.17 (P. 9.26), I discuss above in the context of Pythian 9.\footnote{See p. 287 above.} Of the first, 2.D.16 (O. 7.30), the adjectival \(τᾶσδε\) is combined with a \(ποτὲ\) in speaking of the foundation of Rhodes by Tlapolemos, but the larger view offers good support: Pindar is trying to set straight the lineage of the Rhodians as descended from Heracles and Amyntor.\footnote{See n.39 on p. 288 above.}
Appendix B | Particles and discourse in relative clauses

Relative clauses in Archaic Greek poetry are many and various, yet I have proposed that we can say something of their poetic conventions and generic associations based on their consistent combination with certain particles and adverbs. This combination, of course, observes what has come to be known as Wackernagel’s Law, which states that the placement of these enclitics in a given clause is consistently the second position. Thus it is natural that we commonly observe syntagms such as ὁς ποτε and ὁς ῥα.

When combined with forms of ἀρα and ποτε, I suggest that the discursive context is most likely the catalogue, the individual genealogy, and the paradeigma. In support of this proposal and its transparency, this appendix details aspects of the combination of particles and adverbs with pronouns in the relative clauses of Archaic Greek poetry. To begin, let us compare the use of the relative pronoun ὁς in Homeric and Hesiodic poetry with various particles in Table 11 (just below):

Table 11: Relative-pronoun syntagms in Homeric and Hesiodic poetry

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntagm</th>
<th>Homeric poetry</th>
<th>Hesiodic poetry</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ὁς + ∅</td>
<td>212</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


25. On the idea of specific Relativpartikeln see Schmitt 1889 and, of ἀρα in particular, Grimm 1962.

26. As I show below, other uses of the syntagm are normally differentiated by added particles or adverbs. In the simile, for example, a τε is normally added to the ὁς-ῥα syntagm.

27. The data were assembled using the TLG, and therefore represent the editions drawn on there. For the total number of verses, I have used 27,803 for Homeric poetry (15,693 in Il.; 12,110 in Od.) and 3,024 for Hesiodic (1,022 in Th.; 828 in WD; 750 in Catalogue; 424 in Sc.). I do not count the Homeric Hymns in these initial statistics.
This table hardly makes the case that ὃς ποτὲ and ὃς ῥα are most closely associated with what we might called the ‘Hesiodic’ or ‘catalogue’ style, but neither has this table been properly constructed. After all, ‘Hesiodic’ poetry is not specific enough—we should be considering only the genealogical Theogony and Catalogue— and Homeric poetry is to be seen not as a monolithic style, but as a super-genre that comprises many speech genres.

It would be too difficult and methodologically opaque to try to reconstruct Table 11 above, but below I have assembled several tables that aim to lay bare the way in which these syntagms are conventionally embedded in traditional genealogical discourse. I have subdivided their instances first by particle/adverb, then by case and gender. Instances of combination (e.g., τόν ῥά ποτέ) will be considered together at the end, and will not be listed in other tables.

---

28. The use of ὃς δη and ὃς δε over ὁ δε(ε) seems largely governed by metrical sedes: ὃς δη and ὃς δε are most often verse-initial and, but for a few instances at the BD, otherwise occur at the start of the second metron. It is likely that we should see meter as the greatest factor in the choice between ὃς δη and ὃς δε: ὃς δη is most often followed by a long syllable (esp. τοι) but for the cases where there is epic correpson, and ὃς δε by a short (esp. κε).

29. See on ὃς δη (n.29 above).

30. E.g., ὃς ἄν, ὃς μὲν γάρ κεν, ὃς γάρ, ὃς νῦν.

31. The Hesiodic corpus of interest, then, would comprise 1772 rather than 3024 verses. The Sc. may well have fit into a genealogical catalogue, but is not consistently of the genealogical style.


33. This subdivision is an artifact of the actual lexical searches, but, if there is any division to be made that had consequences for poetic composition in light of register and syntax, case and gender are the most likely.
**Forms of ἃρα following a relative pronoun**

The following five tables, Table 12 to Table 16, give brief descriptions of the context of all of the instances of the combination of ἃρα or ὅς with the relative pronoun (or pronouns acting as we would expect a relative pronoun would). Footnotes accompany some entries, but some summary remarks may be found after Table 16 (p. 365 below).

**Table 12: Masc. sing. relative with ὅς (ὅς ὅς and ὅς ὃς)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Il. 1.405</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς παρὰ Κρονίῳ καθέξος κῦδέι γαῖών</td>
<td>Genealogical comparison; Achilles of Briareos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 2.77</td>
<td>Νέστορ, ὃς ὃς Πύλου ἀνάς ἴν ἡμαβέντος,</td>
<td>Nestor’s background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 2.752</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς εἰς Πηνείον προείκα Καλλίρρου ὕδωρ,</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships; geographical background</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 3.61</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς εἶσιν διὰ δουρὸς ὅπ’ ἀνέφερε ὃς ὃς τε τέχνη</td>
<td>Simile (τη)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 4.520</td>
<td>Πείρως ἱμεροπαράγετος ὃς ὃς Αἰνιόθεν εἰληλοῦτε.</td>
<td>Genealogical background (-ιδῆς)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 4.524</td>
<td>θυμὸν ἀποτυπεῖν· δὲ ἐπεθράμμεν ὃς ὃς ἔβαλεν περ</td>
<td>Very brief clause with ὃς ὃς</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 5.70</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς νόθος μὲν ἔτην, πῦκα δέ ἔτρεφε διὰ Θεανώ</td>
<td>Genealogy of victim; follows υἱόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 5.77</td>
<td>υἱόν ὑπερθύμου Δολοπόνος, ὃς ὃς Σκαμάνδρου</td>
<td>Genealogy of victim; follows υἱόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 5.612</td>
<td>και ἄρα ἈμφανΤ Ἠλίῳ υἱόν, ὃς ὃς εἶν Παισώ</td>
<td>Genealogy of victim; follows υἱόν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 5.650</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς μὲν εὖ ἔρζαντα κακῶν ἠμῖππα μῦθον.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 5.708</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς ἐν ''Υλη ναίεσκε μέγα πλούτοιο μειμλώς,</td>
<td>Digression within catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 6.18</td>
<td>αὐτόν καὶ θεράτοντα Καλήσιον, ὃς ὃς τόθ ἵππον</td>
<td>Return from genealogical digression (τόθ')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 6.131</td>
<td>ἐνθὰ ἵνα, ὃς ὃς θεοίνι ἐπουρανίοις ἔρζεν·</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 6.158</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς ἐκ δήμου ἐλάσσεν· ἐπεὶ πολύ φέρτερος ἤθεν,</td>
<td>Digression within catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 10.318</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς τότε Τροανό τε ἐκτοξεύναντο εἶπεν·</td>
<td>Return from background (ὑμ ὑπ σι, υἱός, ὃς)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 11.123</td>
<td>υἱόν Ἀκτιάχονος δαίφρονος, ὃς ὃς μάλιστα</td>
<td>Genealogy of victims (ύιόσ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 11.231</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς τότε Ατριέδαγο Ἀγαμέμνονας ἀντίον ἦθεν</td>
<td>Return from background (τότ')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 12.380</td>
<td>μαρμάρῳ ὠκρίσειν βαλόν· ὃς ὃς τέχνης ἔντος</td>
<td>Beginning of digression on stone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 12.445</td>
<td>Ἐκτωρ δ’ ἀρπάζατο λᾶον φέρεν, ὃς ὃς πυλάας</td>
<td>Extended background of stone; into simile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 13.63</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς τ’ ἀπ’ αἰγίλιπος πέτρης περιμέρικαις ἀρθίσι</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 13.364</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς νέον πολυμεῖον μετὰ κλέος εἰληλοῦτε.</td>
<td>Genealogy of victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 13.644</td>
<td>Ἀρπαλίων, ὃς ὃς πατρὶ φίλῳ ἐπετο πτολεμίσιον</td>
<td>Genealogical background (follows ἔνθα...ὑίόσ)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 13.646</td>
<td>ὃς ὃς τότε Ατριέδασ μέσον σάκος ὀὕτασ δούρι</td>
<td>Return from victim’s genealogy (cf. Il. 13.644)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

34 There are three instances of the neuter pronoun: II. 22.470 (κρήδεμον ὅς, ὃς ὃς ὃς δῶκε χρυσῆ Αρριδίττι; genealogy of a helmet); Od. 22.327 (κείμενον, ὃς ὃς Ἀγάλλος ἀποπροέρηκε χρυσῆ; background of sword); Od. 24.182 (γυνῶν ὃς ὃς, ὃς ὃς τ’ ζήθεν ἐπιτάρροθος ἴν; meaning ‘that’).
This example follows on a simile (vv. 579–83).

35. This verse is equivalent to Od. 22.331 below, and, given the limited use of this syntagm in the Od., it may be worth noting that it is used of a citharode. At Od. 22.331, the syntagm follows on a Τερπιάδης in the previous verse.)
Table 13: Fem. nom. and acc. singular relative with ἓ (ὦ ἰα, ἢν ἰα)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 4.483</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα τ' ἐν εἰμανεῖ ἔλεος μεγάλοι περιφέκε</td>
<td>Simile (τ')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 7.45</td>
<td>βουλήν, ἦν ἰα θεοῖς εἴφωδον μητιῶδοις-</td>
<td>Helenos and the gods’ intention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 9.566</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα ἐξ ἀρέων μητρὸς κεχολομένος, ἦν ἰα θεοῖς</td>
<td>Phoenix of Cleopatra (Catalogue-ic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 13.443</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα οἱ ἀσπαρίουσαι καὶ οὐράριχοι πελέμεζεν</td>
<td>Elaboration on beating heart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 13.796</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα τ' ὑπὸ βρουττῆς πατρὸς Δίου εἰς πέδου δὲ</td>
<td>Simile (Β')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 16.590</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα τ' ἀνήρ ἀρέων περιμένεσ ή ἐν ἀέθλεω</td>
<td>Comparison (δοσι...τόσου)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 21.494</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα τ' ὑπ' ἱρίκος κολλὴν εἰσέπτατο πέτρην</td>
<td>Simile (Β')</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 9.330</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα κατὰ σπειρὸν κέλευ ἡλίθα πολλή</td>
<td>Odysses describes dung in Cyclops’ cave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 14.7</td>
<td>καλὴ τ' μεγάλῃ τε, περιβρομοῦντ ἐν συβίωτης</td>
<td>Background description of αὐλή</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 20.111</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα μύλην στήσασα ἐπὸς φάτο, σῆμα ἀνακτήν</td>
<td>Woman at mill and omen (σῆμα, φήμην)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc. 4 (= fr. 195.4)</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα γυναικὸν χολον ἐκαίνυτο θηλυκεράνως</td>
<td>Beginning of Alkmene’s entry in Catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sc. 149</td>
<td>σχετήν, ἦν ἰα νὸν τε καὶ ἐκ φρένας εἰλέτο φέρον</td>
<td>Elaboration on Eris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.Ap. 6</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα βιοῦ τ' ἐξάλασε καὶ ἐκλήσει φαρέτρην,</td>
<td>Of Leto within hymn to Apollo (ὦν τε)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.Merc. 26</td>
<td>ἦν ἰα οἱ αὐτεξόλεθεν ἐπ' αὐλείης τὴρησα</td>
<td>Of lyre within hymn to Hermes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14: Masc. acc. singular and plural relative with ἓ (ὦ ἰα, οὐς ἰα)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.21</td>
<td>Νίστορι, τὸν ἰα μάλιστα γερόντων τ' ἀγαμέμνον-</td>
<td>Of Nestor (follows uii)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.309</td>
<td>ομερδαλέος, τὸν ἰα αὐτοῦ Ὀλύμπιος ἦμε φῶς δὲ</td>
<td>Of the σῆμα-snake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.728</td>
<td>τὸν ἰα Ετέκεν Ῥήμη ὑπ' Ὀλυμπί πτολυπότροβα.</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships (υὸς...ἔτεκεν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.742</td>
<td>τὸν ἰα ὑπὸ Πειρήδος τέκετο κλετος Ἰπποδάμεια</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships (υὸς...τέκτο [bis])</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 4.459</td>
<td>τὸν ἰα ἐβάλε πρότος κόρωσος φαλόν ἤπποδασίης,</td>
<td>Post-genealogy (follows -αδης)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 4.501</td>
<td>τὸν ἰα Ὀδυσεύς ἔταρχοι χολωσάμενος βάθε δουρι</td>
<td>Return from genealogy (υὸς...δος)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 5.137</td>
<td>ὃν ἰα τ' ποιήμν ἄγρο ἐπ' εἰροπόκοις ὁδεῖσαι</td>
<td>Simile (τε)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37. See n.20 on p. 148 above with discussion there.

38. The preceding verse—ἐνθ' ἐφιάνυ μέγα σῆμα ἡράκων ἐπὶ νῦντα δασφυνός (v. 308)—makes this instance especially strong support for ‘vividness’ or ‘visualization’.
Il. 5.503  λευκοὶ ὑπερθεὶ γένοντο κοινόκλω, ὃν ῥα δι’ αὐτῶν  Part of a simile
Il. 5.537  τὸν ῥα κατ’ ἀσπίδα δουρὶ βάλε κρείσσον Ἀγαμέμνον.  Return from genealogy (ἢ ην...ὦς)
Il. 5.615  τὸν ῥα κατὰ ζωοζήμη βάλεν Ἐλαμώνος Αἰας,  Return from genealogy (ὁς ῥα...ωδεῖς)
Il. 5.735  ποικίλου, ὃν ῥα αὐτὴ ποιήσατο καὶ κάμη χερῶν  Brief background of Athena’s dress
Il. 6.9  τὸν ῥ’ ἔβαλε πρῶτος κόρυφος φάλον ἰπποδασιῆς,  Return from genealogy (ωδεῖς...ὦς)
Il. 6.402  τὸν ῥ’ ἔκτωρ καλέσκε Σκαμάνδριον, αὐτόρ οἱ ἄλλοι  Genealogy and naming of Astyanax (ἢ ην)
Il. 7.182  ἐκ δ’ ἔβαλε κλίρος κυνῆς ὃν ἱπ’ ἔθελον αὐτῷ  Lot leaps from the helmet (ἄρ’)
Il. 7.469  τὸν ῥ’ ἔτεχ’ ὑψηλῆ ὑπ’ ἱσσον ποιμέν λαῶν.  Genealogical (ἢ ην...ἔτεχ’)
Il. 8.128  Ιριτήνῃ Ἀρχεπτόλεμον βρασῶν, ὃν ῥα τὸ θ’ ἵππων  Genealogical (ἢ ην)
Il. 8.304  τὸν ῥ’ εὲ Αἰσιομήθην ὑπονυμένη τέκνα μήτηρ  Genealogical (τέκε)
Il. 8.386  ποικίλου, ὃν ῥα αὐτὴ ποιήσατο καὶ κάμη χερῶν,  = Il. 5.735
Il. 8.493  τὸν ῥ’ ὁ ἔκτωρ ἀγώρειν Διᾷ φίλος· ἐν δ’ ἄρα χειρὶ  Of Hector’s peculiar speech
Il. 10.562  τὸν ῥα διστηῆρα στρατοῦ ἐμεναι ἡμετέροιο Elaborating entry in a catalogue
Il. 13.177  τὸν ῥ’ υἱὸς Θελαμώνος ὑπ’ οὖσατο ἔχχει μακρῷ Return from genealogy (τέκεοι)
Il. 14.218  τὸν ῥα οἱ ἔβαλα χεριν ἐπος τ’ ἔρατ’ ἐκ τ’ ὀνόμας.  Return from description of Aphrodite’s zone
Il. 14.444  Ἰνοπηνὶ, ὃν ἄρα νύφῃ τέκνα υλῆς αἰμίλων  Genealogy of Satnios (ἄρα)
Il. 14.465  τὸν ῥ’ ἔβαλεν κεφαλῆς τε καὶ αὐχένος ἐν συνεχοιῳ, Physical description
Il. 14.490  υἱὸν Φόρβαντος πολυμήλῳ, τὸν ῥα μάλιστα Genealogical (ὑιόν)
Il. 15.433  τὸν ῥ’ ἔβαλεν κεφαλῆ υπ’ ὀουσάτος ἐξεῖ χαλκῷ Return from background (ὅς ῥα...τὸν ῥ’)
Il. 15.530  τὸν ῥ’ ἔφρει γυαλοίς αρηπτατ’ τὸν ποτῆς Φιλείως Genealogy of item (leads into τὸν ποτῆς)
Il. 15.552  τὸν ῥ’ ἔκτωρ ἐνέπνευ ἐπος τ’ ἔρατ’ ἐκ τ’ ὀνόμας.  Return from geneal. digression (ἢ ην, τέκ-)
Il. 16.577  τὸν ῥα τὸ τὸ ἀπτοίμου νέκυου βάλε φαίνεις ἔκτωρ  Return from geneal. digression (ὑιός, ὃς ῥ’)
Il. 17.110  ὃν ῥα κύνες τε καὶ ἄνδρες ἀπὸ σταθμοῖ διόνται Simile (πο τε)
Il. 17.578  τὸν ῥα κατὰ ζωοζήμη βάλε ξαυθός Μενέλαος Return from genealogy (ὕιος)
Il. 17.674  πάντοσι παπταῖνων ὡς τ’ αἰτεῖς, ὃν ῥα τε φαίνει Simile (τε)
Il. 18.237  τὸν ῥ’ ἤτοι μὲν ἐπεμε σὺν ἰπποσιν καὶ ὠχοφιν Achilles at death of Patroclus
Il. 18.371  χαλκοῦ, ὃν ῥ’ αὐτός ποιήσατο κυλλοποδίων. Construction of Hephaestus’ house
II. 21.35  ἐκ ποταμοῦ φεύγουντι Λυκάσσω, τὸν ῥα ποτ’ αὐτός Background (follows υιόι)
II. 21.283  ὃν ῥα τ’ ἔναυλος ἀπολογεῖ χειμών περνάτα. Simile (τε)
II. 21.405  τὸν ῥ’ ἄνδρεις πρότεροι θέας αἰμεναι σύρον ἄροφης Genealogy of stone (note ἄνδρεις πρότεροι)

39. An Aristonicus scholion (Σ II. 8.493a) reports that Zenodotus rejected this range of verses for their similarity to II. 6.318–20. Aristarchus deemed them more suitable here (ὦς ῥα...τὸν ῥ’). To my mind, the scene of assembly among corpses, with a spear substituted for a scepter, is rather peculiar.

40. Some MSS have τὸν δ’ ἔβαλεν.

41. The addition of ἤτοι μὲν is unusual, but not unexpected given the emotional scene.
On Priam’s self-mythologization (complete with καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν in v. 188) see n.11 on p. 329 above. We might also describe this as an instance expressing ‘vividness’.

### Table 15: Masc. nom. plural relative with ᥇α (οἵ ᥇α)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.632</td>
<td>ὦ ᥇α τὴν καικυν εἴχον καὶ Νήριτον εὐνοτάριον</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.853</td>
<td>ὦ ᥇α Κύτωρον ἤχον καὶ Σήσαμον ἀμφικύρη</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 3.187</td>
<td>ὦ ᥇α τὸτ’ ἐστρατόωτον παρ’ ὁχθας Σαγγαρίοιο</td>
<td>Priam’s self-mythologization⁴⁶</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 8.177</td>
<td>καὶ τὸ ᥇α δὴ τάδε τείχεα μηχανώντο</td>
<td>Vividness (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 12.199</td>
<td>ὦ ᥇α ἐπὶ μεριμνὸν ἐφεσταότες παρὰ τάφρῳ</td>
<td>Soldiers about to see bird sign (ὄρνις)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 13.793</td>
<td>ὦ ᥇α ἐξ θανάτου ἐφίλησεν τέρεν ἁλιαέες</td>
<td>Backstory of men in a catalogue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 16.672, 682</td>
<td>ὥσπερ καὶ βασιλὲα διδυμόσιν, ὦ ᥇α μὲν ἄκα</td>
<td>Zeus of Sarpedon’s burial (fut., past)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 17.532</td>
<td>ὦ ᥇α ἠλίθιον καθ’ ὁμιλόν ἐταίρου κικλήκοντος</td>
<td>Vividness (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 21.206</td>
<td>ὦ ᥇α ἐπὶ πάρ ποταμὸν θεοπρόμου διιόντα,</td>
<td>Vividness (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 21.236, 344</td>
<td>πολλούς, ὦ ᥇α κατ’ ἀυτὸν ἄλις ἔσαν, ὦ ᥇α κτάν’ Αχιλλεὺς</td>
<td>Vividness (?)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 4.361</td>
<td>πτειόντες φαϊνονθ’ ἀλιαέες, ὦ ᥇α τε νηὼν</td>
<td>Menelaos of his nostos and/or vivid</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁴² On the καὶ γὰρ νῦν in 22.46, see p. 50 and n.11 on p. 329 above. Cf. II. 3.187 with discussion below.

⁴³ On τίῳ, see n.54 on p. 367 below.

⁴⁴ West (ad loc.) compares II. 2.308. One MS family has δ’ instead of ᥇α (but ᥇α suits).

⁴⁵ τὸν Ρζαχ, ὀ ᥇α West.

⁴⁶ On Priam’s self-mythologization (complete with καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν in v. 188) see n.11 on p. 329 above. We might also describe this as an instance expressing ‘vividness’.
On these instances in Odysseus’ speeches among the Phaeacians, see below.

On this instance, which occurs in the parable of Phoenix’ speech, see also the context of Table 3 (p. 72 above).

Cf. ὅς ρά of a stone just above at 12.445.

On the use of the verb ἐρρώσαντο (v. 261) in this description of nymphs, see n.13 on p. 14 above.
First, it may seem naïve to make much of occurrences of the word ὠιός leading up to the relative clause. After all, forms of ὠιός occur some 435✕ in the Iliad, or about every 35th verse. Yet those instances are not evenly distributed, and their correlation with the ὃς-ῥα sytagm is very strong. Take, for example, Iliad 5: this book has more instances of ὠιός

and ὠιόν than any other in the poem (44✕); it also has more instances of ὃς ῥα, ὤν ῥα, and τόν ῥα (10✕). Such a correlation is strong across the books of the Iliad,51 and the combination with forms of τίκτω and τρέφω only adds to this. Still, the tables of individual verses above captures only the truly small-scale, and it is the slightly larger context of ten to twenty lines that even better capture these features. Observe Th. 984–91:

Τιθωνῷ δ’ Ἡώς τέκε Μέμνονα χαλκοκορυστήν,
Αἰθιόπων βασιλέα, καὶ Ημαθίωνα ἀνακτά.
αὐτάρ τοι Κεφάλῳ φιτύσατο φαίδιον ὠιόν,
ἰφθιόν Φαέθοντα, θεοίς ἑπείκελον ἄνδρα.
τόν ῥα νέον τέρεν ἄνθος ἔχοντ’ ἐρικυδέος ἤβης
παῖδ’ ἀταλὰ φρούουντα φιλομειδῆς Ἀφροδίτη
ἔρτ’ ἀνερειψάμην, καὶ μιν ζαθείοις ἐνι ηὐοῖς
 νηπότολον μύχιον ποιήσατο, δαίμονα δίοιν.

To Tithonos, Eos bore bronze-helmeted Memnon, the king of the Ethiopians, and lord Emathion. And to Cephalus she bore splendid son, powerful Phaethon, a man equal to the gods. While he was young, a delicate-spirited child, and still possessed the tender flower of glorious youth, smile-loving Aphrodite snatched him away, and made him her innermost temple-keeper in her holy temples, a divine spirit. (trans. G. W. Most)

Here, again, the ὃς-ῥα sytagm suits narrative digression in a genealogical context.

I have also marked out instances of ὃς ῥα in combination with τοτε, which tend to mark the end of genealogical or background digression and return to the foreground. Theses cases are sometimes preceded by another instance of the ὃς-ῥα sytagm (e.g., Il. 16.577 in Table 14 above).52 This may be related to those instances described as having ‘vividness’,53 for some such resumptions even introduce direct speech after some background of the speaker (Il. 8.493, Sc. 77). The elaborations on flies, worms, Harpies, and

51. Note especially Books 16 (22:7) and 17 (23:7); Books 2 (15:6), 4 (14:5), 6 (13:5), 13 (16:6), and 15 (15:8).

52. Note especially the sequence there: ὠιός…ὁς ῥ’…τόν ῥα τόθ (571–7).

Sirens (see Table 16, above) certainly seem to fit into this category, as does the beating heart of Il. 13.443. Likewise, the idea of ‘vividness’ may extend into instances such as those which include a σῆµα (Il. 2.309, Od. 20.111), but we might also wonder whether there remains a genealogical connection in the word σῆµα through the inscriptive use (see, e.g., Il. 7.89–90, discussed below). It strikes me that the ‘genealogical’ mode may be described as ‘vivid’ in invoking the past and its traditions, but I do not see ‘genealogical’ as being a subspecies of ‘vivid’ description so much as I see ῥά as being an effective discourse boundary marker and ὡς-ρα as being primarily bound up in the register of genealogical catalogue and digression.\textsuperscript{54}

We must also note the combination of τε with the ὡς-ρα syntagm. As the tables show, with very few exceptions does the additional particle entail the context of a simile, and the tables here show only one simile where the syntagm lacks a τε (Il. 17.110). Those instances which feature a τε but are not properly similes seem to fall primarily in the feminine nominative plural instances in Table 16 (above).\textsuperscript{55} I have largely described them as ‘elaborations’ and note that they do not always feature the particle τε.

In two instances Priam uses the ὡς-ρα syntagm of himself (Il. 3.187, 22.60), and, with support in the footnotes to those instances, I have suggested that this may play a part in his self-mythologization. Yet we might also note that seven instances of the syntagm fall in Odysseus’ speeches of Books 8–10 in the Odyssey. Three of the instances describe Cyclops (9.107, 187, 399), one the dung in the Cyclops’ cave (9.330), and one instance describes Giants (10.121)—‘vivid’ may indeed be an apt description—but there are three more instance with which we ought to align this view. One instance is of an unknown god that never properly ‘appears’ but instead sends a stag to Odysseus (10.158). The last of these seven instances, but the first in narrative sequence, is at Od. 8.225, where

\textsuperscript{54} I have not noted all instances of the ὡς-ρα syntagm’s combination with forms of τίω, but they include Il. 2.21, 5.77, 5.537, and 24.574. This trend seems appropriate for genealogical discourse, and is a register appropriate to and attested in inscriptions as well. In this case, ‘vividness’ would be of less descriptive power.

\textsuperscript{55} See also Od. 15.319, which provides the background of Hermes in the hymnic manner.
Odysseus says that he would not wish to vie with earlier men, citing the *paradeigmata* of Eurytos and Heracles (vv. 223–8).56 Factoring this into our interpretation of Odysseus’ way of speaking in these books, we might then see the syntagm as part of the self-mythologization that takes place in his Scherian storytelling, as explored in Chapter 11. We can even see this supported by use of the syntagm in the speeches of Antilokhos (12.281) and Penelope (16.428), as well as in his use of the ὡς-ποτε syntagm below.57

*The adverb ποτέ following a relative pronoun*

Some of the cases of the relative pronoun combined with the adverb ποτέ in hexameter have already been treated above.58 For cases in Pindar, see Appendix A (p. 350). The remaining cases follow in Table 17 and Table 18 (next page):

**Table 17: Masc. acc. singular and plural relative with ποτέ (ὥ/τόν ποτέ)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Il. 2.547</td>
<td>δῆμον Ἑρεχθίου μεγαλήττορος, ὡς ποτὲ Ἀθήνη</td>
<td>Erechtheus in Catalogue of Ships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 4.474</td>
<td>ἦθεον δαλερὸν Σιμοείου, ὡς ποτὲ μήτιρ</td>
<td>Genealogical (follows ἐθο’…ὐίόν)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 7.90</td>
<td>ὡς ποτὲ άριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἐκτωρ.</td>
<td>Inscription of Hector’s victim</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 11.20</td>
<td>τὸν ποτὲ οἰ Κινύρης δῶκε ξεινὴίον εἴναι.</td>
<td>Origin and description of cuirass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 15.530</td>
<td>τὸν ῥ’ ἐφόρει γυάλοις ἀρηρότα· τὸν ποτὲ Φυλεύς</td>
<td>Origin of cuirass</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 3.84</td>
<td>δίου Ὀδυσσείας ταλαιπώρου, ὡς ποτέ φασι</td>
<td>Telemachus of Odysseus (φασι)59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 8.448</td>
<td>ποικίλοιν, ὡς ποτὲ μιν δέδαι φρεσὶ πότνια Κίρκη.</td>
<td>Knot that Circe taught Odysseus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 8.494</td>
<td>ὡς ποτὲ ἐς ακρόπολιν ἤγαγε δῖος Οὔσσαεύς</td>
<td>Odysseus of himself to Demodocus60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 17.249</td>
<td>τὸν ποτὲ ἐγὼν ἐπὶ νηὸς ἐὔσσαεύς μελαίνης</td>
<td>Melanthios of Odysseus (future)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 17.340</td>
<td>κλινάμενος σταθμὸς καταρασίσκῳ, ὡς ποτὲ τέκτων</td>
<td>Origin of doorpost in palace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

56. On this paradeigma, see p. 108 above.

57. See below, too, for his use of the ὡς-ποτε syntagm at Od. 8.448 and 8.494. Cf. too Telemachus’ use for Odysseus at 3.841; Melanthios’ use at 17.249.

58. The syntagm ὡς ποτε is treated in Table 5 (p. 82 above); ἦν/τήν ποτε in Table 6 (p. 83 above).

59. I consistently emphasize Odysseus’ self-mythologization, but this is an instance of Telemachus pursuing the same strategy—note the φασι—for his father. We might seem a similar approach in the narrator at 8.448 just below.

60. This is an excellent example of Odysseus’ self-mythologization.
The relative pronoun + ρά ποτε / ποτ’ ἄρ(α)

Although I have commented extensively on the significance of ὃς ποτε in Pindaric poetry in Appendix A (p. 350), there is only one instance of the ὃς-ῥα syntagm, and that instance is even loosely combined with ποτε. This affinity between the particle and adverb extends also to hexameter poetry, where we may observe in a number of cases that the adverb ποτε is used in combination with the ὃς-ῥα-type of relative clause in the beginning of a genealogical digression, or a digression within catalogue poetry. Such cases only strengthen my argument for the simultaneous importance of ὃς ποτε and ὃς ῥα to paradigmatic narrative and genealogical digression. Examples from Archaic Greek poetry follow in Table 19:

---

**Table 18: Various oblique cases of the relative with ποτε**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 6.21</td>
<td>βὴ δὲ μετ’ Αἰσιπτον καὶ Πήδασον, ὃς ποτε νῦμφη</td>
<td>See p. 285 above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 8.108</td>
<td>οὖς ποτ’ ἀπ’ Αἰνείαν ἐλύσην μήστωρε φόβοι</td>
<td>Diomedes of Aeneas’ horses (οἷοι)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 23.291</td>
<td>ἅπασα ὃς τε Γραφού χαλκῷ υπαγε ζυγόν, οὖς ποτ’ ἀπηύρα</td>
<td>Diomedes with Aeneas’ horses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hes. fr. 161.2.</td>
<td>ὃς ποτ τίκτε Πελασγός</td>
<td>Catalogue of Women (follows υἱεῖς)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hes. fr. 388.1</td>
<td>τὸν ποτε Κιλίκιον θρέψεν πολυώνυ μον ἄντρον</td>
<td>Spuria (= Pind. P. 1.16–17) 61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

---

61. See n.63 on p. 249 above.

62. Note diction of following verse (v. 5): μίγη φιλό[τη]τι καὶ ε[ῖνή]ι νῦμφη[.]

63. See also n.45 on p. 289 above.

64. It is worth considering this verse to be the beginning of Solon’s extended self-mythologizing stance in this poem.
Based on this syntagm’s infrequency and distribution, we ought not make too much of these instances. After all, for many commentators the syntagm’s appearance in the *Doloneia* and *Iliad* 24—2 of the 5 Iliadic instances—would be reason to downplay their significance. Yet the consistency with which the idea of genealogy surrounds this combination of pronoun, particle, and adverb—even when most of the ‘genealogies’ above are of objects—speaks to the ingrained compositional habits of Archaic Greek verse.

### The bare relative pronoun and the genealogical register

One way to disprove my my claim that the ὁς-ποτε and ὁς-ῥα syntagms are part of the genealogical register would be to show that the bare relative pronoun is equally likely to combine with this register. In anticipation of such an objection, I provide in Table 20 all instances of the masculine singular pronoun used in conjunction with three genealogical diction extends beyond this verse, and we might here recall Typhos’ significance to discussions of Pindaric and Hesiodic poetry above.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 4.106</td>
<td>ἀγρίου, ὃν ἐς ποτὲ ἀὐτὸς ὑπὸ στέρνοι τυχήσας</td>
<td>‘Genealogy’ of Pandaros’ bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 10.266</td>
<td>τὴν ὅς ποτ’ ἐς Ἐλεῶνος Ἀμύστερος Ὀρμευίδαο</td>
<td>‘Genealogy’ of boar’s tusk helmet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 16.153</td>
<td>τὸν ὅς ποτ’ Ἡπείρων ἑλών πόλιν ἤγαγ Ἀχιλλεὺς</td>
<td>‘Genealogy’ of horse Pedasos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 21.35</td>
<td>ἐκ ποταμοῦ φεύγοντι Λυκάον, τὸν ὅς ποτ’ ἀὐτὸς</td>
<td>Story of Priam’s son Lykaon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 24.278</td>
<td>τοὺς ὅς ποτὲ Πριάμῳ Μυσοὶ δόσαν ἀγλαὰ δῶρα.</td>
<td>‘Genealogy’ of Priam’s mules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 17.292</td>
<td>Ἀργος, Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, ὃν ὅς ποτ’ ἀὐτὸς</td>
<td>Genealogy of dog Argos (θρέψε)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 24.206</td>
<td>καλὸν Λαέρταο τετυγένον, ὃν ὅς ποτ’ ἀὐτὸς</td>
<td>Backstory of Laertes’ farm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>h.Ap.</em> 307</td>
<td>ὃν ὅς ποτ’ ἀρ’ Ἡρη ἔτικτε χολωσαένη Διὶ πατρὶ</td>
<td>Genealogy of Typhos65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>h.Hom.</em> 32.14</td>
<td>τῇ ὅς ποτὲ Κρονίδης ἐμίης φιλότητι καὶ εὐνῇ</td>
<td>Extended, formulaic genealogy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hes. fr.</em> 171.7</td>
<td>[ ]</td>
<td>Hyakinthos killed by Apollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Hes. fr.</em> 234.2</td>
<td>τοὺς ὅς ποτὲ Κρονίδης Ζεὺς ἀρθία μὴδε εἰδώς</td>
<td>Leleges led by Lokros66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pind. fr.</em> 125 S–M</td>
<td>τὸν ὅς Τέρπανδρος ποθ’ ὁ Λέσβιος εὐρεν</td>
<td>‘Genealogy’ of the <em>barbitos</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:**

65. Note that only here are the particle and adverb reversed following the relative pronoun. The genealogical diction extends beyond this verse, and we might here recall Typhos’ significance to discussions of Pindaric and Hesiodic poetry above.

66. Although Hirschberger (F *16) and Most (F 251) do not place this within the fragments of the *Catalogue*, West’s emphasis on the connections to the story of Deukalion and *fr.* 9 are compelling. Hirschberger (ad *loc.*) suggests, “Man könnte an einen Truppenkatalog ähnlich dem Schiffskatalog der *Ilias* denken.”
nealogical verbs (τίκτω, τρέφω, γείνωμαι). I have underlined keywords in order to highlight how metrically constrained these instances are: very often they are the second hemistich in a hexameter verse, or even the final adonean.

Table 20: The genealogical register and relatives without particles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Verse</th>
<th>Context</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 1.36</td>
<td>Ἀχιλλεών ἀνακτὶ, τὸν ἥκοιομι τέκε Λητώ·</td>
<td>Half-verse, bounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.658</td>
<td>ὧν τέκεν Αστυσέα βεββ Ἱακηληπίης.</td>
<td>Catalogue of ShipsJune7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.714</td>
<td>Εὐμηλος, τὸν ὑπ’ Ἀδμήτω τέκε διὰ γυναικῶν</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships (ep. II. 2.820)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.741</td>
<td>ὦν Περιδίον τὸν ἀθάνατος τέκετο Ζεύς·</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships (see discussion below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.820</td>
<td>Ἐνειασ, τὸν ὑπ’ Ἀγχησι τέκε δἰ’ Ἀρρόδητη</td>
<td>Catalogue of Ships (ἐνυφήθεσα)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 5.546</td>
<td>ὦν τέκετ’ ὡρτίλοχον πολλέος ἀνδρέσσον ἀνακτα·</td>
<td>Follows on υἱὸν τῶν ῥα (vv. 542–3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 10.404</td>
<td>Ἀίλλος γ’ ἤ Ἀχιληπ, τὸν ἀθανάττυ τέκε μῆτηρ.</td>
<td>Half-verse, bounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 11.222</td>
<td>ὦν τράφ’ ἐν Ὀρθήν ἐριβώλακι μητέρι μῆλαν</td>
<td>Catalogue in Agamemnon’s aristeiaJune8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 11.224</td>
<td>μητροτάτωρ, ὦν τίκτε Θεαῦ καλλιπάρην</td>
<td>See just above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 13.450</td>
<td>ὦν πρῶτον Μίνωα τέκε Κρίτη πειρενο.</td>
<td>Iomeneus of selfJune9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 13.465</td>
<td>Ἀλλ’ ἔπει Ἀλκαθών ἐπαιμοῦνος, ὦν σε πάρος γε</td>
<td>Adonean (ἐθρέψε follows in 466)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 14.114</td>
<td>Τυδέσ, ὄν Ὀτήριε συνή κατὰ γαία κάλυπτε.</td>
<td>Diomedes’ genealogy (follows γένος)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 14.434</td>
<td>᾿Ζάνθου διήνεντος, ὦν ἀθάνατος τέκετο Ζεύς,</td>
<td>Half-verse, bounded = II. 14.434 = 21.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 15.526</td>
<td>Ἐπιμετίδης, ὄν Λάμπιος ἐγείνατο φέρτατον υἱὸν</td>
<td>Bounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 16.175</td>
<td>ὧν τέκε Πηλῆος δυνάτην καλὴ Πολυδώρη</td>
<td>Catalogue (note υἱὸν ὦν τέκε, vv. 177–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 17.78</td>
<td>Ἀίλλος γ’ ἤ Ἀχιληπ, τὸν ἀθανάττυ τέκε μῆτηρ.</td>
<td>Half-verse, bounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 19.413</td>
<td>Ἀσέων ὡριστος, ὄν ήκοιομι τέκε Λητώ.</td>
<td>Half-verse, bounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 20.304</td>
<td>Δαρδάνου, ὄν Κρονίδης περὶ πάντων φιλοὶ παῖδων</td>
<td>Dardanos dear to Zeus (follows γενεί)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 20.384</td>
<td>ὧν νύμφη τέκε τῆς Ὄρυντου ἵττολιπόρθῳ</td>
<td>Iphition, victim of Achilles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 21.2</td>
<td>᾿Ζάνθου διήνεντος, ὀν άθανατος τέκετο Ζεύς,</td>
<td>= I. 14.434 = 24.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 21.159</td>
<td>ὦν τέκε Πηληγόνα κλυτον ἐγχει: τὸν δ’ ἐμ’ φασι</td>
<td>Extended genealogy of Asteropaios</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 22.87</td>
<td>κλαδούομαι ἐν λεχέσσοι φιλον θάλος, ὦν τέκεν αὐτή,</td>
<td>Adonean, bounded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 22.353</td>
<td>ἐνεμείνῃ λεχέσσοι γοινείται ὡν τέκεν αὐτή,</td>
<td>Adonean, bounded</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

67. In the Catalogue of Ships, as in the Nekyia, it is natural to encounter some conjunction-reduction.

68. Further genealogical diction in 223 (ἐθρέψε) and beyond. The narrative digression comes at v. 225 (αὐτὰρ ἐπ’ ὅ’ ἠβης ἐρικυδέως ἑκτο μέτρου) and it is worth comparing this verse to Hes. fr. 205.2 (αὐτὰρ ἐπ’ ὅ’ ἠβης πολυηράτος ἑκτο μέτρου).

69. Compare the preceding verse, ὡρρᾳ Ἰδη οἶς Ζηνὸς γόνους ἐνθάδ’ ἰκάνω (v. 450), to Achilles’ own genealogical speech to Lykaon at p. 335 above.
| Il. 22.485 | ὰν τέκουμεν | Andromache, briefly, of Astyanax |
| II. 24.61 | Πηλεῖ, ὃς περὶ κήρι φίλος χένετ’ αθανάτουι. | Bounded |
| II. 24.693 | ξανθου δινόγετος, ὃν αθάνατος τέκετο Ζεύς, | = Il. 14.434 = 21.2 |
| II. 24.727 | ὰν τέκουμεν ὦ τ’ ἐγὼ τε δυσάμοροι, οὔτε ὦ τούτῳ | Andromache, briefly, of Astyanax |
| Od. 3.489 | ὀιός Όρτιλόχιοι, τὸν Ἀλφεῖος τέκε παιδά. | Half-verse, bounded |
| Od. 4.11 | ὃς οἱ τηλύγατος χένετο κρατερός Μεγαπένθῃς | Megapenthes, son of Menelaos |
| Od. 11.318 | ἀλλʼ ἄλλων Διός οὐς, ὃν ἥκους τέκε λήπτω, | Nekyia, set within οἱ ῥα (313) |
| Od. 14.174 | οὐν οὐ παιδός ἀλαστὸν ὀδυροίμαι, ὃν τέκ’ Ὀδυσσεύς, | Adonean, bounded |
| Od. 15.187 | ὀιός Όρτιλόχιοι, τὸν Ἀλφεῖος τέκε παιδά. | Half-verse, bounded |
| Od. 19.267 | ἢ Ὀδυσσή’, ὃν φασι θεία’ ἐναληγίκων εἶναι. | Follows τέκη φιλότητι μιγείσα (v. 266) |
| Od. 23.61 | πᾶσι, μάλιστα δ’ ἐμοί τε καὶ ἐμὶ, τὸν τεκόμεσθα | Adonean, bounded |
| h.Cer. 234 | Διμοφώνθι, ὃν ἔτικεν Εὔνομος Μετάνειέρα. | Brief, but ἐτέρευν ἐν μεγάροις follows |
| h.Ap. 178 | ὑμίνων ἀργυρότοξον ὃν ἥκους τέκε λήπτω. | Half-verse, bounded |
| h.Ap. 317 | παῖς ἐμὸς Ἡραίοις χρυσάορον ὃν τέκου σύτη | Adonean, bounded |
| h.Merc. 3 | ἀγγελον ᾠδανώτων ἐριυοίνων, ὃν τέκε Μαία | Extended genealogy70 |
| h.Bacch. 56 | εἰμὶ δ’ ἐγὼ Διόνυσος ἐρίβρομοι ὃν τέκε μήτηρ | Runs into genealogical next verse |
| h.Hom. 34.5 | ἶππου καλὰ ρέεσθος ὃν αθάνατος τέκετο Ζεὺς. | Adonean, bounded, end of hymn |
| Th. 334 | γενέστα διονυσί όρων, ὃς ἐρεμουνες κεύθει γαίης | Follows φιλότητι μιγείσα |
| WD 804 | Ὅρκον γενομένου, τῶν ἔρις τέκε πήμ’ ἐπίτροπους. | Half-verse, bounded71 |
| Hes. fr. 40.1–2 | ἀλουμ, ὃς τέκεθ’ ὧν ἴσονα ποιεόν παλαῦν | Limited context |
| Hes. fr. 357.3 | Φοιβον Απόλλωνα χυρόφορον, ὃν τέκε Λητώ Θ | Adonean, bounded but limited context72 |
| Pind. fr. 34.1 | ὅς καὶ τυπις ἀγνῷ πελέκει τέκετο ξανθὰν Ἀθάναν | Limited context (extent of hymnic fr.) |
| Pind. fr. 156.2 | ὃν Μαλέας ὀρος ἐθέρεψε, Ναῖδος ἀκοίτασ | Limited context |

Two patterns are worth noting among these instances, both verse-end (♯) and starting at a caesura (|): | ὰν/τὸν NOM-ADJ τέκ- NOM-N# (11X); | ὰν τέκ- NOM-N# (7 X). These two formulae, which account for nearly half of these instances, are notable for not running beyond the verse-end (thus the term ‘bounded’ above).

---

70. This instance could hardly be more embedded in the genealogical register: υἱόν (v. 1); νύμφη ἐν ολγῷ Διός ἐν φιλότητι μιγείσα (v. 4); ἄντρον ἐσόω ναίουσα παλίκοιον, ἐνθα Κρονίων | νύμφῃ ἐν ολγῷ μιγείσκετο νυκτὸς ἀμολῶς (vv. 6–7).

71. Follows φασιν (v. 803).

72. This is the last verse in a three-verse quotation at Σ Pind. N. 2.1, in which Hesiod presumably describes himself and Homer as ἀοιδοί in Delos, stitching together song (ἀοιδήν) with new hymns (νεαροὶ ὕμνοι).
Several of the instances in the Catalogue of Ships and the *Nekyia* must be seen in light of conjunction-reduction (cf. esp. *Il.* 5.543–6), and there is one passage that well exhibits the distinction that must be drawn (*Il.* 2.740–4):

\[
\text{τῶν αὖθ᾽ ἠγεμόνευε μενεπτόλεμος Πολυποίτης}
\]

\[
\text{ὑὸς Πειριθόοιο τὸν ἀθάνατος τέκετο Ζεὺς·}
\]

\[
\text{τὸν ὦ᾽ ὑπὸ Πειριθόω τέκετο κλυτὸς ἦποδάμεια}
\]

\[
\text{ηματι τῷ ὅτε Φήρας ἐτίσατο λαχνήεντας,}
\]

\[
\text{τοὺς δ᾽ ἐκ Πηλίου ὦσε καὶ Αἰθίκεσσοι πέλασσεν·}
\]

… of these men, in turn, staunch-in-battle Polypoites was leader, son of Peirithoos, whom immortal Zeus begot—him whom renowned Hippodameia bore to Peirithoos on that day when he exacted vengeance from the hairy centaurs, and drove them out of Pelion and send them among the Aithikes.

In this case the ὅς-ῥα syntagm at v. 742 well represents the style of narrative digression in a genealogical digression, while the τὸν ἀθάνατος τέκετο Ζεὺς (v. 741) is a half-verse formula that suits limited genealogical information or conjunction-reduction.

**The relative pronoun in inscriptions**

The use of the relative clause in Greek inscriptions is an intriguing comparandum. Although we must carefully consider the date and location of extant inscriptions, Homeric poetry does seem to be aware of the stylistic conventions of inscriptions, as indicated by Hector’s speech in *Iliad* 7 (vv. 87–91):³⁴

\[
\text{καὶ ποτὲ τις ἐξήσει καὶ ὁψιγόνων ἀνθρώπων}
\]

\[
\text{νηῒ πολυκλήιδι πλέων ἐπὶ οὐνατα πόντου}
\]

\[
\text{ἀνδρὸς μὲν τὸδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθηκότος,}
\]

\[
\text{ἡ ἀνδρὸς μὲν τὸδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθηκότος,}
\]

\[
\text{ἄλος ποτὲ τὶς ἔρεε· τὸ δ᾽ ἐμὸν κλέος ὦ ποτ᾽ ὀλεῖται.}
\]

³³. Below I focus on ὅς-ποτε syntagm, but ὅς ῥα does occur in inscriptions (though far less frequently). Note especially (the late second century BCE) honorary inscription in elegiacs for a proconsul at Ephesos (*SEG* 36, 1031):

\[
\text{ἔπρεπε Νάξον γένες}
\]

\[
\text{οὐλίου, ἦ ῥα καὶ αὐτόν}
\]

\[
\text{θέρεωσι κισσοφόρον}
\]

\[
\text{Βάκχον ἐς εὐφροσύνην.}
\]

³⁴. See n. 22 on p. 283 above. On v. 91, cf. Hes. *fr.* 70.7 of the infant Dionysus (τοῦ μὲν κλέος ὦ πι[οτ᾽ ὀλεῖται].
And some day someone of men to come, sailing across the wine-dark sea in a benched ship, might say: 'This is the grave of a man long dead, a brave man whom once gleaming Hector killed.' Thus will someone speak. And my glory will not die.

To this we might compare the following sixth-century Attic inscription, noting a very similar articulation, even down to word order (IG I³ 1240):  

στέθι : καί οἴκτιρον : Κροίσο
παρὰ οἴμα θαυμόντος : / ἱόν
ποτ' ἐνι προμάχοις : ὀλεος
θόρος : Ἀρες.

Stand and weep beside the tomb of dead Kroisos, whom once among the front-fighters furious Ares killed.

Yet I have suggested that we can be more specific than 'inscriptional' when we describe this style, specifically that we should see inscription itself as an instance of genealogical narrative. After all, an inscription on a grave marker is nothing if not an entry in a material genealogical catalogue, and the same syntax and word order we saw of the death of Hector’s and Ares’ victims above is very often used to describe a person’s birth. In each case, the syntagm marks a narrative digression within a genealogical context. Notice, for example, this Mysian inscription, dating probably from the second century BCE:

παῖδα με [θηρολέ]ταρ περίκλυτον Ἡρακλῆος
Τήλεφος, [ἐνο] ποτ' ἐτικτεῖς θεᾶς ἐναλίγκιος Αὔγη,
πατρίδι κ [αι ναέτησιν ἐ]πίφροσι Κητείοισιν
εἰητὴρ ἀνε[θῆκε φίλα φρ]ονέων Ἀμαλώ[(ι)]ος.

Me the famous son of beast-slaying Heracles, Telephos, whom once goddess-like Auge bore, Amaloios the physician dedicated with kindly intent to his fatherland and its thoughtful (?) Keteians inhabitants.

The text is lacunose, and the relative-pronoun syntagm is even supplied, yet that epigraphers are able to supplement these words speaks to their being conventional. In each

---

75. This inscription, dated to c. 540–30? BCE, was found on a private marble monument in Attica. Cf. too IG VII 2247 (GVI 321 [cf. SEG 15.327] = CEG I 112 + add. p. 261), a Boiotian funerary epigram for a Phanes on a stele (c. 500? BCE).
76. The inscription (SEG 28.972) describes the dedication of a statue of Telephos found at Pergamon.
case—though we may find an inset narrative of either birth or death—the context and intent is clearly genealogical.\[^{77}\]

Finally, I propose that some epigraphic evidence may even make explicit the connection between the inscriptive or genealogical and the paradigmatic insofar as several inscriptions either represent \textit{paradeigmata} of the deceased’s virtue or present the victor as a \textit{paradeigma} of athletic prowess:\[^{78}\]

\[
\text{[σ]ῆς ἀρετῆς Α⇤⇤.]}? \text{παρα[δείγματα] πᾶσιν ἰδέσθαι σωθεὶς ἐ[κ ـــــ] ἀνε[θ]ηκε Μῦρω[ν].} \quad IG \text{I}^{\circ} \text{II}^{\circ} \text{4908} \[^{79}\]
\]

Of your virtue … a \textit{paradeigmata} for all to see, having been saved from … Myron dedicated.

\[
\text{Δρύμος παῖς Θεοδώρου Ὀλυμπικὸν ἐνθάδ’ ἄγωνα ἣν γειλ’ σαθήμαρ δρομέων θεοῦ εἰς κλυτὸν ἄλσος, ἀνθείας παραδείγμασιν πατρίς δὲ μοι ἑπιπον Ἀργος.} \quad IG \text{I}^{\circ} \text{V}^{\circ} \text{2,1 618} \[^{80}\]
\]

Drymos son of Theodoros announced his Olympic victory here on the very day he was running in the glorious precinct of the god, a \textit{paradeigma} of manliness. And my fatherland was Argos, famed for horses.

---

\[^{77}\] In the case of Telephos, the context is equally, or complementarily, that of foundation tale (cf. the Telephos Frieze from roughly the same period). On my suggestion of the importance of genealogical catalogue to the New Archilochus, see p. 158 above.

\[^{78}\] Here we might also note \textit{GV}I \textit{I} \textit{689} vv. 1–4, the very peculiar (and heavily supplemented) second-century BCE inscription from a Bithynian sarcophagus. Cf too \textit{IG} \textit{II}^{\circ} \textit{3022}.

\[^{79}\] A \textit{donarium incertum}, on a stone from the wall of a house in Athens, mid fourth century BCE.

\[^{80}\] This inscription, on a statue of a man found near the temple of Aesclepius at Epidaurus, dates to c. 350–300 BCE.
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