

## **Kleos aphthiton: An Indo-European Perspective on Early Greek Poetry**

By EDWIN D. FLOYD, Pittsburgh

1. *Introduction.* The correlation of the Greek formula κλέος ἄφθιτον with Vedic *śrávaḥ . . . ákṣitam* enjoys a special importance among the scattered bits of evidence which have been adduced for the existence and reconstruction of Indo-European poetry. The two phrases were first connected by Kuhn in 1853, and they have been frequently compared since then. Often, the etymological identity of the two phrases has been cited simply as evidence for the existence of an Indo-European poetic tradition in both Greek and Indic, but in the last forty years or so the correlation has increasingly come to be regarded as giving some special insight into the heroic nature of prehistoric Indo-European poetry<sup>1</sup>).

Although considerable scholarly attention has been devoted to κλέος ἄφθιτον and its Vedic congener, discussion both of the original

---

<sup>1</sup>) The present paper is an extension of a version read before the Department of Classics at the University of Pittsburgh in April, 1978. I am grateful to all who participated in discussion then, and particularly to Nicholas F. Jones, who first called my attention to the important Marathon epigram (cf. Section 9 below).

Scholarship on Indo-European poetry from 1853 through the mid-1960's is conveniently summarized by R. Schmitt, *Dichtung und Dichtersprache in indogermanischer Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1967), with specific discussion of κλέος ἄφθιτον on pp. 1-2, 6, and 61-69. Actually, Kuhn's initial reference to the correlation with Vedic *śrávaḥ ákṣitam* was only a very brief obiter dictum in an article on a quite different topic, "Über die durch nasale erweiterten verbalstämme", *KZ (Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung)* 2 (1853) 467. Many important articles on Indo-European poetry are reprinted in R. Schmitt, *Indogermanische Dichtersprache* (Darmstadt 1968); for κλέος ἄφθιτον, see especially pp. 337-340, in Schmitt's conclusion. Investigation of the correlation of κλέος ἄφθιτον with *śrávaḥ ákṣitam* also forms the basis for G. Nagy, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Cambridge, Mass. 1974). On the other hand, κλέος ἄφθιτον is not prominent in M. L. West's important article "Greek Poetry 2000-700 B.C.," *CQ* n.s. 23 (1973) 179-192; for West's cautious views concerning this particular correlation, see his p. 187.

usage of the phrase and of its development in the Indic and Greek literary traditions has been singularly limited in scope. There has been a decided tendency, even in quite lengthy treatments, to explain the semantic content of the phrase just on the basis of one passage, viz., Achilles' use of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* in *Il.* 9.413. As a result, other occurrences of the phrase, both in Greek and in Sanskrit, have been read in the light of this very famous passage; or often, they have not been discussed as separate semantic entities at all.

*Κλέος ἄφθιτον*, as used in *Il.* 9.413, clearly alludes to the post-humous preservation of a warrior's fame. The means by which such fame is to be preserved is presumably by bards such as Homer, although this is not actually specified in the immediate context of *Il.* 9.413. Earlier in Book 9, however, we see Achilles himself singing of the deeds of heroes (*ἄειδε δ' ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν*, line 189), and in any event it seems natural to regard poetry as the means by which fame is preserved from generation to generation.

In view of the existence of an exact phonological parallel for *κλέος ἄφθιτον* in Vedic Sanskrit, it also seems straightforward enough to assume a long, indeed Indo-European ancestry for the concept of poetically preserved fame and furthermore to connect this concept specifically with the Indo-European ancestor of Homer's phrase *κλέος ἄφθιτον*. Wackernagel, for example, argues as follows: "Nicht bloß der Umstand, daß diese Wortgruppe in beiden Sprachen zunächst in poetischen Texten bezeugt ist, sondern auch der Inhalt des Ausdrucks führt darauf, ihn für die älteste Dichtersprache in Anspruch zu nehmen. Von unvergänglichem Ruhme der Helden zu reden, war vor allem Sache des Dichters." Both Schmitt and Nagy follow Wackernagel's general line of argument in discussing *κλέος ἄφθιτον*, but they focus more specifically on the poet's role in preserving the warrior's deeds. Schmitt, for example, says: "Der Ruhm, der sich der Held im Kampf erwirbt, wird ja gerade im Verse des Dichters weiterleben," while Nagy says: "The epic Singer sings of past deeds without actually knowing the facts himself, but the facts are contained in the *κλέος* that he *hears* from other singers and that he himself passes on to still other singers."<sup>2</sup>)

<sup>2</sup>) The quotes are from J. Wackernagel, "Indogermanische Dichtersprache," *Philologus* 95 (1943) 16 (= Schmitt 1968: 98 [n. 1, above]), Schmitt 1967: 67–68 (n. 1, above), and Nagy 1974: 249 (n. 1, above); cf. also Nagy, *passim*, and especially his chapter "The Hidden Meaning of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* and *śráva(s) ákṣitam*," pp. 229–261.

2. Vedic *śrávaḥ* . . . *ákṣitam*, etc. Although it may seem plausible enough, there are actually serious objections to the interpretation of κλέος ἄφθιτον just presented. The first problem arises with the Vedic material. The concept of a kind of posthumous, disembodied fame living on from generation to generation beyond the individual hero is not really present in any of the four passages in which the phrases *śrávo* . . . *ákṣitam* (*RV* 1.9.7) and *ákṣiti śrávaḥ* (*RV* 1.40.4, 8.103.5, and 9.66.7) appear. Also, although the Vedic passages do refer to prowess in battle as the background for fame which is preserved by poetry, these ideas are not central in any of them in quite the way in which *Il.* 9.143 revolves around Achilles' heroic prowess. Rather, there are two principal connotations associated with *śrávo* . . . *ákṣitam* / *ákṣiti śrávaḥ* in the *Rig-Veda*, viz., (1) fame as manifested in secure material possessions, festive celebration, long life, etc., and (2) an appeal to the gods to bestow such fame.

These connotations of 'unfading fame' appear most clearly in *RV* 1.9.7 – which also happens to be the one Vedic passage in which *śrávaḥ* is used with the exact phonological correlate of ἄφθιτον, viz., *ákṣitam*, rather than the undoubtedly newer form *ákṣiti*<sup>3</sup>). The poem is a hymn to the warrior-god Indra, inviting him to the Soma-ritual. It opens with the idea that sacrifice and song strengthen Indra (stanzas 1–3). The next and longest section of the poem (stanzas 4–9) presents the worshippers' desire for recompense from the god. The theme is introduced in stanza 4, through comparing songs which are yet unsatisfied with cows which are without a bull. Stanzas 5 and 6 then develop the idea that, as his worshippers praise Indra, so he should reward them. In stanzas 7–8, the hoped-for reward is described as fame. Finally, the two concluding stanzas serve to summarize the entire poem: stanza 9 sums up stanzas 4–8, while stanza 10 returns to the ideas of 1–3, with allusion to the Soma-ritual.

Stanzas 7–8 of *RV* 1.9, which refer specifically to fame, run as follows:

sám gómad Indra vájavad / asmé pṛthú śrávo brhát  
viśváyur dhehy ákṣitam.  
asmé dhehi śrávo brhád / dyumnám sahasrasátamam  
Índra tá rathínīr íṣah.

<sup>3</sup>) For discussion of the two forms *ákṣitam* and *ákṣiti* and their relative chronology, see Schmitt 1967: 64–65 (n. 1, above) and Nagy 1974: 153–165 (n. 1, above).

Since this section of the poem is crucial for my argument, I present it in both Griffith's and Geldner's translations. Griffith translates as follows<sup>4</sup>):

Give, Indra, wide and lofty fame, wealthy in cattle and in strength,  
Lasting our lifetime, failing not.  
Grant us high fame, O Indra, grant riches bestowing thousands, those  
Fair fruits of earth borne home in wains.

Geldner's German translation, perhaps more generally careful, is as follows<sup>5</sup>):

Häuf auf uns, Indra, den Ruhm vieler Rinder und Belohnungen, der  
breit, hoch, fürs ganze Leben, unerschöpflich ist.  
Verschaff uns hohen Ruhm, Glanz, der Tausende einbringt, die Labsale  
wagenvoll, o Indra.

Albeit at the risk of somewhat anticipating my discussion in Section 7, it may be stated at the outset that the contrast between *śrávaḥ . . . áksitam* and *κλέος ἄφθιτον*, as used in this passage and in *Il.* 9.413, could scarcely be greater. In the Homeric passage, there is a fundamental dichotomy between posthumous renown and Achilles' continued earthly existence. *RV* 1.9.7–8, on the other hand, refers to the secure possession of wealth consisting of cattle, booty, the fruits of the earth, etc. He who is wealthy in such possessions is esteemed, and to have the continued enjoyment of such renown throughout one's life is to have unfading fame<sup>6</sup>). Just as clearly, the external guarantor of this fame is not the poet, but rather the god Indra.

---

<sup>4</sup> R. T. H. Griffith, *The Hymns of the Rgveda* (Delhi 1973, reprint of 1889 edition), p. 5.

<sup>5</sup> K. F. Geldner, *Der Rig-Veda* (Cambridge, Mass. 1951) I.10. The additional translations given below from Geldner are from I.50, II.434, and III.53.

<sup>6</sup> The connection of fame with the material enjoyment of possessions is particularly stressed by the word *viśváyur*, at least as it is generally taken in this passage as meaning 'life-long'; so Griffith ("lasting our life-time"), Geldner ("fürs ganze Leben"), and Schmitt 1967: 19, n. 114 (n. 1, above) "der das ganze Leben über währt." Nagy 1974: 110 (n. 1, above), on the other hand, translates *RV* 1.9.7bc as follows: "to us fame which is wide and far and everlasting and imperishable, grant!" Nagy's translation of *viśváyur* as "everlasting" of course tends to give the passage a different connotation, but in my opinion this connotation is not entirely consistent with the preceding and following context; note that Nagy quotes only 1.9.7bc, thus omitting the reference to cattle in 1.9.7a, along with the references in 1.9.8.

*ṚV* 1.9 is of course a *poem* to a *warrior-god*. Both components of the generally accepted interpretation of the phrase *κλέος ἀφθιτον / śrávaḥ ákṣitam* (i.e., the preservation of martial prowess through song) are therefore implicit throughout the hymn. Within stanza 7 itself, there is an allusion to battle in the word *vájavat*, which is probably best taken as ‘possessing booty’; also, the address to Indra to grant riches, fame, etc., is framed by specific references to song in stanzas 4 and 9. All these considerations, though, are secondary to the direct semantic application of *śrávaḥ . . . ákṣitam*, which is clearly to contemporary fame, reflecting material prosperity.

The fundamental divergence between the Vedic and Homeric connotations of ‘unfading fame’ is corroborated by the parallel phrase *ákṣiti śrávaḥ*, as used in *ṚV* 1.40.4, 8.103.5, and 9.66.7. While somewhat broadening the picture of the Vedic concept, these three passages do not bring us substantially closer to the usage of *Il.* 9.413.

*Ákṣiti śrávaḥ* first occurs in 1.40, addressed to Brahmanaspati, Lord of Prayer. Stanza 4 of this poem runs thus:

yó vāgháte dádāti sūnáram vāsu / sá dhatte ákṣiti śrávaḥ.  
tásmā ilām suvírām á yajāmahe / suprátūrtim anehásam.

Geldner’s translation is as follows:

Wer dem Priester echtes Gut schenkt, der erwirbt unvergänglichen Ruhm.  
Für ihn erbitten wir den Segen guter Mannen, die tüchtig voranstreben,  
fehlerlos sind.

Of the four Vedic occurrences of *śrávaḥ* with *ákṣit-*, this contains the most extensive connotations of heroic poetry, since it clearly refers to the poet or priest (*vāgháte*), and the fame which he can bestow. Taking just the first half of 1.40.4, we might well think in terms of immaterial fame, preserved from generation to generation. The second half of the stanza, though, describes *śrávaḥ* in a much more material fashion. The poet-priest and his associates ask for *ilām suvírām . . . suprátūrtim anehásam* ‘a blessing consisting of men who are victorious and without blemish’. Thus we see that the individual hero’s prowess is to be complemented by his retinue of stout warriors who fight for him and thereby maintain his reputation unfading. The ultimate source of this fame must furthermore be regarded as a god or gods. In addition to Brahmanaspati, the poem refers to the Maruts, Indra, Varuṇa, Mitra, and Aryaman, and although no divinity is specifically mentioned in stanza 4, there is a clear indication of their importance in bestowing fame on the warrior in the phrase *tásmā . . . á yajāmahe* ‘we make sacrifice for him’.

*ṚV* 8.103 is addressed to the fire-god Agni, and describes his powers and his beneficent relationship with mankind. Stanza 5 is as follows:

sá dr̥ḥé cid abhí tṛṇatti vājam árvatā, / sá dhatte ákṣiti śrávaḥ.  
tvé devatrā sádā purūvaso / viśvā vāmāni dhimahi.

Geldner translates thus:

Er bahnt sich mit dem Schlachtroß den Weg zum Gewinn, selbst wenn dieser unter Verschuß ist; er erwirbt unvergänglichen Ruhm.

Von dir möchten wir stets alles Gute bei den Göttern empfangen, du Schätzerreicher.

In this passage, military activity is clearly the means through which fame is obtained. The primary focus, though, is not on heroic exploits as such, nor on the singer's preserving or embellishing the memory of them; rather, it is on the material prosperity, variously referred to as *vájam* 'booty', *śrávaḥ* 'fame', and *vāmāni* 'fortune, wealth', which is the result of success in battle, and which Agni is here invoked to grant.

Like the other poems of Maṇḍala Nine, *ṚV* 9.66 is addressed to the mystic intoxicating drink Soma<sup>7</sup>). Stanza 7 of this poem runs thus:

prá Soma yāhi dhārayā / sutá Índrāya matsaráḥ  
dádhāno ákṣiti śrávaḥ. Geldner translates as follows:

Komm hervor mit deinem Strome, o Soma, für Indra ausgepresst, be-  
rauschend, unvergänglichen Ruhm erwerbend!

Since *ákṣiti śrávaḥ* here describes something to be attained by a god (Indra) rather than by human beings, its connotations are obviously different from the use of the phrase in 1.9.7, 1.40.4, and 8.103.5. The difference is further accentuated by the fact that in passages such as 1.91.6, 8.48.3, 9.106.8, and 9.113.7–8, Soma is specifically the drink of immortality. Nevertheless, 9.66.7 can be correlated with the other Vedic occurrences of *śrávaḥ ákṣit-* far better than it can with the way in which *κλέος ἀφθιτον* is used in *Il.* 9.413. Just as the other passages ask Indra, Brahmaṇaspati (?), and Agni, respectively, to grant secure fame on the human level, so Soma is invoked in 9.66.7 to strengthen Indra and thus make secure his renown among the gods. The benefit of Soma in 9.66.7 is furthermore viewed in a quite material sense, unlike *Il.* 9.413, with its focus on immaterial, post-humous fame; cf. the reference to Indra's success in battle later in *ṚV* 9.66 (stanza 15) and more generally the references to the visible and tangible exhilaration brought by Soma (stanzas 16, 18, 24, 27, 30).

3. *Homer or Veda?* Surprisingly little attention has been paid to the divergence between the Vedic and earliest Greek usage of *śrávaḥ ákṣit-* and *κλέος ἀφθιτον*. Nagy, for example, does not really consider the problem at all in his *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter*, while Schmitt merely glances at the difficulty, stating that the typical Vedic connection of *śrávaḥ* with the gods is a secondary development, dictated by the nature of the Vedic hymns as sacral, rather than heroic poetry<sup>8</sup>).

<sup>7</sup>) For general discussion of Soma, cf. A. A. Macdonell, *The Vedic Mythology* (Varanasi 1971 = Strassburg 1897) 104–115.

<sup>8</sup>) Possibly I am missing something in Nagy's treatment, but so far as I can see he offers no explicit discussion of the divergence between the Vedic and Homeric usages. There is a kind of implication in this direction in the point Nagy 1974: 255–261 (n. 1, above) makes about *κλέος* as a reward for

The difference in subject-matter and genre which we find in comparing the Vedic hymns with Homeric epic is clearly adequate to account, on a purely synchronic and descriptive level, for the differing uses of the inherited phrases *śrávaḥ ákṣitam* and *κλέος ἄφθιτον*. When considering the matter diachronically, though, it is by no means obvious that we should give priority to the Homeric usage of the inherited phrase. In addition to the detailed evidence from archaic and early classical poetry to be considered in sections 4, 5, 6, 8, and 9, at least three general considerations suggest that the Vedic pattern may actually be closer to the original meaning of the formula: (1) the single Homeric occurrence of the phrase is in Book 9 of the *Iliad*. Although we do well to reject the Analysts' view that this section was composed later than most other parts of the *Iliad*, we must nevertheless admit that there are innovative elements in Achilles' speech in which he criticizes the traditional warrior code. Consequently, we should not put undue weight on Achilles' use of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* as evidence for its traditional connotations<sup>9</sup>). (2) As against just one occurrence in Homer, the com-

---

success in battle, as contrasted with *πένθος ἄλαστον* as the result of defeat, but Nagy does not here distinguish the Homeric concept of posthumous fame from the different Vedic usage. The discussion in Schmitt to which I refer is 1967: 96 (n. 1, above): "In der vedischen Dichtung traten die 'Rühme der Männer' . . . gegenüber den Heldentaten der Götter, eines *Indra* vor allem, zurück. Wir dürfen eben nicht aus den Augen verlieren, daß wir in den vedischen *Sūktas* lyrische und nicht epische Dichtung vor uns haben!" Cf. also Schmitt 1968: 342 (n. 1, above). Actually, the passage which I quote from Schmitt 1967: 96 comes in his discussion of the correlation of Homeric *κλέα ἀνδρῶν* (*Il.* 9.189) with Vedic *śrávaḥ nṛṇām* (*RV* 5.18.5); he does not specifically consider the problem in his discussion of the phrase *κλέος ἄφθιτον* in Schmitt 1967: 61–69.

<sup>9</sup>) Despite its sketchiness in detail, the most provocative treatment of the untraditional nature of Achilles' language in Book 9 is probably A. Parry, "The Language of Achilles," *TAPA* 87 (1956) 1–7. For criticism of Parry's article, see M. D. Reeve, "The Language of Achilles," *CQ* n.s. 23 (1973) 193–195, D. B. Claus, "*Aidós* in the language of Achilles," *TAPA* 105 (1975) 13–28, and P. Friedrich and J. Redfield, "Speech as a personality symbol: The case of Achilles," *Language* 54 (1978) 263–288. On the whole, Reeve's treatment of Parry is negative, while the other two accept Parry's article as a valid starting point for further discussion. In particular, Claus considers the rhetorical sophistication of Achilles' language, while Friedrich and Redfield consider the way in which Achilles' use of linguistic phenomena such as the use of similes, subordinate clauses, vocatives, etc., differs from that of other characters in the *Iliad*. Also, for the specific passage under consideration, cf. Willcock (notes 25 and 26 below).

ination of *śrávaḥ* with *áksit-* occurs four times in the *Rig-Veda*, in thematically diverse passages, addressed to four different divinities. Since the combination has essentially consistent connotations in all of its Vedic occurrences, it is more economical to assume a single Homeric innovation in the semantics of the phrase than to postulate an Indic reinterpretation of the traditional formula which equally affected all four of its occurrences in the *Rig-Veda*. (3) Although the *Iliad* stands at the beginning of the Greek literary tradition, the Vedic material is older by at least several centuries, and thus closer in time to the original use of the phrase. Furthermore, it is becoming increasingly clear that Homer's overall poetic practice is not particularly conservative; in particular, see Nagy's discussion of the ways in which Greek poets of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C. were more traditional than Homer, both in general metrical technique and in the particular poetic formulas which they used<sup>10</sup>).

4. *The Delphi inscription.* Outside of Homer, the earliest occurrence of *κλέος ἀφθιτον* for which we know essentially its full original context is a now lost dedicatory inscription from near Delphi. The inscription appears to be earlier than 550, perhaps closer to 600 B.C., and despite some uncertainty concerning the dedicator's name, it consists of a substantially complete poem in two hexameter lines. It is printed as follows by Jeffery<sup>11</sup>):

τασθε γ' Ἀθαναιαι δραφεος Φα[·]ε|αριστος εθεκε,  
 Ηἔραι τε, ἠὸς και κ|ενος εχοι κλεφος αφθιτον αιφει.

Except for the hapax legomenon *δραφεος* (for this, see the discussion toward the end of this Section), the sense of the inscription is clear:

<sup>10</sup>) For meter, see Nagy 1974: passim, and especially 1–23 (n. 1, above); cf. A. Meillet, *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs* (Paris 1923) (for Meillet, cf. Schmitt 1968: 40–48 [n. 1, above]). For poetic formulas, especially in Sappho, fr. 44 (cf. Section 6 below), see Nagy 1974: 118–139.

<sup>11</sup>) L. H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece* (Oxford 1961) p. 403 (pl. 12.1); see also pp. 101 and 103 for discussion of the date and provenance of the inscription. The inscription appears also as E. Schwyzler, *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora* (Leipzig 1923 = Hildesheim 1960) no. 316 (p. 160) and P. Friedländer and H. B. Hoffleit, *Epigrammata: Greek Inscriptions in Verse, from the Beginnings to the Persian Wars* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1948) no. 44 (pp. 47–48); cf. also *SEG* 15 (1958) no. 351 (p. 90).



# G L O T T A

*Zeitschrift für griechische und lateinische Sprache*

Herausgegeben von

Hartmut Erbse, Hansjakob Seiler  
und Klaus Strunk

LVIII. Band



GÖTTINGEN · VANDENHOECK & RUPRECHT · 1980

*Begründet von Paul Kretschmer und Franz Skutsch*  
*Nach 1945 fortgesetzt von Paul Kretschmer und Bruno Snell*

Printed in Germany by Hubert & Co., Göttingen

## Inhalt

|  |     |
|--|-----|
| Baldwin, B., <i>carzimasium</i> : a Greek word? .....  | 266 |
| Bartelink, G. J. M., Ἀλλότριος und <i>alienus</i> als Teufels- und Dämonen-<br>bezeichnung ..... | 266 |
| Booth, A. D., <i>sedere</i> dans Martial 11.99 .....   | 278 |
| Braswell, B. K., Three Linguistic Notes on Pindar .....  | 205 |
| Carey, C., ΓΟΝΙΑΣ (Aeschyl. Cho. 1067) .....   | 47  |
| Cunningham, I. C., Συρμαιογραφεῖν .....  | 66  |
| Darcus, S. M. How a Person relates to νόος in Homer, Hesiod etc. ....                            | 33  |
| Dunkel, G., Ennian <i>atque atque</i> ; <i>prope</i> .....                                       | 97  |
| Durling, R. J., Lexicographical Notes on Galen's Writings (II) .....                             | 260 |
| Erbse, H., Zur normativen Grammatik der Alexandriner .....                                       | 236 |
| Fehling, D., Lehnübersetzungen aus orientalischen Sprachen usw. ....                             | 1   |
| Floyd, E. D., <i>Kleos aphthiton</i> .....   | 133 |
| Heubeck, A., Πρόφασις und kein Ende (zu Thuk. I 23) .....  | 222 |
| Johnstone, H. W., Pankoinon as a Rhetorical Figure in Greek Tragedy                              | 49  |
| Jordan, D. R., Ἐκατικά .....   | 62  |
| Kimball, S. B., A Homeric Note .....   | 44  |
| Macleod, M. D., A Lexicographical Note on Lucian, <i>Navigium</i> 39 .....                       | 259 |
| Mugler, F., Concerning the Usage and Evolution of the Conditional Sen-<br>tence in Latin .....   | 119 |
| Opelt, I., „Töten“ und „Sterben“ in Caesars Sprache .....  | 103 |
| Reeve, M. D., Martialis res agitur .....   | 279 |
| Shields, Jr., K., The Oscan-Umbrian Third Person Plural .....                                    | 68  |
| Thraede, K., Metrische Proklise im epischen Vers der Römer .....                                 | 78  |
| Treloar, A., Rufinus: De bened. patriarch. II 27 .....   | 280 |
| Untermann, J., Die venetische Sprache .....  | 281 |
| Vara, J., Phonological Structure of the Syllable in Ancient Greek .....                          | 24  |
| Vivante, P., Men's Epithets in Homer .....   | 157 |
| Vox, O., Πυγαστόλος: una donna-uccello? .....  | 172 |
| Wilson, J. B., KAIROS as "Due Mesure" .....  | 177 |



“These *draweoi* Phawearistos (?) dedicated to Athena and to Hera, so that he too might always have unfading fame.”<sup>12)</sup>

As one might expect, *Il.* 9.413 has often been mentioned in discussion of this inscription; however, direct comparison of the two occurrences of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* has proved somewhat difficult. Friedländer and Hoffleit note that the Delphi inscription does not refer to great deeds in battle, while Nagy points out that there is no reference or allusion to poetry as the means by which the dedicator is to acquire fame<sup>13)</sup>. One might also add that the epigram contains no clear reference to posthumous fame, and that it is addressed to Athena and Hera, while the Homeric passage contains no specific indication of any divinity as the guarantor of Achilles’ reputation.

At least with respect to the source of fame, the inscription is obviously closer to the four Vedic passages considered in Section 2 than to *Il.* 9.413. Just as Indra is invoked in *ṚV* 1.9.7 to grant *śrávāḥ*, so here a dedication is made to two goddesses in the expectation of obtaining *κλέφος*.

It is harder to define the nature of the *κλέφος* which the dedicator in the Delphi inscription hopes to receive; however, a comparison with other Greek dedicatory inscriptions reveals a general similarity to the connotations of the Vedic phrase as discussed in Section 2. In Friedländer and Hoffleit’s collection of epigrams down to the early fifth century, there are some dozen or so other dedicatory inscriptions which mention or allude to some hoped-for recompense from a divinity<sup>14)</sup>. In most, the content of the wish is expressed

---

<sup>12)</sup> In my translation, I assume that the dedicator’s name is *Φαφάριστος*, written on the stone with an etymologically original -ε- (from *\*Phawesaristos*), which has, however, no metrical force. For this general sort of phenomenon, cf. *Δεινοδικῆο*, *Δεινομενεός*, and *αλήδων* in the famous Nikandre inscription (Friedländer and Hoffleit no. 46 = Schwyzer no. 758 = Jeffery, pl. 55.2 = *IG* XII.5.1425b) and *Λεαρετη* in Friedländer and Hoffleit no. 60 = Jeffery, pl. 58.68 = *IG* XII.8.398. The question of the dedicator’s name is not, of course, of any particular significance for us—except inasmuch as it would be helpful to be assured of the accuracy of the 19th century copies of the stone!

<sup>13)</sup> Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948: 48 (n. 11, above), Nagy 1974: 251 (n. 1, above).

<sup>14)</sup> The inscriptions, with numbers from S(chwyzer), J(effery), and *IG*, along with other appropriate references, are Friedländer and Hoffleit, nos. 37 (S 538, *CP* 4 [1909] 76), 144 (S 771, J pl. 56.34, *IG* XII.5.215), 147 (*IG* I<sup>2</sup>.700), 35 (S 538 note, J pl. 7.1, *AJA* 39 [1935] 511), 36a (S 123.13, J pl.

in rather general terms, but in all of them it can or must be read as including some material coloring. Certainly none of them unambiguously refers to a hope for posthumous fame. Friedländer and Hoffleit no. 37, for example, asks for ἀρετάν [τε καὶ ὄλβον] (with the crucial last three words restored on the basis of *Homeric Hymns* 15.9 and 20.8) and no. 144 asks Artemis to increase the family and livelihood of the dedicators: τῶν γενεῆν βίωτόν τ' αἰξ' ἐν ἀπημοσύνηι. Another, no. 147, asks for ἀγαθῶν . . . ἀφθονίαν. In nos. 35 and 36a, the request is for χαρίεσσαν ἀμοιβάν, variously spelled; the phrase is rather general, but in its one Homeric occurrence (*Od.* 3.58), it clearly has material connotations. In one inscription, no. 36b, Poseidon is asked to grant χαρίεσσαν ἀφορμάν “a gracious beginning”—presumably of some business undertaking. Likewise, no. 39, διδοίης ἄλλο ἀναθεῖναι, has a clearly material implication. Three others, nos. 36A, 40, and 115, are more general, asking simply for χάριν from the divinity, while no. 108 asks Athena to have a πρόφρονα θυμόν toward the dedicators. Finally, in one sixth century epigram, the request is for fame, just as in the Delphi inscription (although the term used is δόξα, rather than κλέος). This is no. 111, which runs as follows:

*Νικόμαχος μ' ἐπόει.  
Χαῖρε, Φάναξ Ἡρακλῆς· ὁ τοι κεραμεύς μ' ἀνέθηκε·  
δὸς δέ F' ἰν ἀνθρώποις δόξαν ἔχειν ἀγαθάν.*

If we were to consider just the bare text of this inscription, it might seem uncertain whether the request is for contemporary or posthumous fame. Its physical location, however, strongly favors the former interpretation. The epigram was inscribed on a clay pillar, made by the potter himself—as Friedländer and Hoffleit say, “a specimen from his kiln.” While expressed in traditional poetic phraseology, it must therefore be principally intended as a kind of “advertisement”, to call the dedicator’s craftsmanship to his contemporaries’ attention, rather than as an appeal for permanent fame<sup>15</sup>).

In view of the complete lack of early epigraphic parallels for a dedication made to a divinity in the hope of obtaining posthumous

---

20.26, *IG* IV.212), 36 b (*IG* IV.213), 39 (*IG* I<sup>2</sup>.650), 36A (J pl. 36.19, *Philologus* 94 [1941] 330), 40 (*IG* XIV.2424), 115 (*Anth. Pal.* 6.137), 108 (*IG* I<sup>2</sup>.471), and 111 (S 438, J pl. 255, *IG* XIV.652).

<sup>15</sup> Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948: p. 107 (n. 11, above); cf. also their discussion of no. 37 on pp. 40–41.

fame, it is most probable that the request in the Delphi inscription was likewise for lasting good repute among men of the dedicator's own generation rather than in some more distant future. This analysis of the inscription is also indicated by consideration of the objects dedicated. In most discussions or translations of the inscription, these are conceded to be the hapax legomenon *δραφεος*<sup>16</sup>). Mysterious as this word may be, it is fairly definitely indicated by the copies of the stone, and its existence may also be supported by comparison with *δροίτη* 'bath, bathtub' (probably from \**δροφίτα*) and by Hesychius' *δραιόν· μακρόν· πυλεόν* (for which read *μάκ(τ)ραν* and *πέελον*?)<sup>17</sup>). Assuming that *δραφεος* is correct in the Delphi inscription, and that it has the semantic connections just suggested, the dedication would seem to be of a relatively humble nature, viz., clay basins, troughs, bathtubs, or the like. This may seem surprising, but it would actually be much like the clay pillar dedicated to Herakles, on which F & H 111 was inscribed (cf. also F & H 37, inscribed on a tile), and the purpose of the Delphi inscription is likely to have been a similar sort of "advertisement"—with the difference that in this instance the dedication was inscribed on a stone base, while the products of the craftsmen's skill were displayed above the inscription.

The concluding word of the Delphi inscription, *αἰφεῖ*, may seem to offer difficulties. It can of course have the meaning 'forever', and used with *κλέφος* it could therefore imply posthumous fame. The word need not, however, have this connotation. Instead, it can mean 'lifelong', or simply 'always, all the time'; for these frequent, weaker meanings of the word, cf. Theognis 3–4: *αἰεὶ πρῶτόν τε καὶ ὕστατον ἐν τε μέσοισιν | ἀείσω*, or *Od.* 1.91, where the word refers simply to the suitors' customary activities<sup>18</sup>).

<sup>16</sup>) So Nagy 1974: 251 (n. 1, above), Schmitt 1967: 62–63 (n. 1, above), Schwyzler 1923: p. 160 (n. 11, above), Jeffery 1961: p. 403 (n. 11, above). On the other hand, A. E. Raubitschek in two articles, "Another Drachma Dedication," *YCS* 11 (1950) 295–296, and "Das Denkmal-Epigramm," in *L'épigramme grecque* (Geneva 1968) 8–9, proposes *δραχμάς*, and this is adopted by Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948: pp. 47–48 (n. 11, above). This, however, seems definitely at variance with the copies of the stone; cf. W. Peek apud *SEG* 15 (1958) no. 351 (n. 11, above).

<sup>17</sup>) See the bibliographical material in Schwyzler 1923: p. 160 (n. 11, above). Cf. also *LSJ*, s.vv. *δραφεός* and *δραιόν*.

<sup>18</sup>) Cf. my translation of the inscription toward the beginning of this Section, where I use "always" for *αἰφεῖ*. A somewhat similar problem may also be posed by the word *καὶ* in the second line, which may seem to indicate

5. *Pseudo-Hesiod*, fr. 70.5. Although the passage is fragmentary, the occurrence of κλέος ἄφθιτον in (pseudo-)Hesiod, fr. 70.5 may be regarded as certain. Furthermore, enough of its context is preserved for us to reach fairly definite conclusions concerning its connotations as used here. Lines 1–7 of the fragment are printed as follows by Merkelbach and West<sup>19</sup>):

]ὑπερ.[  
 μ]εγάροισι λιπ[  
 εὔ]αδεν ἀθανάτ[οισι  
 πατή]ρ ἀνδρῶν τε θ[εῶν τε  
 ]. ἵνα οἱ κλέος ἄφθιτ[ον εἴη  
 ]ι πολυστάφυλον πο[λυγηθέα  
 ]ι· τοῦ μὲν κλέος οὗ π[οτ' ὀλεῖται.

The immediately following section of the fragment (lines 9–10) mentions a son of Athamas, along with Euipe, who is known from other sources as the daughter of Athamas' son Leukon<sup>20</sup>). For the first half of line 5, Merkelbach therefore suggests *Λευκοθέην τ' ἐκάλεσ]σ'*, with reference to Athamas' wife Ino, who was later called Leukothea. With this restoration, we can then translate lines 4–5 as follows: “the father of gods and men . . . and called her Leukothea, so that she might have unfading fame.” Marg, on the other hand, explains lines 5–7 as referring to Ino's son Melikertes, transformed, like his mother, into a sea divinity, Palaimon<sup>21</sup>). Both interpretations seem to involve some loose ends (particularly with respect to the transition of thought between lines 5 and 6);

---

a connection between the dedicator and the goddesses, which somehow relates him to the extratemporal world; cf. the paraphrase given by Nagy 1974: 251 (n. 1, above): “since you, Athena and Hera, merit permanent fame, my *δραφεοι* in your honor will give me permanent fame as well.” However, the word may also be taken in a much weaker sense, as indicated by Friedländer and Hoffleit 1948: p. 48 (n. 11, above): “καὶ may set off either *κεῖνος*: ‘he like the others who dedicated such offerings’, or the whole clause: ‘not only to honor the goddesses, but also to receive their reward’.”

<sup>19</sup>) R. Merkelbach and M. L. West, *Fragmenta Hesiodica* (Oxford 1967) 43–44. Additional, more doubtful restorations are printed by them at the bottom of the page as footnotes; cf. below concerning Merkelbach's conjectural supplement in line 5.

<sup>20</sup>) Pausanias IX.34.7–9; cf. Apollodorus I.9.1–2. For general discussion of the overall setting of fr. 70, see J. Schwartz, *Pseudo-Hesiodica* (Leiden 1960) 431–435.

<sup>21</sup>) W. Marg, *Hesiod: Sämtliche Gedichte* (Zürich and Stuttgart 1970) 446–447.



however, the idea that we have to deal with the transformation of a human figure into a divine figure, which is common to both, certainly seems reasonable, given the connection of the passage with Athamas' family. This line of explanation is also suggested by the fact that in other authors forms of the adjective *ἄφθιτος* (without *κλέος*) are several times used in connection with the god's granting or intending to grant immortality to a human being, viz., *Hymn to Demeter* 261, along with 263 (Demophoon), Pindar, *Olym.* 1.63 (Tantalos), and especially Pindar, *Olym.* 2.29 (Ino). Since *κλέος* does not otherwise have the sense 'life, existence', the connection of the particular combination *κλέος ἄφθιτον* with immortality may seem surprising (contrast the phrase *βίοτον ἄφθιτον* which Pindar uses of Ino in *Olym.* 2.29). The putative use of the phrase in Hesiod, fr. 70, though, may be easily enough explained as an extension from (a) reference to the continuation of an individual's prosperity throughout his (or her) lifetime to (b) reference to the perpetual maintenance of material existence as a god or goddess.

If the foregoing analysis is correct, the Hesiodic connection of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* with immortality will obviously be similar to *RV* 9.66.7, where Soma, the drink of immortality, is asked to grant Indra *ákṣiti śrávaḥ*. It is not so clear, though, whether the particular connotation seen in the Vedic and Hesiodic passages is inherited, or represents independent development from a more general sort of pattern in both traditions. Actually, the two passages do not exactly parallel each other: in *RV* 9.66.7, *śrávaḥ* can be simply enough taken in its usual sense 'fame, report' (Soma is invoked to add to or maintain undiminished Indra's lustre among the gods), while in the Hesiodic fragment, *κλέος ἄφθιτον* would seem rather to refer to 'unfading existence'. As a result of this divergence between the semantics of the two passages, they are perhaps best regarded as representing parallel but independent innovations within the Greek and Vedic traditions, rather than a specifically inherited connotation of the phrase.

6. *Sappho*, fr. 44.4. The overall setting in which Sappho uses *κλέος ἄφθιτον* in fr. 44, the poem dealing with the wedding of Hektor and Andromache, is distinctly clearer than the context we have just considered in Hesiod, fr. 70. The specific significance of the phrase as used by Sappho, however, is considerably more difficult to establish.

The preserved part of the Sappho poem opens (lines 1–3) with mention of the Trojan herald Idaos (Homeric *Idaios*, *Il.* 3.248, 7.276, 24.325, etc.), who speaks lines 4–10. At the beginning of Idaos' speech, there is an exasperating lacuna of one or more lines. This section was accidentally omitted and written somewhere above

the preserved part of the text, as is indicated by the notation  $\dot{\alpha}\nu\omega$  in the papyrus. Immediately following the lacuna is the line with our phrase, as follows:

τάς τ' ἄλλας Ἀσίας .[.]δε.αν κλέος ἄφθιτον·

Then, in lines 5–8, the herald refers to Hektor and his companions bringing Andromache from Theba, and in lines 8–10, he describes her bridal gifts, while the rest of the poem (lines 11–34) deals with the ensuing celebration at Troy.

Both because of the preceding lacuna and because of the uncertainty of the text within line 4, it is hard to say just what force κλέος ἄφθιτον has here<sup>22</sup>). Nevertheless, it seems tolerably clear that the combination of ideas on which scholars have ordinarily focused in discussing this phrase—prowess in battle and the preservation of martial success through poetry—does not quite fit.

<sup>22</sup>) The line is printed as above, with gaps in the text, by both E. Lobel and D. Page, *Poetarum Lesbiorum Fragmenta* (Oxford 1955) and E. M. Voigt, *Sappho et Alcaeus* (Amsterdam 1971); consequently, it seems fair enough to say that the correct restoration of the line is doubtful. Actually, though, nothing in the line is entirely uncertain, and its restoration should therefore be fairly straightforward. According to both Lobel and Page (p. 37) and Voigt (p. 68), the traces on the papyrus are such that the first partially preserved letter must be π, τ, or possibly ζ, while the other partially preserved letter must be γ or λ. Because of meter, the one letter which is entirely missing must be a short vowel. The “obvious” restoration is perhaps τ[ό]δε γᾶν, as printed by both H. Saake, *Zur Kunst Sapphos* (Paderborn 1971) 145 and Z. Franyó and B. Snell, *Frühgriechische Lyriker, III: Sappho, Alkaios, Anakreon* (Berlin 1976) 30. Neither Saake nor Franyó, however, makes it clear in their translations (p. 147, p. 31) how the line as thus restored would be syntactically connected with the preceding line(s), and in my opinion it is difficult to imagine a plausible construction for both parts of the interlocked word-order which results from restoring τ[ό]δε γᾶν in line 4 (τάς τ' ἄλλας Ἀσίας . . . γᾶν and τόδε . . . κλέος ἄφθιτον).

Possibly, the correct restoration is τ[ά]δ' ἔλαν. The Lesbian infinitive of ἐλαίνω is not otherwise attested, but cf. the discussion of forms such as γέλαν ‘to laugh’ in E. M. Hamm (-Voigt), *Grammatik zu Sappho und Alkaios* (Berlin 1958) 142–143. If correct here, ἔλαν would be metaphorical: not ‘drive’ simply, but rather ‘set in motion, bring, produce, spur on’; cf. such uses in Pindar, *Nem.* 3.74, *Paian* 9.6, and Aeschylus, *Agamemnon* 701. The beginning of Idaeos’ speech will then be something of the following sort: “I say that . . . through Mysia(?) and through the rest of Asia these things (i.e., Hektor’s coming with Andromache, etc.) produce unfading fame.” Full discussion of this restoration would require more extensive treatment, which I hope to provide sometime in a separate study; however, though the matter is important in itself, it does not seem to be of crucial importance for our treatment of the archaic Greek use of κλέος ἄφθιτον.

The overall setting in the poem is a time when Troy was at peace. There may be allusions to Hektor's military accomplishments, and more particularly to the disasters later to befall Hektor and Andromache because of war (see next paragraph), but this is a different sort of thing from explicit reference. Specific mention of heroic military activity *might* have been present in the lost sections of the poem, but the preserved part does not support such a hypothesis. The situation is similar with respect to song as a means of preserving the memory of past events. Although the poem itself is just such a memorialization of Hektor and Andromache, the musical and poetic celebration described in lines 24–27 and 31–34 is not so presented; rather, the focus is on song as part of the immediate celebration at the moment, so as to add to its sensually pleasing aspects, and not on the way song will memorialize the wedding in the future.

Sappho's use of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* in fr. 44.4 would also seem to be difficult to analyze simply in terms of the Vedic and Greek patterns we have considered in Sections 2, 4, and 5; however, I think we penetrate more fully into Sappho's intended effect with this approach than by looking for some specifically "heroic" connotation for the phrase. In their analyses of the poem as a whole, Lesky, Kakridis, and Nagy make a good case that it has a deliberately somber undertone: the present happiness of Hektor and Andromache as described in the poem will not last indefinitely, but will eventually be destroyed by the Greeks and in particular by Achilles<sup>23</sup>). The reality of this level of meaning is of course dependent on the audience's familiarity with elements from the traditional story, such as

---

<sup>23</sup>) The somber element in the poem is briefly discussed by A. Lesky, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern and Munich 1963) 165 = 1971: 171. Building on Lesky's suggestion, J. T. Kakridis, "Zu Sappho, 44 LP," *WS* 79 (1966) 21–26 develops the idea that the poem cannot be an epithalamion. Kakridis' analysis is generally followed by Nagy 1974: 118–139 (n. 1, above), although he does not explicitly consider the question of the poem's genre, as epithalamion or otherwise. W. Rösler, "Ein Gedicht und sein Publikum: Überlegungen zu Sappho Fr. 44 Lobel-Page", *Hermes* 103 (1975) 275–285, on the other hand, takes issue with Lesky's and Kakridis' analysis, presenting generally convincing arguments that the poem was in fact intended for performance during a wedding procession. While Rösler's conclusions concerning genre and performance may be correct, I think the analysis presented by Lesky, Kakridis, and Nagy concerning the *mythic* allusions –the underlying significance of Achilles in the story, etc. –remains valid.

the description of Andromache's background in *Il.* 6.397 (cf. line 6 of the Sappho poem) and the references to Idaios in connection with Priam's going to Achilles to ransom Hektor's body in *Il.* 24.325 and 470. Our appreciation of this aspect of fr. 44 will also be enhanced by Sappho's skillful reuse of traditional poetic phrases. As Nagy points out, the concluding word of the poem, *θεοεικέλοις* (used here to describe Hektor and Andromache) is used in the *Iliad* only of Achilles; consequently, its use in Sappho's poem subtly reminds us of his ominous presence in the overall story of Hektor and Andromache<sup>24</sup>). In view of its clearly traditional nature, *κλέος ἄφθιτον* seems a particularly obvious candidate for Nagy to discuss in terms of this sort of interplay between traditional implication and surface meaning. Nevertheless, he does not consider the phrase in this connection—perhaps because of the uncertainty concerning the context of *κλέος ἄφθιτον*, or perhaps because its Homeric usage, which Nagy's analysis heavily emphasizes, does not produce anything particularly relevant. (Of course, we could regard *κλέος ἄφθιτον* as simply an additional allusion to Achilles, since *he* uses the phrase in *Il.* 9.413; however, this seems a distinctly flat way of analyzing its significance in Sappho, fr. 44.4.) While admitting the textual uncertainty, I think we may nevertheless see the relevance of *κλέος ἄφθιτον*, as used by Sappho, to greater effect in terms of its non-Homeric, but highly traditional connotations, as seen in both the *Rig-Veda* and in the Delphi inscription and pseudo-Hesiod: Idaios' use of the phrase implies a hope that the material happiness of Hektor and Andromache (cf. especially the description of Andromache's dowry in lines 8–10) might be maintained unimpaired—but we, the audience, know that this implied hope is not to be fulfilled.

7. *Iliad* 9.413. In all of the remaining post-Homeric instances of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* the fame in question is either posthumous, or is viewed as stretching indefinitely into the future. Most of these passages do maintain important elements of the traditional focus on material well-being and celebration, or on the role of the gods in bestowing fame (see Sections 8 and 9); however, the inherited connotations of the phrase are modified in all of them in a way which is either parallel to the Homeric usage or is more or less directly influenced by it. Consequently, it will be convenient to postpone discussion of them until we have reconsidered *Il.* 9.413.

<sup>24</sup>) Nagy 1974: 138–139 (n. 1, above).

In *Il.* 9.412–416, Achilles describes the alternative fates which his mother has revealed to him. He can either remain at Troy and perish, with lasting fame as compensation. Or, he can return home to an insignificant but secure existence:

*εἰ μὲν κ' αὖθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,  
 ὤλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται·  
 εἰ δέ κεν οἴκαδ' ἴκωμι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν,  
 ὤλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ μοι αἰὼν  
 ἔσσεται, οὐδέ κέ μ' ὄκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχεῖη.*

As we noted in discussing *R̥V* 1.9.7 in Section 2, the relationship between Vedic *śránaḥ ákṣitam* and Homeric *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is one of contrast rather than similarity. Strangely enough, it is not the first alternative, by which Achilles will gain *κλέος ἄφθιτον*, but rather the *other* possible fate, described in the second part of the passage quoted above, which is the closer to the traditional pattern. If Achilles returns home, he will have long life (cf. *viśváyur* in *R̥V* 1.9.7, and cf. also the apparent focus on physical immortality in Hesiod, fr. 70). More generally, the broader context of this imagined return home is the undisturbed enjoyment of the material possessions which Peleus won (lines 398–400; cf. lines 406–407), and this has connections with non-Homeric *κλέος ἄφθιτον* as we have thus far analyzed the phrase (cf. especially the context in which *Idaos* uses it in Sappho, fr. 44, along with the allusion or reference to booty in *R̥V* 1.9.7 and 8.103.5).

We thus have a paradox. The inherited phrase is used in an untraditional manner in *Il.* 9.413, while the immediately following lines contain important elements of the pattern traditionally associated with *κλέος ἄφθιτον*. The paradox is, I think, intentional. Despite all our discussion thus far, *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is actually very well suited as an expression for lasting, posthumous fame. The meaning of the adjective, ‘unfading’, is just what we need for this, and the basic sense of the noun, ‘report, hearing’, goes well with it to give a sense of immaterial, but secure fame. Given the inherited material connotations of the phrase, though, *κλέος ἄφθιτον* could not readily be used in early Greek poetry to refer to posthumous fame, unless it were somehow dissociated from its traditional frame of reference. There would, of course, be various possible ways of doing this, and in Section 8 we shall see how *Ibycus* and *Theognis* dealt with this general sort of situation. Homer’s solution, it appears, was to indicate by specific contrast in the next few lines that *κλέος*

ἀφθιτον here does *not* refer to the secure enjoyment of material possessions.

This explanation of the relationship of *Il.* 9.413 and 414–416 finds support in the peculiar status of the latter passage. As is well-known, it is somehow out of place in the *Iliad*; or rather, the contrasting fate which is presented here appears to be an ad hoc invention in this particular context<sup>25</sup>). Otherwise, only the shortness of Achilles' life comes into play in the *Iliad* (1.352, 1.416, 1.505, 18.458). Furthermore, in 16.50–51, Achilles explicitly denies that he has received any information concerning his future from his mother. These various passages are obviously hard to reconcile with the idea that Thetis had ever told Achilles of the possibility of choosing a long, but inglorious life. We need not, however, conclude that this section of the *Iliad* is from a different hand than other parts of the poem. Rather, Willcock's analysis is surely along the correct lines: *Il.* 9.410–416 appears in the poem because it is "particularly relevant to the argument that Achilleus is developing in his speech there, that a man's life is not worth risking for material objects or honor, because death is final."<sup>26</sup>). Willcock's view therefore is that the idea of Achilles' choice in *Il.* 9.410–416 is an ad hoc invention, suggested by consideration of its immediate context, rather than consistency with the poem as a whole. I am fully in agreement with this analysis; however, it seems to me that Willcock's discussion of the passage does not probe quite deeply enough. Not only the idea of a possible choice of a long, inglorious life, but also the inclusion of 'unfading fame' in association with the other alternative is unusual in the *Iliad*. Elsewhere in the poem, the recompense which Achilles will receive for his short life is presented either in rather vague terms of how Zeus ought to honor him (1.353–354, 508–510), or it is presented specifically in terms of the material honor which Agamemnon has taken from him (1.355–356, 506–507). Given the nature of Achilles' speech in Book 9—particularly his rejection of Agamemnon's material offer—, we need some more positively stated balance to the situation described in the first half of line 413: if he is to be short-lived, he should have recompense in the form of unfading fame. The choices in lines 412–413 and 414–416 therefore complement each other. An unusual

---

<sup>25</sup>) M. M. Willcock, "Ad hoc invention in the *Iliad*," *HSCP* 81 (1977) 41–53.

<sup>26</sup>) Willcock 1977: 49 (n. 25, above).

reference to posthumous fame was called for by the context, and Homer chose to express this in striking fashion, by boldly reusing the traditional phrase *κλέος ἄφθιτον*. Then, in view of his unusual use of this well-known phrase, lines 414–416 became desirable, so as to clarify, by contrast, just how *κλέος ἄφθιτον* was here used.

8. *Ibycus and Theognis*. Ibycus, fr. 1, addressed to a Samian Polykrates (either the famous tyrant or a relative) concludes as follows (lines 46–48)<sup>27</sup>:

τοῖς μὲν πέδα κάλλεος αἰὲν,  
καὶ σὺ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἐξεῖς  
ὡς κατ' αἰοιδὰν καὶ ἔμὸν κλέος.

For the first time in our investigation of the phrase, we here find *κλέος ἄφθιτον* closely connected with a reference to poetry. (It may of course be implied in *Il.* 9.413 that poetry is the source of fame, but this is not actually stated in the immediate context.) Ibycus' use of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is also closely connected with the heroic past, since the rest of the poem (at least, what is preserved of it) deals with the heroes of the Trojan war, some of whom are referred to in *τοῖς*, the first word quoted above. There is of course also the clear implication that, just as the heroes of the past are remembered, so Polykrates' fame will long outlast his earthly existence.

Ibycus' use of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* thus seems to contain exactly the elements of *Heldendichtung* which have commonly been associated with the phrase in modern discussion. There is, however, an important difference. The references to the Trojan war in lines 40–45 of the Ibycus poem focus on the beauty of Troilos and of a son of Hyllis, rather than on great deeds in battle; consequently, beauty is the immediate point of the comparison with Ibycus' addressee, rather than Polykrates' martial or political accomplishments. Viewed simply against the precedent of *Il.* 9.413, the more personal and erotic setting which Ibycus gives to *κλέος ἄφθιτον* might seem to be a deliberately "post-heroic" lowering of tone, much in the manner of Archilochus, fr. 5, in which he disparages the significance of losing his shield. When we view Ibycus, fr. 1 against the broader

<sup>27</sup>) The most extensive recent discussion of this poem is J. P. Barron, "Ibycus: To Polycrates," *BICS* 16 (1969) 119–149. According to Barron, the poem is addressed to the father of the Herodotean tyrant, himself likewise tyrant. For additional discussion concerning Ibycus in general and this poem in particular, see D. E. Gerber, *Euterpe* (Amsterdam 1970) 207–213.

background of the passages considered in Sections 2, 4, 5, and 6, though, it becomes clear that Ibycus was not merely being innovative or anti-heroic, but that he also included allusions to the traditional associations of *κλέος ἀφθιτον* with material well-being and festive celebration. His utilization of tradition is therefore not just a matter of modification, but rather of artfully combining the various connotations of *κλέος ἀφθιτον*—Homeric and non-Homeric—which his tradition made available to him.

In Theognis 245–246, *κλέος* is not specially combined with *ἀφθιτον*; nonetheless, the way in which the two words are used separately in this passage is extremely important as evidence for their traditional context. The passage is from the concluding poem (lines 237–254) of West's *florilegium purum* (so identified by him because of its containing more frequent references to Kyrnos than appear in the rest of the Theognidean corpus)<sup>28</sup>. Through his verse, Theognis has given Kyrnos wings (line 237), with which he will fly over sea and land, visiting banquets, where youths will sing of him (lines 241–243). Even in death, he will be famous (lines 245–246):

*οὐδέποτ' οὐδὲ θανῶν ἀπολεῖς κλέος, ἀλλὰ μελήσεις  
ἀφθιτον ἀνθρώποις αἰὲν ἔχων ὄνομα.*

In referring to posthumous fame, Theognis here does not actually use the phrase *κλέος ἀφθιτον*—even though the phrase has been thought to be traditional in just this sort of context. Rather, he first uses *κλέος* alone, and then he uses *ἀφθιτον* with another noun, *ὄνομα*. It might seem that Theognis' variation from tradition—his dissociation of the noun from an adjective which traditionally was used with it—is due simply to a desire for variety<sup>29</sup>. Actually, though, Theognis 245–246, along with Ibycus 1.46–48, just considered, and perhaps Sappho 55 (which compares the ways in which different individuals will be remembered after death) is the *first* clear statement in Greek literature that poetry can convey secure posthumous fame<sup>30</sup>. In addition to *Il.* 9.413, the idea is implied in Homeric passages such as *Il.* 2.484ff. (invocation to the Muses

<sup>28</sup> M. L. West, *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin and New York 1974) 40–61; cf. also West's brief summary of his views in *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (Oxford 1971) I.172–174.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Schmitt 1967: 63–64, with n. 403 (n. 1, above), where the Theognis passage is cited in company with other modifications such as *ἀφθιτος τιμή* and *ἄσβεστον κλέος*.

<sup>30</sup> C. M. Bowra, *Early Greek Elegists* (Cambridge, Mass. 1938) 164–167.



to catalogue the heroes who fought at Troy), *Il.* 6.357–358 (where Helen says that her scandalous misconduct will be a subject for song in the future), and *Od.* 3.204 (reference to how Orestes' avenging his father's death will be a subject for song). None of these passages, however, so clearly proclaims the triumph of poetry over time as Theognis 245–246, and except for *Il.* 9.413 (where there is no explicit reference to song), neither these nor any other similar passages from Homer use the word *ἄφθιτος*. Consequently, it may be seriously doubted whether the specific connection of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* with fame through song is traditional at all. Rather, it would seem to be an innovation which *Il.* 9.413 develops in one way, and Ibycus, fr. 1.46–48 in another. More cautiously than either Homer or Ibycus, Theognis in lines 245–246 avoids the exact phrase *κλέος ἄφθιτον*, while using its individual elements to express the idea that poetry produces lasting fame<sup>31</sup>).

That Theognis, like both Homer and Ibycus, recognized the importance of the traditional connotations of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* appears from consideration of the imagery of lines 237–254. Throughout this section, there are two dominant images, viz., the journey and the symposium: Kyrnos' fame will go over land and sea (lines 237–238, 247–250), and he will be sung of at banquets (lines 239–243). Significantly, both of these images are associated with one or more other occurrences of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* which we have thus far considered. Sappho 44.4 probably deals with the extent to which the news of Hektor and Andromache will spread, “through . . . and the rest of Asia”, while the same poem also refers to celebration in lines 13–34. Specifically symposiac imagery, on the other hand,

---

<sup>31</sup>) To attempt to settle the chronological relationship of Ibycus and Theognis would require more extensive discussion than can be given here. The question is not, however, crucial for our discussion, as long as the innovative nature of both poets' association of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* with the fame bestowed by poetry is recognized. If we accept the usual dating of Theognis around 540, he will probably be later than Ibycus. Accordingly, his usage of *κλέος* and *ἄφθιτον* may be regarded as a more careful restatement of Ibycus' innovative use of the entire phrase—which would be quite in keeping with the generally conservative tenor of Theognis' poetry. The chronological priority, though, may actually be the other way, since West (n. 28, above) 1974: 65–71 (cf. West 1971: I.172) proposes an earlier date for Theognis, viz., late seventh century. If this is correct, Theognis 245–246 will be a first somewhat tentative modification of the connotations of *κλέος . . . ἄφθιτον*, from which Ibycus then takes the obvious further step of using the inherited phrase itself with a new meaning.

appears in Hesiod, fr. 70.6, where we find the word *πολυστάφυλον*, probably in reference to Dionysos; cf. also *RV* 1.9 and 9.66, both of which are connected with the Soma-ritual.

9. *The Marathon epigram*. It is highly probable that *κλέος ἀφθιτον* stood in a fifth century Athenian epigram, commemorating either Marathon or Salamis; however, the epigram is too fragmentary for us to be sure of the connotations of the phrase as used here (or even to be absolutely sure that *κλέος ἀφθιτον* should be restored). The epigram is preserved in two versions. One is from the fifth century, and the other is apparently a fourth century copy. The two complement each other, and despite very little real overlap between the two documents, Meritt has made a good case that they in fact represent the same text. Taking the two stones together, the preserved material in lines 1–2 (there are eight lines all together, of which only the first four appear in the fourth century version) is as follows<sup>32</sup>):

ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ' ἀρετε . . . . . ος ἀφθι . . . αἰεὶ  
 ἡ . . . . . νεργ . . . . . νέμοσι θεοί

Perhaps the best restoration for the first line is that proposed by Lang<sup>33</sup>):

Ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ' ἀρετὴ τέχσει κλέος ἀφθιτον αἰεὶ

“The valor of these men will generate undying praise forever”  
 (Lang’s translation)

Alternative possibilities either have a confusing duplication of genitives (*ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ' ἀρετῆς*) or the verbs *δόχσει* or *λάμψει*, which seem awkward in this context, or substitute the word *φάος* for *κλέος*; while it is a possible restoration, *φάος* would be distinctly less formulaic with *ἀφθιτον αἰεὶ*, and therefore seems a less likely restoration than *κλέος*<sup>34</sup>). Less is preserved in the second line, and

<sup>32</sup>) B. D. Meritt, “Epigrams from the Battle of Marathon,” in *The Aegean and the Near East: Studies Presented to Hetty Goldman* (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1956) 268–280; cf. Meritt, “The Marathon Epigrams Again,” *AJPh* 83 (1962) 294–298. Cf. also the discussion in R. Meiggs and D. M. Lewis, *A Selection of Greek Historical Inscriptions to the End of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford 1969) 54–57.

<sup>33</sup>) M. L. Lang, “Again the ‘Marathon’ Epigram,” in *ΦΟΡΟΣ: Tribute to Benjamin Dean Meritt* (Locust Valley, N.Y. 1974) 80.

<sup>34</sup>) For the various alternatives, cf. the discussion in Meiggs and Lewis 1969: 55 (n. 32, above). The clausula *κλέος ἀφθιτον αἰεὶ* appears also in the Delphi inscription (Section 4 above), and in the Rhodian epigram discussed in Section 10 below.

possible restorations are consequently greater, but the most attractive seems to me to be Meritt's restoration<sup>35</sup>):

οἷς κἄν εἰν ἔργοις ἐσθλὰ νέμωσι θεοί

“No matter to whom in deeds of war the gods may grant success”  
(Meritt's translation)

Whether or not these particular restorations are correct, the epigram is clearly important for our study, if the missing noun in line 1 is in fact κλέος. As in *Il.* 9.413, we have to deal with essentially immaterial fame as a reward for heroic deeds in battle. Otherwise, though, the traditional connotations of κλέος ἀφθιτον are still prominent. Since no reference to death in battle appears anywhere in the entire eight lines as preserved, the κλέος which is here referred to is apparently not posthumous, but refers rather to the fame which accompanies the warrior throughout his life<sup>36</sup>). The gods are furthermore clearly present as the bestowers of something in the phrase (-)νέμωσι θεοί in line 2. However we restore the couplet, the ἀρετή and the κλέος ἀφθιτον spoken of in line 1 will therefore also be, at least indirectly, an ἐσθλόν, καλόν, or the like, granted by the gods, just as *śránaḥ* is in the *Rig-Veda* passages and as κλέος is in the Delphi inscription and in Hesiod, fr. 70.5.

10. *Two later examples.* An epigram attributed to one Ion, dealing with the posthumous fame of Euripides, appears in *Anthologia Palatina* 7.43. Although it has sometimes been ascribed to Ion of Chios, this seems clearly wrong, since he died some years before Euripides. Probably, we should follow Edmonds' and Beckby's attribution to Ion of Samos<sup>37</sup>). In any event, the epigram is from the end of the fifth century or later. It runs as follows:

<sup>35</sup>) So Meritt 1962: 296 (n. 3?, above); this is mentioned, with hesitation but without any alternative suggestion, by Meiggs and Lewis 1969: 55–56 (n. 32, above). Lang 1974: 80 (n. 33, above) proposes:

ἄττα καλῶν ἔργων κ' αὖ προνέμωσι θεοί.

While smoother than Meritt's restoration, this is less forceful, since it eliminates the contrast between ἀνδρῶν τῶνδ' "these men", whom the inscription honors, and Meritt's οἷς . . . ἄν, "to whomever" in the future the gods might grant success. Also, the compound προνέμω "present in advance, present before one" is relatively rare, and it is hard to see what particular appropriateness it would have in this context.

<sup>36</sup>) For the absence of any reference to death in battle (and the consequent improbability that this is a funerary monument), see Meiggs and Lewis 1969: 57 (n. 32, above).

<sup>37</sup>) J. M. Edmonds, *Elegy and Iambus* (Cambridge, Mass. 1931) I.437 and H. Beckby, *Anthologia Graeca* (Munich 1957) II.572.

*Χαῖρε μελαμπετάλοις, Εὐριπίδη, ἐν γνάλοισιν  
Πιερίας τὸν αἰὲν νοκτὸς ἔχων θάλαμον.  
ἴσθι δ' ὑπὸ χθονὸς ὄν, ὅτι σοι κλέος ἀφθιτον ἔσται  
Ἴσον Ὀμηρείαις ἀενάοις χάρισιν.*

Since the verb used here with *κλέος ἀφθιτον* is *ἔσται*, just as in *Il.* 9.413, and since there is an explicit comparison of Euripides with Homer's "everflowing graces" in line 4, it is most reasonable to regard the epigram as being directly modeled on the Homeric use of the phrase. As such, it is of interest as showing the eventual triumph of the Homeric usage over the traditional connotations of the phrase. By the same token, though, it cannot be assigned any independent importance in our investigation of the original use of *κλέος ἀφθιτον*.

The final example of the phrase is in a Rhodian inscription, probably funerary, from the third or second century B.C., which runs as follows<sup>38</sup>):

*Ἀμφιλόχου τοῦ Λαάγου Ποντωρέως.  
Ἦκει καὶ Νείλου προχοὰς καὶ ἐπ' ἔσχατον Ἰνδόν  
τέχνας Ἀμφιλόχοιο μέγα κλέος ἀφθιτον αἰεὶ.*

"Of Amphilochos the son of Laagos of Pontoreia:  
Even to the mouth of the Nile and the farthest Indus,  
Great fame unfading forever reaches the crafts of Amphilochos."

Though it is undoubtedly fortuitous, the Hellenistic poet's reference to the Indus River here brings us back to our Vedic starting point. There are also several more substantive connections with the pattern we have thus far developed. The clausula *κλέος ἀφθιτον αἰεὶ* is found also in the Delphi and (probably) Marathon inscriptions. Like Sappho, fr. 44.4 and Theognis 237–238, 247–250, the Rhodian epigram focuses on the spatial extent of *κλέος ἀφθιτον*; also, the word *τέχνας* would appear to provide a parallel to the focus on the dedicator's craftsmanship, which is likely in the Delphi epigram. In the most fundamental ways, though, the inherited connotations of the Indo-European phrase are thoroughly modified in the Rhodian epigram. There is no reference to the gods as the source of fame, and there is also no focus on the preservation of material prosperity; rather, the nature of the monument on which

<sup>38</sup>) G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca* (Berlin 1878 = Hildesheim 1965) no. 197a (p. 519) = W. Peek, *Griechische Grabgedichte* (Berlin 1960) no. 222 (pp. 144–145) = *IG* XII.1.144.

the epigram was inscribed suggests that the fame referred to is posthumous in nature. These developments need not, however, surprise us, given the famous Homeric precedent in *Il.* 9.413. If anything, we should perhaps rather be surprised that the inherited connotations had proven so persistent, in the face of the Homeric usage, which seems such a forceful and obvious application to give to the inherited phrase.

## Men's Epithets in Homer

An Essay in Poetic Syntax

By PAOLO VIVANTE, Montreal

### 1.

My question is: what difference does it make to our perception of a sentence whether there is an epithet or not? How does an epithet contribute to the mental image of what is mentioned? And how, on the other hand, does the lack of epithets contribute to the further development of a sentence by simply letting us notice that something is mentioned for the sake of some ulterior purpose<sup>1</sup>)?

In any sentence or sequence of sentences there are zones of focus or exposure which are naturally brought out by the very idea of what we wish to express. To take a trivial example of every-day speech, I may say quite naturally "I walked over the soft grass", but just as naturally "I decided to walk over the grass" or "I ran over the grass to meet him". Why is it so? The reason is that only in the first instance do I linger upon the act of walking, on the spot,

---

<sup>1</sup>) The question has hardly been touched in any comprehensive way. As it is, no general answer is available but Milman Parry's. On the epithets of men in particular, see *The Making of Homeric Verse*, Oxford 1971, p. 114–115. As usual, no consideration is given to the fact that in Homer (as anywhere else) the same noun may or may not have the epithet, or may be replaced by a pronoun, or may be simply understood without being mentioned. Disregard for the absence of the epithet prevents us from appreciating the epithet's presence. Hence the view of the Homeric epithet as ad purely metrical or ornamental element.