

How a Person relates to νόος in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets

By SHIRLEY M. DARCUS,
Univ. of British Columbia (Canada)*)

One of man's important psychic entities is νόος, an organ of clear inner vision that often allows him to grasp the essence of any situation¹). Examination of the grammatical usage of νόος gives some indication of how a person relates to this psychic organ. This usage in Homer suggests that νόος is seen most often as an entity whose nature is to be discovered or known; in being discovered, νόος reveals to some extent the nature of the person in whom it is found. Person and νόος remain distinct but νόος can be a carrier of a person's deepest qualities. The following analysis will both treat all instances of νόος in the genitive, dative, accusative, and nominative cases (all singular since the plural of νόος is not found) and

*) I thank the Canada Council for the Research Grant that allowed me to work on this article in Oxford.

¹) This paper does not attempt any discussion of the nature or function of νόος in Homer. For this see the following important studies: E. Schwyzer, "Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung", *Festschrift Paul Kretschmer* (Wien 1926) 244–251; V. Magnien, "Les Facultés de l'Âme d'après Platon, Hippocrate et Homère", *Acropole* 1 (1926) 300–314; P. Justesen, *Les Principes psychologiques d'Homère* (Copenhagen 1928); R. Schottländer, "Nus als Terminus", *Hermes* 64 (1929) 228–242; J. Böhme, *Die Seele und das Ich im homerischen Epos* (Leipzig and Berlin 1929); V. Larock, "Les premières Conceptions psychologiques des Grecs", *RBPh* 9 (1930) 377–406; B. Snell, "J. Böhme: *Die Seele und das Ich im homerischen Epos*", *Gnomon* 7 (1931) 74–86; K. von Fritz, "ΝΟΥΣ and ΝΟΕΙΝ in the Homeric Poems", *CP* 38 (1943) 79–93; T. B. L. Webster, "Language and Thought in Early Greece", *Manchest. Lit. and Phil. Soc. Proc.* 94 (1952) 32–33; B. Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind*, trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer (Oxford 1953); R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*² (Cambridge 1954) 82–83; D. J. Furley, "The Early History of the Concept of the Soul", *BICS* 3 (1956) 1–18; P. Vivante, "Sulle designazioni Omeriche della realtà psichica", *AGI* 41 (1956) 113–138; G. Bona, *Il "ΝΟΥΣ" e i "ΝΟΟΙ" nell' Odissea* (Torino 1959); E. L. Harrison, "Notes on Homeric Psychology", *Phoenix* 14 (1960) 63–80; H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*² (Munich 1962); P. Frei, "Zur Etymologie von griech. νοῦς", *Lemmata Donum Natalicium G. Ehlers* (Munich 1968) 48–57; A. W. H. Adkins, *From the Many to the One* (Ithaca, N. Y. 1970); D. G. Frame, *The Origins of ΝΟΥΣ* (Diss. Harvard Univ. 1971); J. R. Warden, "The Mind of Zeus", *JHI* 32 (1971) 3–14; S. M. Darcus, "The Phren of the Noos in Xenophanes' God", *SO* 53 (1978) 25–30.

discuss the relationship between person and *νόος* that these passages reveal.

I. *Genitive*

In the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* there are seven occurrences of the genitive. In one case the genitive is governed by the verb *δέυομαι* (*Od.* 7.73). In the other instances the genitive appears to be subjective. There are references to *ἀιδρεῖη* (*Od.* 11.272); *ἀφραδίη* (*Il.* 10.122); *κακορραφίη* (*Od.* 2.236); and *πολυιδρεῖη* (*Od.* 2.346; 23.77) of *νόος*. *Iliad* 24.354 mentions *φραδέος νόον ἔργα*. These instances of the subjective genitive suggest that *νόος* was an active agent within man, one whose knowledge, lack of knowledge, or evil devisings could influence his behaviour.

II. *Dative*

Several instances of the dative of *νόος* appear to be locative or comitative-instrumental. The activities of the following verbs take place in, by means of, or in the company of *νόος* (9 instances): *ἀντιβολέω* (*Od.* 13.229), *ἐκφεύγω* (*Od.* 12.211–212), *ἐπιβάλλω* (*Od.* 6.320), *κεύθω* (*Il.* 1.363; 16.19), *κλέπτω* (*Il.* 1.132), *μηχανάω* (*Od.* 16.196–197), *φράζω* (*Od.* 3.127–128), and *χαίρω* (*Od.* 8.78)². In *Odyssey* 13.304–305 *νόω* is a dative of cause with the idea of instrument also present³. Athena addresses Odysseus:

χρήματά τε κρύψω, ὅσα τοι Φαίηκες ἀγανοὶ
ᾠπασαν οἴκαδ' ἰόντι ἐμῇ βουλή τε νόω τε.

Odysseus travels home both because of and with the aid of Athena's *νόος*. Finally in two instances the dative appears to be one of "respect"⁴. A person can be *πεπνῦσθαι νόω* (*Il.* 24.377); Telemachus is *ἐπιστήμων νόω* (*Od.* 16.374).

The instances of the locative or comitative-instrumental dative suggest a relationship of harmony between person and *νόος*. A person can act in, by means of, or in the company of *νόος* which contributes to his activity. Person and *νόος* thus coöperate. The

²) On the comitative-instrumental dative see R. Kühner, *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*³, revised by F. Blass and B. Gerth (Hannover, Hahn 1890, 1904) vol. 2¹, 430. Cf. P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* (Paris 1953) vol. 2, 74–77 and H. W. Smyth, *Greek Grammar*², revised by G. M. Messing (Cambridge, Mass. 1956) 346–349.

³) On this dative see Chantraine (note 2) 77.

⁴) On this dative see Smyth (note 2) 348, no. 1516.

two instances of the dative of respect indicate *νόος* as both the location of a person's knowledge and a psychic entity that carries on intellectual functions within the person.

III. *Accusative*

Of the instances of *νόος* in Homer, many are found in the accusative case (41 instances)⁵). First, *νόος* is the object of the prepositions *κατά* (*Il.* 9.108) and *παρέκ* (*Il.* 10.391; 20.133)⁶). Second, in two instances the accusative is one of respect. Euryalos is *ἀποφώλιος νόον* (*Od.* 8.177); a son *ἐτέτυκτο νόον* (*Il.* 15.643). These two passages, as with the dative of respect, show *νόος* both as a location and as a psychic entity that could engage in intellectual activity.

Νόος is the object of the following influences: *νεοίη νικᾷ* (*Il.* 23.604), *πάρφασις κλέπτει* (*Il.* 14.217), *τιμὴ ἐπιγνάμπει* (*Il.* 9.513), and *χόλος οιδάνει νόον* (*Il.* 9.554). A god can affect another god's *νόος* with the following verbs: *ἀλιόω* (*Od.* 5.103–104; 137–138), *ἐξαπαφίσκω* (*Il.* 14.160), *λέγω* (*Il.* 14.252), *μεταστρέφω* (*Il.* 15.52), and *παρέρχομαι* (*Od.* 5.103–104; 137–138). Gods too can affect man's *νόος* with the following verbs: *θέλω* (*Il.* 2.255), *πόρω* (*Od.* 10.494), *τελέω* (*Il.* 23.149), *τίθημι* (*Il.* 13.732), and *τρέπω* (*Od.* 19.479). Similarly *νόος* is found as the object of the action of some person or god other than the one possessing it, with these verbs: *ἀναγιγνώσκω* (*Od.* 21.205), *γιγνώσκω* (*Il.* 22.382; *Od.* 1.3), *ἐδάην* from *δαῆναι* (*Od.* 4.267; 493), *εἶπον* (*Od.* 11.177), *ἐνίπτω* (*Il.* 7.447), *ἐρώω* (*Il.* 8.143–144), *καταλέγω* (*Od.* 4.256), and *λανθάνω* (*Il.* 15.461)⁷).

In some passages *νόος* is the object of verbs whose subject is the person possessing it: *βουλεύω*, *ἔχω*, *κατὰ . . . ἰσχάνω*, *νόεω*, *νωμάω*, and *περιέμιμι*⁸). In these cases a person exercises some control over *νόος* whether the term refers to the psychic organ, its function, or the object of that function⁹).

⁵) In this reckoning I have omitted *Il.* 15.379. See below note 7. *Od.* 22.215 (accusative and infinitive) is included here but treated under the Nominative.

⁶) Cf. also *Od.* 19.42 (*κατὰ . . . ἰσχάνω*) and *Od.* 1.66 (*περὶ . . . εἰμί*) where the preposition may govern the accusative.

⁷) In *Il.* 15.379 a variant reading would make *νόος* the object of *πυρνώομαι*.

⁸) Respectively: *Od.* 5.23 and *Od.* 24.479; *Il.* 4.309, *Od.* 2.124, and *Od.* 14.490; *Od.* 19.42 (see note 6); *Il.* 9.104; *Od.* 13.255; *Od.* 1.66 and *Od.* 19.326 (see note 6).

⁹) These three are not distinguished in Homer's use of *νόος*. See von Fritz (note 1) 81.

The instances of *νόος* in the accusative show that it is the object of the action of some verb¹⁰). As with *φρήν/φρένες*, the subject of the verb is often an agent or influence other than the person possessing *νόος*¹¹). Such instances of the accusative suggest that *νόος* was seen as an object, an entity to be grasped, known, or affected in some way¹²). These passages indicate a close relationship of person and *νόος*. Others may wish to affect, grasp, or know a person's *νόος* since this psychic organ most closely reflects his nature.

In some cases of the accusative a person affects *νόος* within him. These instances likewise suggest a close relationship of person and *νόος*. A person can "plan" or "think" a *νόος*: this suggests that his activity and the activity of *νόος* are closely related. A person can "have", "check", "direct", or "excel in" *νόος*: these passages suggest a person's control over *νόος* that acts within. These last passages also may indicate that *νόος* itself could act more independently in a person than *φρήν/φρένες* do, having activities that he either checks or influences¹³).

IV. *Nominative*

Many of the instances of *νόος* in Homer occur in the nominative case (42 instances). First, *νόος* occurs with verbs in the passive voice. The *νόος* of Zeus, Calypso, and the gods can be "turned" (*τρέπω*: *Il.* 17.546; *Od.* 7.263; 3.147)¹⁴). The *νόος* of Priam on one occasion is "confused" (*συνγέω*: *Il.* 24.358). *Νόος* occurs once in the

¹⁰) *Νόος*, like *φρήν/φρένες*, is very much open to external influences; it changes with the "day". See H. Fränkel, "Man's Ephemeros Nature According to Pindar and Others", *TAPA* 77 (1946) 131-145 and for man as an "open-field" see especially B. Snell, *The Discovery of the Mind*, trans. T. G. Rosenmeyer (Oxford 1953) 31, 43, 61; H. Fränkel, *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums*² (Munich 1962) 85-90; J. Russo and B. Simon, "Homeric Psychology and the Oral Epic Tradition", *JHI* 29 (1968) 485-486.

¹¹) On *φρήν/φρένες* in Homer see S. M. Darcus, "A Person's Relation to *φρήν* in Homer, Hesiod, and the Greek Lyric Poets", in *Glotta* 57 (1979), 159-173.

¹²) On the relationship of *νόος* and verbs indicating intellectual activity see S. M. Darcus, "*Noos* Precedes *Phren* in Greek Lyric Poetry", *AC* 46 (1977) 41-51.

¹³) See also below on the nominative. As *φρένες* become more active in the Greek lyric poets, a person's control over them also increases.

¹⁴) Cf. the one instance of *φρήν* in the nominative singular in Homer: Zeus' *φρήν* is "turned" (*τρέπω*: *Il.* 10.45). See Darcus (note 11).

accusative as subject of the passive infinitive, *τελέεσθαι* (*Od.* 22. 215). In these instances νόος is a psychic entity that can be acted upon.

Second, νόος appears as the subject of these verbs: *ἀΐσω* (*Il.* 15.80), *ἀπόλλυμι* (*Il.* 15.129), *μενουάω* (*Od.* 2.92; 13.381; 18.283), *ῥορνυμι* (*Od.* 1.347), and *ῥέζω* (*Il.* 14.62). The νόος of Zeus *δαμνᾷ* (*Il.* 16.103), *ἐγείρει* (*Il.* 15.242; *Od.* 24.164), and *κεύθει* (*Od.* 24.474). These instances of the nominative show νόος as an active agent performing its own functions within the person.

Νόος occurs also in the nominative with the copulative verb *εἰμί* and the following epithets: *ἄκλητος* (*Od.* 10.329), *ἄπηγής* (*Il.* 16.35; 23.484; *Od.* 18.381), *ἀτάρβητος* (*Il.* 3.63), *ἔμπεδος* (*Il.* 11.812; *Od.* 10.240), *ἐναίσμιος* (*Od.* 5.190), and *θεουδής* (*Od.* 6.121; 8.576; 9.176; 13.202). Νόος is likewise found with *εἰμί* understood and the following epithets: *ἀμείνων* (*Il.* 15.509), *βράσσω* (*Il.* 10.226), *κραιπνός* (*Il.* 23.590), and *κρείσσων* (*Il.* 16.688; 17.176). In one passage the νόος of Theoclymenos is *τετυγμένος* (*Od.* 20.366). In another, νόος *ἐστὶ μετὰ φρεσίν* (*Il.* 18.419)¹⁵. Νόος is found as well in the following expressions: *τοιούτος νόος ἐστίν* (*Od.* 18.332 = 392), *τοιός νόος ἐστίν* (*Od.* 18.136), *οἷος νόος Ἀτρείωνος* (*Il.* 2.192), *ὄπη νόος ἐστίν* (*Il.* 20.25; cf. 22.185), *τίς . . . νόος εἶη* (*Il.* 24.367), *ὄδ' ἦν νόος* (*Il.* 15.699).

The instances of νόος in the nominative with *εἰμί* and an epithet indicate some of its characteristics. A person is distinct from this psychic organ but it appears to be a locus of certain qualities strongly influencing his nature. Person and νόος thus appear closely related.

But, unlike *φρήν/φρένες*, νόος can also act independently within the person. It “leaps in thought”, “perishes”, “desires eagerly”, “urges on”, and “acts”. The νόος of Zeus “conquers”, “stirs up”, and “conceals”¹⁶. Νόος is thus less subordinate in Homer than *φρένες*. This independent activity of νόος within a person may also account for the greater control he exercises over νόος than over *φρένες* in Homer¹⁷).

V. Conclusion

This examination of grammatical usage suggests that Homer saw νόος in the following ways:

¹⁵ Νόος is usually found *ἐν στήθεσσι* (see, e.g., *Il.* 3.63, 4.309, 13.732, *Od.* 2.124–125, 13.255). Once it is placed in the *θυμός* (*Od.* 14.490).

¹⁶ For the significance of the νόος of Zeus, see especially Warden (note 1).

¹⁷ See above, Accusative, and Darcus (note 11).

(1) as a location, instrument, or accompaniment in, by, or with which a person acts. *Nóος* also contributes to the different emotional, intellectual, or volitional activities a person engages in. (Locative or comitative-instrumental dative, dative of respect, accusative of respect.)

(2) as the object of some activity signified by a verb. In several cases the subject is another person, the gods, or an outside influence. (Accusative after a verb; nominative with verb in the passive voice.)

(3) as an object of some activity of a verb where a person affects his own *νόος*. (Accusative with a verb.)

(4) as an entity qualified by certain characteristics. (Epithets with *νόος*.)

(5) as an active agent within the person. (Subjective genitive and nominative.)

Nóος, unlike *φρήν/φρένες*, does not function principally as a location. Other psychic organs are not found in it nor is any activity said to take place *ἐν νόῳ*¹⁸). Some instances of the dative may be locative but these may also be comitative-instrumental. These passages suggest that *νόος* can be subordinate to the person, acting in harmony with him. A person can act in, by, or with *νόος* but he does so much less frequently in Homer than with *φρένες*.

Sometimes *νόος* acts independently within a person. Like *κραδίη* and *θυμός*, it can directly stir up a person¹⁹). But a person exercises some control over *νόος*. It may in fact not be as active within a person as *ἦτορ*, *κραδίη*, and *θυμός* since he does not address *νόος* directly as he does these²⁰). Person and *νόος* seem generally to act in harmony; on occasion he can check *νόος* or this psychic organ can stir him up.

Often *νόος* appears as an entity modified by certain epithets. Its nature seems to influence strongly a person's behaviour and may closely reflect his deepest qualities. But most often *νόος* appears as an object to be affected, grasped, or known. The discovery of *νόος* apparently gives information about the nature of the person in whom it is found. *Nóος* may so frequently be affected since it is

¹⁸) *Nóος* occurs with *κατά* (= "according to") and *παρέκ* but these passages do not describe activities taking place in *νόος*.

¹⁹) *Od.* 1.347. See, e.g., *Il.* 6.439, 10.220, 15.43, and *Od.* 18.61 for *κραδίη* and *θυμός*. See also Darcus (note 11) p. 166, note 35.

²⁰) For *ἦτορ*, *κραδίη*, and *θυμός*, see, e.g., *Il.* 11.403, 18.5, *Od.* 5.298, 20.18, 20.22. See also Darcus (note 11) p. 166, note 36.

seen as the carrier of the person's most important qualities. Νόος and person remain distinct but somehow νόος reveals person. Therefore, in Homer νόος is principally an object: acted on, controlled, or known.

B. Hesiod and the Greek Lyric Poets

An examination of the grammatical usage of νόος in Hesiod and the lyric poets reveals aspects of how a person related to this psychic organ²¹). To a large extent these poets see νόος as Homer did, but there are some differences. Even though it is fragmentary, the evidence for the lyric poets allows analysis and some general conclusions²²).

I. Genitive

Νόος is found in the genitive in only five passages in Hesiod and the lyric poets. In one case the genitive is subjective: Hesiod mentions ἀϊδρείη νόοιο (*W. & D.* 685). In the other instances it appears to be objective. Archilochus speaks of a man who is νόου παρήγορος (130.5). In Theognis Persephone harms νόος: βλάπτουσα νόοιο (705). Theognis speaks too of a person disabled in his νόος (νόου βεβλαμμένος) and one no longer καρτερός νόου (223; 480). The single instance of the subjective genitive suggests νόος as an independent agent acting within man. The instances of the objective genitive show that νόος could be adversely affected by outside influences. The expression καρτερός νόου suggests a person exerted some control over νόος.

²¹) For νόος in the lyric poets see especially: Furley, Fränkel, and Adkins (note 1). See also E. Lobel, *ΑΛΚΑΙΟΥ ΜΕΛΗ* (Oxford 1927) xxxii–xxxvii; V. N. Jarcho, “Zum Menschenbild der nachhomerischen Dichtung”, *Philologus* 112 (1968) 166–172; Darcus (note 12).

²²) Fragments of the different poets are numbered according to the following editions: *Hesiodi Theogonia, Opera et Dies, Scutum*, ed. F. Solmsen (Oxford 1970); *Fragmenta Hesiodica*, ed. R. Merkelbach and M. L. West (Oxford 1967); *Anthologia Lyrica Graeca*, ed. E. Diehl, fasc. 1 (Leipzig 1951), fasc. 3 (Leipzig 1952) = (D) [For poets not treated in West]; *Iambi et Elegi Graeci*, ed. M. L. West (Oxford 1971), 2 volumes = (W); *Poetae Melici Graeci*, ed. D. L. Page (Oxford 1962); *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis*, ed. D. L. Page (Oxford 1974) = (S); *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta*, ed. E. Lobel and D. L. Page (Oxford 1955) [For Sappho and Alcaeus]; *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis*, ed. B. Snell (Leipzig 1964), Parts I and II; *Bacchylidis Carmina cum Fragmentis*, post B. Snell, ed. H. Maehler (Leipzig 1970). See also below note 29.

II. *Dative*

Nóos is found quite frequently in the dative case in Hesiod and the lyric poets. In one instance the dative follows the verb *μέλω* (Pind., *Dithy.* 4.35). In two passages the dative is governed by the adjectives *ἀντίπαλος* and *πίσυνος* (Pind., *Is.* 5.61; Sim. 581). In one case the dative appears to be one of respect: Simonides speaks of a person who is truly good *νόω* (542.2).

The remaining occurrences of *νόος* in the dative appear to be instances of the locative and/or comitative-instrumental dative. In one passage the dative is locative: Apollo is asked to place *ταῦτα νόω* (Pind., *Pyth.* 1.40). The activities of the following verbs are found in, by, or with *νόος*: *ἄγω* (Pind., *Pyth.* 6.47), *ἀθρόω* (Bacch. 5.8), *αὐδάομαι* (Pind., *Ol.* 2.92), *βλέπω* (Pind., *Pyth.* 8.67), *βουλεύω* (Theog. 1052), *γέβομαι* (Pind., *Nem.* 3.42), *δέκομαι* (Pind., *Pyth.* 8.18; *Pae.* 5.45), *ἔχω* (Hes., fr. 45.3; Theog. 365; Pind., *Pyth.* 3.103), *οἶδα* (Pind., *Pyth.* 3.29), *πονέω* (Pind., *Is.* 1.40), *προσέχω* (Pind., *Pyth.* 6.51), *ῥόομαι* (Hes., *Theog.* 661), *συνεῖδον* (Theog. 1237), *σφάλλω* (Pind., fr. 1a6), *ὑπαντιάζω* (Pind., *Pyth.* 5.43–44), and *φιλέω* (Pind., *Nem.* 7.88). These instances of the dative show a relationship of harmony between person and *νόος*; he acts in coöperation with this psychic entity. These passages also suggest that in the lyric poets, especially in Pindar, a person acted more often with *νόος* as location, means, or accompaniment than in Homer.

III. *Accusative*

By far the most frequent occurrence of *νόος* in Hesiod and the lyric poets is in the accusative case. *Nóος* is three times the object of the preposition *κατά* (Theog. 142; 350; Scol. 908), once of *ἐπί* (Theog. 633). In a few passages *νόος* occurs as an accusative of respect. It is found with the epithets *ἄριστος* (Sol. 27.13–14), *ματαιότερος* (Theog. 1025), and *νηλής* (Pind., *Pyth.* 1.95). It occurs also with the following verbs: *ἤρθη νοῦν* (Sim. 85.4 [D]), *νόον πεπνυκασμένος* (Hes., *W. & D.* 793), and *προσφέρομεν . . . νόον* (Pind., *Nem.* 6.5)²³. These instances of the accusative of respect suggest a close relationship between person and *νόος*: an attribute of the person is specifically located in *νόος*.

In further instances of the accusative the *νόος* of the gods can be the object of the action of another god with the verbs *ἐξαπαφίσκω*

²³) See also the instances of the accusative of part below.

and *τέρπω* (Hes., *Theog.* 537; 36–37; 50–51). In one passage a man tells (*ἔρέω*) the *νόος* of Zeus (Hes., *W. & D.* 661). In three fragments of Hesiod men do not know (*οἶδα*) the *νόος* of Zeus (43a52; 43a76; 303.2). Hesiod also says that it is impossible *ἐξαλέασθαι, κλέψαι, or παρελθεῖν* the *νόος* of Zeus (*W. & D.* 705; *Theog.* 613). Bacchylides similarly says that it is difficult *παρatreψαι* the *νόος* of the gods (5.95).

Man's *νόος* can be the object of the action of the gods with these verbs: *γηρύω* (Hes., *W. & D.* 260), *γινώσκω* (*Theog.* 898), *δίδωμι* (Hes., fr. 203.2), *ἐντίθημι* (Hes., *W. & D.* 67–68), *κλέπτω* (Sim. 525 = Sem. 42 [W]), *ὀρθόω* (*Theog.* 760), *ποιέω* (Sem. 7.1), and *τρέπω* (*Arch.* 96.1)²⁴. In two instances a person is affected specifically in his *νόος* (accusative of part): a person can deceive another in his *νόος* (*ἐξαπατάω*: Hes., *W. & D.* 373) or *εἶδος* can disgrace one in his *νόος* (*κατελέγχω*: Hes., *W. & D.* 714). In others, *νόος* is affected directly by the following influences: *ἀνάγκη* makes *νόον πλήμονα* (*Theog.* 196). *Βουλὴ ἄγει εἰς ἀγαθόν* (*Theog.* 1054), *γαστήρ παράγει εἰς ἀναιδεῖην* (*Arch.* 124b4), *γῆρας βλάπτει* (*Mim.* 5.8), *ἔρος δάμνησι* (Hes., *Theog.* 122), *ἦβη καὶ νεότης ἐπικουφίζει* (*Theog.* 629), and *κέρδος ἐξαπατᾷ νόον* (Hes., *W. & D.* 323). *Οἶνος δέει* (Hes., fr. 239.3), *δείκνυσι* (*Theog.* 500), and *ἔχει νόον* (*Theog.* 507); it makes (*τίθημι*) *νόον κοῦφον* (*Theog.* 498). *Πενίη* casts shame on (*καταισχύνω*) but *χάρις* submits *νόος* to *γλυκύταται φροντίδες* (*Theog.* 650; *Pind., Ol.* 1.19). In two passages external circumstances (*τάδε, ταῦτα*) either deceive (*ἀπατάω*) or fail to cheer (*ιαίνω*) *νόος* (*Theog.* 203; *Pind., Pyth.* 2.89)²⁵.

In some cases a person can affect another's *νόος*. This happens with these verbs: *γινώσκω* (*Theog.* 367 = 1184a), *εἰσοράω* (*Scol.* 889.2), *ἐφέπω* (*Alcman* 104), *ἔχω* (*Theog.* 439), *θέλω* (*Sapph.* 57.1), *θερμαίνω* (*Pind., Ol.* 10.87), *μανθάνω* (*Pind., Ol.* 9.75), and *οἶδα* (*Theog.* 125, 375, 598)²⁶.

All these instances of the accusative show that *νόος* was frequently the object of the action of a verb whose subject was an outside

²⁴ Cf. *Adesp. eleg.* 19.1 (W) where the gods do not implant a *νόος* in a fluteplayer. For the relation of *νόος* with verbs indicating intellectual activity see Darcus (note 12).

²⁵ Cf. *Adesp. eleg.* 22.2 (W) where time shows *νόος* and Euenus 5.1 (W) where *δογή* reveals a concealed *νόος*. A possible new reference to *νόος*: P.Lille 76abc, 207 as in *GRBS* 19 (1978) 32.

²⁶ All these passages where gods, persons, or outside influences affect *νόος* show how it remains "open" to external influences. See above note 10.

influence, the gods, or another person. As in Homer, these passages show νόος as an object to be affected, grasped, or known. Νόος appears as a vital psychic organ whose condition can significantly affect a person's behaviour. These instances of the accusative suggest a close relationship of person and νόος: this psychic organ may so often be an object affected or sought since it reveals most clearly a person's nature and acts as the locus of his deepest qualities.

In other instances of the accusative νόος is the object of verbs whose subject is the person possessing νόος: ἀπόλλυμι (Theog. 36; 1271), ἐκφαίνω (Sol. 34.3), ἔχω²⁷, προσφέρω (Pind., fr. 43), and τίθημι (Sol. 4c3; Theog. 89; Scol. 901). These passages reveal a person's control over νόος. This control seems greater than it was in Homer. Νόος is frequently an entity that a person "has". He can put on a καθαρόν νόον (Theog. 89; Scol. 901) or place νόον ἐν μετρίοισι (Sol. 4c3). He can show forth a τραχὺν νόον (Sol. 34.3), nourish a νόον κρέσσονα ἀλικίας (Pind., *Pyth.* 5.109–110), destroy τὸν ἐόντα νόον or an ἐσθλὸν νόον (Theog. 36; 1271), and bear a νόον of changing nature (Pind., fr. 43). Νόος is active in man but he can check it, determine its nature (τραχύς, καθαρός), nourish, or destroy it. Thus his influence upon νόος is considerable.

IV. *Nominative*

Νόος appears less frequently in the nominative than in the accusative case in Hesiod and the lyric poets. First, νόος is the subject of the following verbs in the passive voice: ἐκτελέω (Hes., *Theog.* 1002), καταρτύω (Sol. 27.11), λανθάνω (Theog. 121), and τρέπω (Theog. 379). Second, νόος is found with verbs in the active voice. The νόος of Zeus is subject of τολμάω and κυβερνάω (Theog. 377; Pind., *Pyth.* 5.122); the νόος of the gods is subject of ὑπερέχω (Theog. 202). The νόος of man is subject of the following verbs: γηθέω (Corinna 654 i 28), εἶργω (Theog. 686), ἔπω (Theog. 397), πέτομαι (Theog. 1053), πρέπω (Pind., *Pyth.* 10.67–68), φρονέω (Theog. 395), and φύομαι (Theog. 1163)²⁸. These instances show νόος as an active agent within a person. Νόος clearly carries on definite activities over which, nonetheless, a person exercises some control (as the accusative usage shows).

²⁷ Hes., *Theog.* 262; Arch. 185.6 (a fox); Sapph. 96.2; Theog. 74,87 = 1082c, 91, 109, 367 = 1184a, 461, 580, 698, 792, 814, 898, 1016, 1267; Pind., *Pyth.* 3.5.

²⁸ Cf. *Adesp. eleg.* 19.2 (W): the νόος of a fluteplayer ἐκπέτεται.

Nóος occurs in the nominative accompanied by the following epithets, the copulative verb, *εἰμί*, being understood: *ἄδικος* (Sol. 4.7), *ἄλλοῖος* (Hes., *W. & D.* 483), *ἀφανής* (Sol. 17), *κρέσσων* (Theog. 631), and *κρυπτός* (Hes., fr. 16.17). So too is the verb *εἰμί* understood when Hesiod says that *νόος* is *[γλ]ώσσης καθ[ύπ]ερθεν* (fr. 150.14), when Semonides says that *νόος* is not found in men (1.3), when Theognis says that *νόος* is an *ἀγαθόν* (1185), and when Pindar says that his *νόος* is *δίχ' ἀτρέκειαν εἶπεῖν* (fr. 213.4). *Nóος* as subject of *εἰμί* is called *μὴ ἄρτιος* (Sol. 6.4; Theog. 154) and, as subject of *ἔνεμι*, *αὐτός* (Theog. 622), *πιστός* (Theog. 88 = 1082d), and *χαῦνος* (Sol. 11.6). *Nóος* also appears once as subject of *κεῖμαι*: *οἷς ταύτη κεῖται νόος* (Sem. 29.10 = Sim. 8.10 [W]). These instances of *νόος* with a copulative verb suggest some of the characteristics of *νόος*. Person and *νόος* are distinct but *νόος* can reflect a person's nature: it acts as a locus of some of his qualities²⁹).

V. Conclusion

This grammatical usage of *νόος* in Hesiod and the lyric poets reveals the ways in which this psychic organ was viewed. To a large extent *νόος* retains the characteristics it had in Homer with three qualities enhanced: it is more often a location, instrument, or accompaniment (especially in Pindar) than it was in Homer; it is in even greater degree an object to be influenced or known; it is more subject to the control of the person in whom it is found. In general *νόος* is seen in the following ways:

(1) as a location, instrument, or accompaniment in, by, or with which a person acts. *Nóος* at the same time contributes to the various emotional, intellectual, or volitional activities a person engages in. (Locative or comitative-instrumental dative, dative of respect, accusative of respect.)

(2) as the object of some activity signified by a verb. In several cases the subject is another person, the gods, or an outside influence. (Accusative after a verb, nominative with verb in the passive voice, objective genitive after a verb.)

²⁹) The following fragments are not included in the above notes because they are too fragmentary or the context is not clear: Hes., fr. 43a50; Arch. 94.6; Stesich. S15i15; Ibyc. S192a5; Alc. 43 (B11. 1); 363 (Z40.1); Corinna 692 fr. 7.9; Sim. 511 fr. 4.9; Pind., fr. 177e; *Pap. Ox.* 2439 fr. 2.6; *Pap. Ox.* 2445 fr. 1ii10; Bacch. 4.9. I have omitted discussion of *νόος* in Xenophanes B25 (Diels-Kranz) since I have treated this fragment fully in "The *Phren* of the *Noos* in Xenophanes' God", *SO* 53 (1978) 25-40.

(3) as an object of some activity of a verb where a person affects his own *νόος*. (Accusative after a verb; cf. one instance of the objective genitive: *καρτερός νόου*.)

(4) as an entity qualified by certain characteristics. (Epithets with *νόος* especially with a copulative verb.)

(5) as an active agent acting within the person. (Subjective genitive and nominative.)

As in Homer *νόος* can act as a location, instrument, or accompaniment in, by, or with which a person acts. Here person and *νόος* cooperate in performing some activity; there is harmony between them. This relationship is more common in the lyric poets, especially in Pindar, than it was in Homer.

On other occasions *νόος* can act independently within a person but in Hesiod and the lyric poets a person's control over it appears increased. *Νόος* does not seem to be a psychic organ that he addresses directly (evidence provides no instance of the vocative of *νόος*) but he can direct the way *νόος* functions and the manner in which it manifests itself.

The epithets with *νόος* both reveal its characteristics and its important role as a locus of a person's qualities. This role may in some degree explain the most common occurrence of *νόος* in Hesiod and the lyric poets: as an object to be affected, grasped, or known. *Νόος* is a psychic organ accustomed to be hidden from others³⁰). Most information about a person is found if his *νόος* is known; likewise, if *νόος* is influenced, the person himself is also most keenly affected. Person and *νόος* remain distinct but the importance of *νόος* is recognised. This may account for the frequent outside influence upon *νόος* and also the greater control a person exerts over *νόος* in Hesiod and the lyric poets.

A Homeric Note

By SARA E. KIMBALL, Philadelphia

Iterative preterits are made by the addition of the thematic suffix *-σκε/ο* and secondary endings to full aorist or present verbal stems e.g. *δό-σκον*, *ῶσα-σκε φύγε-σκον*, *φιλέε-σκον* and *ἰσχανάα-σκον*. Iterative preterits derived from verbs in *-έω* and *-άω* take one of two shapes. After heavy

³⁰) See, e.g., Scol. 889, Theog. 121–128, 499–502, 897–900. See also Darcus (note 12).