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Introduction

The origins of Greek tragedy have been debated since Aristotle in his *Poetics*. Greek tragedy suddenly bloomed in the late 6th and 5th century, but of course it cannot have been created *en nihilo*. For one thing, it has always been clear that there are continuities between Greek tragedy, the lyric poetry of the archaic period (ca. 800–480 BCE), and Homeric epic. A number of recent studies have examined in detail such continuities, e.g. in metre, dialect, (story) themes, lexical usages, and ritual formulas, in particular between the choral odes of Greek tragedy and non-tragic poetry. But one such element has received only little attention: narrative form and technique. Greek tragedy contains many embedded narratives, especially in choral odes. These short narratives make use of several techniques. This study sets out to investigate a number of these narrative techniques, examining how the tragic poets adopted – and developed – them from their lyric and epic predecessors.

More in particular, I am interested in the narrative techniques that are used to create narrative authority. While the term ‘authority’ has a variety of meanings, I use the term narrowly to refer to narrative authority, or the competence that a narrator claims to have for giving a reliable account of events.¹ Poets are not historians, of course, but early Greek poetry has a commemorative function and refers to a mythological or historical past.² So, I will examine several devices narrators use to make their accounts of the ‘past’ convincing, believable, and persuasive. The main question is: how does the narrator explain his³ knowledge about the events he tells? For example, is he telling his own story or that of someone else? How involved is he in the events? Where does the story come from? To understand these points this study investigates the relationship of the narrator to the story he tells. It thus examines the relevant narrative techniques: the use of the first-person singular and plural, aspects of focalization, and metalepsis. How did the epic and lyric poets use these techniques, and how did the tragic poets exploit the collection of techniques that were available to them from epic and lyric?

¹ Unless otherwise stated. In Chapter 4, on the parodos of Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon* (as I will explain), I consider other meanings of the term authority as well, such as political and social power.
² See e.g. Grethlein (2010).
³ Throughout this thesis, I will refer to ‘the narrator’ in the generic masculine form, except when the narrator is clearly female, such as for example in the case of a female chorus in Greek tragedy.
Many continuities between Homeric epic and the choral odes of Greek tragedy, via lyric, have received scholarly attention. The most important is content; the same stories are told by epic, lyric, and tragic poets (e.g. Anderson (1997) on the fall of Troy). The influence of Homeric epic on tragedy in particular has been acknowledged for over two millennia, from Plato to e.g. Sideras (1971, examining the extent to which Aeschylus’ diction relies on Homer’s); Knox (1979: 268–9, who sees the Odyssey as Euripides’ model for comic and satiric elements in his plays); Eisner (1980, on textual parallels between the Odyssey and Euripides’ Helen); Gould (1983, on continuities of theme and technique between Homer and Greek tragedy); King (1985, on the relationship of Euripides’ Hecuba to the Iliad, focusing on literary polemics); Cropp (1986, seeing connections between Euripides’ Electra and Heracles because of their resemblance to the Odyssey); Holmberg (1995, arguing that Euripides exploits elements that were expressed, but not fully developed, in the Homeric tradition); Bond (1996, on ‘Homeric echoes in Rhesus’); Lange (2002, contending that Euripides was strongly engaged with Homeric epic, especially the Odyssey, and focusing on similarities of story patterns and on verbal echoes); Griffith (2009, on Aeschylus’ adaptations of pre-existent poetic traditions, among which Homeric epic); and de Jong (2016, ‘Homer the first tragedian’).

In addition, many scholars have examined the allusions of lyric poets to, and their dependence on, Homeric epic (e.g. Davison (1955, allusions); Fowler (1987: 3–52, especially on allusions and the use of epic diction); Garner (1990, allusions); Nagy (1990, on continuous poetic traditions, with Pindar as his main example); Sotiriou (1998, on Pindar’s reception of Homer)). Other scholars have demonstrated continuities between archaic choral songs and songs enacted on the tragic stage (e.g. Kranz (1933: 127–37, examining cultic elements in the choral odes of tragedy); Webster (1970, on the performance and dance of Greek choruses); Stoessl (1987, on ritual aspects); and Calame (1994–5, on cultic and ritual action, and temporal design in Pindar and the choral odes of tragedy)).

Herington’s 1985 Poetry into Drama Herington gave an important new impetus to this line of research. He described pre-classical Greece as a ‘song culture’. From the 8th century BCE, (religious) festivals featured agōnes mousikoi, or games in which poetry was performed, that provided the precedent for the great Athenian dramatic festivals of the classical period. Herington states that, at a certain point in time in the 6th century BCE, a confluence of different poetical genres in Athens resulted in the beginning of Greek tragedy. Thus he compares the rhapsodes of epic poetry to actors of tragedy (both crafts involve the skilled delivery of verse, bodily movement, and convincing impersonation). Furthermore, the similarities and continuities between epic, lyric, and tragic poetry in
the performance conditions, metre, language (i.e. diction, style and verbal imagery), plot concentration, characterization by speech, and repertoire of mythological themes, characters and story patterns show that tragedy ‘represents no abrupt break with the past (...)’; rather, it represents a spectacular renewal and integration of all the finest elements in the archaic song culture’ (p. 144). In addition, Herington suggests that the epic techniques of plot concentration and characterization by speech were not concurrently adopted by the tragedians; rather, tragedy developed over a long period and was during this whole period influenced by epic and lyric.

More recently, Swift analysed the incorporation of lyric genres into Greek tragedy in *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric* (2010), arguing that the tragic poets evoked the ‘cultural and normative assumptions’ (p. 4) connected with lyric genres within their plays by adopting several characteristics of these genres, such as language styles, meters, and themes. The book is divided into chapters on the ‘paian’, ‘epinikion’, ‘partheneia’, ‘hymenaios’ and ‘thrēnos and ritual lament’. Although such generic interaction is also found in the spoken passages, it appears to be at its densest in the choral odes.

Neither Swift nor Herington address the form or techniques of narrative. This topic has been only briefly examined in Rutherford’s (2007) investigation of how and where tragic choruses provide narratives of past events and the characteristics and functions of such narratives. He mentions that embedded narrative was familiar to the tragic poets from epic and lyric (p. 31) but acknowledges his article is only a first exploration of a rich topic (p. 3).

Morrison discusses other narrative features in lyric poetry in his study on the narrator in Hellenistic poetry (2007). In an introductory chapter, he surveys the main features of archaic narrators and the ways in which poets construct personas of themselves: how they draw attention to the presence of their narrating voices, the ways they use indications of a ‘life’ outside their poems, the function of the Muses, and the manner in which they create effects such as the impression that they are composing a song on the spot. This overview is only ‘a general introduction to Archaic primary narrators’ (p. 36), as he intended it to be, and it opens a path to further research.

Narrative techniques of epic, lyric, and drama form part of the narratological history of ancient Greek narrative edited by de Jong et al. (2004; 2007; 2012), but the scope of this multivolume history is restricted: the texts are dealt with in translation, briefly (c. 15 pages per genre). Where lyric is concerned, only Pindar and Bacchylides are included (since only their oeuvres survive in a substantial corpus). Finally, it covers only three aspects: narrators, time, and space.
2. METHODOLOGY AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study examines the techniques that (epic, lyric, and tragic) narrators use to claim their authority to recount the events encompassed in their songs and their development. The methodology I will be using is that of narratology (de Jong (2004 [1987]); (2001); (2014); Richardson (1990); Grethlein (2006); Grethlein-Rengakos (2009)), since this provides a refined framework to investigate these techniques. Moreover, this is also the main methodology used in the SAGN series mentioned above.

My topic, reformulated in a narratological way, is as follows. Since it has been discussed most fully for Homeric narrators,\textsuperscript{4} I first select and outline some of the most noteworthy aspects about the knowledge that Homeric narrators claim to have about events of the past, the ways in which they acquire information and guarantee the truth or reliability of the story they tell, and as a result, their narrative authority.

Many scholars have shown that the primary narrator’s knowledge was closely associated with the Muses. As a professional singer, he bases his authority on these omniscient and omnipresent goddesses. Their aid authorizes him to recount a large variety of events in detail. As such, the Homeric primary narrator is a paragon of an omniscient narrator:\textsuperscript{5} he is privileged to know information that could not be learned by natural means, including (1) the future; (2) non-observable facts, including the doings of the gods, causes of diseases, and information about characters that is not evident from their behaviour, facial expressions, or voices;\textsuperscript{6} such as their inner thoughts. He is also (3) omnipresent, i.e., he can move freely to all the locations in the story.\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{4} E.g. de Jong (2004 [1987]); Richardson (1990). I will refer to more secondary literature in Chapter 1.

\textsuperscript{5} The characteristics of the narrator’s knowledge and the concept of an ‘omniscient narrator’ are relatively old subjects of study in narratology, see e.g. Booth (1961: 160–5) and Sternberg (1978). More recently, the concept of omniscience has been elaborately discussed by e.g. Culler (2004) and Sternberg (2007). See Dawson (2009: 144–6) for a short overview of this and other discussions on the concept.

\textsuperscript{6} See e.g. Richardson (1990: 125) ‘when a warrior is killed or wounded in the \textit{Iliad}, it often happens that every detail of the injury is given, including the exact course of the missile through the body. This could not be told in detail except by a narrator with a more than ordinary vision’.

\textsuperscript{7} For these characteristics of omniscience, see e.g. de Jong (2004: 2–3) and Richardson (1990: 109 and 124). With regard to the last characteristic, Chatman (1978: 212), followed by e.g. Richardson (1990: 119–39), states that this privilege (‘the privilege of mobility’) and the other two (‘the privileges of knowledge’) must be sharply distinguished: ‘[T]he capacity to skip from locale A to locale B without the authorization of an on-the-scene central intelligence should be called “omnipresence” rather than “omniscience”. Logically there is no necessary connection between the two’. I will regard omnipresence as a form of omniscience.
The manifestations of a narrator’s knowledge may differ in force. This becomes clear from the primary narrator’s third privilege: omnipresence. He may, on the one hand, simply not be bound by any restrictions when he narrates events from which he was absent. On the other hand, he may give the impression of having seen the events by providing eyewitness details. It does not automatically follow that a narrator in the latter situation would know more; often, certain privileges are irrelevant and the narrator reveals his knowledge to the narratees selectively. In other words, the information a narrator provides depends not only on his own knowledge, but also on his willingness to share it with the narratees. Hence, if a narrator does not communicate something, it does not necessarily follow that he does not know it.

Apart from the primary narrator, the Homeric poems contain many embedded narratives told by secondary narrators. These narrators have multiple reasons for telling stories from the past, such as providing a parallel for the present in order to convince their narratees of their argument or explaining the situation in which they find themselves. Their main purpose is neither to critically investigate the past like historians nor to give a truthful account of the events. Yet since a story about the past is only usable to the extent that it is believed to be reliable, narrators may be expected (to different degrees) to seek to convince their audience that their account of the past is reliable, relevant to the present, and within their authority to narrate.

What claim do (ordinary) secondary narrators make for their access to information, and how do they obtain (some of) the privileges of omniscient narrators? These narrators, by their nature, are not aided by the Muses. Yet they still have several means at their disposal to acquire information. Many secondary narrators in Homer narrate what they have seen and experienced themselves. The second category (after the Muses) of access to information, then, is direct observation: some narrate events that they have seen, which means that they are internal narrators. External narrators, who have not seen the events they tell about, may rely on what they have been told by others. Thus, thirdly, narrators can claim to know a story because they have heard it from someone else or because it is a traditional tale circulating within society. As we will see, the Homeric primary narrator, too, sometimes appeals to the words of others. The fourth and last category of narrators may give no explanation at all and simply embark on the story they want to tell.

---

8 Richardson (1990: 126–32) has discussed this variation in degree of knowledge as regards the access to inner thoughts of the characters, varying from brief statements of an emotion or attitude to streams of consciousness. Cf. Booth (1961: 60–1).

9 Sternberg (1978: 255–58), for this reason, goes a step further and distinguishes ‘omnicommmunicative narrators’ from ‘deliberately suppressive narrators’, who withhold information in order to create suspense.

10 See e.g. Willcock (1964); Austin (1966); Alden (2000).
2.1. ‘I’ versus ‘we’

How do these narrators refer to themselves? Internal narrators may be expected to emphasize their individual role in the events by using the first-person singular throughout their narrative, while if they want to stress the involvement of others they may be expected to use the first-person plural. In addition, external narrators may underscore the wide distribution of a story by using the first-person plural (e.g. ‘we all know how...’). Therefore, the questions of which number narrators use, how emphatically they use the singular or plural, to what degree of specification, etc., are relevant to narrative authority in multiple ways.

The subject of ‘we’ narratives is an increasingly important area in narratology, after Margolin’s pivotal study (1996). He discusses the role of ‘we’ in communicative situations, drawing on the theoretical framework of the linguistics of enunciation as elaborated by Jakobson (1973). He also emphasizes that, in its communicative role, ‘we’ is not automatically a multiplication of ‘I’s (as ‘you’ (plural) often is of ‘you’ (singular), and ‘they’ is of ‘he’/’she’/’it’). Who, then, are ‘we’? He conceives of four different narrative situations with ‘we’:

(1) All members of the reference class of ‘we’ utter jointly ‘we’, making them joint, simultaneous originators of the current discourse (e.g. collective prayers or hymns);
(2) A subset of a wider class utters ‘we’ in unison to refer to the whole class; (‘the prime literary example is probably the chorus of 25–30 people on stage in Greek tragedy, addressing their king or queen or the gods on behalf of the citizenry as a whole’);
(3) Several or all members of the class utter ‘we’ individually, in succession or alternately, to refer to the whole class (e.g. John Barth’s Sabbatical (1982));
(4) A single member of the class utters ‘we’ to refer to the whole class (e.g. a speaker who provides others with an account of what befell his group).

---

11 See also Morris (1992); Lanser (1992: 239–66); Woller (1999); Britton (1999) (I derive the studies of Morris, Woller and Britton from Richardson (2006)).
13 I do not know why Margolin mentions that the chorus of Greek tragedy consisted of 25–30 singers (instead of 12–15).
In addition, Margolin mentions that the ‘we’ group can be large or intimate, inclusive (‘we’ may also include a ‘you’, i.e. the narratee and/or addressee) or exclusive (when ‘we’ does not include the narratee and/or addressee).

In view of my investigation, Margolin’s example at (2) immediately attracts attention. The chorus of Greek tragedy is arguably not so easily placed in this category, as it may also be placed in (1). Further difficulties arise from the fact that even when the chorus members often represent a large group (e.g. the inhabitants of a city), they mostly use the first-person singular, especially in narratives. Why, then, does the chorus sometimes use ‘we’?

Because of the many possible reference classes of the ‘we’, it is typical of the first-person plural to have some referential ambiguity and semantic instability. Margolin’s work thus shows that, in order to investigate the effects of the use of ‘I’ or ‘we’, we must first examine who ‘we’ is. Given its many possible reference classes, there could be a variety of reasons why the narrator uses it.

Scholars have investigated diverse effects of the use of ‘we’ in modern novels. For example, Richardson argues that a first-person collective voice can be used for narrative community-building, often with ideological bearings (e.g. in feminist and (post-)colonial literature). Marcus, in addition, points out that the ‘we’ form (instead of the ‘I’ form) can be used by an individual speaker (Margolin’s category 4) to repudiate personal responsibility (‘the plural of camouflage’).

Building on these studies, this analysis assumes that a narrator in Greek poetry can use ‘I’ or ‘we’ for several effects, including establishing narrative authority. Many grammars have already discussed certain effects of some particularly striking instances of ‘we’ spoken by Homeric (individual) speakers. I exclude possessive pronouns because they seem to follow other rules. Sometimes a single speaker (not necessarily a narrator) speaks about actions he is responsible for (e.g. Achilles killed Hector) but uses ‘we’ to implicate others. These speakers are mostly leaders addressing their soldiers. The effect can be one of pride and superiority, such as when Achilles boasts about his killing of Hector in II. 22.393: ἠράμεθα μέγα κῦδος· ἐπέφνομεν Ἕκτορα δῖον (‘We have won great glory
– we have killed glorious Hector’). Achilles proudly uses ‘we’, which probably refers to Achilles and the Greek soldiers, to let his soldiers share in his triumph of killing Hector although they were not directly involved. We can also express (seeming) modesty, such as in Il. 7.196: ἐπεὶ οὐ τινὰ δείδῃς ἥμης (‘since there is no one we fear in any case’), where Ajax associates himself with his soldiers although he is a leader. The primary narrator, too, uses ‘we’. For example, he includes the primary narratees in his ‘we’ in Od. 1.10 (τῶν ἁμόθεν γε, θαύ, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν) and mortals in general in Il. 2.486 (ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδὲ τι ἴδμεν).

This study aims to explore the effects of narrators using ‘we’ or ‘I’. It is important to note that I will not systematically examine the use of the first-person singular and plural forms – for this I refer to Kaimio’s (1970) elaborate study on the use of the singular and plural by the chorus of tragedy in referring to themselves, and by other persons in referring to the chorus. Instead, my main aim is to investigate the effects of the epic, lyric, and tragic narrators’ use of either ‘I’ or ‘we’ when this choice is related to the issue of narrative authority.

---

19 Similarly Chantraine (1963(2): 33): ‘Puis il s’agit de la victoire remportée par le seul Achille, mais qu’il met fièrement en commun avec ses compagnons’; Rijksbaron (2007: 114): “[using “we” is] a sign of superiority: although you, other Greeks, have done nothing, I let you share in my triumph’. De Jong (2012a: 161) ad 393, too, finds the possibility that Achilles uses ‘we’ as a ‘sociative plural’, i.e. Achilles includes the soldiers in his ‘we’ to imply ‘that the glory he has won makes all Greeks more glorious’ (emphasis in the original) most attractive.

Contra K-G 1.83.3, according to whom the plural is used here out of modesty, ‘mit einer gewissen Bescheidenheit’. Schwyzer-Debrunner (2. 243) B.IV.2.b, too, call this an instance of the pluralis modestiae. Yet, as Rijksbaron notes, “modesty” is not a characteristic easily associated with Achilles’ (p. 114). Note that lines 393–4 were athetized by Aristarchus (Arn/A). According to an alternative interpretation, the words were given to the Greek soldiers to utter as a paean; see Richardson (1993: 146) ad 393–4.


22 E.g. Chantraine (1963(2): 33).
2.2. Focalization

Another important concept is that of focalization. The subject matter of focalization is vast. It basically means ‘narrative perspective’; the focalizer is the person through whose eyes the events are seen. In this study, I focus on the difference between experiencing and narrating focalization.

As mentioned above, internal narrators, who were present at the events they tell, base their accounts on what they have witnessed. Yet they could have acquired information afterwards as well (ex eventu knowledge). If their account is retrospective and they are thus equipped with ex eventu knowledge, they have a narrating focalization. Contrarily, they can also suppress their ex eventu knowledge and narrate as if they see the events occurring in front of their eyes at the moment of narrating. This can be more engaging, and in this case narrators have an experiencing focalization. Related to this is the fact that narrators may be expected to view the events through a different lens in the present from one through which they saw the events at the moment of experiencing them.

Theoretically, internal narrators are not the only to make use of experiencing focalization. External narrators, too, can narrate as if they see the events they narrate occurring in front of their eyes, for example, according to the focalization of someone who was present (embedded focalization) or otherwise with the characteristics of experiencing focalization. Discourse linguists call this the ‘immediate diegetic mode’ (a marked narrative mode). It is characterized by chronological order, little narratorial intervention, the use of the historical present, and relatively few text-structural and interactional particles.

The distinction between experiencing and narrating focalization is relevant to the subject of narrative authority insofar as different narrative ‘sources’ (autopsy, hearsay, etc.) can be expected to lead to certain narrative perspectives and degrees of privilege (omniscient or limited), or, on the contrary, to break this expectation for specific effects. For example, it may be expected that an internal narrator, narrating according to his experiencing focalization, has no access to the thoughts of others. Also, the way he sees the events of the immediate past may change in the light of what he sees of their aftermath. Finally, a particularly engaging style (as a result of experiencing focalization) might induce the narratee to accept what the narrator says. This could be set up against

---

24 See de Jong (1991: 30–56) for experiencing and narrating focalization in Euripides’ messenger speeches. She has adopted the distinction from Spitzer’s erzählendes and erlebendes Ich (1928: 447–9).
25 See Allan (2009: 174–9) and notes 12–14 for further secondary literature.
devices such as hearsay, which create a distance between the narrator and the story he tells, which in turn may trigger disbelief.

2.3. Metalepsis

A third concept is metalepsis, ‘sharing’, a rhetorical term adopted and adapted by Genette.\(^{26}\) It is the breaking of narrative boundaries, basically when a narrator ‘shares’ his own realm (the communicative situation) with that of his characters (the story world) or vice versa.\(^{27}\) Many devices fall into this category, such as apostrophe (when a narrator turns away from his narratee to address one of his characters, thus ‘entering’ the story world), characters ‘announcing’ the text of which they form part (e.g. when Helen says to Hector in the *Iliad* that they will be the subjects of song for men of future generations (*Il.* 6.357–8: ὡς καὶ ἐπίσσου | ἀνθρώποισι πελώμεθ᾽ ἀοίδιμοι ἐσσομένοισι), and the blending of narrative voices, such as in Demodocus’ narrative starting in *Od.* 8.76:

\[(1) \text{αὐτὰρ ἐπει πόσιος καὶ ἑδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἐντο,} \]
\[\text{Μοῦσ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀοιδὸν ἀνήκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἄνδρὼν,} \]
\[\text{ὁμής τῆς τότ᾽ ἄρα κλέος σύρανόν εὑρὼν ἰκανέ,} \]
\[\text{νείκος Ὀδυσσῆος καὶ Πηλεΐδεω Ἀχιλῆος,} \]
\[\text{ὡς ποτε… (Od. 8.72–6).} \]

But when they had put from them the desire for food and drink, the Muse urged the singer (i.e. Demodocus) to sing of the glorious deeds of men, from the song-path of which the fame had then reached broad heaven, the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles, son of Peleus, how once...

It is not made clear whether the primary narratees hear Demodocus’ or the primary narrator’s words after these lines. I return to this passage in Chapter 1 (pp. 23–4).

Metalepsis is not a device to create narrative authority per se, but it can be used as such, for example when a narrator blends his voice with those of others in order to add more weight to his utterances. The instances in which a reference is to hearsay is combined with apostrophe are striking, since the former establishes a temporal and geographical *distance* (indicating that the narrator only knows something from what he has been told by others) that is bridged by the latter.

---


\(^{27}\) See de Jong (2009), and notes 7 and 8 on p. 89 for secondary literature; (2013); *forthcoming*; Klooster (2013).

The following examples are discussed in more detail in de Jong (2009).
Armed with these concepts, I will address the following questions: how did lyric and tragic poets develop and exploit the epic narrative devices, both those of the Homeric primary narrator and of epic secondary narrators, to fit their own needs? For instance, what is the role of the Muses? How do lyric and tragic narrators achieve knowledge when the temporal distance between them and the events they narrate often makes narration from autopsy impossible? What sort of privilege or, conversely, limitation of knowledge do these narrators have? Do they appeal to others to express doubt or criticize the information provided, or, in contrast, to support it? Is narration from personal experience (which is inescapably subjective) or from hearsay sufficient to establish credibility with their narratees? And how do they use the narrative techniques of 'I versus we', metalepsis, and focalization? I note that I discuss the text internal narrators in lyric without going into the vexed debate of who corresponds to the speaker: a chorus, a singer, or the poet.28

This study's focus on epic, lyric, and the choral odes of tragedy follows logically from earlier studies (see section 1: Status quaestionis), which have shown continuities between these genres. The narrative devices that I investigate can also be found in other genres, such as historiography,29 but I will refer to these genres only when relevant. This is important to note, since it is not my main aim to prove that continuities exist between epic, lyric, and the choral odes of tragedy. Other scholars have already argued this. I believe that continuities in narrative techniques could only be proven if the poets of these three groups of texts used the same, unique techniques in the same way. As I will demonstrate, this is not the case (the techniques have developed), and these techniques are not unique to these three groups of texts. In my opinion, it is far more interesting to see how the poets exploited and developed the narrative techniques of their predecessors and how their specific handling of these techniques can enrich the understanding of the texts in which they are found. Analyses of narratives, therefore, make up an important part of this study.

28 See e.g. Currie (2013).
29 For the subject of authority in historiography, see e.g. Marincola (1997) and the references in Chapter 2, pp. 100-1, n. 3.
3. Structure

I will elaborate on the aforementioned narrative concepts in Homer’s epics in Chapter 1. In Chapters 2, 3 and 4, I will turn to lyric poetry (Chapter 2) and the choral odes of tragedy (Chapters 3 and 4), and investigate how poets of these genres adopted and developed the collection of narrative devices that were available to them from Homer.

The structure of Chapters 1–3 is determined by the possible explanations of the narrators’ acquisition of information. Each is divided into three or four sections, covering narrators who appeal to the Muses, internal narrators (who have eyewitness knowledge) and external narrators appealing to other narrators. In Chapters 1 (epic) and 3 (choral odes of tragedy), I devote a section to narratives in which a narrator does not explain how he knows the events he tells. This is not the case in Chapter 2 (lyric), since such unmotivated omniscience is normal in lyric. Chapter 4 is devoted to the parodos of Aeschylus’ Agamemnon due to the complexity of its narrative and the difficult question of the chorus’ authority.

At the beginning of each section, I list all of the relevant narratives in the corpus in a table. Then I will select some revealing passages for discussion. If a narrative falls into multiple categories (e.g. when a narrator refers to hearsay in only a small part of his narrative, or when an internal narrator appeals to the Muses), I indicate this in the tables between parentheses: (M) when there is also an appeal to the Muses; (I) in the case of internal narrators; (S) (= ‘source’) when narrators also appeal to other narrators; and (Ø) when the narrator’s knowledge is left unexplained in another part of the narrative.

‘Poetry has merged, without any violent transition, into drama’, Herington concluded.30 Let us now investigate how this smooth transition took place.

---

1. Epic

This chapter, divided into four sections, examines the authority of the primary and secondary narrators in epic. The first three each focus on one of the ways in which the narrator explains his knowledge: appeals to the Muses; autopsy; and appeals to other narrators, such as appeals to eyewitnesses or to what ‘people’ say. The fourth examines narratives in which the narrator does not make explicitly clear how he knows the events he tells. The first and third sections consider appeals by primary narrators and secondary narrators or other professional singers; the second and fourth consider only secondary narrators, since other types of narration do not occur in the primary narrator’s text.

1. Appeals to the Muses

1.1. Primary narrator

I begin with the invocations of the Muses by the primary narrator, who, who has the shape of a professional singer, invokes her in the two epics’ proems and in five other passages in the Iliad:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage, type of invocation</th>
<th>Words used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>II. 1.1, invocation in the proem</td>
<td>μὴν μοι δείδει, δεδ, Πηλιάδεω Αχιλής...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.484–6, invocation before catalogue</td>
<td>ἐσπετε νόν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὄλυμπια δώματ’ ἐχουσαι — ὑμείς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε, πάρεστε τε, ἴστε τε πάντα, ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οὐν ἀκουομεν οὐδὲ τι ἰδειν —...</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II. 2.761–2, invocation with superlative</td>
<td>τίς τ’ ἄρ τῶν ἄχ’ ἄριστος ἦν, σοὶ μοι ἐνεπε, Μοῦσα, αὐτῶν ἡδ’ ἵππων, οἳ ἀμ’ Ἀτρείδησιν ἐποντο.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Needless to say, the primary narrator’s Muse-invocations have received much attention from scholars, and I am therefore necessarily selective here. In particular, I rely on the analyses of de Jong (2014a [1987]); (2006). Furthermore, I have benefited from the overview of passages in which the Muse is mentioned in early epic and lyric poetry in Morrison (2007a: 73–90), who also reviews older scholarship, and Wheeler (2002). Older contributions are listed in e.g. de Jong (2014a [1987]: 45–6); Ford (1992: 32–3); Marincola (1997: 3, n. 7).
Table 1.1 Muse invocations in the primary narrator’s text

The primary narrator’s knowledge can best be examined by comparing it with that of the secondary narrators, who are not professional singers and therefore do not have the privilege of the Muses. As ‘ordinary’ narrators, they tell the story from a human perspective. If they have not witnessed the events they tell, they depend on hearsay and traditional stories for information, a matter on which I will elaborate in section 3 (pp. 53–63). Narratological studies of Homer’s epics have shown that the primary narrator, too, narrates from a human perspective in practice. Yet since he is a professional singer, his human knowledge of hearsay differs from that of secondary narrators in that it is authenticated by the Muses’ first-hand knowledge. The Muses see everything, as he states when he invokes them before the catalogue in *Iliad* 2. With their help, his knowledge is ‘doubly motivated’, since it is not merely dependent on hearsay and traditional stories. In this way, the Muses grant authority to his narrative. Moreover, the fact that in practice he will have derived his songs from traditional stories is camouflaged by the invocations to the Muses. The proems of the two epics reflect the collaboration between the narrator and his Muse particularly well. In each, the narrator demands that the Muse sing about a particular theme. The narratives that follow can be regarded as the Muse’s fulfillment of the narrator’s demand, but also as narratives related by the narrator himself.

As mentioned above, in the *Iliad* the Muses are also invoked outside the proem, when the narrator poses questions to them. Like in the proem, the answers given to these questions may be regarded as being issued from both the Muses and the narrator at the same time. Such questions also occur without the Muses being mentioned (e.g. *Il. 8.273*),

---

3 For this double motivation, see Lesky (1961: 30–1); cf. e.g. Edwards (1987: 19 and 134–5).
4 For this point, see Ford (1992: 93–101).
and in general they underscore the achievement of the particular warrior who is asked for.6

Since the questions posed to the Muses in the *Iliad* involve specific facts, such as who a warrior killed first, the Muses appear to be connected to the ability of the narrator *qua* professional singer to memorize and sing about a large number of names and events. This shows that the Muses have a pivotal role in the promulgation of the warriors’ *kleos* (fame). With the information he receives from the all-seeing Muses, the narrator can spread the warriors’ most important feats to his audience. In this light it is noteworthy that in two invocations the narrator uses the words κλειτῶν (*Il. 11.220*) and κλυτός (*Il. 14.510*), referring to the subject about which he is going to sing. These words often imply that a story exists in poetic form; here, they indicate that the narrator tells about events that are already well and widely known among his narratees. As a professional singer, however, he has privileged access to these events via the Muses, who know from autopsy the events of which ordinary narrators only know *kleos* (*Il. 2.484–6*). Hence, at each question, it may be that the Muse is asked to authenticate the *kleos* of warriors that mortals already know, thereby promulgating it. There may be another reason for κλειτῶν and κλυτός immediately after the invocations to the Muses, since these words may have a self-referential and self-fulfilling force: the warriors are famous because singers like the narrator himself, with the help of the Muses, have sung about them.

### 1.2. Other professional singers

In addition to the primary narrator, other professional singers mentioned in the *Odyssey* also have the privilege of the Muses. Thus the Muse is mentioned before the primary narrator gives the contents of two of Demodocus’ narratives:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage, singer: subject</th>
<th>Words used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Od. 8.73–92</em>, Demodocus: quarrel between Agamemnon and Odysseus</td>
<td>Μοῦσας ἀρχηγὸς ἄνηκεν ἁειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν (73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od. 8.499–520</em>, Demodocus: end of the Trojan War</td>
<td>ὁ δὲ ὀρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἱρχέτο (499)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|Table 1.2 Professional singers and the Muses|

---

The other professional singer, Phemius, claims that he is not only self-taught, but also that in addition a god has planted in his heart ‘all ways of song’ (αὐτοδίδακτος δ᾿ εἰμί, θεὸς δέ μοι ἐν φρεσίν οἴμας | παντοίας ἐνέφυσεν, Od. 22.347–8). As the primary narrator’s alter-egos, these professional singers receive help from the Muses as well.  

What privileges do these professional singers enjoy due to their collaboration with the Muses? Two other passages may shed light on this matter. In Od. 8.44–5 the narrator says that a god has given the gift of poetry to Demodocus to τέρπειν (45), and in Od. 17.518–21 Odysseus is said to have been taught by the gods because he enchanted Eumaeus like a singer. They imply that singers can enchant and enrapture their audience as a direct result of their collaboration with the Muses. More precisely, the function of the Muses becomes clear from ‘the beggar’s’ (Odysseus’) famous praise in Odyssey 8 of Demodocus for his narrative about the events at the end of the Trojan War, ‘as if he had seen them himself or had heard them from someone else’ (ὡς τέ ποι ἢ αὐτὸς παρεὼν ἢ ἄλλου ἀκούσας, 491). From Demodocus’ ‘pseudo-eyewitness’ presentation of the events, he had ‘drawn the conclusion’ that Demodocus must have learned of them from the Muse or Apollo. The beggar’s (Odysseus’) compliment gains significance by the fact that Odysseus himself witnessed the events that are being sung about. With regard to his knowledge, then, Demodocus’s singing displays his ability to narrate events from second-hand knowledge as if his narrative has eyewitness authority. This eyewitness authority, again (cf. Il. 2.484–6), seems to be an important result of the Muses’ help: whereas the professional singers have not seen or heard about the events of which they narrate, the Muses’ help gives them at least the same authority as narrators who did.

His eyewitness authority distinguishes Demodocus from ordinary narrators. There is another similarity between Demodocus and the primary narrator. Like the primary narrator, Demodocus’ task is to spread the kleos of heroes. This appears, for example, from Od. 8.73–4: Μοῦσ’ ἀρ’ ἀοιδὸν ἀνῄρηκεν διειδήμεναι κλέα ἀνθρώπων, | οἴμης τῆς τότ’ ἄρα κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἤκανε, … (‘the Muse urged the singer to sing of the glorious deeds of men, from the song-path of which the fame had then reached broad heaven, …’). Like the primary narrator, Demodocus sings about topics that his audience is already familiar with. However, he is assisted by the Muse. Because of the involvement of the immortal Muse, I believe he has eyewitness information about these events and ensures that the topics about which he sings attain (and retain) immortal honour, like the narratives about these topics themselves (οἴμης τῆς τότ’ ἄρα κλέος).  

---

7 See e.g. Scodel (1998) for the distinction in the Odyssey between the songs of professional singers and other storytelling, although I do not fully agree with her arguments; see below, p. 23. Cf. e.g. Macleod (1983: 1–15) on utterances on poetry in the epics as illuminating the poetry of Homer himself, and Richardson (1990: 84–7).

8 For the kleos of songs themselves, see de Jong (2006a), especially p. 194.
In this respect it may be significant that the Muse is not mentioned before Demodocus’ narrative about Ares and Aphrodite (Od. 8.266–366), but only in relation to two narratives about the Trojan War. This may be because these two narratives concerned warriors’ kleos (cf. e.g. μοῦσ᾽ ἄρ’ ἀοιδὸν ἀνήκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν (Od. 8.73)) against the rather ‘humoresque’ song about the – by definition immortal – gods Ares and Aphrodite. By mentioning the Muse in relation to the professional singer Demodocus in the narratives about the warriors of the Trojan War, the primary narrator underscores Demodocus’ (and by extension, his own) active role in promulgating the kleos of warriors.

Scodel argues – wrongly, in my view – that there is, besides the eyewitness authority that they receive from the Muses, something else that distinguishes the professional singers from ordinary narrators: according to her, the stories sung by Demodocus are ‘independent’. That is, they do not directly address the immediate situation or occasion and are not meant as an example or exhortation. She states that Homer seems anxious that his audience suspect ulterior motives in the singers’, and by extension his own, narratives. Therefore, he says that the narratives derive directly from the Muse and do not depend on human intermediaries. I agree that this gives the singers’ narratives more authority, but I am not convinced that there is such a close connection between the claim that singers would not rely on mere hearsay and her argument that the narratives would not serve an immediate end. Although they do not persuade someone to do something, scholars have pointed out that Demodocus’ narratives do not seem to be so ‘independent’. For example, Broeniman shows that Demodocus’ first narrative suits the context in which it is embedded: it could best be ‘understood in the context of the Phaeacian episode’, while his third narrative has an important function for Odysseus, since he wants to have his most famous deeds recounted for all to hear.

I turn to the form in which Demodocus’ collaboration with the Muses is expressed, since it raises questions. We do not know if, and – if so – how, Demodocus invoked the Muses because his songs are not quoted in direct speech. Demodocus’ narratives form a special type of embedded narrative because they are quoted in indirect speech and are embedded via introductory sentences such as:

(1) αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἐντο,
Μοῦσ᾽ ἄρ’ ἀοιδὸν ἀνήκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν,

---

10 Broeniman (1996: 8), emphasis in the original. See for the ways in which Demodocus’ songs suit the context in which they are embedded also de Jong (2001: 195–6) ad Od. 8.73–82. Many older studies may be mentioned here, too, e.g. Braswell (1982: 129–37), who mentions ‘the direct relevance of their (i.e. the songs’) immediate context and the action described in it’ (p. 130).
When they had put from them the desire for food and drink, the Muse urged the singer to sing of the glorious deeds of men, from the song-path of which the fame had then reached broad heaven, the quarrel of Odysseus and Achilles, son of Peleus, how once...

Initially, the narrative is syntactically subordinate to the introductory sentence, but it takes the form of an independent construction after this passage. Thus it is not made explicitly clear whether the primary narratees hear Demodocus’ or the primary narrator’s words. The voices of the primary narrator and Demodocus seem to speak together, an instance of metalepsis (pp. 16–7).

What is the role of the Muse in this metaleptic blending of voices? In Od. 8.73 the Muse ‘urges’ (ἀνῆκεν) the singer to sing about the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, but the question is how far the exhortation by the Muse extends. Does she urge him to sing only about a topic within the field of the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, or specifically of the quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles? In my view the indirect presentation of Demodocus’ narratives suggests that her urging extends much further, since it is even possible to read the whole narrative as the Muse’s exhortation to Demodocus to sing it. In this way the introduction to this narrative reflects close collaboration between the professional singers and the Muse, since the narrative is issued not only from the primary narrator and Demodocus, but also from the Muse. As such it can be compared to the Muse invocations in the epics’ proems and the questions posed to the Muse (in both cases, the answer comes from the narrator and his Muse). The difference in Od. 8.73 is that the initiative seems to have come from the Muse instead of the narrator, but the result appears to be similar.

Od. 8.499 is more complicated:

(2) ὦς φάθ᾿, ὁ δ᾿ ὁρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἄρχετο, φαῖνε δ᾿ ἀοιδήν,
 ἔνθεν ἑλὼν ὡς οἱ μὲν ἐὕσσελμων ἐπὶ νηῶν
 βάντες ἀπέπλειον, ... (Od. 8.499–501)

So he spoke, and the singer, stirred, began from the goddess, and let his song be heard, taking up the tale where the Argives had embarked on their benched ships and were sailing away, ...

Two interpretations are possible: θεοῦ may be read as a genitive originis, and ὃς ὁρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἄρχετο may accordingly be translated as ‘he began from (i.e. with) the goddess’ (as above). That would mean that Demodocus invoked her at the beginning of his narrative,
like the primary narrator in his proems. Or the words may denote the same sense of urging as in line 74: ‘the singer, stirred by the goddess, began’. The implication would be that the Muse was not merely invoked by the singer, but also urged the whole narrative, comparable to her role in Od. 8.73. Yet the metrical caesura that separates ὁρμηθείς from θεοῦ is an argument in favour of interpreting it as a genitive originis, as is the fact that Demodocus was indeed urged here, namely by Odysseus (although I should add that this was also the case in Od. 8.492–3). Furthermore, and this may be the most convincing argument for favouring the first interpretation, this passage differs from Od. 8.73ff. in that the singer seems to have a more prominent and active role and three verbs (ἄρχετο, φαῖνε δ᾽ ἀοιδήν, ἑλὼν) refer to his active role in the narrative, as opposed his relatively passive role in Od. 8.73ff. Therefore I favour the first interpretation and read θεοῦ as a genitive originis: Demodocus started his narrative by invoking the Muse, like the primary narrator does. Yet, again, with regard to its result, there does not seem to be a major difference between the narrator invoking the Muse or being urged by the Muse.

Both the Muses and others (like Odysseus in the case of Demodocus’ second narrative in Odyssey 8) can thus be said to urge the professional singers’ narrative. In addition, in Od. 8.45, a passage reflecting on Demodocus’ status as a professional singer, Demodocus’ own θυμός is said (by Alcinous) to urge him how to sing:

(3) τῷ γάρ ἥκα θεός πέρι δώκεν ἀοιδήν τέρπειν, ὅππῃ θυμὸς ἐποτρύνῃσιν αἰείδειν. (Od. 8.44–5)

For to him above all others has the god granted skill in song, to give delight in whatever way his spirit urges him to sing.

Arguably this phrase, the phrase in Od. 8.73 (Μοῦσ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν), and that in 8.499 (ὁ δ᾽ ὁρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἄρχετο), show that in this respect, viz. the urging of the narrative, there is no clear division between the tasks of the singer and those of the Muse.

---

12 So e.g. Garvie (1994: 335) ad 499.
13 ἄλλ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἄρτον ἐφέσσε μετάβητι καὶ ἱπποῦ κόσμον ἄεισον | δουρατέου, τὸν Ἐπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ, … (‘But come now, change your theme, and sing of the building of the wooden horse, which Epeius made with Athena’s help, …’ Od. 8.492–3) Odysseus exhorts Demodocus to sing about a particular theme: he, as I mentioned above (p. 23), wants to have his most famous deed recounted for all to hear. As part of his request he begins a short narrative of his own.
44 A similar phrase occurs in Od. 1.347.
2. Internal Secondary Narrators: Autopsy

Many of the Homeric secondary narrators are internal: they were present at the events they tell and, as such, have first-hand knowledge of them. The following table gives an overview of these internal narrators:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage, narrator: subject</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Il. 1.259–74, Nestor: warriors in the past</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 1.365–412, Achilles: quarrel with Agamemnon (S)</td>
<td>In 396–406, Achilles refers to stories told by Thetis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 2.303–32, Odysseus: omen of the serpent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 7.132–56, Nestor: strife between Pylians and Arcadians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 8.229–34, Agamemnon: warriors boasting on Lemnos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 9.447–84, Phoenix: autobiography</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 11.670–803, Nestor: strife between Pylians and Eleians</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 15.18–30, Zeus: Hera’s punishment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 20.187–94, Achilles: pursuing Aeneas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 21.441–60, Poseidon: building the walls of Troy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 23.629–45, Nestor: Amarynceus’ funeral games</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 3.133–85, Nestor: departure from Troy and his nostos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 4.240–64, Helen: Odysseus in disguise</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 4.266–89, Menelaus: the wooden horse</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 4.351–386, Menelaus: Egyptian tale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 7.241–97, Odysseus: his hardship and encounter with Nausicaa</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 9–12, Odysseus’ Apologue</td>
<td>Odysseus partly narrates what he has seen himself, partly what he has not seen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 13.253–86, Odysseus: lying tale</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In these narratives (as in all related by internal narrators), several degrees of the narrators’ involvement in the events they tell may be distinguished. At one end of the spectrum they may be the sole protagonists, while at the other they may have been bystanders. A further distinction may be made between the secondary narratees, who are either internal, in which case the narrator also draws on their memory, or external to the events the narrator tells. Narrators may create authority for themselves as narrators by stressing their individual role or eyewitness status, and/or involving their narratees. Before examining the narratives in more detail, I will make some general remarks on the use of first- and second-person forms when these forms are used to stress one of these aspects.

### 2.1. General remarks on the first- and second-person forms

I start with internal narrators who tell a story that involves the narratees they address. The frequent use of the ‘you’ form involves their narratees more directly. Thus

---

1. For this distinction see e.g. Lanser (1986); Nieragden (2002).
2. Signs of the ‘you’ in the primary narrator’s text have been examined by de Jong (2014: [1987]: 53–60). Referring to the work of Prince and Piwowarczyk, she shows that the second-person addresses involve the primary narratees more directly into the story. There are some important a priori differences between addresses of the primary and secondary narratees, since the secondary narratees are specific persons. Seeing that these secondary narratees have an identity of their own, it is not, in the first place, the audience that will have been more directly involved in the narrative, but the specific person addressed.
in *Od*. 24.37–93, where Agamemnon tells Achilles in the underworld about Achilles’ funeral, the ‘you’ form almost makes the narratee Achilles into a witness of his own funeral:¹

(4) ἔνθα κεν οὐ τιν’ ἀδάκρυτον γ’ ἐνόησας
'Ἀργείων' οὖν γὰρ ὑπώροπε Μοῦσα λίγεια. (Od. 24.61–2)
*There could you not have seen an Argive but was in tears, so deeply did the clear-toned Muse move their hearts.*

(5) ἀλλὰ κε κεῖνα μᾶλιστα ἰδὼν δνήσασθαι γυμῷ,
ο’ ἐπ’ σοι κατέθηκε δεα περικαλλέ’ ἀειθλα,... (Od. 24.90–2)
*But had you seen that sight you would most have marvelled most at heart, ...*

The ‘you’ form can also imply a threat. Thus when Zeus reminds Hera of her punishment in *Il*. 15.18–30, it adds force to his power to carry out threats in the present, especially the phrase ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ:⁴

(6) ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε τ᾽ ἐκρέμω ὑψόθεν, ἐκ δὲ ποδοῖιν
ἀκμονέας ἠκα δῦω, περὶ χερσί δὲ δεσμον ήθλα
χρύσων ἀρρηκτὸν; σὺ δ’ ἐν αἰθέρι καὶ νεφέλῃσι
ἐκρέμω· ... (Il. 15.18–21)
*Or do you not remember when you were strung up on high, and I hung two anvils from your feet and fastened a golden rope round your hands that could not be broken? You hung there in the sky and the clouds; ...*

Zeus’ narrative shows similarities with that of Achilles in *Il*. 20.187–94. Achilles reminds Aeneas of an earlier encounter when Aeneas would have been defeated had he not been rescued by the gods:

(7) ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ὅτε πέρ σε βοῶν ἀπὸ μούνον ἐόντα
στεία κατ’ ἰδαίων ὄρεων ταχέεσσι πόδεσσι
καρπαλίμως; (Il. 20.188–90)

---
⁴ Moran (1975: 201) describes this passage as a variation on the invocation pattern: since the speakers are relatively equals (two gods rather than a mortal person and a god), the *do ut des* idea does not apply, and instead of a request we find a threat.
Or do you not remember when I cut you off alone from your cattle and sent you running down the mountains of Ida with all speed of your legs?

The many ‘you’ forms in this narrative (187, 188 (2x), 190, 191, 194) achieve a similar, threatening, effect.

It is noteworthy that phrases containing forms of μιμνήσκω (like the phrase ἦ οὐ μέμνη used by Zeus and Achilles) are also typically used by narrators (qua professional singers) who are about to invoke a god and to tell (litt. ‘remember’) a tale. This means that the primary narrator lets Zeus and Achilles use phrases that both are appropriate to their own context, i.e., they ask their narratee to remember an event from the past, and outside their own context, namely as a rather technical term referring to telling a story. Since I restrict myself to examining the ways in which narrators create authority for their narrative, these multiple meanings of story introductions fall outside my scope. Nevertheless, I mention them here because we will see other examples of story introductions that have multiple meanings (e.g. pp. 57–61, 101–23, and 165–9).

As my last example, I mention Od. 4.266–90, where Menelaus’ use of ‘you’ forms makes his tone accusative in a counter-attack against Helen.

(8) τρὶς δὲ περίστειξας κοῖλον λόχον ἀμφαφόωσα, ἐκ δ᾽ ὄνομακλήδην Δαναῶν ὀνόμαζες ἀρίστους, πάντων Ἀργείων φωνὴν ἴσκου σ᾽ ἀλόχοισιν. (Od. 4.277–9)

Three times did you circle the hollow ambush, trying it with your touch, and you named aloud the chieftains of the Danaans by their names, likening your voice to the voices of the wives of all the Argives.

I turn to first-person forms. Using first-person forms frequently is characteristic of a subjective style of narration because internal narrators are by their nature involved in the events that they narrate. Yet this involvement may differ in force. Proetus, for example, a tertiary narrator introduced by Menelaus in his narrative addressed to Telemachus, refers to Odysseus’ nostos embedded in a first-person verb of seeing. He uses no first-person forms for the nostoi of Ajax and Agamemnon although he has witnessed them, too:

(9) υἱὸς Λαέρτεω, Ἰθάκῃ ἔνι οἰκία ναυσιν· τὸν δ᾽ ἵδεν ἐν νῆσῳ δαλερόν κατὰ δάκρυ χέοντα, ... (Od. 4.555–6)

---

1 Cf. e.g. the Homeric Hymn to Dionysus (7), lines 1–2.
2 Moran (1975).
3 For this narrative, see de Jong (2000: 101–2) ad Od. 4.234–89.
It is the son of Laertes, whose home is in Ithaca. Him I saw on an island, shedding big tears, ...

Proteus could simply have said ‘Odysseus was on an island…’. By using the first person and thus stressing his own, personal perspective, Proteus presents Odysseus’ unfortunate fate more engagingly and authoritatively.⁸

Narrators typically use ‘we’ (as opposed to ‘I’) for shared experiences, and the first-person plural often creates a sense of solidarity. Thus Menelaus and Nestor use ‘we’ in their narratives in the Odyssey addressed to Telemachus when they recall memories from their time in Troy. Their ‘we’ refers to the Greek warriors, as when Menelaus tells about them inside the horse:

(10) ὂπως ἐν ἔξοστῳ, ἱν’ ἐνήμεθα πάντες ἄριστοι Ἀργείων, ... (Od. 4.272)

In the carved horse, wherein all we chiefs of the Argives were sitting, ...

The first-person singular and plural forms work together in Odysseus’ Apologue. Here Odysseus uses ‘we’ forms, referring to himself and his comrades, when he talks about quintessentially collective events, viz. when they are engaged in battles (e.g. Od. 9.56–7), when they sail and arrive somewhere as part of their journey (e.g. ἐνθὲ δὲ προτέρω πλέομεν ἄκακόμοι ήτορ 9.62, 105; ἐνδα κατηπλέομεν, 9.142, ἄλλ’ ὅτε δὴ τὸν χώρον ἀφικόμεθ’ ἐγγός ἐόντα, 9.182), and when he talks about the fate sent from the gods (e.g. τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατὰ μεγαλήτορα θυμόν ... 9.299). Odysseus shifts to ‘I’ forms when he narrates his own plans and orders. Since they actually are Odysseus’ plans and orders, this is unsurprising. Yet the fact that he himself took the initiative is often underscored by (emphatic) first-person forms such as ἐγὼ (e.g. αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ σίτοιό τ’ ἐπασσάμεθ’ ἠδὲ ποτῆτος, | δὴ τοτ’ ἐγὼν ἑτάρους προΐειπεύθεσθαι ἰόντας, 9.87–8; τὸν μὲν ἐγὼ βούλευσα κατὰ μεγαλήτορα θυμόν ..., 9.299). I elaborate on such narratives in which the narrator draws attention to his individual role in section 2.2. In addition, Odysseus uses ‘I’ when he makes counter-factual remarks (e.g. καὶ νῦ κεν ἄπιστα ἢμᾶς ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν, 9.79).

In rare instances, Odysseus speaks about his journey and engagement in battles in the first-person singular. Thus in Od. 9.39–40 Odysseus begins his narrative in the singular:

From Ilium the wind bore me and brought me to the Cicones, to Ismarus. There I sacked the city...

Arguably, he may have used the singular because Alcinous had just asked him to tell about his nostos (cf. νόστον ἐμὸν, 37). Another example is:

Now all unscathed would I have reached my native land, but the waves and the current and the North Wind beat me back as I was rounding Malea, and drove me off course past Cythera. Thence for nine days’ space I was borne by savage winds over the fish-filled sea; but on the tenth we set foot on the land of the Lotus-eaters, ...

The singular form in line 79 is part of a counter-factual remark, but why does Odysseus use it in the other instances? It may be that these first-person singular forms follow directly upon, and are, so to speak, attracted by, the ‘default’ singular form used for the counter-factual remark in line 79. In line 84, then, Odysseus returns to the ‘we’ form, moving on to his and his comrades’ next adventure.

In the following sections I will examine three ways in which narrators can create authority for themselves and their narratives within the larger subject of narration from autopsy: appeals to the individual, often heroic, role of the narrator himself; appeals to common memory of the narrator and narratee(s); and appeals to a narrator’s status as an eyewitness (2.2–4). In the last section I turn to the knowledge of internal narrators, examining the restrictions of autopsy (2.5).

2.2. Appeals to the narrator’s own role

A prime example of an internal narrator who presents himself as the sole protagonist of the events he narrates is Nestor in his narratives in the Iliad. He introduces his narratives, in which he often plays a heroic role, with the words:
Would that I were as young now, and the power was still in me (as when...)

This is one of his characteristic signals for narration from memory. His nostalgia emphasizes his old age, which gives him a special status as an advisor: he has an age-entitled authority over his younger narratees, since he can dig into his own past to find relevant examples for the present. Whereas the primary narrator turns to the Muse to ask which warrior killed someone first, Nestor boasts that he himself achieved such heroic exploits.

The longest instance in which Nestor emphasizes his protagonist role by using first-person singular forms is Il. 11.670–803, which contains nineteen instances of the first-person singular and fifteen of the plural. The singular forms mainly occur in the second half of the narrative, and the first half serves to tell the background of the story. It is a classic example of ‘epic regression’ or ‘lyric narrative’: the narrative begins with its main subject (the strife that broke out between the Eleians and Pylians), takes a few steps back in time, and explains the current situation to the narratee(s). Thus lines 690–5, which are introduced by γάρ, explain why the Eleians owed a debt to the Pylians. In lines 698–720, also introduced by γάρ, the narrator explains why Neleus selected such a great part of the booty taken from the Eleians. Nestor explains that a large debt was owed to Neleus because Augeias, king of the Eleians, had once stolen his horses, so the Eleians owed a particularly large debt to him. Then, from line 706 onwards, the story is told in largely chronological order, and the number of first-person references increases: ἐγώ (742), ἐγώ (743), στῆν (744), ἐγὼν (747), ἐπόρουσα (747), ἔλον (748), ἄλαπαξα (750). Here Nestor focuses on his own role. He increasingly ‘relives’ the events and lets his narratees relive them with him, telling the story through his own perspective at the time when the events occurred.

---

9 Cf. Il. 7.133 where Nestor expresses a similar idea. In Od. 14.468 and 503 the phrase is spoken by the beggar (Odysseus).

10 For Nestor’s special status, see Minchin (1991: 279, n. 17), also for further literature: ‘Through a preface of this kind a speaker invites his audience to enter his storyworld’.

11 See e.g. Dickson (1995: 71): ‘This direct, experiential access to the past contrasts sharply with the mediated access most others enjoy, for whom it is largely a matter of fabled song, of kleos in the sense of “hearsay” or “rumour”’. Cf. e.g. Minchin (2005: 66). This status may be compared to Phoenix’ in Il. 9.447–84.

12 As a matter of fact, it is the narrative for which Schadewaldt first used the term ‘lyrische Erzählung’: Schadewaldt (1966 [1938]: 84). For lyric narrative/epic regression in Homer see also Krischer (1971: 136–40); de Jong (2007: 35). This narrative form is also found in the Homeric hymns, in lyric, and in the parodos of Aeschylus’ Agamemnon.
Let us now turn to the instances of the first-person plural; who are referred to by the ‘we’ forms? They mainly refer to Nestor and the Pylians, but there are no fewer than five groups:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Identity of the ‘we’ group</th>
<th>Words used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 The Pylians in general (as opposed to the Eleians)</td>
<td>Ἠλείοισι καὶ ἡμῖν, 671; ἡμεῖς παύροι κεκακωμένοι ἐν Πύλῳ ἦμεν, 689; ἡμέας ὑβρίζοντες, 695; ἔμμι 714.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 The Pylian cattle raiders</td>
<td>συνελάσσαμεν, 677; ἡλασάμεσθα, 682.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 The Pylians to whom the Eleians owed a debt, and who were dividing the spoils</td>
<td>ἡμεῖς μὲν τὰ ἑκαστά διεῖπομεν, 706, ἔρδομεν, 707 (cf. 695).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 The Pylian warriors in the battle against the Eleians</td>
<td>μείναμεν, 723; ἰκόμεσθ’, 726; κατεκοιμήθημεν, 754; βήσαμεν, 756.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 The sons of Neleus</td>
<td>ὑλέες ἦμεν, 692.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Group 5 is a ‘nostalgic’ ‘we’ group that no longer exists, since Nestor is Neleus’ only surviving son.

This wide range of possibilities shows that the ‘we’ groups are constantly redefined when Nestor finds himself in another group. Nestor is the outstanding member in three of the five groups, which reflects his position at the centre of his narrative:

| 1 | Nestor was the one amongst the cattle raiders who slew Itymous: ἐγὼ κτάνον Ἰτυμονῆα (672); ἔβλητ᾽ ἐν πρώτοισιν ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἄκοντι (‘he was hit amid the foremost by a spear from my hand’, 675). |
| 2 | Nestor was the only one of Neleus’ sons who survived (τὸν οἶνος λιπόμην, 693). |
| 3 | (Neleus has the most prominent position within this group) |
| 4 | E.g. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὃς ἰππεύς μετέπρεπον ἡμετέρουσι | καὶ πεζὸς προ ἑω, ἐπεὶ δὲς ἄγε νεῖκος Ἀθήνη (‘But even so I distinguished myself among our chariot-fighters, even though I went on foot, since this was how Athena directed the battle’, 720–1) ἄλλα ὡς ἐκ Πυλίων καὶ Ἐπειῶν ἐπλεττό νεῖκος, | πρῶτος ἐγὼν ἔλον ἀνδρα (‘But when the fighting began between Pylians and Epeians, I was first to kill a man’, 737–8). |
| 5 | Nestor was the only one of Neleus’ sons who survived (τῶν οἶνος λιπόμην, 693). |

The instances in groups 2 and 4 reflect Nestor’s concern of presenting himself as a particularly brave warrior in the past. Moreover, he seems to be distinguishing himself from others as a warrior by using ‘I’ forms to denote martial actions (although many are
collective events), while the ‘we’ forms predominantly denote waiting, sacrificing, dividing, eating supper, and sleeping. The effect is that Nestor’s war efforts and heroic role receive emphasis, which increases his authority as a narrator.

Some scholars argue that the last sentence of Nestor’s narrative retrospectively decreases his narrative authority: ‘that was the man I was, if ever I was’ (ὣς ἔον, εἴ ποτ᾽ ἔον γε, μετ᾽ ἀνδράσιν, 762). This phrase would indicate that Nestor does not remember the events he recounts in this narrative exactly. However, the detailed description of the booty in lines 677–81, which arguably emphasizes his own strength and bravery (which would have been required to seize such an impressive number of cattle from his enemies), suggests that Nestor can remember the events. Therefore, in my view, line 762 does not raise doubts on Nestor’s narrative authority but expresses nostalgia, just as the introductory sentence does. I agree with Kirk that the phrase is above all ‘a verbal sigh over the loss of something’; Nestor’s youth is so long past that he can barely believe it once was there.

Nestor’s narrative in Od. 3.105–85, too, nicely illustrates some effects of the combination of first-person singular and plural forms. Nestor addresses Telemachus, an external narratee, who had asked him for information about Odysseus. Nestor does not know much about Odysseus’ whereabouts (one of the purposes of his narrative is to explain why he cannot continue to help Telemachus), so he responds with experiences he shared with Odysseus when they last saw each other during the Greeks’ departure from Troy. The use of ‘I’, ‘we’ and third-person forms in this narrative can be summarized as follows:

13 ἐγὼ κτάνον, 672; (Ελαυνόμενος, 674); ἐμῆς ἀπὸ χειρὸς ἄκοντι, 675; μεί τόχε πολλά νέω πόλεμονδὲ κιόντι, 684; τῶν ὀίος λιπόμην, 692; ἡμεῖς μὲν τὰ ἕκαστα διείπομεν, ἀμφί τε ἅστυ ἥρδομεν ἱρὰ θεοῖς, 706–7, μείναμεν, 723, ἱκόμεσθ᾽, 726; ῥέξαντες, 727; ἑλόμεσθα, 730; κατεκοιμήθημεν, 731; ἑπόμεσθα, 754.
14 συνελάσσαμεν, 677; ἡλασάμεσθα, 682; Νηλῆος ἀμύμονος υἱέες ἦμεν, 692; ἡμεῖς μὲν τὰ ἕκαστα διείπομεν, ἀμφί τε ἅστυ ἥρδομεν ἱρὰ θεοῖς, 706–7, μείναμεν, 723, ἱκόμεσθ᾽, 726; ἔξαντες, 727; ἔλαυνος, 730; κατεκοιμήθημεν, 731; ἐπίμεσθα, 754.
15 E.g. Lynn-George (1988: 36): ‘this phrase articulates distance, uncertainty and discontinuity in relation to a past which, in its remoteness, is situated on the blurred borders of the real and the realm of the imaginary, on the indeterminate threshold between history and fiction’. Cf. O’Maley (2011: 6–7): ‘on all occasions it is used to present the past as something distant, and by extension dim’. See Kirk (2003 [1985]: 290–1) ad 3.180 for a discussion of (in my view implausible) solutions to the question of why Nestor inserts this phrase.
16 Cf. Stinton (1976: 62–3); de Jong (2001: 374) ad Od. 15.267–70: ‘it is used of things of the past which – unfortunately – have changed’.

341 Epic
The Greek warriors endured sorrow in Troy 'we' = the Greek warriors

Among the Greek warriors, Odysseus was the best 'he' = Odysseus

During the Trojan war, Nestor and Odysseus were of one mind 'we' = Nestor and Odysseus

An argument arose between Agamemnon and Menelaus 'they' = Agamemnon and Menelaus; 'they' = Greek warriors

Some stayed behind with Agamemnon, others, including Nestor, left with Menelaus 'they' = warriors who stayed behind; 'we' = warriors who left

Some, including Odysseus, returned to Agamemnon, some, including Nestor, went on 'they' = warriors who returned; 'we' = warriors who went on

Diomedes arrives in Argos, Nestor in Pylos 'he' = Diomedes; 'I' = Nestor

In his introduction, Nestor presents the group of Greek warriors in Troy as a 'we' group:

(14) ὦ φίλ', ἐπεί μ' ἔμνησας ὀϊζύος, ἥν ἐν ἐκείνῳ
dήμῳ ἀνέτλημεν μένος ἄσχετοι υἷες Ἀχαιῶν,
ἡμέν δὲσα ξῦν νησίν ἐπ' ἡροειδέα πόντον
πλαζόμενοι κατὰ ληίδ᾽, … (Od. 3.103–6)
My friend (i.e. Telemachus), since you have recalled to my mind the sorrow that we endured in that land, we sons of the Achaeans, dauntless in courage—all that we endured on shipboard, as we roamed after booty over the misty deep, …

Why does Nestor begin a 'we' narrative here, emphasizing the collective sorrow of the Greek warriors and leaders, rather than 'I' ('you have recalled to my mind the sorrow that I endured in that land...')? Nestor is probably reacting to Telemachus' question about Odysseus. Odysseus' fate, contrary to that of the other leaders, is unknown. That prompts Nestor to embark on a narrative about their memories of the Trojan War and their nostoi. Furthermore, by referring to the Greek warriors and leaders together at the start of his narrative, Nestor is able to single out Odysseus as excelling within this group:

(15) εἰνάετες γάρ σφιν κακά φάπτομεν ἀμφιέποντες
παντολοίσι δόλοισι, μόγις δ᾽ ἐτέλεσε Κρονίων.
Nestor says that the Greeks, the ‘we’ group, were trying to conquer the Trojans by παντοίοισι δόλοισι (119). Thus Nestor ascribes to the ‘we’ group something that Odysseus is famous for, and that he, in fact, will repeat verbatim three lines later when he praises Odysseus (122) for excelling in this respect.

At this point Nestor briefly interrupts his narrative and addresses Telemachus, elaborating on the resemblance between him and his father Odysseus. When Nestor resumes his narrative in line 126, he effectively uses ‘we’ for Odysseus and himself (ἐβάζομεν, 127; φραζόμεθ᾽, 129) and emphasizes their one-mindedness (ἕνα θυμὸν ἔχοντε νόω, 128). Nestor narrates how the Greeks departed, after their victory. Now he shifts from ‘we’ to ‘they’ forms and dissociates himself from the other Greeks by referring to them in the third person: Ἀχαιούς (131), Ἀργείοις (133), οὐδὲ δίκαιοι | πάντες ἔσαν (133–4). Arguably this is because, as Nestor goes on to narrate, the Greeks were unjust and imprudent, which will turn out badly for many of them, whereas Nestor enjoys a relatively fortunate nostos.

Nestor relates about the quarrel between Agamemnon and Menelaus: Menelaus wanted to leave but Agamemnon wanted to stay to offer hecatombs to Athena. Nestor reveals that he is wiser than many of the Greek warriors, and he calls Agamemnon a νήπιος (146). This is not necessarily an addition from Nestor’s ex eventu knowledge, as one might expect, because line 166 also suggests that he knew it was a bad idea to stay even when the events were taking place: ‘for I knew that the god was devising evil’ (ἐπεὶ γίγνωσκον, ὃδὴ κακὰ μήδετο δαίμων, 166). His foresight, which Nestor seems keen to stress here, will be realized later in the narrative by the favourable wind with which Nestor reaches Pylos.

The quarrel caused the Greek warriors to be split up into two groups: the warriors who stayed behind with Agamemnon (ἡμίσεες δ᾽ ἄρα λαοὶ ἐρητύοντο μένοντες, 155) and who followed Menelaus, including Nestor and Odysseus. The last group forms a new ‘we’ group (ἡμίσεες δ᾽ ἀναβάντες ἐλαύνομεν, 157), which is broken up when some of the warriors decided to return to Agamemnon with Odysseus but Nestor continued his journey home. The ‘we’ group now consists only of the Greeks who continued with Nestor. Finally, Nestor uses ‘I’ when he narrates how he safely reached Pylos.
To sum up, in this narrative Nestor begins with ‘we’ forms to refer to all the Greeks in the Trojan war, responding to Telemachus’ question about his father and reference to the other Greek leaders. This ‘we’ group becomes increasingly smaller until only Nestor, ‘I’, remains. In this way Nestor explains why he does not know the fate of the others. Nestor, furthermore, uses ‘we’ to let Odysseus excel within the group of Greeks and showcase his and Odysseus’ one-mindedness and ‘they’ to disassociate himself from the Greeks when they acted unwisely.

2.3. Appeals to shared experiences of the narrator and his narratee(s)

Another way in which narrators create authority is by referring to previously shared experiences. A good example is Il. 21.441–57, where Poseidon addresses Apollo (442, 448) and reminds him of the labour they once undertook in Troy: Poseidon himself built the walls, while Apollo tended the flocks. King Laomedon refused to pay the gods, even threatening to mutilate them and to sell them as slaves. Poseidon uses the first-person plural throughout his narrative (443, 444, 451, 455, 456), thereby emphasizing his and Apollo’s shared experiences. He even reminds Apollo of not only his own, but also of Apollo’s own thoughts and emotions at that time, thus showing his access to his narratee’s past inner thoughts:

(16) νῶϊ δὲ τ’ ἄψορροι κίομεν κεκοτηότι θυμῷ, 
μισθοῦ χωόμενοι, τὸν ὑποστὰς οὐκ ἐτέλεσσε. (Il. 21.456–7)
So we returned with fury in our hearts, angered for the payment he (i.e. Laomedon) had promised but did not make good.

In this way Poseidon makes an effort to revive their past anger and the disgrace. The fact that Apollo also participated in these events adds force to Poseidon’s argument that Apollo, like Poseidon, should oppose the Trojans: Apollo must remember the hardship that they endured. By drawing on common memory, the narrator Poseidon creates authority for the narrative and for his argument, albeit without the desired result.

The first-person plural is also used to create authority by referring to shared experiences in Il. 2.301–32, when Odysseus exhorts the Achaean warriors to stay in Troy and keep on fighting. To add force to his argument, he narrates an omen of ten years before about a serpent that devoured ten sparrows, followed by Calchas’ interpretation.

---

of it, viz. that they will capture Troy after nine years of waging war. Many first-person plural and no first-person singular forms occur throughout this narrative.

When Odysseus takes the floor in the midst of the Greeks in Il. 2.284, he first addresses Agamemnon: ‘son of Atreus, as things are, the Achaeans are intent on [bringing] you...’ (‘Ἀτρεΐδη νῦν δή σε ἐθέλουσιν Ἀχαιοί ..., 284). He refers to the other members of the group bystanders, the Greek warriors, in the third-person plural (ἐθέλουσιν (284), ἐκτελέουσιν (286), ἔδωρονταί (290), Ἀχαιοῦς (296)) and the first-person plural (ἡμῖν (295)). In line 299 he shifts from Agamemnon to these warriors, addressing them as follows:

(17) τλήτε, φίλοι, καὶ μείνατ᾽ ἐπὶ χρόνον, δέρα δαῶμεν
ἡ ἐτέον Κάλχας μαντεύεται, ἥ καὶ οὐκ ἦν
(II. 2. 299–300)

Bear with it, my friends, and wait for a time longer, until we can learn whether Calchas’ prophecy is true or not.

Odysseus forms a ‘we’ group of himself and the warriors who are listening. In addition to φίλοι, which ‘conveys a sense of fellowship that elevates the troops he addresses to his own level’, the direct address and ‘we’ forms have a function in involving the warriors more directly in his narrative and in emphasizing that they have witnessed this together.

The mention of ‘Calchas’ prophecy’ in lines 299–300 sparks the story of the omen and the contents of this prophecy, which he gave in Aulis ten years earlier. Odysseus continues to use ‘we’ forms, still referring to himself and the Greeks in Aulis who witnessed the events that Odysseus is going to narrate. Odysseus even claims to know what his narratees remember:

(18) εὖ γὰρ δὴ τάδε ἱκμὲν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἐστὲ δὲ πάντες
μάρτυραι, οὐσ μὴ κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοι φέρουσαι:
χθιζά τε καὶ πρωίζ᾽ ὅτ᾽ ἐς Αὐλίδα νῆες Ἀχαιῶν
ἡγερέθοντο κακὰ Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ φέρουσαι,

As such, it is an instance of the ‘recalled prophecy motif’; see de Jong (2001: 54) ad 2.171–6. For the function of this elaborate narrative to exhort the warriors, see e.g. Hebel (1970: 45): er läßt seine Zuhörer das Geschehen noch einmal erleben in der Hoffnung, die damalige Wirkung werde sich in den Männern wieder einstellen; Kirk (2001 [1985]: 148) ad 305–7 it ’stresses the authencity of the reminiscence and by implication, of the religious experience itself‘; BK (2000: 92) ad 299–332: ‘Die anschauliche, emotionale und dramatische Darstellung der Wundererscheinung in Aulis (Prinzip der ausführlichen Darstellung) ist das stärkstmögliche Argument’.}


21 Cf. Hebel (1970: 46); Kirk (2001 [1985]: 148) ad 299–300: ‘through the first person plural of δαῶμεν (…) he claims to share their feelings’.

22 As such, it is an instance of the ‘recalled prophecy motif’; see de Jong (2001: 54) ad 2.171–6. For the function of this elaborate narrative to exhort the warriors, see e.g. Hebel (1970: 45): er läßt seine Zuhörer das Geschehen noch einmal erleben in der Hoffnung, die damalige Wirkung werde sich in den Männern wieder einstellen; Kirk (2001 [1985]: 148) ad 305–7 it ’stresses the authencity of the reminiscence and by implication, of the religious experience itself‘; BK (2000: 92) ad 299–332: ‘Die anschauliche, emotionale und dramatische Darstellung der Wundererscheinung in Aulis (Prinzip der ausführlichen Darstellung) ist das stärkstmögliche Argument’.


25 As such, it is an instance of the ‘recalled prophecy motif’; see de Jong (2001: 54) ad 2.171–6. For the function of this elaborate narrative to exhort the warriors, see e.g. Hebel (1970: 45): er läßt seine Zuhörer das Geschehen noch einmal erleben in der Hoffnung, die damalige Wirkung werde sich in den Männern wieder einstellen; Kirk (2001 [1985]: 148) ad 305–7 it ’stresses the authencity of the reminiscence and by implication, of the religious experience itself‘; BK (2000: 92) ad 299–332: ‘Die anschauliche, emotionale und dramatische Darstellung der Wundererscheinung in Aulis (Prinzip der ausführlichen Darstellung) ist das stärkstmögliche Argument’.


27 Cf. Hebel (1970: 46); Kirk (2001 [1985]: 148) ad 299–300: ‘through the first person plural of δαῶμεν (…) he claims to share their feelings’.
In the first lines of this passage, Odysseus introduces the events which he is going to relate as ‘it was but as yesterday or the day before’. By these words he suggests that the events are still fresh in the narratees’ minds, and he re-activates their memory. The presentation of this event in the past as ‘it was but as yesterday’ significantly differs from Odysseus’ presentation of how their absence must feel to those who stayed at home: δηρόν, (‘long’, 298), as he mentioned earlier:

(19) ἀλλὰ καὶ ἔμπης αἰσχρόν τοι δηρόν τε μένειν κενεόν τε νέεσθαι. (I. 2.297–8)

But for all that is a shaming thing to wait long and return with empty hands.

Furthermore, Odysseus lays emphasis on the sensory perception and memory of the ‘we’ group, referring to his narratees as μάρτυροι (302). He includes many eyewitness details, recalling what he and his narratees saw when they were in Aulis, e.g.: ἀμφὶ περὶ κρήνην (305); καλὴ ὑπὸ πλατανίστῳ ὅθεν ῥέεν ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ (307); ἐπὶ νώτα βαρφίνος | σμερδαλέος (308–9). Because the narratees were all eyewitnesses, as Odysseus emphasizes, they can remember the events themselves and therefore fully endorse what Odysseus is saying (τόδε ἴδμεν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, 301). After the ‘we’ forms disappear (308–19), they are found again from line 320, when Odysseus, again, reminds them how they experienced the events:

---


23 In addition, Odysseus’ presentation of time here may be set up against Agamemnon’s II. 2.134–8, who, by contrast, emphasized that they are away for no less than nine years, while their task is still unaccomplished.
The narrative now continues with Calchas’ prophecy in Aulis, quoted in direct speech. Calchas addresses the warriors who had just witnessed the events. Calchas’ prophecy, although it was spoken in the past, consists of events in the future from the perspective of Odysseus and the other warriors now, and also of the plot of the *Iliad*. In narratological terms, Calchas’ prophecy is an *external prolepsis* within an *external analepsis*. Calchas says:

((20)) τίπτ’ ἄνεῳ ἐγένεσθε, κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί; ἡμῖν μὲν τόδ’ ἔφηνε τέρας μέγα μητίετα Ζεὺς, δύσιμον, δυστέλεστον, δου κλέος οὐ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται. 325

ὡς οὕτως κατὰ τέκνα φάγε στρουθεῖο καὶ αὐτήν, ὑπόκτω, ἄτορ μὴν ἐνατῇ ἡν ἦν τεκνά, ὡς ἡμεῖς τοσσαῦτ’ ἔτεα πτολεμίξομεν αὖθι, τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν αἰρήσομεν εὐρυάγιαν. (II. 2.323–9)

*Why fall silent, you long-haired Achaeans? This is a great sign revealed to us by Zeus the counsellor – a sign late-pointing, late-fulfilled, whose fame will never perish. Just as this snake ate the sparrow’s children and the sparrow herself, eight of them, and the mother who bore the brood made nine, so we shall battle there for that many years, and in the tenth year we shall take the broad streets of the city.*

Like Odysseus, Calchas uses the first-person plural (ἡμῖν (324), ἡμεῖς … πτολεμίξομεν (328), αἰρήσομεν (329)). Some of Calchas’ lines show close similarities with Odysseus’: line 326 echoes 317 (αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ τέκνα φάγε στρουθεῖο καὶ αὐτήν), and line 327 is the same as 313. Although Kirk explains Odysseus’ recalling of Calchas’ exact words simply as an instance of ‘oral economy, or artifice based thereon’, these repetitions also have a persuasive force. Calchas functions as an authority figure here, and by quoting his speech directly Odysseus reinforces his own argument: Calchas’ words, spoken in the past, confirm the message that Odysseus himself wishes to convey in the present.

Moreover, it is particularly worth noting that many of Calchas’ words, which he spoke in Aulis in the past, are directly applicable to the present, the moment of Odysseus speaking to the soldiers in Troy. Thus αὖθι (328) is an ‘Ausdruck für die Identität des Ortes, an dem das Subj. oder Obj. ist, war oder sein wird’ (LfgrE, emphasis added). ἡμεῖς is...

---

46 As such, Calchas’ speech has a ‘double relevance’ (for this term, see de Jong (2013: 114)).
used not only to denote somewhere else (for example Helen uses it to refer to Sparta while she is in Troy: ἐν Λακεδαίμονι αὖθι, φίλῃ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ, Il. 3.244), but also the speaker’s current location (e.g. Nestor’s exhortation to Agamemnon not to remain gathered ‘here’: μηκέτι νῦν δήβ’ αὖθι λεγόμεθα (Il. 2.435)). So αὖθι in Il. 2.322, too, may refer to Troy from the geographical perspectives of Odysseus and his narratees and of Calchas. Because of its ambiguity αὖθι reinforces the persuasive force of Calchas’ speech: it is almost as though it is spoken at the moment of narration, and it refers to the particular time and place of Odysseus and his narratees. This may be regarded as a metaleptic use of direct speech, since the warriors seem to hear Calchas speaking again and may feel that they are addressed by the ‘we’ forms.

Summing up, Odysseus cleverly draws on common memory and uses the first-person plural in his narrative, and he also uses the words of Calchas, which are applicable to the present. The ‘we’ point of view emphasizes their shared experiences, and in this way Odysseus appeals to his narratees’ own eyewitness knowledge of the events that he recounts. As such, they could fully endorse the messages Odysseus wishes to convey, viz. that they should to continue to wage war against the Trojans to achieve the victory that is, as it has been predicted, at hand. All warriors praise Odysseus after he finishes his speech, so his rhetorical strategies are successful.

To close, I briefly mention Agamemnon’s short narrative, in which he reminds his warriors that they had once boasted about being able to conquer the Trojans on the island of Lemnos but are no longer a match for even one of them, namely Hector:

(21) πῇ ἔβαν εὐχωλαί, ὅτε δὴ φάμεν εἶναι ἄριστοι, 
δὲ ὑπότ’ ἐν Λήμνῳ κενειαχέες ἡγοράσθε, 
ἐσθόντες κρέα πολλὰ βοῶν ὀρθοκραιράων, 
πίνοντες κρητῆρας ἐπιστεφέας οἴνοι, 
Τρώων ἅνθ’ ἐκατὸν τε ἑκατόν τε ἕκαστο 
στήσεσθ’ ἐν πολέμῳ νῦν δ’ οὐδ’ ἄξιοί εἰμεν

‘Extoros... (Il. 8. 229–334)

Where have those boasts of ours gone, when we said we were the bravest of men – those empty prattings you made in Lemnos, as you ate great quantities of meat from straight-horned cattle and drank whole bowls brim-full with wine, claiming that each one of you would take his stand in battle against a hundred of Trojans, or two hundred? And now all of us are not even a match for one of them – Hector, ...

Like Odysseus in Iliad 2, Agamemnon addresses the warriors and reminds them of something from the past. All of them, including Agamemnon himself, used to say that they were the bravest. Yet Agamemnon disassociates himself from the warriors when his
tone becomes accusative, and he uses ‘you’ to confront the warriors with their meaningless bragging.27

2.4. Appeals to the narrator’s eyewitness status

Narrators who are the protagonists of the events they recount are by their nature eyewitnesses. Sometimes such narrators explicitly refer to their eyewitness status and presence at the events they recount. Such explicit references to a narrator’s eyewitness status serve a special function. Thus ‘the beggar’ (Odysseus) tells Eumaeus in Od. 14.331 that the Thesprotian king had sworn in his presence (πρὸς ἔμ᾽ αὐτόν, 331) that his men and ships had been ready to bring Odysseus home. This is a ‘subtle move’, as Bowie calls it,28 since the ‘beggar’ had already unsuccessfully tried to persuade Eumaeus by using an oath (151–64) that Odysseus would soon come home. Now he lets the Thesprotian king swear this oath, in ‘the beggar’s’ own presence. Eumaeus is not persuaded by his story, either (see e.g. 361–5).29

In the Odyssey 19, too, ‘the beggar’ says that he has seen Odysseus: ἔνθ᾽ Ὀδυσῆα ἐγὼν ἰδόμην (19.185), he will describe him as his mind pictures him (ἐρέω ὥς μοι ἰνδάλλεται ἦτορ, 223), and he noted his tunic (τὸν δὲ χιτῶν᾽ ἐνόησα, 232). Significantly, ‘the beggar’ draws attention to his eyewitness status in particular when he tells of Odysseus, the most important element of his story. Arguably Odysseus, disguised as ‘the beggar’, feels the need to draw attention to ‘the beggar’s’ eyewitness status to gain credibility for this – largely false – story.

2.5. Restrictions of knowledge

As we have seen, internal narrators are by and large authoritative, since they know the events they narrate from first-hand experience or direct observation. However, their autopsy has drawbacks.30 There is a spatial limitation (they cannot recount what happened in places from which they were absent), they do not know the inner thoughts

---

29 This reference to autopsy is repeated verbatim in Od. 19.288, also used by ‘the beggar’ with regard to Odysseus.
30 For restrictions that come with autopsy, see e.g. Edmiston (1991: 1–14); de Jong (1991: 12–39).
of other characters, and they do not necessarily understand everything they see, especially when the gods are involved.

Previous scholarly work on the embedded narratives in Homer’s epics shows that internal secondary narrators often circumvent or simply break the restrictions in their knowledge (paralepsis).31 When they show restrictions, this has a special function. We may conceive of a scale to differentiate between the degrees of restriction, from the complete absence of restrictions to the rare ‘true’ restrictions, i.e. when narrators cannot give certain pieces of information. I will examine these degrees of restriction successively. Many of my examples come from Odysseus’ Apologue, which is a good hunting ground for various characteristics of internal narrators mainly because it is so long and embraces a large variety of topics.

At one end of the scale, no explanation is given when an internal narrator has apparently impossible knowledge; he simply breaks the restrictions that come with autopsy. Indeed, in many cases the primary narrator’s wish to expose something seems to overrule narrative logic. This is illustrated by Od. 10.31–45 and 12.339–51, where Odysseus recounts what his companions said while he was asleep, thereby showing their foolishness.32 Some are instances of transference, when the narratees know events the narrator cannot know and thus ‘transfer’ their knowledge to the narrator. For example, in Od. 10.432–4, it does not matter that Eurylochus’ knowledge of the companions’ metamorphosis into pigs is left unexplained because narratees already know of it. In other cases, the internal narrators might be acquainted with the events and people from stories. Thus when Odysseus tells about the people he met during his Apologue, he often gives more information than he could have obtained during his short stay.33

Closer to the centre of the scale are the cases in which the narrator circumvents restrictions. To begin with, narrators may use their ex eventu knowledge and narrate according to their narrating focalization (see Introduction p. 15), which allows them to bring forward and highlight certain events. For instance, Odysseus mentions early in his narrative the dangerous nature of the people he met upon arrival to win the sympathy of his narratees when he has to tell about the loss of his companions.34 Nestor in Iliad 11 makes use of his ex eventu knowledge, for example, when he moves to the side of his enemies and verbalizes their intentions:

(22) ἔστι δὲ τις Θρυόεσσα πόλις, αἰπεῖα κολώνη,

33 This is suggested by the present tense of the narratives, and by the occurrences of the word κλυτός (10.60, 87, 114), see de Jong (2001: 226).
34 Od. 9.84; 106–15; 187–92; 214–15; 10.1–13; 82–6; 135–9.
There is a steep hill-town called Thryoëssa, far away beside the Alpheus, at the edge of sandy Pylos; They (i.e. the Epeians) laid siege to this town, intent to on breaking it apart. But when they had overrun the whole plain, Athena came to us as a messenger, speeding down from Olympus by night, (with the news) that we must arm, and throughout Pylos she raised an army of men who were in no way reluctant, but full of eagerness for battle.

At the moment of experiencing the events, Nestor and the other Pylians did not yet know that the Eleians were nearby. It was probably not until Athena ‘as a messenger’ came that they learned this. In lines 711–4, then, Nestor uses his *ex eventu* knowledge to include the threatening proximity of the Eleians in his narrative, which underscores the imminent danger.

When internal narrators do not explain how they acquired information about the events they could not possibly have witnessed, it is often clear that they inferred it. For example, Nestor in *Il.* 11.605–803 relates the thoughts and emotions of other characters, such as Neleus, when he says in lines 683–4 that ‘Neleus was happy at heart that as a youngster going into battle I had met such success’ (γεγήθει δὲ φρένα Νηλεύς, οὕνεκά μοι τύχε πολλὰ νέῳ πόλεμον δὲ κιόντι). Neleus’ embedded focalization transpires from νέῳ in particular, referring to Nestor’s young age, which reflects Neleus’ anxieties as a father (cf. 719). In lines 703–4 Nestor recounts why Neleus was very angry (κεχολωμένος, 703) at the Eleians. Arguably Nestor has ‘read off’ Neleus’ mental state from his physical behaviour or facial expressions or inferred Neleus’ thoughts and emotions from either what Neleus said at that time or from what he later told Nestor (*ex eventu* knowledge).

The aforementioned passages are all instances of rather unrestricted ways of narrating. Now we reach the restricted ways of narrating. There are some instances in which the narrator makes clear that his information is based on mere inference. A particularly clear instance occurs in Odysseus’ *Apologue*, where the particle που in 9.419 shows that Odysseus is describing Polyphemus’ thoughts on the basis of inference rather than omniscience:35

---

35 The inference of Polyphemus’ thoughts here serves to show Odysseus’ cleverness; see e.g. de Jong (1992: 4) *ad* 9.419.
Similarly, when internal secondary narrators talk about the gods’ doings, they rely on mere inference. As Jörgensen pointed out, secondary narrators’ references to gods are predominantly non-specific. While the primary narrator knows the gods’ identities, the (ordinary) secondary narrators typically do not know which god is responsible for what. Except in special circumstances, e.g., in the case of personal protection gods, they refer to a vague θεός, θεοί, Ζεύς or δαίμων instead of Poseidon, Aphrodite, Athena, etc., which indicates inference. An example occurs in Od. 4.274–5, where Menelaus says that ‘a god’ must have urged Helen to come to the wooden horse and to call out the Greeks: κελευσέμεναι δὲ σ᾽ ἐμελλε | δαίμων, ὡς Τρώεσσιν ἔβοιλετο κύδος ἀρέξαι.

In addition, in some narratives the narrator tries to understand why a character did something and suggests a set of possibilities. In his narrative in Od. 7.241–97, which is addressed to Alcinous and Arete, Odysseus hesitates between two explanations as he tries to reconstruct Calypso’s thoughts: ‘Ζηνὸς ὑπ’ ἀγγελίης, ἢ καὶ νόος ἐτράπετ’ αὐτῆς’, ‘(she ordered me to go) either because of a message from Zeus or because her own mind was turned’ (263). Garvie notes that the audience would have known that the first alternative is correct (this would have become clear to them from e.g. Od. 5.150) although Calypso said to Odysseus that her mind was turned (5.190–1). The fact that Odysseus not only reports what Calypso said to him but also includes the ‘true’ reason is almost an instance of transference of the primary narratees’ knowledge to Odysseus. By giving this set of possibilities, Odysseus is characterized as clever because he does not simply believe what Calypso had told him.

Likewise, in Od. 9.337–9, Odysseus wonders why Polyphemus drove his ewes and his rams into his cave, ‘either from some foreboding or because a god so bade him’ (ἢ τι διέσκευσαν, ἢ καὶ θεός ὡς ἐκέλευσεν, 339). This piece of information is important, since the rams will help Odysseus escape. Such explicit inferences are not limited to internal narrators. Phoenix, too, wonders why Oeneus did not sacrifice to Artemis when he narrates the story of Meleager: λάθετ᾽ ἢ οὐκ ἐνόησεν (II. 9.537).

In each of these three passages the narrator wonders why a certain character acted as he did, but the narrator is unable to answer. Why do these narrators hesitate? In my view it is significant that a single, minor, sometimes even accidental event (Calypso’s decision to let Odysseus go, Polyphemus’ decision to drive all of his flock into his cave, and Oeneus’ unintentional snub) turns out to be of great importance for the main protagonist.

in the story. The three hesitations, therefore, may emphasize both the narrator’s surprise and the event’s importance. It is though the narrator wants to say ‘I almost cannot believe it, but it did occur and it had far-reaching consequences’.

A narrator may also narrate according to his experiencing focalization, i.e. with his restricted understanding of the events at the moment when they occurred. This is particularly engaging because it invites the narratees to experience the events with him. At this point on the scale, I include instances where it is, or will become, clear that narrators are withholding information that will become important later in their narrative. Representative examples occur in the *Apologue*, where Odysseus often hides the dangerous nature of the people on whose island they arrived (*Od.* 9.84, 106–15, 10.80–134).

An unambiguous instance of experiencing focalization is found in Eumaeus’ narrative about his youth (*Od.* 15.403–86). Addressed to ‘the beggar’ (Odysseus), it holds an exceptional place among the Homeric embedded narratives. Eumaeus first narrates how the Phoenician pirates hatched a plan to abduct him (403–58), from which he was absent. He narrates with an objective style and barely comes to the fore as a narrator (most notably in his reference to Laertes as πατρός ἐμοῖο, 417), which means that he is largely covert. In this part, Eumaeus is not bound by any restrictions when he relates the events, and, for example, quotes direct speech verbatim although he did not hear it (425–53). When the Phoenician pirates’ plan has been laid out, the narrative speed accelerates for three lines to summarize a full year’s events (455–8). There are significant differences between the first and second parts of the narrative after this summary (459–84), when Eumaeus goes on to narrate the execution of the plan. I have indicated the transition between the first and second part in the translation:

(24) οἱ δ’ ἐνιαυτὸν ἅπαντα παρ’ ἡμῖν αὖθι μένοντες ἐν νηῒ γλαφυρῇ βίοτον πολὺν ἐμπολόωντο.

And they (i.e. the Phoenicians) remained there in our land for a full year, and got

---


39 Previous research on this narrative has, among other issues, demonstrated the ‘exile from paradise’-, or ‘exile from home’-, theme, which Eumaeus’ narrative in many respects shares with the *Odyssey* (Olson 1995: 135–9), and the importance of Eumaeus’ narrative on the level of the primary narratees: the narrator springs a surprise on the primary narratees when they, after hearing this story, realise that their initial assessment of Eumaeus’ status as a humble employee on the estate was based on false premises since he is in fact the son a king (Minchin (1992: 259–66)).
by trade much property in their hollow ship. But when their hollow ship was laden
for their return, then they sent a messenger to bear tidings to the woman. || (459:)
There came a man, well informed, to my father’s house with a necklace of gold,
and with amber beads was it strung between.

One of the most significant differences between lines 403–58 and 459ff. is the way in
which Eumaeus refers to the messenger. First, the Phoenician pirates sent a ‘messenger’
(ἄγγελον, 458), who could be identified as part of the plan according to which a ‘message’
(ἄγγελίῃ, 447) would be brought into the palace. When he arrives, this event is perceived
by the young Eumaeus as ‘there came a man’ (ἦλυθ ἄνήρ, 459), and Eumaeus mentions
that he showed the women a necklace. In addition, Eumaeus perceives the man’s
message as a nod of the head towards the Phoenician nurse (κατένευσε σιωπῇ. | ἦ τοι ὁ
καννεύσας …, 464 –5). Taken together, the ‘man’ and the ‘nod’ (rather than ‘messenger’
and ‘message’) show a more restricted understanding of the events on the part of the
young Eumaeus, as if he were by a bystander unaware of their actual meaning. In this
way, the plan is narrated omnisciently, but the experiencing focalization takes over when
the narrator tells about its execution.

The non-restrictive and restrictive presentation of the events, respectively, means
that the first part (403–58) is told according to Eumaeus’ narrating focalization and the
second (459ff.) to his experiencing focalization. This is also evident from Eumaeus’
feelings at that time, which come to the fore in the second part, e.g.: ‘I was left, my heart
sore stricken’ (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ λιπόμην ἀκαχήμενος ἦτορ, 481). Nonetheless, in this second part,
Eumaeus’ ex eventu knowledge occasionally intrudes into his experiencing focalization,
e.g. when he says that the ‘man’ was ‘well informed’ (πολύϊδρις, 459) at the transition from
narrating focalization to experiencing focalization. In another example, Eumaeus’
followed the Phoenician nurse ‘in his folly’ (ἀεσιφροσύνῃσι, 470), which emphasizes his
youthful ignorance at the time.

The differences in the presentation of the story and in the narrator’s knowledge
between the two parts of Eumaeus’ narrative have noteworthy effects. By narrating partly
from an unrestricted point of view, both the secondary narratee (‘the beggar’ (Odysseus))
and the primary narratees receive enough information to understand the story and the
Phoenicians’ plan. The presentation of the story from an unrestricted point of view in the
first part of the narrative shows the Phoenician pirates’ depravity, since they ‘execute a
meticulously premeditated plan’.47 The experiencing focalization in the narrative’s
second half is especially poignant in that the narratees learn of that depravity by seeing
its result through the eyes of the young Eumaeus and hearing how he experienced his

47 As mentioned by de Jong (2001: 379) ad 15.403–484. Beck (2012: 40) argues that especially the Phoenician
nurse is depicted as responsible, since her speech, more than the Phoenicians’, is quoted directly.
er away from his beloved Syrie. By revealing the outcome of the plan and his eventual safe arrival in Attica only at the end of his narrative, Eumaeus engages his narratees in the story.

At the far end of the decreasing scale of knowledge are the true cases of restriction. Two narrators in particular express this lack of knowledge. First, in the introduction to his narrative on his nostos and that of the other Greek leaders, Nestor informs Telemachus about the fate of other Greek leaders and he confesses that he does not know the others’ fate because he has not seen them since he travelled to Pylos. Yet he will tell what he does know:

(25) τέτρατον ἥμαρ ἔην, ὃτ’ ἐν Ἀργείᾳ νήσας ἔίπασι
Τιθέμεν πάροι Διομήδεις ἱππόδαμοι
ἔστασαν: αὐτάρ ἐγὼ γε Πύλον ἔχον, οὐδὲ ποτ’ ἔσβη
οὕρος, ἐπεὶ δὴ πρώτα θεός προῆκεν ἀδύναι.
ὡς ἠλθον, φίλε τέκνον, ἀπευθὺς, οὐδὲ τὶ σῶδα
κεῖνων, οϊ’ ἐσάωθεν Ἀχαιῶν οϊ’ ἀπόλοντο.
ὅσσα δ’ένι μεγάρισι καθήμενος ἠμετέρουσι
πεύθομαι, ἦ θέμις ἐστι, βαθύταται, οὐδὲ σε κεύσω.
εὖ μὲν Μυρμιδόνας φάσ’ ἐλθέμεν... (Od. 3.180–8)

It was the fourth day, when in Argos the company of Diomedes, son of Tydeus, tamer of horses, stayed their well balanced ships; but I held on toward Pylos, and the wind was not once quenched from the time when the god first sent it forth to blow. Thus I came, dear child, without tidings, and I do not know anything of those others, who of the Achaeans were saved, and who were lost. But what tidings I have heard as I abide in our halls you shall hear, as is right, nor will I hide it from you. Safely they say that the Myrmidons came...

Nestor recounts how he came home, unlike those whose fate he does not know. The narrative on these nostoi is introduced with φάσ’ (188), which marks the change from autopsy to hearsay. This denial of (certain) knowledge is functional for the plot of the Odyssey, since it necessitates Telemachus to visit Menelaus.

In Od. 19.221–3, ‘the beggar’ (Odysseus), too, says that he lacks knowledge. When Penelope asks him what clothes Odysseus was wearing when they met, he says that he cannot remember Odysseus very well because such a long time has passed:

(26) ὃ γύναι, ἀργαλέον τόσσου χρόνον ἀμφις ἔόντα

---

* Cf. Telemachus’ question as to whether Nestor has seen or heard anything of Odysseus: ε’ ποι ὅπως | ἄφθασυ τεσσαράκοντ’ ἡ Ἐξικαίδευς (Od. 3.93–4).
Lady, hard is it for one that has been so long abroad to tell you this, since it is now the twentieth year since he went from there and departed from my country; ...

In all other preambles in the Odyssey, the narrator indicates that there is too much to say or that telling the story would be too emotional.⁴² Here, however, 'the beggar' says that it is hard for him to talk about Odysseus because he cannot remember their meeting clearly. Of course, Penelope's question is easy for Odysseus: he knows better than anyone else what he wore. Yet he is clever (cf. δόλῳ (212) and πολύμητις (220)) and plays the role of a Cretan with restricted knowledge about Odysseus. In this way, he makes his knowledge seem realistic.⁴³ Similar feigned ignorance is found later in this narrative when 'the beggar' recounts his meeting with Odysseus, but he tells Penelope that he does not know how Odysseus obtained his clothes:

(27) οὐκ οἶδ᾽ ἢ τάδε ἐστο περὶ χροὶ οἶκοθ᾽ Ὀδυσσεύς,
ἤ τες ἔταιροι δώκε θοῆς ἐπὶ νηὸς ἰόντι,
ἤ τις ποι ἐπεὶ πολλοῖσιν Ὀδυσσεύς
ἐσκε φίλος· ἤτακεν λόγον ἀνθρώπων ἦσαν ὁμοίοι.

I do not know whether Odysseus was so clothed at home, or whether one of his comrades gave him the tunic when he went on board the swift ship, or perhaps even some stranger, since to many men was Odysseus a friend, for few of the Achaeans were his peers.

The beggar employs the opportunity to extol Odysseus/himself while paying Penelope a compliment – she provided Odysseus with the clothes and brooch (227) – which she accepts in lines 253–60.⁴⁴

---


⁴³ Similar are the παρϱ-utterances that Athena effectively uses in Od. 11.87 and 13.249 'to mask her own omniscience as a god and strengthen the credibility of her human disguise': de Jong (2014 [1987]: 238).

⁴⁴ Cf. Od. 15.381–8 with de Jong (2001: 377) ad Od. 15.346–484: 'Odysseus affects ignorance in Od. 15.381–88 as well, asking Eumaeus whether his city was sacked or whether he was captured in a cattle raid. In this way Odysseus enables to express sympathy after Eumaeus has told his story.'
3. EXTERNAL NARRATORS APPEALING TO OTHER NARRATORS

When secondary narrators have not witnessed events, they often rely on other narrators’ information. We have just seen one example in Nestor’s narrative in Od. 3.180–8 (p. 48), when he says that his account of the fate of the Greek leaders is based on the words of others. The primary narrator, too, occasionally refers to other speakers for particular pieces of information.

Homeric narrators may introduce their story, or certain details of a story, by φασί (‘they say that...’)1 or by other verba dicendi.2 I call the people on whose words the narrator relies ‘reported narrators’, following de Jong in her study of Herodotus (2004c). In this section I also include narratives introduced by verbs of learning and hearing, such as πεύθομαι and ἄκουω,3 which often signal an anonymous source. Sometimes a narrator appeals to the words of a specific person, whose words may be quoted in direct or indirect speech.

Since narrators typically provide other people’s stories (or details of those stories) in a clause that depends on a verb of saying or hearing, the information is neither presented as an independent fact nor spoken on the narrator’s own account. It is ‘simply’ reported. This form may beg an evaluation, confirmation, or an expression of (dis)belief from the narrator: does he believe and accept his informant’s information or not? From antiquity to the present, scholars have found elements of doubt and disbelief in φασί-utterances. Thus O’Maley argues in a recent article that φασί often ‘serves to de-authorise their (i.e. narrators’) narrative’ and create distance.4

---

1 According to grammars, ‘people’ is to be understood as the subject: Kühner-Gerth (1963(1): 33) ad 352.c: ‘[a]ls Subject schwebt dem Redenden ein allgemeiner persönlicher oder sächlicher Begriff vor, wie α) οί ἄνθρωποι (man) oft in den Ausdrücken des Sagens (φασί, λέγουσιν, u.e.g. wie lat. aiunt, dicunt), seltener bei anderen Verben’. Schwyzer (1939(2): 245) δ: Der Gebrauch der 3. Per. Plur. in allgemeiner Bedeutung is bes.häufig bei phasi legousi = lat. aiunt, dicunt ‘man sagt’ u.e., von andern Verben (und ausser dem Präsens auch hier) vereinzelt.

2 In Hesiod’s Theogony, too, an example of unattributed φασὶ occurs (326). Here the primary narrator relies on hearsay for the story of Typhoeus and Echidna. For this passage see Clay (1993: 110, n. 24): ‘φασὶ may indicate that the monstrous cannot even be vouched for by the Muses’, and Stoddard (2004: 49–54), who argues that it highlights the Hesiodic narrator’s human ignorance.

3 I leave καλέουσι, which occurs eight times in Homer, out of consideration, since the word is not used to explain a narrator’s knowledge. Yet it is worth noting that, as Stoddard (2004: 52) argues, ‘Homer uses unattributed καλέουσι to show that he has more specific knowledge than perhaps the average member of his audience may be expected to possess’. This shows similarities with what we have seen in sub-chapter 1, on the Muses.

4 O’Maley (2011: 9).
The idea that φασί de-authorizes narratives is premised on the assumption that ‘distance’ between a narrator and the events he tells, which is expressed by φασί, implies ‘disbelief’, and it is based on utterances made by characters (outside embedded narratives) who rhetorically challenge a statement. Yet these are emphatically rhetorical utterances: Menelaus in Il. 13.631–5 does not really question whether Zeus is the wisest of all as ‘they say’, and he does not voice his disbelief and doubt with φασί but with other words.

The following section, like the parallel sections on lyric and tragedy, examines whether narrators believe other narrators’ stories and their motivations for including them. I start, in section 3.1, with the primary narrator’s references to other narrators for information, and in 3.2 I turn to the secondary narrators. In 3.3 I conclude by asking whether narrators tend to introduce other speakers to create authority or express doubt.

3.1. Primary narrator

I mentioned in section 1.1 that the primary narrator, like the professional singers Demodocus and Phemius, can be distinguished from ordinary (secondary) narrators by means of his knowledge. His human knowledge (hearsay), which he shares with ordinary narrators (cf. ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἶον ἀκούομεν οὐδὲ τι ἴδμεν, Il. 2.486), is authenticated by the Muse’s eyewitness knowledge. By claiming that his narrative derives from the Muse, he establishes narrative authority, since the Muse elevates his narrative above mere hearsay on which mortal narrators generally have to rely. I have also mentioned that narratological studies have shown that, in practice, the primary narrator narrates from a human perspective. This human perspective may come to the fore when he states that he relies on other speakers’ knowledge. This occurs in three passages, and is indicated by φασί:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage, narrator: information provided by others</th>
<th>Words used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Il. 2.783, primary narrator: Typhoeus’ lair in Arima</td>
<td>φασί + A.c.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Il. 17.674, primary narrator: the sharp sight of the eagle</td>
<td>φασίν + A.c.I.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Od. 6.42, primary narrator: weather conditions on the Olympus</td>
<td>φασί + A.c.I.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Primary narrator appealing to other narrators

---


6 For an overview of all φασι-utterances in the Iliad and Odyssey, see de Jong (2014a [1987]: 237–8).
To understand why he makes this explicitly clear here, let us consider these passages in more detail. I begin with the φασί-utterance in *Od.* 6.42:

(28) ἡ μὲν ἄρ᾿ ὡς εἰποῦσ᾿ ἀπέβη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη

Οὐλυμπόνδ᾿, ἕθι φασὶ θεῶν ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ

ἐξεμεναί οὔτʾ ἀνέμοισί τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ᾿ ὃμβρῳ

δεύτει οὔτε χιών ἐπιπύλναται, ἀλλὰ μάλʾ ἀἰθρῆ

πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ᾿ ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη·

tώ ἐν τερπονται μάκαρες θεοὶ ἕμμεναι· (Od. 6.41–6)

So saying, the goddess, flashing-eyed Athena, departed to Olympus, where, they say, is the abode of the gods that stands fast forever. Neither is it shaken by winds nor ever wet with rain, nor does snow fall upon it, but the air is outspread clear and cloudless, and over it hovers a radiant whiteness; here the blessed gods are happy all their days.

The primary narrator relies on reported narrators for information about the Olympus, which ‘they say’ is the abode of the gods and a place not plagued by unpleasant weather conditions such as rain, snow, etc. Together with φασί, the negated form in which the weather conditions are presented reveals the narrator’s human focalization, since he sets up the weather conditions on the Olympus against those typical of the human world. The narrator’s foregrounded human perspective here arguably serves to emphasize the differences between the pleasantness of the Olympus and the harshness of the human world, particularly those aspects which Odysseus will have to face in the next few days and which he has already struggled with.

I turn to the two *Iliadic* instances of φασί:

(29) γαῖα δ᾿ ὑπεστενάχιζε Διὶ ὡς τερπικεραύνῳ

χωμονή, ὁτε τ᾿ ἀμφὶ Ἰυπροὶ ἱμάσσῃ ἐν Ἀρίμοις,

ὅτι φασὶ Τυφωέος εὐνάς· (Il. 2.781–3)

The earth groaned under them, as it does under the anger of Zeus who delights in thunder, when he lashes the ground over Typhoeus, in Arima, which they say is the place where Typhoeus lies.

(30) ὡς ἄρα φωνήσας ἀπέβη ξανθὸς Μενέλαος,

πάντοσε παπταίνων ὡς τ᾿ ἀιετός, ὁμιλητής

ὁξύτατον ἐλέπνησεν ὑπουράνιων πεπεθυνόντων,

ὅτι τε καὶ ὑψόθ᾿ ἐόντα πόδας ταχὺς οὐκ ἔλαβε πτώξ

7 Cf. de Jong (2001: 154) ad *Od.* 6.41–7 for this effect of the negated form.
External narrators appealing to other narrators

θάμνῳ ὑπ᾿ ἀμφικόμῳ κατακείμενος, ἀλλὰ τ᾽ ἐπ᾽ αὐτῷ ἔσσυτο, καὶ τὲ μὲν ὡκα λαβὼν ἔξειλε τυμῶν. (Il. 17.673–8)

So speaking fair-haired Menelaus left them, looking all around him like an eagle, which they say has the sharpest sight of all flying things under the heavens, and, though he is high above, the quick-running hare does not escape his eye where it crouches cowering under a leafy bush, but the eagle swoops on it, quickly seizes it, and takes the life from it.

Why does the primary narrator in the Iliad refer to reported narrators only in these passages? It is noteworthy that these instances of φασί occur within similes. Since only two of the 303 similes in the primary narrator’s text contain the verb φασί, it is impossible to make any structural remarks on the narrator’s knowledge of the events he narrates within similes. Yet, in my view, it is significant that similes are instances of shared knowledge: in similes, the primary narrator relies on the primary narratees’ general knowledge, so they have a function in helping them to visualize the events of the main storyline. Therefore, it is unsurprising that the narrator’s human perspective, which he shares with his primary narratees, comes to the fore within similes. Because he, like his narratees, would not have personally seen Typhoeus lying in the country of the Arimi, he relies on hearsay in Il. 2.783. In Il. 17.674, φασί confirms a superlative statement, viz. the fact that the eagle has the sharpest sight of all birds.

These passages show that the citation of reported narrators does not automatically imply scepticism or disbelief, nor does the narrator always voice doubts. Rather, as Il. 17.674 makes particularly clear, the narrator introduces reported narrators to create authority, in this case for the eagle’s sharp sight: many people say so, hence it is true. It is noteworthy that the primary narrator appeals to reported narrators only for specific pieces of information, not for whole episodes.

3.2. Secondary narrators

Turning to the secondary narrators, there are eleven appeals to other narrators in the secondary narrators’ text:

---

9 Cf. e.g. Fontenrose (1966: 67) states that the poet means that he has not been there to see for himself and accepts other men’s report. Differently Stoddard (2004: 50): ‘Homer is pointing to his human failing to know all things, despite his privileged relationship with the Muses’. The question arises, then, of why Homer would do so in these three passages in particular.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage, narrator: subject</th>
<th>Words used and other remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 1.396–406, Achilles: Thetis and Zeus</td>
<td>ἔφησα (subject Thetis) + A.c.I. (397); part of Achilles’ narrative (365–412)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 4.370–400, Agamemnon: Tydeus</td>
<td>ὡς φάσις (O) μὴ ἐδοκεῖ θεὸν πονεύμενον (374) and ἔφησα + A.c.I. (375)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 19.95–133, Agamemnon: Zeus and Ate</td>
<td>φασί + A.c.I. (limited to 95–6, referring to Zeus’ superlative reputation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 24.615–6, Achilles: Niobe</td>
<td>ἔφησα + compl. (615); part of Achilles’ narrative (602–17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 3.187–98; 247–52; 276–302 + 311–2, Nestor: nostoi of the other Greek leaders</td>
<td>πεῦθομαι + compl. (187); φάσι + A.c.I. (188)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 4.512–37, Menelaus: nostos of Agamemnon</td>
<td>Proteus, quoted in direct speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 11.405–504, Odysseus: nostos of Agamemnon</td>
<td>Agamemnon, quoted in direct speech</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 12.372–90, Odysseus: Zeus en Helios</td>
<td>Calypso and Hermes: ταύτα δ’ ἐγὼν ἠκούσα</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 19.270–87, Odysseus’ lying tale</td>
<td>ὡς μοι Θεσπρωτῶν βασιλεύς μυθήσατο Φείδων (287)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 3.2 Secondary narrators appealing to other narrators*

### 3.2.1. Specific persons

The table shows that secondary narrators sometimes refer to specific persons from whom they have received information (*Il.* 1.396–406; *Od.* 4.512–37; *Od.* 11.405–504; *Od.* 12.372–90; *Od.* 14.321–30; *Od.* 19.270–87). Because these specific narrators are often eyewitnesses, protagonists in the stories they tell, or omniscient, they give the narrative authority. Thus Menelaus’ narrative on Agamemnon’s nostos (*Od.* 4.512–37) is authoritative, since it comes directly from the all-knowing Proteus (cf. θεοὶ δὲ τὲ πάντα ἴσασιν, 468). Odysseus’ narrative in *Od.* 11.405–504 is authoritative as well, since he lets Agamemnon tell about his own death.

A particularly clear example of this authoritative function is found in Achilles’ narrative (*Il.* 1.396–406), part of Achilles’ longer speech to Thetis (365–412). Achilles
narrates how Thetis once rescued Zeus, and he refers to her own frequent speeches in the past on this subject:

(I. 1.396–406)  
I often heard you in my father's house telling with pride how you alone among the immortals averted a shaming plight from the son of Cronus, lord of the dark clouds, when other Olympian gods sought to bind him fast – Hera and Poseidon and Pallas Athena. But you came and released him from his bonds, goddess, quickly calling up to wide Olympus the hundred-handler, called Briareus by the gods, but Aegaeon by all humans. He is yet stronger than his father, and he took his seat beside the son of Cronus glorying in his splendour. The blessed gods shrank in fear from him, and there was no more binding. Remind him of this now, and sit beside him...

Achilles repeats Thetis' words to Peleus in his narrative in indirect speech (A.c.I. construction), introduced by ἔφησθα (397). Thetis, so Achilles narrates, often boasted that she saved Zeus from destruction when the other gods wanted to bind him. In line 401, where Achilles narrates how Thetis saved Zeus by calling the hecatoncheir Briareus for help, he abandons the A.c.I construction and starts addressing Thetis directly (ἀλλὰ σὺ). Homer regularly abandons indirect construction, but, in this case, changing to the

---

See e.g. BK (2000: 139) ad 42 and K-G 2.556F. Cf. e.g. the 'you' narrative in II. 15.18–21, where Zeus reminds Hera of her punishment once (ἦ οὐ μέμνῃ ἥτη) while he, in line 20, abandons the syntactic construction that follows upon the verb of remembering.
'you' form arguably emphasizes Thetis’ role and involves her more directly in the narrative.\textsuperscript{11}

Achilles underlines that what he says is based on what he has heard Thetis boasting, σεο … ἄκουσα | εὐχομένης (396–7), to remind her that she herself often tells this story. This means that Thetis is not only Achilles’ narratee, but also the protagonist and his narrative ‘source’. This has an authoritative function, since Thetis can confirm the truth of this – indeed her own – story better than anyone else.\textsuperscript{12}

Other examples in which narrators draw on the authority of other speakers occur in Odysseus’ lying tales. In e.g. Od. 14.321–33, the Thesprotian king had told (ἔφασκε, 322) ‘the beggar’ (Odysseus) that Odysseus was in Dodona to consult the oracle about his return to Ithaca. Comparable is Od. 19.270–90, where ‘the beggar’ recounts Odysseus’ Thesprotian adventures. He introduces the story as ‘I have heard of Odysseus’ nostos’ (Οδυσῆος ἐγὼ περὶ νόστου ἄκουσα, 270), while at the end he mentions that Pheidon, the king of the Thesprotians, was his informant, ‘as Pheidon, king of the Thesprotians, has told me’ (ὥς μοι Θεσπρωτῶν βασιλεύς μυθήσατο Φείδων, 287). ‘The beggar’ bolsters his authority by citing no less than the Thesprotian king.

In Od. 12.372–90, which is part of Odysseus’ Apologue, Odysseus recounts a dialogue between Zeus and Helios that took place on Mount Olympus. Helios asks Zeus to punish Odysseus for slaughtering his cattle, and Zeus agrees. Odysseus probably wanted to pass this information on to his narratees to explain that the ensuing storm is actually a divine punishment sent by Zeus.\textsuperscript{13} Odysseus explains his authority for reporting a dialogue that took place in the world of the gods by providing the provenance of the information:

(32) ταύτα δ᾽ ἐγὼν ἄκουσα Καλυψοῦς ἠὐκόμοι·

ἡ δ᾽ ἔφη Ἐρμείαο διακτόρου αὐτὴ ἄκοισαι. (Od. 12.389–90)

This I heard from lovely-haired Calypso, and she said that she herself had heard it from the messenger Hermes.\textsuperscript{14}

\textsuperscript{11} Cf. Hebel (1970: 16–7): ‘(Achilles) erinnert so (i.e. by using ‘you’ in lines 397 and 401) an die Erzählssituation, so daß die Illusion der erzählten Gegenwart immer wieder durchbrochen oder überhaupt am Aufkommen gehindert wird’.

\textsuperscript{12} Achilles’ strategy may be compared to e.g. Apollo’s in Il. 3.83–5, who reminds Aeneas of words spoken by himself in the past (for this passage see de Jong (2014 [1987]: 175)). It is noteworthy that Zenodotus attested lines 396–406, probably precisely because it he found it superfluous that Achilles told his mother what she herself had done in the past; see e.g. Moran (1975: 205).

\textsuperscript{13} De Jong (2001: 31) ad Od. 12.374–93.

\textsuperscript{14} For the passage, see Suerbaum (1968: 157–61). The lines have been considered spurious, but are defended by e.g. Erbse (1972: 12–5).
The reason why Odysseus need to explain this knowledge is clear: as Heubeck and Hoekstra write, ‘the narrator must justify his account of events which clearly lie outside his province’.\(^{15}\)

In all these examples, he names other (specific) narrators to assume the unassailable authority of their account of the events.

### 3.2.2. Unsourced persons

In other instances, narrators refer to unspecified informants, often reported narrators (type ‘they say’ or ‘I/we have heard’). Can they also serve to create authority? I begin with \( \text{II. 4.370–400} \), where Agamemnon tells about the courage of Tydeus, one of the Seven against Thebes. Tydeus serves as an example for his son Diomedes, and the story is meant to spur Diomedes into fighting. Before he begins his narrative of Tydeus' feats of arms during his Theban expedition, Agamemnon introduces this narrative as follows:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{(33) } & \text{oú mév Túdēi } \gamma \text{ oúde phílon πτωσκαζέμεν ἤεν,} \\
& \text{ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρὸ φίλων ἑτάρων δηΐοισι μάχεσθαι,} \\
& \text{ὡς φάσαν ὦ μν ἰδοντο πονεύμενον οὐ γὰρ ἐγωγε} \\
& \text{ἡνησ' ὦδε ἰδον περὶ δ’ ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι. (II 4.372–5).}
\end{align*}
\]

*It was not Tydeus' way to skulk like this, but rather to engage the enemy far ahead of his own company – so said those who had seen him toiling in fight: I myself never met him or saw him, but they say he was the best of them all.*

Agamemnon indicates that he has never met Tydeus and tries to compensate by referring to the words of other people (ὡς φάσαν, 374, and φασὶ + inf., 375).\(^{16}\) These people are primarily mentioned to confirm Tydeus’ pre-eminence and courageous reputation: the people who are the subject of φάσαν in line 374 support the claim that Tydeus fought against enemies before his comrades did, and φασὶ in line 375 refers to the claim that Tydeus was superior to all others. The fact that the people who are the subject of φάσαν have seen Tydeus themselves increases their reliability. In line 375 Agamemnon uses φασὶ, which, contrary to φάσαν (374), does not imply moments of locution in the past and

---

\(^{15}\) Heubeck-Hoekstra (1989: 143) ad 389–90.

\(^{16}\) Cf. e.g. de Jong (2014a [1987]: 278, n. 29): ‘I submit that 374–5 is inserted by Agamemnon to compensate for the fact that he has not himself witnessed what he is going to narrate’. Hebel (1970: 81–2) stresses the objectivity of these eyewitnesses as against a narrator’s own subjective presentation of the events if he would relate them on his own account: ‘Der Sprecher ist in der Situation zu sehr mit seinem Gefühl beteiligt. Sein Zeugnis allein wäre nicht objektiv genug, um wirklich zu wirken. Die Augenzeugen aber, die er (i.e. Agamemnon) erwähnt, sind unbeteiligte objective Autorität. Agamemnon erhöht somit den Wahrheitsgehalt er Erzählung’. 
has no expressed subject. The occurrence of these words in successive lines suggests that eyewitnesses are also the subject of ἡμιθέω (375). However, apart from two instances in the Odyssey (Od. 7.322 and 19.383 (not in embedded narratives)) where the people who are the subject of ἡμιθέω are identified as eyewitnesses, it is deducible that ἡμιθέω introduces traditional stories (e.g. in Il. 24.615, where the possibility of eyewitnesses is clearly excluded (see pp. 62)). Therefore, it is not inconceivable that ἡμιθέω (375) might intimate that Tydeus’ reputation and heroic feats of arms have become, at the moment of utterance, the subject of widely circulating stories and even common knowledge. While ἡμιθέω shows that stories about him emerged from eyewitnesses, this story is already a ‘step further’ and is widespread and well known.

The narrative itself also hints at Agamemnon’s narrative ‘sources’. It tells how Tydeus came to Mycenae as a messenger of the Seven and killed fifty Theban men, who had ambushed him. Firstly, the Theban Maeon (394), the only survivor, who was spared and therefore could have spread the story. This is an example of the ‘sole survivor motive’.

The fact that Maeon was an inhabitant of Thebes explains why Agamemnon is able to relate the events that took place within the city of Thebes although Tydeus was amid the Thebans ‘all alone’ (μοῦνος ἐών, 388). Agamemnon may not have needed to justify his knowledge of events in Mycenae, since he was Mycenaean and this information was part of Mycenaeans’ common knowledge.

We may conclude that in Agamemnon’s narrative, the reported narrators may well be seen as an authoritative device, viz. as a way to back up Tydeus’ reputation because claims that someone is best could be challenged. Agamemnon never met Tydeus, but he can draw upon Tydeus’ widespread reputation. This will turn out not to be redundant, since Sthenelus will later (4.404-10) object to Tydeus’ pre-eminence. Despite Sthenelus’ response, Agamemnon’s narrative will indeed have its desired effect to spur on Diomedes, since Diomedes will fight heroically in the ensuing battle, as we read in Iliad 5.

If we now turn to the level of primary narrator and narratees, I suggest that the traditional status of Tydeus’ heroic achievements is also relevant. The primary narratees may have known of him from stories, namely from the epic cycle and songs of

---

17 For this concept, see de Jong (2001: 223).
18 For parallels of this phrase see e.g. Barker-Christensen (2006: 25, n. 1).
19 This point is taken another step further by Barker-Christensen (2011: 22–3), who argue that, while Diomedes does indeed perform extraordinary deeds in the next book, he does so as part of the (collective) Achaean army, as against Agamemnon who emphasized ‘the exceptionality of an individual warrior’ (p. 23, emphasis added) and tried to replace Achilles with Diomedes. As such, not only Sthenelus, but also Diomedes himself counters the lesson of Agamemnon’s narrative.
professional singers. So Agamemnon's reference to the widespread reputation of Tydeus may signal an allusion to pre-existing stories, specifically the Theban legends. Although this lies outside my subject, strictly speaking, I mention this signalling of allusions here because similarly interesting cases are discussed in Chapter 2 on lyric.

In this regard it is also worth considering Phoenix' narrative on Meleager, since similar issues can be found there. Phoenix, too, is an external secondary narrator, and he tells Meleager's story as an exhortation to Achilles in Iliad 9. He recounts the hunt on the Calydonian boar, the resulting fight, and the attempts to urge Meleager to rejoin the fight after having withdrawn. In his introduction to the narrative, Phoenix presents the story as one of the old and well known tales:

(34) οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνθρών ἥρωων, ὅτε κέν τιν᾽ ἐπιζάφελος χόλος ἴκοι· δωρητοὶ τε πέλοντο παράρρητοί τ᾽ ἐπέεσσι. μέμνημαι τόδε ἔργον ἑώς ἰν τότε νέον γε ὡς Ἰ. (I. 9.524–8).

This is what we have heard in tales of the fame of the past heroes too, when furious anger came on one of them – they could be won by gifts and words' persuasion. I myself remember this story from long ago, no recent thing.

The first-person plural of ἐπευθόμεθα (524), 'we have heard', suggests that such stories have been transmitted to at least several people. Since Phoenix intends to persuade Achilles to do something, ἐπευθόμεθα may well be taken as an inclusive first-person plural,
i.e., including Achilles: Achilles himself could confirm the existence of such stories about famous warriors who were moved by words and gifts. Thus it is another example in which a narrator emphasizes the wide distribution of stories to enhance their authority.

In line 527 Phoenix turns to the story that he is going to relate, and the line suggests that it is already a widespread tale. Although the story of Meleager took place in the previous generation, strictly speaking, Phoenix ascribes it to the realm of the distant past by emphasizing that it occurred a long time previously (πάλαι οὔ τι νέον γε, 527). Some scholars, however, state that his use of the verb μέμνημαι (‘I remember’) (527) emphasizes that Phoenix remembers the events he is going to narrate, I believe that Phoenix remembers the story because he has heard it being told. He does not claim that he has experienced or witnessed these events, but he seems to remember them from the large collection of ancient stories, whose antiquity and wide distribution give it authority.

Does the introduction to Phoenix’ narrative, like Agamemnon’s, also operate on the level of the primary narrator? Κλέα (524) often implies that a story exists in poetic form, and Moran argues that μιμνήσκομαι is a conventional term associated with traditional stories and often used in references to epic tales. Μιμνήσκομαι is often combined with kleos. Thus, for instance in Il. 19.63–4 Achilles tells Agamemnon that the Greeks will recall their strife in the future:

(35) Ἐκτορὶ μὲν καὶ Τρωσὶ τὸ κέρδιον αὐτὰρ Ἀχαίοις δήρων ἐμῆς καὶ σῆς ἔριδος μνήσεται ὀϊὼ. (Il. 19.63–4)

22 A clearer example of such an inclusive ‘we’ for perceived information occurs in e.g. Il. 2.190, where Odysseus says: ἐν βουλῇ δ᾽ οὐ πάντες ἀκούσαμεν οἷον ἔειπε (‘did we not all hear what he (i.e. Agamemnon) said in the council?’).

23 So Scodel (2002: 71) states that the words mean: ‘His knowledge depends not on poetry but on personal memory’. West (2010: 3) leaves the possibility open that Phoenix may have participated in the hunt: ‘there is an artful ambiguity on the point’ in that the words do not exclude that Phoenix indeed did witness the events. In addition, discussions exist on τόδε ἔργον (527), whether this refers to this story itself (as in the translation above), to Meleager’s actions that inspired the story (which are literally ‘remembered’), or that it is ambiguous on purpose: see O’Maley (2011: 4), who suggests that the ambiguity that Phoenix creates by using τόδε ἔργον is more important than the correct referent. In the versions of Hyginus (Fabulae, 173) and Ovid (Metamorphoses, 8.307), Phoenix did indeed participate in the hunt.

24 See for remembering events heard of in stories e.g. Od. 9.646–7.
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For Hector and the Trojans this has been their gain: but I think the Achaeans will long remember the quarrel between us.

Although some of the Achaeans will indeed know of the strife between Achilles and Agamemnon because they have witnessed it, Achilles arguably refers to a far larger audience in the future, i.e. when Achaeans will know of it from now-traditional tales and songs. Moran even suggests that μνήσεσθαι here would have a remarkable self-reference, the ἔρις that the Iliad is all about. As such, this could be a meta-narrative (or metaleptive) remark by the primary narrator, who announces his own poem. In the same vein, in Phoenix’ narrative the words ἐπευθόμεθα, κλέα and μέμνημαι indicate that Meleager’s anger is also known from stories and songs and may meta-narratively flag the existence of an earlier epic text, a Meleagris. If Phoenix’ narrative really has its origins in a Meleagris, the introductory sentence would be significant: with a seemingly general appeal to tradition Homer would, through Phoenix, refer to a specific, existing, pre-Homeric work.

The narrator seems to refer to such a work, but his account differs from all known versions of the story. The story may well have been modified by the primary narrator to fit this context. Phoenix’ introduction, then, allows the primary narrator to embed this modified story within a collection of established legends to present his new version as traditional. This exploits the authoritative function of reported narrators particularly well.

If reported narrators signal allusions to pre-existing stories, can they also embed newly invented stories in this tradition? Or is this contradictory? Even when they refer to material from pre-existing stories (indeed to identifiable and specific poems), Willcock has shown that the narrator could modify and adapt the story to fit the context in which it occurs. Therefore, there is not necessarily any tension in signalling allusions.

---

27 Kakridis (1949: 11–42). Contra Willcock (1964: 149). Welcker (1865), see Kullmann (1986: 118–9)) has even gone so far as to suggest that the Iliad as a whole is based on this Meleagris. For discussions, see Bremmer (1988: 38–9), and Alden (2000: 236–41); the latter also refers to much secondary literature.

28 Cf. Willcock (1964: 151): ‘it is immediately obvious that Homer’s version is eccentric’. In the two existing stories Meleager is killed by Apollo (epic version, in the Eoeae (pseudo-Hesiod) and the Minyas) or by his mother with a brand, Meleager’s life-token (folk-tale version, Apollodorus (Bibl. 1.8.1–3)). For this, see Swain (1988: 271–6) and Alden (2000: 236–41), also for further literature. See Kakridis (1949: 11–42) for the story of the brand as a folk-tale motif, and see Willcock (1964: 151–2), who argues that the story of the brand was the oldest version of Meleager’s death, and the story that Meleager was killed by Apollo is an ‘epic rationalization’ of this version.

29 Willcock (1964:).
to pre-existing stories while embedding new details of stories in that older tradition. I will come back to these functions in Chapter 2 (on lyric).

Reported narrators are not only found at the start of narratives, but also within them. The question arises why they are mentioned for a particular piece of information but not for the rest of the story. In *Il. 24.602–17*, Achilles tries to comfort Priam after Hector’s death and wishes to share a meal with him. To add force to his argument, he provides a hortatory story from the distant past: Niobe lost not only one, but twelve children, and even she then did not refuse to eat (602). In the first half of the narrative Achilles does not explain his knowledge about the story of Niobe: he recounts, for example, Apollo’s and Artemis’ anger (χωόμενος (i.e. Apollo) Νιόβῃ, 606) and the exact time (ἐννῆμαρ, 611), and he is not bound by any restrictions. By contrast, Achilles adduces hearsay as the basis of his knowledge when he turns to Mount Sipylus:30

(36) νῦν δὲ που ἐν πέτρῃσιν ἐν οὐρέσιν οἰοπόλοισιν ἐν Σιπύλῳ, δὴ φασὶ θεάων ἔμμεναι εὐνάς νυμφάων, αἱ τ’ ἀμφ’ Ἀχελώϊον ἐρρώσαντο, ἐνθα λίθος περ ἐοῦσα θεών ἐκ κήδεα πέσσει. (*Il. 24.614–7*)

Now she is somewhere among the rocks, in the lonely mountains, in Sipylus, where they say the goddesses sleep, the nymphs that dance by the stream of Achelous: there, though she is stone, she still digests the pain the gods gave her.

The narrator Achilles has access to Niobe’s thoughts when he tells how she ‘broods on the pain’ (κήδεα πέσσει, 617). Yet Achilles does not know her exact location (που, 614). Why, then, does he express uncertainty with regard to Niobe’s location, and why does he introduce the dancing Nymphs on the Sipylus by φασί?

The explanation probably lies in the geographical distance between Achilles and Mount Sipylus. Parallels exist in Homer for φασί-utterances denoting events far away. Thus, in *Il. 2.783*, as discussed above (pp. 52–3), the primary narrator says of the country of the Arimi: ‘where they say is the place where Typhoeus lies’ (ὅθι φασὶ Τυφωέος ἔμμεναι εὐνάς). Similar words occur in *Od. 13.248–9* about Troy. Here, Athena, disguised as a young shepherd, speaks to Odysseus: ‘the name ‘Ithaca’ has reached even to the land of Troy which, they say, is far from this land of Achaea’ (Ἰθάκης γε καὶ ἐς Τροίην ὄνομα τίκει, | 30 Lines 614–7 were athetized by Aristophanes and Aristarchus. See e.g. Richardson (2000 [1993]: 341–2) ad 614–7 for their reasons and objections.
3.3. Drawing up the balance: authority or scepticism?

I return to the question of why narrators in epic tend to introduce other narrators for (details of) stories. In some narratives, they appeal to others to compensate for their limited personal knowledge of the events and to explain how they know what they tell. Good examples are Nestor telling about the nostoi of the other Greek leaders in Odyssey 3 and Odysseus explaining how he knew that the storm he encountered was sent by Zeus.

In other narratives, narrators attempt to create more authority for the information by appealing to reported narrators. Good examples are Agamemnon’s narrative about Tydeus in Il. 4.370–400 and Phoenix’ narrative about Meleager in Iliad 9; both are intended to persuade someone to fight. Here the reported narrators indicate that something is generally accepted belief and so increase its authority. In Iliad 4, the reported narrators whom Agamemnon appeals to also bolster Tydeus’ superlative reputation. They are often used to reinforce others’ superlative reputations, like the primary narrator does in Il. 17.674 or Agamemnon in Il. 19.95–6. Indeed, a reason why scholars so often have found elements of disbelief may be because the information they support is often almost unbelievable.

In again other narratives, the reported narrators stress the geographical and temporal distance between the narrator and the events he recounts, which may produce various effects (Achilles in Il. 24.615; primary narrator in Il. 2.783; Od. 6.42).

31 In the case of Athena in Od. 13.248–9 on Ithaca, the geographical distance and lack of precise knowledge is particularly apt since the goddess is disguised as a shepherd and by hiding here omniscience she adds credibility to her disguise.

32 Cf. Richardson (2000 [1993]: 342) ad 614–7 ‘[these lines] lift Akhilleus’ consolation on to a different plane, as we rest our eyes on this great, solitary and distant figure, frozen in the image of perpetual grief.’ For the tendency of Achilles to invoke distant places, see also Griffin (1986: 53–6). As the BK (2009: 248) ad 614–7 notes, this tragic effect is enhanced by the information that Achilles does give about Mount Sipylus, viz. the dancing Nymphs, who stand in shrill contrast to Niobe’s – ‘unmoving’– fate: ‘die ausschmückende Beschreibung de Sipylos als angeblicher Wohnort der lebensfrischen Nymphen (615f.) bildet darüber hinaus eine kontrastierende Folie zur Einsamkeit der steingewordenen Niobe (614, 617).
Finally, some narrators appeal to specific people, whose omniscience or eyewitness status of certain events authorizes the information they provide. Thus, Achilles repeats her own story to Thetis in *Il.* 1.396–406, Menelaus quotes in *Od.* 4.512–37 to the omniscient Proteus, Odysseus quotes Agamemnon about his own death in *Od.* 11.45–504, and Odysseus disguised as a beggar refers to the Thesprotian king.

I conclude that the device of reported narrators does not necessarily imply doubt, and the narratees are not expected automatically to question a story when reported narrators introduce it. The analyses in this section show that, to the contrary, the wide distribution of a story gives it authority.
4. NO EXPLICIT EXPLANATION OF NARRATIVE KNOWLEDGE

In nine narratives the narrator does not explicitly indicate how he knows the events he tells:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage, narrator: subject</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 5.385–424, Dione: gods wounded by mortals</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 19.95–133, Agamemnon: Zeus and Ate</td>
<td>In 96 φασ (limited to 95–6, referring to Zeus’ superlative reputation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Il.</em> 24.602–17, Achilles: Niobe</td>
<td>In 615 φασ (limited to 615–7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 3.263–75 + 304–12, Nestor: Agamemnon’s nostos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 3.276–303, Nestor: Menelaus’ nostos</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 8.266–366, Demodocus: Ares and Aphrodite</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 15.403–84, Eumaeus: youth and abduction</td>
<td>Eumaeus is an internal narrator in lines 459–84.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Od.</em> 21.295–304, Antinous: feud between the centaurs and mankind</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 4.1 No explicit explanation*

In most narratives in this table, the narrator would not need to explain how he learned of the events he tells. Nestor, in his narratives in *Odyssey* 3, already explained his knowledge about the nostoi of the other Greek leaders: he makes his reliance on hearsay clear in lines 184–7, and he (mistakenly) assumes Telemachus has also heard of these nostoi (193–4). Therefore, although he does not explain his knowledge again when he tells about Agamemnon’s and Menelaus’ nostoi, Nestor has probably already heard of it. In addition, narratives on nostoi and heroic deeds appear to be quickly distributed by songs, as shown by Phemius’ song in *Od.* 1.325–7 and Demodocus’ songs about the Trojan War (*Od.* 8.73–92, 499–520), which might be another source for Nestor’s narrative. An explanation of his knowledge is therefore unnecessary. In *Il.* 10.285–93, Diomedes tells about his father Tydeus. Although Tydeus is a relatively unknown figure of the past and his son Diomedes was not old enough to remember him when he left, Agamemnon’s

---

91 See Andersen (1978: 34).
92 See *Il.* 6.222–3.
narrative on Tydeus, which his addressed to Diomedes himself (Iliad 4.370–400), makes clear that Tydeus’ exploits were famous from hearsay and songs (see above, pp. 57–9). Furthermore, Diomedes speaks to Athena in prayer (κέκλυθι νῦν καὶ ἐμεῖο, Διὸς τέκος, Ἀτρυτώνη· ἵπτεί μοι ὡς ὑπ’ ἄτρι πατρὶ ἐν’ ἐμεῖο Τυδεί διώ ι ἐς Θῆβας, ..., Iliad 10.284–6) and arguably did not need to appeal to other narrators to convince her, an omniscient goddess, of the truth of his account.

Is there a reason why other narrators do not explain their knowledge in instances where their ‘source’ is less clear? Dione’s extensive knowledge93 in Iliad 5.385–404 needs no explanation, since she is a goddess and, as such, omniscient. She has, for example, access to her characters’ inner thoughts. When she comforts her daughter Aphrodite, who had been wounded by the mortal Diomedes, she emphasizes how other gods suffered from wounds inflicted by mortals: Hera suffers from pain that ‘in no wise might be assuaged’ (ἀνήκεστον, 394), and Hades was ‘pierced through with pains’ (ὀδύνῃσι πεπαρμένος, 399) that ‘distressed his soul’ (κῆδε... θυμόν, 400).

Yet in the other narratives, the mortal narrators also speak relatively freely about the doings of the gods. For example, Agamemnon in Iliad 19.95–133 recounts what happens among the gods on Mount Olympus and in other locations (114–5), quoting Zeus and Hera verbatim (101–5, 107–11, 121–4). In fact, there are only two narratives about the gods told by a mortal narrator in which the narrator does explain his knowledge. In Odyssey 12.372–90, Odysseus tells about Zeus promising Helios to punish Odysseus (p. 56). Here Odysseus needs to explain his knowledge because the dialogue between Zeus and Helios directly influences his own nostos. It would have been a very conspicuous exception to Jörgensen’s rule (p. 45) if Odysseus, not relying on hearsay, had known of this divine intervention. The other exception is Iliad 1.365, where Achilles points out to Thetis, who had asked him why he is lamenting, that she, as an immortal, knows the story already.

Often in narratives in which the narrators leave their knowledge unexplained, they have access to their characters’ inner thoughts, which is information that they could not have actually had. For example, in Iliad 24.602–17 Achilles relates the story of Niobe and recounts that she ‘thought of food, when she was worn out with her weeping’ (ἡ δ’ ἠρξα

---

93 Gods often relate events without explaining how they know of them, e.g.: Odyssey 5.21–7, 202–13, 286–90. Cf. Iliad 1.365, where Achilles points out to Thetis, who had asked him why he is lamenting, that she, as an immortal, knows the story already.
In addition, Agamemnon in *Iliad* 19.95–133 has access to e.g. Hera’s thoughts (ἐνθ’ ἂρα ἡ Ὑδη | ἰφθίμην ἄλοχον Σθενέλου Περσηίδαο, ‘(Hera came to Argos), where she knew was the strong wife of Sthenelus, son of Perseus’, 115–6).

Narrators’ unmotivated omniscience about events from the distant past may also explain the curious fact that Demodocus, as a professional singer, is said to receive help from the Muse in two of his three narratives (p. 23) but the Muse is not mentioned in his narrative on Ares and Aphrodite in *Od.* 8.266–366. As I argued on p. 23, this may be due to the fact that the former are concerned with the *kleos* of warriors (cf. e.g. Μοῦσ’ ἄρ’ ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν (*Od.* 8.73)), while the latter concerns the – by definition immortal – gods Ares and Aphrodite. Demodocus does not explain his knowledge because he is a professional singer and because narrators in general do not explain their knowledge of the doings of the gods.

In the final category, as in *Od.* 15.423–84, where Eumaeus recounts events that he both experienced himself and could not possibly have witnessed. I have discussed the effects of his rather restrictive narration based on autopsy in the second half of the narrative in section 2.5 (pp. 46–8). I believe that his unmotivated knowledge in the first half is left unexplained because the desire to place the Phoenician into a negative light overrules strict narrative logic.
5. **CONCLUSION**

The primary narrator and the professional singers, as the primary narrator’s alter-egos, receive information from the Muse. Their knowledge is authenticated by the Muse’s autopsy, which elevates it above that of other narrators. As professional singers, they spread the fame of the warriors about whom they sing. As such, the Muse and the professional singers are associated with remembering and commemorating the past.

Many narrators in Homeric epic are internal narrators. They appeal to their own individual, often heroic, role, to common memory of themselves and their narratee(s); or to their status as an eyewitness. They may turn to ‘we’ forms for two purposes: to draw on common memory and enhance their authority by reminding the narratees about the events that they experienced together. On the one hand, they show access to their own and their characters’ inner thoughts at the time the events. On the other hand, the ‘we’ forms enable the narrator to single out a particular person within this ‘we’ group. Thus in *Od.* 3.133–85, Nestor presents Odysseus as superior to the other Greek warriors and ascribes to this group the characteristic in which Odysseus excels. In *Il.* 11.670–803, Nestor singles himself out, for example using verbs denoting martial actions in the ‘I’ form. When the narrator uses ‘we’ forms to single out a particular person, the identity of the group typically varies within the narrative. Internal narrators are by their nature bound by restrictions, but they can break such restrictions, when they, or the primary narrator, wish to reveal something. Even their claim to not know something has a function for the main storyline.

When narrators have not seen the events they tell, they can compensate for this by appealing to other narrators, who personally experienced the event or know about it in another way. In most instances these appeals also have an authorizing function. And on the part of the primary narrator ‘Homer’, they arguably signal allusions to pre-existing poetry.
2. Lyric

Lyric narrators tell about events from the distant past until the immediate past. On the one hand, narratives about events from the distant past are found in Stesichorus’ poems, which cover the Trojan and Theban cycles, and in Pindar’s and Bacchylides’ epinician odes, for example about the lives of Heracles (e.g. O. 10), Orestes (e.g. P. 11), Meleager (B. 5), and many other heroes. Epinician poets typically link the present with the distant past in their odes, either by drawing parallels between the two or by setting up a story of the distant past against the achievements of a laudandus in the present.¹ Often their narratives go back to the beginning of the world and the emergence of the city or island where the laudandus lives (e.g. O. 9). Narrators in Sappho’s and Alcaeus’ poems also relate stories from the mythological past, for example about Helen (Alcaeus frs 42 and 283, and Sappho fr. 16).² Like those in the epinician odes, they are often intended as a parallel to the narrator’s situation in the present.

On the other hand, lyric narrators recount stories from the immediate past. Well known examples are found in Simonides’ poems celebrating warriors in recent battles (e.g. Salamis, Thermopylae, Plataea). Another is Sappho fr. 94, where the narrator tells about her emotional dialogue with a departing woman, during which she reminisces about events in which they participated together.

Lyric narrators largely employ the same authenticating devices for creating narrative authority as their epic counterparts: they refer to hearsay and traditional stories for the distant past and occasionally they reveal what they saw themselves or heard about from eyewitnesses. The Muses, too, occur frequently in lyric poetry. Yet lyric narrators also use a new strategy: when they do not have first-hand knowledge, they refer not only to...

¹The use of stories from the distant past in epinician odes has received much scholarly attention, starting with Bundy (1962) and Köhnken (1971). More recent publications that draw attention to the interaction between distant past and present in epinician poetry are e.g. Pavlou (2008) on Olympian 9; (2011) on the contrast between the past in Pindar’s dithyrambic and epinician odes; (2012) on the past in Pindar in general; Grethlein (2010) on Olympian 2. Currie (2012) shows how space is deployed to contribute to the interplay between what he calls the mythical narrative, that of the athletic contest, and of the performance. Furthermore, de Jong (2013), examining metalepsis in Pindaric and Bacchylidean myths, states that in epinician poetry the distance between the world of the present and of the distant past is often temporarily bridged or even blurred by metaleptic devices.
²In addition to stories from the distant past, see Purves (2014) for the importance of narrative form in the construction of Sappho’s poems in general.
hearsay and traditional stories (or perhaps allude to pre-existing stories), but also to poems composed about these events. Especially Pindar is portrayed as a ‘man of letters’. This raises the question whether these ‘poetic sources’ are reliable, and how lyric narrators create authority for their own story when other, perhaps contradictory, versions are already widespread.

In this chapter I investigate the devices that lyric narrators use to create authority for their narratives. I examine how they know of the events, where their stories come from, and the ways in which they employ and develop an assortment of devices from epic to construct narrative authority. First I investigate the Muses (1), then internal narrators (autopsy) (2), and finally appeals to other narrators (3), such as references to (older) poets, tradition, and hearsay.

This discussion considers only ‘proper’ narratives in the lyric poems; it omits, for example, the (brief) accounts of athletic victories in epinician odes. To avoid confusion, section 2.2 explores non-narrative passages in which epinician narrators explicitly claim eyewitness knowledge so that these claims can be compared to ways in which narrators explain their knowledge in the narratives proper. Non-narrative parts of poems occasionally come to the fore in the discussions of the Muses, and, more generally, when I discuss the ‘mirror’ function of the presentation of the stories from the distant past for the present and future. That is, how narrator’s explanation of his knowledge of stories of the distant past can reveal how he envisions his own poem being disseminated and thus shed light on his conception of his task as (epinician) poet. This is a recurring topic in this chapter.

---

3 West (2011).

4 For athletic ‘descriptions’ and ‘sports writing’ in Bacchylides, see Rawles (2012:14–7); Hadjimichael (2015).
1. Appeals to the Muses

Many studies describe the development of the role of the Muses in pre-Hellenistic Greek poetry. We have seen that the Homeric narrator's knowledge from mortal hearsay is authenticated by the Muses' eyewitness knowledge (see pp. 19–25 above), as the Muses are omniscient divine transmitters of (eyewitness) information about the past and guarantors of truth. Yet the Hesiodic Muses seemed to have a different nature and function than the Homeric ones, since in the proem of the Theogony they tell the narrator 'Hesiod' that they are capable of lies:

(1) 'ποιμένες ἄγραυλοι, κάκ᾽ ἐλέγχεα, γαστέρες οἶον,
Ἰβρεν ψεύδεα πολλὰ λέγειν ἐτύμοισιν ὁμοῖα,
Ἰβρεν δ᾽ εὖτ᾽ ἐθέλωμεν ἀληθέα γηρύσασθαι.' (Hes. Th. 26–8)

'Shepherds of the wilderness, wretched things of shame, mere bellies, we know how to speak many false things indistinguishable from true things; and we know how, when we will, to utter true things.'

In this (probably intentionally) cryptic passage, Hesiod arguably attempts to express what fiction is and acknowledges that what is narrated in poetry is not necessarily the truth. Phrases like εὖτ᾽ ἐθέλωμεν (28) are commonly used of the gods, and as other gods do not always fulfil prayers, its use here suggests that the Muses can grant a poet's request for help (i.e. speak the truth) or not. In this way the narrator presents poetry as a combination of truth, i.e. when the Muses authenticate the narrator's own restricted knowledge (see Chapter 1.1), and falsehood, i.e. when the Muses present false information as the truth. This passage thus implies that the Muses are responsible for both truthful and false accounts. It is not my purpose to examine the Muses in Hesiod's poems in

---

1 Text: West (1966); translation: Evelyn-White (1914), adapted.
2 See West (1966: 163) ad 28 for other passages.
3 Similarly, Finkelberg (1998: 156–60): 'Whether the poets’ accounts are truthful or false, it is nevertheless the Muse who is to be held responsible for these accounts’. The traditional and often held interpretation, defended by Finkelberg, is that the poet’s target was Homeric epic: ‘Hesiod is here contrasting the true content of his own poetry with the plausible fiction of Homeric epic’, so Murray (1981: 91), with further references. Pratt (1993: 106–13), too, argues that Hesiod leaves open the possibility that his poem contains certain elements of fiction: ‘the listeners can never entirely escape being deceived’ (p. 111). This is part of her larger argument that archaic poets were not only interested in speaking the truth, but could also claim to be capable of falsehoods. Differently, Scodel (2001: 112–23) argues that Hesiod in this passage openly
Before turning to archaic lyric, I briefly jump forward in time to the Hellenistic era. The Hellenistic narrators base their accounts much less on the Muses, for example holding themselves accountable for deceptive poetry. At the same time, drawing on Plato and Democritus, who associated the Muses with divine inspiration and even madness, the Hellenistic poets continue to profit from this ancient idea of a vatic poet, one inspired by the Muses. Morrison shows that the Muses in archaic lyric occupy an important intermediate position within this development from Homer’s and Hesiod’s Muses to the Hellenistic Muses and that important aspects of both ends of the continuum are attested here.

In this section I investigate why lyric narrators mention or invoke the Muses. Since this subject has already received much scholarly attention, my analyses often draw on earlier studies, which I discuss and (hope to) complement. Yet, as in Chapter 1.1, where I discussed the functions of the epic Muses, I need to be very selective. My approach is unique in that I focus on whether narrators attempt to create narrative authority by invoking the Muses and how they adopt (and develop) the Muses’ functions and forms from epic. I start with preliminary remarks on the Muses in lyric poetry on the basis of all occurrences of the Muses in the lyric passages of my corpus (1.1). Then, I explore the role of the Muses in Bacchylides (1.2) and Pindar (1.3).
1.1. The Muses in lyric poetry

The following table provides an overview of the occurrences of the Muses in lyric, outside Bacchylides and Pindar, omitting the very fragmentary passages:8

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem + lines</th>
<th>Form of the Muses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Archil. 1 W</td>
<td>2 Poetry is presented as the gift of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archil. 117 W</td>
<td>1 Epic parody</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcman 11 PMG</td>
<td>25 Fragmentary; possibly comparable to 14a and 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcman 14a PMG</td>
<td>1 The Muse is invoked to start a new tune</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcman 27 PMG</td>
<td>1 The Muse is invoked to give grace to the song and dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solon 13 W</td>
<td>1–2 The Muses are invoked to grant the narrator success</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stesichorus 90</td>
<td>8–10 The Muse is invoked to correct the old version of the story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stesichorus 100</td>
<td>6–9 The Muse is invoked as provider of mythic narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stesichorus 172</td>
<td>1 The Muse is invoked to collaborate with the narrator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stesichorus 277–9</td>
<td>1 Calliope is invoked at the start of a poem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho 32 PLF</td>
<td>1 Fragmentary; possibly the Muses (suppl.) make the narrator famous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho 55 PLF</td>
<td>3 The addressee will not be remembered after her death because she has no share in the roses from Pieria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho 58 PLF</td>
<td>1 The narrator asks her narratees to be eager for the Muses' gifts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho 103 PLF</td>
<td>5 The Muses and Graces are requested to come (suppl.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho Thalia-poem 9</td>
<td>5, 8 Fragmentary; narrator possibly asks that songs may still surround her after her death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho 127 PLF</td>
<td>1 The narrator asks the Muses to come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho 150 PLF</td>
<td>1 The narrator speaks of a household of mousopoloi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho 193 PLF</td>
<td>Sappho may have said that the Muses have made her blessed and remembered after death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theognis 15–18</td>
<td>15 The Muses and Graces are invoked and said to have sung at the wedding of Cadmus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theognis 237–54</td>
<td>250 The gifts of the Muses will escort the poet</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8 I omit some very fragmentary references to the Muses in Sappho. See Hardie (2005: 14, n. 10) for a complete overview of the Muses in Sappho’s extant corpus.

9 Sappho’s second poem on the Cologne papyrus.
The poet is called the servant and messenger of the Muses, and should share his superior knowledge.

The narrator says to pay heed to the Muses.

Epic parody.

The Muses are associated with epic subject matter.

The narrator asks the Muse to spread the fame of his song.

Homer is said to know everything because of the Muses.

The Muse is invoked to act as the narrator’s helper.

The Muses have made Anacreon immortal.

Table 1.1 Muses or Muse-like invocations in lyric poetry outside Bacchylides and Pindar

Stesichorus is heavily indebted to Homer’s epics, and his use of the Muses resembles that of the epic narrator. For example, in the Sack of Troy (fr. 100), the narrator addresses his Muse (θε̣ά, τ扬尘..., 6) and asks her to tell the following story (νῦν δ᾿ ἄγ̣ε̣ μοι λ̣<έγ>ε πῶς..., 9), as the Homeric narrator does in the proems of the Iliad and the Odyssey. Yet the Stesichorean narrator seems to draw more attention to his own role and status qua singer than the Homeric narrator, when in lines 7–8 he possibly (the lines are fragmentary) says that his heart longs to sing (7–8). In fr. 172 (the opening of the Oresteia), he again invokes the Muse and presents her as his collaborator:

(2) Μοίσα σὺ μὲν πολέμους ἀπωσαμένα πεδ᾿ ἐμοῦ κλέιοσα θεῶν τε γάμους ἀνδρῶν τε δαῖτας καὶ θάλιας μακάρων... (Stesich. fr. 172)

Muse, do you, rejecting wars with me, celebrating the weddings of gods, the feasts of men, and the banquets of the blessed(, ...).¹³

The phrase πεδ᾿ ἐμοῦ (2) suggests that the narrator and his Muse make the poem together. This double motivation is found in Homer, but only implicitly. In addition, in the two Palinodes (fr. 90), the narrator asks the Muse’s help in rectifying the false version of the story of Helen: θε̣ώρ ρ σύντε θεά φιλόμολπε (8–9), and χρυσόπτερε παρθένος (10).¹⁹ Such

¹⁹ See e.g. Kelly (2015).
¹⁴ Trans. Davies-Finglass.
¹⁵ See e.g. Feeney (1992: 15–6).
explicit ‘corrections’ do not occur in Homer, but Stesichorus uses Homer’s authentication device. In the first Palinode, moreover, the narrator asks the Muse to come ‘once more’ (αὖτε), which suggests that she helps him regularly.14

As argued in Chapter 1, knowledge of the professional singers (including the primary narrator) in Homer elevates them amongst mortals and is authenticated by the Muses. The idea that professional singers/poets aided by the Muses have superior knowledge is more explicit in lyric. It is, for example, the subject of lines 769–72 of the Theognidea:

(3) χρὴ Μουσῶν θεράποντα καὶ ἄγγελον, εἰ τι περισσόν εἰδείπ, σοφῆς μὴ φθονερὸν τελέθει, ἄλλα τὰ μὲν μῶσθαι, τὰ δὲ δεικνύναι, ἄλλα δὲ ποιεῖν- τί σφιν χρήσηται μοῦνος ἐπιστάμενος; (Thgn. 769–72)

_The servant and messenger of the Muses, if he has surfeit of knowledge, should not begrudge his wisdom; he should seek, he should show, he should create; what good is it to him, if he is the only one who knows?_

The poet is here presented as the Muses’ ‘servant and messenger’, which would enable him to have a ‘surfeit of knowledge’. Yet, unlike his Homeric counterpart, the Theognidean narrator lays emphasis on the _active_ role that a poet should have: a poet should τὰ μὲν μῶσθαι, τὰ δὲ δεικνύναι, ἄλλα δὲ ποιεῖν (771). Following Fowler, this probably means that he must seek information, present the results of this ‘inquiry’, and share this with other people in poetry.15 It is particularly noteworthy that the poet should δεικνύναι, i.e. _show_ what he knows, an element that is only very implicitly present in Homer (e.g. when he invokes the Muse at the start of the Odyssey: (τῶν ἁμόθεν γε, θεά, θύγατερ Διός, εἰπὲ καὶ ἡμῖν…, Od. 1.10). In this respect it is significant that, in Theognis, the poet is called an ἄγγελον (769) of the Muses (besides the more frequent θεράποντα in the same line).17

14 Cf. e.g. the opening words of Sappho fr. 127. Differently, Davison (1968: 223) writes that αὖτε shows that ‘the Palinode criticizing Hesiod (i.e. the first, lines 8–9) was intended to precede that criticizing Homer (i.e. the second, line 10)’, thus assuming that the word means that the Muse should come to the second Palinode, too, as she came to the first. However, I follow Davies-Finglass (2014: 331), who comment that the word refers to the narrator’s hope that the Muse will assist him now as before, not specifically in the other Palinode.

15 Fowler (2013: 51–3), who compares the passage to Plato’s Prot. 320b. Bagordo (2000: 197) interprets εἰ τι περισσόν | εἰδείπ (769–70) differently, namely as the capacity of a poet to perform the tasks mentioned in the next line.

16 E.g. Archil. 11–12 W (ἐμὴ δ’ ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίοιο δώρον καὶ Μουσῶν ἐρατὸν βαρέον ἐπιστάμενος); Hes.
referring to this ‘public’ function. As Woodbury comments on this passage, the poet’s art appears to comprise two basic elements, namely ‘his particular wisdom and his production of verses’.

Whereas the narrator in Homer’s epics only occasionally revealed his self-consciousness, mostly by invoking the Muse, the Theognidean narrator uses the same authenticating device but is much more self-conscious and so explicit about his own role that he speaks about poets themselves as the purveyors of the Muse’s wisdom.

In many other poems the Muses do not authenticate the narrator’s knowledge. For instance, they are almost completely absent from Archilochus’ and Hipponax’ iambic poems, most likely due to the limited portion of narrative about events of the past in their poems. Yet the narrator can make invocations – he does not explicitly address the Muses here – to parody epic (Archil. 117 W and Hippon. 128 W). This indicates that the Muses have become closely associated with the epic genre and with epic subject matter. Furthermore, the narrator in Ibycus’ fr. S151 PMGF invites the Muses to embark upon epic themes. Some of Alcman’s poems may be an exception, as the narrator invokes the Muse to start songs for him but not to provide epic subject matter (frs 11, 14a, 27).

However, only a few lines of these poems have survived, so we cannot be certain that the narrator does not treat epic themes in them.

As the narrators’ dependence on the Muses for narrative authority decreases in lyric and the narrators become more explicit about their own role qua poet, the Muses become not only closely associated with the epic genre, but also with the immortalizing power of the poets’ own poetry and the poets’ self-conscious role as dispensers of kleos for both their topics and themselves. For example, Sappho mentions the Muses on several occasions in passages in which she is especially concerned with being remembered. The Muses – i.e. her poems – ensure her fame.

Th. 100 (Μουσάων θεράπων); B. 5.13–4 (χρυσάμπυκος Οὐρανίας κλεινός θεράπων).

Woodbury (1991: 490), emphasis added. In this article (483–90) he also discusses many interpretations of the passage proposed by other scholars. Other interpretations are also discussed in Bagordo (2000).

See further Woodbury (1985: 201).

So notes e.g. Morrison (2007: 80).

See Stehle (2011, n. 33); Wilson, L.H. (1996: 158–71); Hardie (2005). Palmisciano (1998: 190–1) discusses previous secondary literature on this subject. Furthermore, it has been suggested that Aphrodite, who is invoked in Sappho’s fr. 1, functions as a double for the Muse, see e.g. Skinner (1991: 83–90). Yet it is in fact the narrator Sappho herself who provides the information for which she asks.
A classic example of the function of the Muses in helping poets spread someone else’s fame is found in Theognis (237–54), where the narrator addresses Cyrnus:

(4) ... σε πέμψει ἀγλαὰ Μουσάων δῶρα ἱοστεφάνων πᾶσιν δοσιν μέμηλε, καὶ ἔσσομένοισιν ἀοιδὴ

ἐσσῃ ὁμῶς, ὅφρ᾽ ἢ γῆ τε καὶ ἠέλιος. (Thgn. 249–52)

(when you have died) the glorious gifts of the violet-crowned Muses will send you to all who care for you, and for people of the future you will nevertheless be a song, as long as the earth and sun abide.

The narrator says that Cyrnus will have an immortal name thanks to Theognis’ poetry, which suggests that, because of their relationship with the Muses, poets are capable of perpetuating their subjects’ fame.

Simonides’ Plataea Elegy exemplifies how Muses are asked to ensure the song’s and its subject’s kleos (10–18 W6). This poem starts with a hymn-like proem,23 in which Achilles is addressed.24 Despite its fragmentary state, it is probably safe to say that Simonides evokes the Trojan War as recounted by Homer to parallel the battle of Plataea, with Achilles standing for Pausanias (who may have himself commissioned the poem)25 and other Greek soldiers.26 West states that since a proem was always addressed to a divinity, as far as we know, Simonides accords Achilles the status of a god here and refers to his hero cult.27 The narrator may have also envisioned such a cult status for the soldiers who died in the battle of Plataea, but this is disputed.28 Yet even if it is incorrect to speak

---

22 For this passage, see e.g. Tarkow (1977).
23 West (1993) calls this proem a hymn, but e.g. Capra-Curti (1995: 30) and Lloyd-Jones (1994: 1) argue against this.
24 An address of Achilles is probable in fr. 10.5 and almost certain in fr. 11.19–20 (the passage quoted above). For Achilles’ presence and address here, see e.g. Luppe (1993: 3); Obbink (1996: 194). It is unclear whether lines 7–8 (not quoted) refer to Achilles’ or Patroclus’ death.
25 See e.g. Morgan (2015: 147–50) for the singling out and prominent role of Pausanias in the Plataea Elegy.
26 Therefore, Grethlein (2000: 54–5) calls this an exemplary use of the past.
27 West (1993: 5). He furthermore suggests that the poem may well have been composed at the time of some festival or ritual in Achilles’ honour. See Shaw (2001: 164–81) for the status of Achilles as a cult hero. Lloyd-Jones (1994: 1), in contrast, states that the address to Achilles is explicable because the narrator is merely aiming to do for the warriors at Plataea here what Homer did for Achilles and the warriors of the Trojan War, and therefore the passage would not imply a cult. Yet this mere comparison of the narrator’s poetic aim to Homer’s does not explain why the narrator apostrophizes Achilles.
of the heroization of the warriors in this passage, it would not contradict the idea that
the narrator assures the fallen Greek warriors undying fame by means of this poem (23–4), like Homer did for Achilles (17–8).29

The Muses are mentioned twice, once within and once immediately after the hymn-like proem:

(5) τοὶ δὲ πόλι̣ν πέρσαντες ἀοίδιμον [οίκαδ’ Ἥ]κοντο
φέρτατο ἡρ̣ωων ἁγέμαχοι Δαναο[ί],
οἶσιν ἕπ’ ὀθὲν κέχυται κλέος ἄν[θρος] ἔκαητι
δὲ πασαν ἀληθείας ἁντει, καὶ ἐπώνυμον ὅ[ποτέροιοισιν]
καὸρης εἰν]αλίου Νηρέος αὐτάρ ἐγὼ[15
καὶ κυλήσκοις σ’ ἐπίκουορον ἐμοί, π[ολυώνυμε] Μοῦσα,
εἴ πέρ γ’ ἀνδρότων εὐχομένων μέλεαι·[20
κικλήσκω] σ’ ἐπίκουορον ἐμοί, π[ολυώνυμ]ε]
εἴ πέρ γ’ ἀνθρώπων εὐχομένων μέλεαι·[25
[And so] the valiant Danaans, [best of warr]iors,
sacked the much-sung city, and came [home;
[of one who from the dark]-tressed Muses had
the tru[th entire,] and made the heroes’ short-lived race
a theme familiar to younger men.
[But] now farewell, [thou son] of goddess glorious,
[daughter] of Nereus of the sea, while I[20
[now summon] thee, [illustriou]s Muse, to support,
[if thou hast any thought] for men who pray:
[fit ou]t, as is thy wont, this [grat]eful song-a[rray]
[of mine], so that rem[embrance is preserved]
of those...33

29 So Obbink (1996: 200) states that there is a threefold analogy here: ‘1) What the Greeks of epic did in rites
of burial and funeral cult for Achilles; 2) What Homer did in his divinely inspired poems for the heroes of
the Iliad; and 3) What Simonides himself does in the present elegy for the near-contemporary subjects of
the section which follows’. As scholars agree, I do not think that it is important that the death of Achilles,
if that is what the Plataea Elegy narrates, is actually not recounted in Homer’s Iliad.
33 Trans. West. For the full text and translation, see Boedeker-Sider (2001: 13–29).
If the reconstruction is correct, the narrator says that Homer received the entire truth (πᾶσαν ἀληθείαν, 17) from the Muses, referring to the idea that the Muses authenticate the Homeric narrator’s mortal hearsay knowledge and thus guarantee the truth of his story. The Simonidean narrator follows in Homer’s footsteps when he, too, invokes the Muse (21). Yet he does not invoke her in connection with the distant past, but in transition to the immediate past, the battle of Plataea. His knowledge of the distant past is explained by the wide dissemination of Homer’s stories about it (15–6).

From line 25 onwards the narrator turns to the battle of Plataea. While the Homeric narrator’s hearsay knowledge (of the distant past) was authenticated by the Muse, the Simonidean narrator does not need such an authentication: the battle occurred only recently, and the audience may well have witnessed (and could confirm) the events he tells. This difference between Simonides’ and Homer’s temporal point of view is also reflected in the Simonidean narrator’s knowledge in the Plataea Elegy. In Simonides’ poem, Homer is aided by the Muses and seemed to speak freely about the gods (if West’s reconstruction is correct, Homer’s subjects are Apollo, Hera, and Athena because their wrath had caused the war (9–10)). In the narrative of the battle of Plataea, however, no gods are mentioned by name, and the narrator states only that the warriors trusted ‘omens’ (τεράεσσι πεποιθότες, 39). Fr. 14, in addition, may have included the Spartan seer Teisamenos’ prophecy. This means that the narrator only recounts what eyewitnesses and participants themselves experienced. With regard to the will and the doings of the gods, he only mentions what they learned from omens. So while the Muses allow Homer to know everything, even the gods’ actions, the narrator ‘Simonides’ recounts events only from a human’s restricted point of view.

In what way, then, does the Muse help the narrator in the Plataea Elegy? West reconstructs that he asks (cf. εὐχομένων[ν], 22) them to ἔντυνον (23), which he translates as ‘fit out’. This word often means ‘make x ready/’prepare’ and is frequently used in military contexts (for example, of warriors harnessing horses). Yet it is also used when the Sirens start to sing (λιγυρὴν δ᾽ ἔντυνον ἀοιδήν, Od. 12.183). In line 21, the narrator, again using a military term, calls the Muse his ‘ally’ or ‘helper’ (σ’ ἐπίκουρον ἐμοί, 21). Both

---

32 It could also remind one of Sappho in her hymn to Aphrodite, asking the goddess to be her σύμμαχος, fr. 1.28. Stehle (1996: 210) argues that the narrator (to whom she refers as the ‘performer’) depicts the Muse as his ἐπίκουρος to indicate that she is coming to a territory that is new for her: the battle of Plataea is a new sort of subject, ‘one outside her area of normal operation’. In this way he employs the differences between the two roles of the Muse to reinforce his derivations from epic and, at the same time, to present the Iliad as model and forerunner of his elegy. Boedeker (1995: 224), in addition, suggests that the Muse as ἐπίκουρος...
words suggest that the narrator and the Muse make the following narrative together and that the song as a whole is the product of their collaboration. In addition, if the reconstructed text is correct, the narrator asks the Muse to confer lasting fame on the warriors fallen at Plataea (ἵνα τις μνήσεται ὄστρων, 24–5). This seems to be an important function of the Muse: while the Simonidean narrator does not need the Muse to authenticate his hearsay knowledge, by invoking the Muse he self-consciously places himself in the tradition of Homer, drawing attention to his ability to guarantee a warrior’s immortal fame, like Homer did for the soldiers of the Trojan War.

1.2. Bacchylides

Turning to Bacchylides, we see that he begins only few of his odes with the Muses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem + lines</th>
<th>Form of the Muses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ode 1 3</td>
<td>Fragmentary: the Muses are invoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode 3 3</td>
<td>Clio is invoked in epic fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71 The laudandus has a share in the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>92 The Muse tends the laudandus’ fame as consolation for old age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode 4 7–8</td>
<td>The narrator calls himself the ‘cockerel’ of Urania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode 5 1–4</td>
<td>Hieron knows the gift of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12–4 The poet calls himself the servant of Urania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>176–8 Abbruch: the narrator asks Calliope to halt the chariot</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>191–4 Hesiod is called the attendant of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode 9 1–3</td>
<td>The narrator calls himself the prophet of the Muse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>87 The poem is called the Muses’ delight, left behind after one’s death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode 12 1–4</td>
<td>Clio steers the narrator’s thoughts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode 13 228–31</td>
<td>Clio provides excellence of song</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode 15 47</td>
<td>The narrator poses a question to the Muse in epic fashion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ode 19 4</td>
<td>The poet is said to obtain ‘songs of the Muses’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.2 Muses in Bacchylides

When Bacchylides mentions the Muse, he refers to different poet-Muse relationships: the poet presents himself as a ‘cockerel’ (4.7–8), ‘servant’ (5.13–4), and ‘prophet’ (9.1–4) of the Muse, and in Ode 12 Clio is said to steer his thoughts (1–4). In the same vein, Bacchylides’

would also function well in a context in which the Plataea Elegy was performed in competition, where the Muse helps the poet to win. She writes that she owes this observation to Alessandro Barchiesi (n. 27). See for this point also Aloni (1994: 16); (2001: 95).
'colleague' Hesiod is once called the 'attendant of the Muses' (5.191–4). The Bacchylidean narrator also demands the Muse Calliope halt her chariot (5.176–8), which, contrary to the aforementioned passages, implies that he takes the lead in this ode. All these words suggest that the narrator mentions the Muse to imply that they 'work together'.

A characteristic of the epic Muse is found in Ode 15.47, where the narrator, beginning a narrative on the Trojan War, poses a question to the Muse to introduce Menelaus’ speech:

(6) Μοῦσα, τίς πρῶτος λόγων ἄρχεν δικαίων;
Πλεισθενίδας Μενέλαος γάρῳ θελξιεπεῖ
φθέγξατ᾽, εὐπέπλοιοι κοινώσας Χάρισσιν... (B. 15.47–9)

Muse, who first began the words on the subject of justice? Pleisthenes’ son Menelaus spoke with spell-binding words and voice, having conferred with the fair-robed Graces: ...

This πρῶτος-question and answer makes the narratees recall the Iliad (see pp. 19–21).34 Yet Bacchylides uses the question-and-answer pair differently from Homer. His question is not about heroic deeds, such as which warrior was the first to kill an enemy or was the first victim. Instead he asks who spoke the first words. The effect, however, is largely the same: through this question posed to the Muse, the narrator draws attention to and adds weight to Menelaus’ speech.

In Ode 3 Clio is invoked in an epic manner but in connection with an event of the recent past:

(7) Ἀριστο-[x]άρπου Σικελίας κρέουσαν
Δ[α]ματρα ιοστέφανό τε Κόραν
ύμνει, γλυκόνουρὲ κλειοῖ, θοάς τ᾽ Ὀ-λυμπιοδρόμου Ἱέρωνος ἱππός. (B. 3.1–4)

34 So note e.g. Jebb (1905: 365) and Maehler (2004: 161) ad 47. Cf. Ili. 11.218–9; 14.508–9; 16.112–3, for which see de Jong (2014: [1987]: 50–1) and Fearn (2007: 283–7). For the poem’s intertextual relation with Homer (and Solon) see Fearn (2007: 257–337). Yet Fearn goes too far in suggesting that these intertextual references are easily picked up by the audience. According to Fearn, Bacchylides' audience would here have been reminded of Ili. 11.218–9, but in my view it is implausible that the audience would have easily picked up this particular passage while ignoring the other two Muse-invocations starting with πρῶτος in the Iliad.
Of Demeter, ruler of corn-rich Sicily, ad of the violet-garlanded Maid sing, Clio, giver of sweetness, and of Hieron’s swift horses, Olympic runners.

The narrator asks the Muse to sing about Demeter and Persephone (a logical choice, seeing that the ode praises the Sicilian Hieron) and Hieron’s horses. It may be significant that the narrator calls the Muse Κλειόι, her name implying her function: κλείειν. This indicates that the Muse is not invoked only to authenticate knowledge of the distant past, but, more importantly, to spread kleos, which ties in well with the purpose of this genre.

It is noteworthy that in Ode 2.71, 92 and Ode 5.1–4, like in Ode 3.1–4, the Muses are mentioned in connection with the poet and the laudandum. This reflects the difference between Bacchylides’ (epinician) odes and Homer’s epics: epic can be regarded as ‘proto-historiography’, where the narrator gives a (poetic) account of events from the past and the Muses authenticate his knowledge. On the other hand, Bacchylides’ epinician odes praise a victor, which changes the ‘centre of gravity’ of the Muses in this genre.

### 1.3. Pindar

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem + lines</th>
<th>Form and function of the Muses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Olympian 1</td>
<td>112  The Muse acts as the poet’s helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympian 3</td>
<td>4–5  The poem is the result of joint labour of Muse and poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympian 6</td>
<td>21  The Muses approve the narrator’s testimony</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>91  Aeneas is called message stick of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympian 7</td>
<td>7  Nectar is the Muses’ gift and sent by poet to victor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympian 9</td>
<td>5  The poet presents himself as the archer of the Muses’ bow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>81  The poet drives the chariot of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympian 10</td>
<td>3  The Muse is asked to ward off charge against the poet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>60–3 Questions modelled on Homeric ones posed to the Muse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympian 11</td>
<td>17 Invocation at the end of the ode; the Muses will find the Locrians hospitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Olympian 13</td>
<td>18–22 Questions modelled on Homeric ones posed to the Muse; the Muse is said to flourish in Corinth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>96  The poet acts as the Muses’ helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythian 1</td>
<td>2  The lyre is called the possession of Apollo/Muse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12  The lyre enchants deities through skill of Apollo/Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14  Reference to the song of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>58  The poet directs the Muse to a new section</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

35 As Maehler (2004: 86) ad 1–4 notes, her name ‘makes her particularly relevant for epinician poetry’. 
### Appeals to the Muses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pythian 3</th>
<th>90</th>
<th>Peleus and Cadmus heard the Muses singing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pythian 4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Muse is invoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td>The poet gives topics to the Muse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>279</td>
<td>The Muse is increased in power through true reporting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythian 5</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Apollo confers the Muses on whomever he pleases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Arcesilas ‘soars among the Muses from his mother’ (i.e. he was taught by his mother, or was famous from his earliest years)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythian 10</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>The Muse resides with the Hyperboreans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td>The poet drives the chariot of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pythian 11</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>The Muse acts as the poet’s helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemean 1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>The Muse loves to recall great contests</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemean 3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The poet asks the Muse to come</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9–11</td>
<td>The poet is an intermediary between the Muse and chorus/audience</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>The poet steers the Muse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemean 4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Songs are daughters of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemean 5</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>The Muses sang at the wedding of Peleus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemean 6</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>The poet invokes the Muse to direct verses to house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemean 7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>The victor casts cause into the Muses’ streams</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Songs are, ‘by grace of Mnemosyne’, a mirror for noble deeds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>The Muse binds ivory and coral together</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemean 8</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Narrator compares poem (‘stone of the Muses’) to a commemorative stele</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nemean 9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>The Muse is invoked</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>The poet throws shaft near the mark of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isthmian 2</td>
<td>6–11</td>
<td>The Muse/Terpsichore is for hire and pimps poets’ songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isthmian 4</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>The poet hopes to find the favour of the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isthmian 5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>The poet directs the Muse to a new section of the ode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isthmian 6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>The poet mixes the Muses’ songs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td>The poet acts as the Muses’ helper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td>The Muses have made sacred water to surge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isthmian 8</td>
<td>5b</td>
<td>The poet says that he is asked to invoke the Muse</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>56b</td>
<td>The Muses stood beside Achilles’ tomb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td>The Muses’ chariot speeds forward to a new section</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paean 6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>The poet presents himself as the Muses’ prophet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51–8</td>
<td>Contrary to mortals, the Muses know all things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paean 7b</td>
<td>10–23</td>
<td>Wisdom must be sought with the Muses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paean 8</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Fragmentary: invocation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the Pindaric corpus, the Muses are found at different places within an ode. Occasionally they are invoked at the beginning (O. 10.3, P. 4.1, I. 6.2, N. 3.1 and 9.1) or mentioned at the end (O. 11.12, 11.17, I. 6.74, N. 9.55). In Isthmian 6 and Nemean 9, they are mentioned both at the beginning and at the end to create a ring composition. In most odes they are mentioned at structurally important points, frequently at the transition from the mythical narrative to the present (e.g. O. 9.8ff., 13.96ff., P. 1.58ff.).

With regard to their role and relationship to the narrator, the Pindaric Muses differ considerably from Homer’s and are deployed more widely. They are presented as the narrator’s helpers (e.g. P. 1.12; cf. P. 9.3 (Graces); implicit in e.g. O. 1.111–12, fr. 70a, 14–5), but the narrator may also be their helper (O. 13.96) or prophet (Paean 6.6 and fr. 150, using the same word (προφάταν, Paean 6.6) as for Teiresias (N. 1.60)), or their herald (N. 6.57b, fr. 70b 23–5).35 In Nemean 3.9–11 the poet presents himself as an intermediary between the Muse and the chorus/audience. In addition, many metaphorical terms in connection with the Muses are used for songs and poetry, such as the Muses’ ‘daughters’ (N. 4.3) and ‘streams’ (e.g. N. 7.12), not to mention the diverse activities the Pindaric narrator (often rather playfully) envisages his Muse is involved in, such as tending a weapon (O. 1.112), welding gold with ivory (N. 7.78), and ploughing (N. 10.26). Moreover, in Isthmian 2.6–11 the narrator states that the Muse, personifying poetic talent, is for hire. Therefore, it appears that the Muses are used for a far larger variety of purposes than in epic and appear in more kinds of relationships to the narrator, and they mostly serve the poem as a whole rather than just the narrative.

The Muses are omniscient deities (like in epic) only outside the epinician odes. For example, in Paean 6.54–9, a passage reminiscent of Il. 2.484–6, the narrator refers to the

| Table 1.3 Muses in Pindar |
|---------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| **Paean 12** | 2 | Fragmentary: Artemis and the Muses cull the flowers of hymns(?) |
| fr. 70b | 23–5 | The poet has been appointed as the herald of the Muse |
| fr. 71 | 14–5 | The poet asks the Muse to foster the garland of songs |
| fr. 150 | | The poet calls himself the Muses’ prophet |
| fr. 151 | | The poet is urged by the Muse |

---

36 If we follow e.g. Race (1997), who translates O. 6.21 μελίφθογγοι δ’ ἐπιτρέψοντι Μοῖσαι as ‘the honey-voiced Muses will assist’, they help the narrator in O. 6 as well. However, Scodel (2001: 124) states that the meaning is rather that the Muses will approve. LSJ sub ἐπιτρέπω II translates ‘give way’, with reference to this passage.

37 Cf. O. 6.89–90, where the trainer of the chorus Aeneas is called the messenger, or message stick, of the Muses.
impossibility for mortals to find out ‘whence the strife of immortals began’ (50) although the Muses know everything:

(8) ἀλλὰ παρθένοι γάρ, ἵστατε, Μοίσαις, πάντα, καὶ γεφεῖ σὺν πατρὶ Μναμοσῷ ὑπὸ τε 
      τοῦτον ἐσχετε[εις θε]μὼν, 
      κλύτε νῦν ἐρά[ται] δὲ μο[ι] 
      γλῶσσα μέλιτος ἄωτον γλυκὺν… (Paean 6.54–9)

But, virgin Muses, because you know all things – along with your father of the dark clouds and Mnemosyne you have that privilege – hear me now. My tongue longs (to sing?) the sweet essence of honey…

This double motivation is familiar from Homer: the narrator wishes to sing but has restricted knowledge, so he requests the omniscient Muses to assist him. Similarly, in Paean 7b.10–20, the narrator prays to the Muses to ‘provide facility’ (μαχανίαν διδόμεν, 17), since ‘the minds of men are blind, if anyone without the Muses seeks the deep path of wisdom’ [(τ]υφλα̣[ὶ γὰρ ἀνδρῶν φρένες,] [ὁ]στις ἄνευθ᾽ Ἑλικωνιάδων | βαθεῖαν ὁδόν, 18–20). Yet he adds that the Muses have handed over ‘this immortal task’ to him (ἐμ̣ο̣ι δ̣ὲ τοῦτο̣[ν δ̣έ̣]έδω[κ . ν] ἀθάνατ̣ [ο]ν πόνον, 21), which suggests that he himself is responsible for the paean. Unfortunately, the next eight lines are missing or very fragmentary, which makes it difficult to define his task and requests to the Muses.

Turning to the epinician odes, Pythian 4 is firmly placed within the epic tradition and mentions the Muses three times. At the beginning they are asked to stand beside (παρ’… στάμεν, 1–2) the laudandus Arcesilas39 and to enlarge the breeze of hymns owed to Leto’s children and Pytho (Λατοίδαισιν ὀφειλόμενον Πυθῶνί ταdating ήμνων, 3). Scholars rightly note that the invocation of the Muses gives the ode an epic flavour (other deities are invoked in many other odes),40 but contrary to epic, the Muses are here mentioned in connection with the laudandus.

In line 67, the Muses are mentioned again:

(9) ἀπὸ δ’ αὐτῶν ἐγώ Μοίσαιας δώσω 
      καὶ τὸ πάγχρυσον νάκος κριοῦ· μετὰ γάρ

39 For different readings of this line, see e.g. Radt (1958: 124–6) ad 54ff.
38 Braswell (1988: 63) ad 1d compares the phrase in which the Muse is asked to stand beside someone to ‘summoning her with δεῦρο or a similar expression’, ‘a lyric rather than an epic convention’.
40 Similarly, Braswell (1988: 57–8) states that by invoking the Muse, the narrator ‘places an ode more firmly in the epic tradition, whereas the invocation of another divinity (…) points rather to the traditional hymn’. 
κεῖνο πλευσάντων Μινυάν, θεόπομποί σφισιν τιμαὶ φύτευθεν.

tίς γὰρ ἀρχὰ δέξατο ναυτιλίας,
tίς δὲ κλίνον κρατεροῖς ἀδάμαντος δήσεν ἄλοις; θέσφατον ἦν Πελίαν
ἐξ ὁγαυῶν Αἰολιδὰν δεινὲμεν χείρεσιν ἢ βουλαίς ἀκνάμπτοις. (Π. 4.67–72)

And for my part, I shall entrust to the Muses both him (i.e. the laudandus Arcesilas, 65) and the all-golden fleece of the ram, for when the Minyai sailed after that (fleece), god-sent honours were planted for them. What beginning took them on their voyage, and what danger bound them with strong nails of adamant? It was fated that Pelias would perish because of the proud descendants of Aeolus, at their hands or through their inflexible counsels.

The narrator poses two questions to the Muses, and the answer to these questions is given in the ensuing narrative about the quest for the golden fleece. This narrative form shows similarities with the many question-and-answer pairs in epic (Chapter 1, pp. 19–21). Yet the Pindaric narrator ‘entrusts’ to the ‘Muses’ (Μοίσαισι δώσω, 67) not only the golden fleece, but also the laudandus. By this he means that both are the subjects of his song, which will ensure their fame. The Muses, then, are connected both to the distant past and the present. Indeed, many scholars argue that, in Pindar, the Muses’ main function is not that to authenticate information about the past but to bolster the ode’s (and hence the laudandus’) fame and assist in the poem’s composition.

Finally, the Muse is mentioned in lines 278–9, near the end of the ode. The narrator explains that it is important to ‘be a noble messenger’, since ‘the Muse also increases in

---

* This idea is for example strongly advocated by Pavlou (2012: 106): ‘It would not be far-fetched to say that the Pindaric Muse is associated more with the skillful composition of song and the commemoration of the present than with the remembering of the past, as is commonly believed’, and Morrison (2007b: 89): ‘Hence we find in Pindar a degree of independence from the Muses as the source of narrative’. Differently Mackie (2003: 55), whose main argument is that the past in Pindar’s odes above all serves, and is thus subordinate to, the present and the praise of the victor, states that the typical placement for the Pindaric Muse-invocation is in the middle of the ode: ‘It (i.e. the Muse-invocation) marks a special departure, a change in theme and style, as the poet makes a transition from present-day concerns to narratives about the distant past’. When the narrator returns to the present, there is, so Mackie argues, a renewed emphasis on the poet himself, who seems to relinquish divine aid and emphasizes his autonomy in regulating what he has to say: ‘In Pythian 4, for example, the shift in perspective (i.e. from the present to the distant past) is marked by a change of addressee. At the same moment as he invokes the Muse, embarking on the ode’s mythic narrative, the poet also addresses the ancient hero Battos (ancestor of the victor) directly’ (p. 59). However that may be, I emphasize that the Muse is mostly found after an ode’s narrative, or at the beginning of the ode as a whole. Pythian 4 is a pre-eminently ‘epic’ ode, and in many respects an exceptional case. In my view the Pindaric Muse is not more closely associated with the distant past than with the present.
Appeals to the Muses

power through a truthful message (αὔξεται καὶ Μοῖσα δι᾽ ἀγγελίας ὀρθᾶς, 279). The Pindaric narrator uses the Muse’s ‘old’ function of authentication to strengthen his praise of the laudandus, which would be worthless otherwise.

Thus in Pythian 4 there are several echoes of the epic Muses: the narrator invokes his Muse at the start, asks her questions in the narrative, and in praising the laudandus mentions her to emphasize the veracity of his account. These three forms occur in other odes: the Pindaric narrator invokes the Muses in O. 10.3, I. 6.2, N. 3.1 and 9.1. In Olympian 6.21, he stresses the veracity of his account, saying that he will bear witness for the laudandus and that the Muses will give their consent. Because of their occurrence within or immediately adjacent to narratives, I will pay closer attention to the questions that the narrator poses.

Pythian 4 aside, the question form is also found in Olympian 10. The narrator mentions in catalogue style the six victors of the first Olympian games after Heracles founded them:

(10) τίς δὴ ποταίνιον
 Ἠλαχε στέφανον
 γείρεσσι ποιών τε καὶ ἀρματι,
 ἀγώνιον ἐν δόξῃ θέμενος εὖχον, ἔργῳ καθελών;
 σταδίον μὲν ἀρίστευσεν… (O. 10.60–4)

Who then won the new crown with hands or feet or with chariot, after fixing in his thoughts a triumph in the contest and achieving it in deed? First, the winner of the stadion was...

The addressee is not named, but it seems clear that the Muses are implied. However, Pavlou argued that ‘the catalogue’s lack of elaboration and aesthetic value’ suggest that Pindar has this information not from the Muses, but from a real victory list. Yet as the victors mentioned here are victors from the distant past, it is safe to say that no actual victory list would have been available. It is plausible and more important that Pindar imitated the style of such a list, just as he used the language of reading in this ode’s first lines when he asked the Muse and Truth to ‘read’ him the name of the laudandus (which represents an unfulfilled contract between victor and poet):

(11) τὸν Ὀλυμπιονίκαν ἀνάγνωστε μοι
 ἄρχεστράτου παῖδα, πόθι φρενάς

---

42 Cf. Braswell (1988: 379) ad 279(a): ‘the Muse is not just metaphorically “exalted”, but literally “increased in power’; Braswell connects this phrase to the Hes. Th. 27–8, and the idea that poetry could contain falsehoods. For this reason, Pindar wanted to insist that what he said was true.

Pindar connects the Muse with the reading of the name of the victor. This invocation to the Muse and the similarities between this passage and passage 10 suggest that the questions there are also posed to the Muse. Furthermore, the narrator mentions that songs celebrated the early athletes after their victory (e.g. ἀείδετο, 76), which implies that their names were spread by songs (i.e. by the Muses), just as the name of the laudandus will be spread by Pindar (ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἑπόμενοι καὶ νῦν..., 78). The Pindaric narrator, then, like Homer, poses questions to the Muse before the Muse ‘reads’ the answer from a victory list. In this way Pindar draws attention to his task of spreading the fame of the laudandus.

In Isthmian 5, the narrator asks which men defeated some of the warriors in Troy:

(12) ἔλα νόμοι πεδόθεν
 λέγε, τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἑκτορα πέρνον,
 καὶ στράταρχον Ἀθηνάων ἀφόβοι
 Μέμνονα χαλκόαραν· τίς ἀρ᾽ ἔσπεϊ Τήλεφον
 τρώαν ἐφ δορὶ Καίκου παρ᾽ ὀχθαις;
 τοῖσι Αἴγινα προφέρει στόμα πάτραν,
 διαπρεπέα νάσον... (I. 5.38–44)

Drive me now up from the plain; tell me which men slew Cycnus, which ones slew Hector, and the fearless general of the Ethiopians, Memnon of the bronze armour? Who then wounded noble Telephus with his spear by the banks of Caïcus? One’s mouth proclaims Aegina as their homeland, that illustrious island; ...

Although these questions are not explicitly addressed to the Muse, the verb ἔλα (38) suggests a chariot. As a typical attribute of the Muses, it probably indicates that the addressee is the Muse.45

44 A lot of scholarly work has been conducted on the metaphor of the Muses' chariot, which occurs frequently in Pindar's odes: e.g. Steiner (1986); Asper (1997: 26–39); Nünlist (1998: 255–64); Calame (2012).
45 E.g. Mackie (2003: 52–3) and Race (1997: 179) ad l. 5.38 also state that these questions are addressed to the Muse.
The answer to all four questions is Achilles, as most people in Pindar’s audience familiar with the epic cycle will have known.\textsuperscript{46} The plural forms in the first two questions and in line 43 are significant, as Achilles is only one man. They emphasize Achilles’ exceptional battle qualities, since he has single-handedly accomplished deeds that would normally be the work of many. The narrator mentioned earlier in the ode that Achilles has been a theme for poets (μελέταν ... σοφισταῖς, 28), which means that the narrator, like in \textit{Olympian} 10, poses questions to the Muse about subjects spread by poetry. Unlike them (and those in \textit{P.} 4.67–72 and Bacchylides’ \textit{Ode} 15.47–9), however, the answer is not provided. The narrator only mentions Aegina as the men’s ancestral homeland (43). He presupposes his audience’s foreknowledge of these stories about Achilles so that, although the questions are posed to the Muse, the audience can supply Achilles’ name.\textsuperscript{47}

Another passage that reminds of the epic Muse occurs in \textit{Isthmian} 8, where the narrator tells that the Muses stood beside Achilles’ tomb:

\begin{quote}
(13) Αἴγιναν σφετέραν τε βίζαν πρόφαινεν.

\textit{...} \\

τὸν μὲν οὐδὲ θανόντ᾽ ἀοιδαὶ ἔλιπον,

αλλὰ οἱ παρὰ τὸ πυρὸν τάφον θ᾽ Ἑλικώνιαι παρθένοι

στάν, ἐπὶ δρήνον τε πολύφαμον ἔχεαν.

ἔδοξ᾽ ἡρα καὶ ἀθανάτοις,

ἐσθάλον γε φῶτα καὶ φθίμενον ὕμνοι θεᾶν διδόμεν.

τὸ καὶ νῦν φέρει λόγον, ἐσσυταί τε Μοισαῖον ἅρμα Νικοκλέος

μνᾶμα πυγμάχου κελάδησαι. γεραίρετε νιν, ...
(\textit{I.} 8.55b–62)

\end{quote}

\textit{[Achilles] made famous Aegina and his own descent. Not even when he died did songs abandon him, but the Heliconian maidens stood beside his pyre and his tomb and poured over him their dirge of many voices. Indeed, the immortals too...}

\textsuperscript{46} The questions span the \textit{Cypria}, \textit{Iliad} and \textit{Aethiopis}. See West (2011: 61).

\textsuperscript{47} Cf. Burnett (2005: 96): ‘[the chorus] challenge the listener with questions that force him to supply three battlefield contests to his own inner eye, then cap these with a fourth. Who killed Kyknos? Hektor? Memnon? Who wounded Telephos? the chorus cries, and each time the spectator responds with a silent shout, “Achilles!”’. Cf. p. 242. Burnett (\textit{Ibid.}: 96–8) goes further in saying that the audience, because of their knowledge of older poetry, will remember a different Achilles-killer each time: against Cycnus a young warrior, against Hector a mature one, while against Memnon a warrior that will soon die. The name of Telephus will recall “the victory by which Achilles came of age, the one in which he made his first show of defensive courage, the one that foreshadowed all the deeds of his adult years” (pp. 97–8).
thought it best to entrust a brave man like that, even though dead, to the hymns of the goddesses. That principle holds true now as well, and the Muses' chariot is speeding forward to sing a memorial to the boxer Nicocles. Praise him...

This passage recalls *Od*. 24.58–62, where Agamemnon tells the deceased Achilles that the Nereids and Muses personally attended his funeral and sang dirges (Μοῦσαι δ᾽ ἐννέα πᾶσαι ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ θρήνεον, 61–2).48 Agamemnon was possibly (somewhat metaleptically) 'looking ahead' to Achilles becoming the subject of songs. The narrator in *Isthmian* 8.56 probably also mentions the Muses to refer to Achilles' fame through songs.49

The narrator moves on to the immediate past and present by using καὶ νῦν (61), which Mackie wrote 'is often used in connection with the thought that the athletic victor has renewed the kleos (fame) of his family by replicating the achievements of his ancestors'.50 In this way he connects Achilles, who had obtained immortality from the Muses, i.e. poetry, to Nicocles, the laudandus' deceased cousin, on whom he now bestows immortality. Via Nicocles, the narrator reaches the laudandus Cleandrus in line 65a. This shows that the narrator is drawing a parallel between older poets/their Muses promulgating Achilles' fame and himself, doing the same for Nicocles and Cleandrus.

Finally, the double motivation of the narrator's knowledge was largely implicit in Homer, but, as above, explicit in many lyric poems. The Pindaric narrator, too, depicts the creation of his ode as a result of his joint authorship with the Muse,51 and sometimes he even uses 'we' for himself and the Muse.52 Scholars generally agree that 'I' can be used

---

48 See also the *Aethiopis* quoted in Proclus, *Chrest.* 2.3, PEG p.69. For *Od*. 24.58–62 Tsagalis (2004: 5) argues that *thrēnοι* (contrary to *gοοι*), are 'musical laments, set-dirges sung by non-kin professionals' (emphasis added); so the Muses fulfil the role of professional singers here. He adds that this lament sung by the Muses is particularly appropriate for Achilles, 'as it would certainly give him, even through his loss, greater prestige and glory' (6).

49 Since Pindar seems to refer to the genre of the dirge (*δρῆνεον, 58*) in particular, Nash (1990 [1976]: 13) argues that Pindar here brings together the two genres of *epinikion* and *threnos*, developing Wilamowitz' suggestion that the epinician genre developed from the dirge.


51 Schmid (1998: 159–60) also briefly discusses the 'metaphorical depictions of joint authorship' of the narrator and his Muse.

52 The scholarly debate on Pindar's use of 'we' is vast, and the first-person forms are often connected to the question of whether Pindar's odes were performed by a chorus or by a single singer: Lebkowitz (1988); See, furthermore, e.g. Heath (1988); Davies (1988); Carey (1989); Goldhill (1991: 144–5); Heath and Lebkowitz (1991); Aloni (1998: 163; Bonifazi (2000: 212); Neumann-Hartmann (2005); Eckerman (2011); Currie (2013). Others whom the narrator may include in his 'we's' are: (1) the laudandus (N. 4.37; I. 7.49, for which see Bremer (1999: 49)); (2) people in general, often words like 'mortals' occur in the same sentence (*O*. 2.30–3;
by both a chorus and a solo singer, but ‘we’ does not refer to the singer alone. The frequent use of the singular suggests that a chorus is regarded as a single entity or that each of its members speaks for him- or herself. I will now take a closer look at instances where the narrator uses ‘we’.

The narrator exhorts the Muse to compose a song together with him in *Pythian* 1:

(14) Μοῖσα, καὶ πάρ Δεινομένει κελαδήσαι
πίθεο μοι ποινὰν τεθρίππων· χάρμα δ᾽ οὐκ ἀλλότριον νικαφορία πατέρος.
ἀγ᾽ ἐπείτ᾽ Ἀἴτνας βασιλεῖ φίλιον ἑξεύρωμεν ὑμνὸν ... (P. 1.58–60)
Muse, at the side of Deinomenes too I bid you sing the reward for the four-horse chariot, for a father’s victory is no alien joy. Come then, let us compose a loving hymn for Aetna’s king; ... 

A similar idea occurs in *Olympian* 10:

(15) ὠ Μοῖσ’, ἀλλὰ σὺ καὶ θυγάτηρ
Ἄλαθεια Διός, ὡρᾶ κερὶ
ἐρύκετον ψευδέων ἐνιπὰν ἀλιτόξενον.

ἔκαθεν γὰρ ἐπελθὼν ὁ μέλλων χρόνος
ἐμὸν καταίσχυνε βαθὺ χρέος.
δὲς λύσαι δυνατὸς ὀξεῖαν ἐπιμομφὰν τόκος. ὁράτω νῦν ψᾶφον ἑλισσομέναν
ὅπῃ κῦμα κατακλύσσει ῥέον,
ὅπῃ τε κοινὸν λόγον
φίλαν τείσομεν ἐς χάριν. (O. 10.3–12)
O Muse, but you and Zeus’ daughter, Truth, with a correcting hand ward off from me the charge of harming a guest friend with broken promises. For what was then

---

13.105; P. 3.114; 10.28; N. 4.77). The narrator can also (3) present himself as acting in a celebratory context for a god, identifying himself with the worshipping multitude to which he refers in the plural (e.g. P. 10.69–71; I. 4.61–4). In O. 1.16 the narrator identifies himself with men performing at symposia, and at the opening of *Isthmian* 6 the ode itself is compared to the second libation at a symposium. In both passages the narrator uses the plural.

33 See Calame (1977(1): 436–9). Cf. Lanser (1992: 239–54) for (somewhat comparable) nineteenth century narratives that employ ‘singular communal narrators’, i.e. ‘I’ narrators who narrate from a collective perspective: ‘while the narrators retain the syntax of “first person” narrative, their texts avoid the markers of individuality that characterize personal voice and thereby resist the equation of narrator and protagonist. Rather, the narrator’s identity becomes communal’ (p. 241).
The future has approached from afar and shamed my deep indebtedness. Nevertheless, interest on a debt can absolve one from a bitter reproach. Let him see now: just as a flowing wave washes over a rolling pebble, so shall we pay back a theme of general concern as a friendly favour.

The narrator first asks the Muse and Truth to protect from him the reproach that his ode is late. In line 12 he uses the first-person plural τεσσάρες, indicating that the three of them will pay his debt together. In this way he presents the ode as the result of his collaboration with the Muse and Truth.

It is important to note that the Muses are not the only ones whom the Pindaric narrator includes in his ‘we’ in reference to the ode’s composition. The narrator often addresses his mind or heart (θυμός or ἦτορ), for example:

**16** ἐπεχε νῦν σκοπῷ τόξον, ἄγε θυμέ· τίνα βάλλομεν ἐκ μαλθακᾶς αὐτῆς φρενὸς εὐκλέᾳ διστούς ἱένες; (O. 2.89–90)

*Now aim the bow at the mark, com, my heart. At whom do we shoot, and this time launch from a kindly spirit our arrows of fame?*

The Muses are not mentioned in Olympian 2, and in lines 1–2 the Pindaric narrator chooses to address ‘hymns’ (ὕμνοι), instead of the Muses or other gods: ἀναξιφόρμιγγες ὤμοι, | τίνα θεόν, τίν᾽ ἥρωα, τίνα δ᾽ ἄνδρα κελαδήσομεν; (‘Hymns that rule the lyre, what god, what hero, and what man shall we celebrate?’, 1–2). Both passages indicate that he is

---

54 Contra Verdenius (1988: 61), who states that ‘we’ only designates Pindar. Nassen (1975: 223) and Van Niekerk Viljoen (1955: 44) state that ‘we’ designates Pindar, the Muse and Truth.

55 Cf. Nemean 9.1–10, where the narrator, uses the first-person plural and exhorts the Muses to join him in an imaginary revel (κόμος). Cf. Gianotti (1975: 65); Heath (1988: 190). For the κόμος in Pindar, see e.g. Morgan (1993), and Pavese (1997: 45) for an overview. Differently, the scholia say that ‘we’ designates the chorus. Braswell (1998: 46) states that it designates the poet, chorus, victor, and guests, but also that it is the poet ‘who is speaking in *propria persona*’. See Pavese (1997: 45) for an overview of instances in Pindar and Bacchylides in which the chorus identify with a κόμος.

56 In O. 1.7, too, the narrator refers to himself and his heart in the first-person plural. Other examples in which the narrator addresses his heart or mouth are: O. 9.35–6, N. 3.28–36, and 4.44–5.

57 Alcaeus fr. 3.81–4 V has generated scholarly discussion on a comparable topic. There are striking verbal similarities with these lines and the opening of the *Homerick Hymn to Hermes*, but Alcaeus says that his heart (ἁμαρτάνει) wishes to sing of the addressee Cyllene, while the Homeric Hymn invokes the Muse to sing. This suggests that ‘Alcaeus may be deliberately varying the Homeric model’ (Morrison 2007a: 82) and that he wishes to emphasize his own role in the production of the poem. See Morrison (2007a: 82) for further secondary literature.

58 As Bundy (1972: 68) mentions in passing: the ‘Hymnoi...substitute for the Muse’.
autonomous. Whatever his reason for leaving the Muses out of Olympian 2, the similarities between the phrases illustrate that he is flexible in his depiction of his authorship: he can emphasize either his individual or ‘joint’ authorship with the Muses. In Olympian 7 he does both: he calls his odes both Μοισᾶν δόσιν (‘gift of the Muses’, 7) and γλυκὺν καρπὸν φρενός (‘sweet fruit of the mind’, 8).

Another suggestion of Pindar’s collaboration with his Muses occurs in Nemean 5, where the Muses are said to sing about Hippolyta and Acastus at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. While their role is introduced at the beginning with ‘[The Muses] first sang of august Thetis and Peleus...’ (ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν Πηλέα θ᾽..., 26–7), the end is not capped by a closing remark. As an effect, the Muses and narrator seem to sing together in the next part, perhaps even the rest of the ode,60 and both can be heard as enunciators (an instance of metalepsis).61 What is more, the effect becomes even greater if it is remembered that the chorus (presumably) performed the ode; the effect I that it is the chorus of Muses. Thus there is a double blurring of voices: that of the narrator with the Muses and the chorus performing the ode with the chorus of Muses. Furthermore, it may be that Pindar is playing yet another game: the story of Hippolyta and Acastus of which the Muses sing here was known from Hesiod,62 and arguably the narratees would have noted that Pindar lets the Muses sing a story taken from Hesiod.

59 Young (1968: 84, n. 2); Pfeijffer (1999: 72–3); de Jong (2009: 103–4). Burnett (2005: 70) states that in Nemean 5 the choral narrator assumes the voice of the Muses, and that it is not possible to say where the Muses’ performance ends until Poseidon comes to the fore in line 38. She compares the passages with the mingling of the choral narrator’s voice with those of the choruses set up by the daughters of Proetus in Bacchylides’ Ode 13, for which see e.g. Carey (1999: 20).

60 A similar phenomenon may be found at Bacchylides’ Ode 17.124–32, where the Cean chorus, the performers of the ode, blends with the paean-singing chorus of Athenian youths about whom they sing. See e.g. Maehler (1997: 167–8, 210); (2004: 173); Carey (1999: 20); Wilson (2000: 46, 330 n. 203); Kowalzig (2007: 88–94); de Jong (2009: 103–4).

61 Cf. e.g. Porphyrius, Quaest. Hom. ad Iliad. pertin. p. 93.
2. INTERNAL NARRATORS: AUTOPSY

2.1. Memories of previously shared experiences: Sappho fr. 94

Since the narrative parts of the epinician poems, which make up the largest portion of the narratives in extant lyric, focus on events from the distant past, internal narrators are relatively scarce in lyric. However, they can be found in non-epinician poems. Thus in Sappho fr. 94, where the narrator ‘Sappho’ (she can be identified as such by the fact that she is addressed: Ψάπφι (5)) recounts the departure of another woman (lines 1–11), in the course of which Sappho recollects experiences they shared (embedded narrative, lines 12ff.). The other woman is the narratee in the embedding narrative:

(17) ... τεθνάκην δ’ ἀδόλως θέλω·
      δὲ με ψισδομένα κατελίμπανεν

πόλλα καὶ τόδ’ ἔειπ.[
‘s’ωμ’ ὡς δείνα πεπ[όνθ]αμεν,
Ψάπφι’, ἥ μᾶν σ’ ἀέκοισ’ ἀπυλιμπάνω.’

τὸν δ’ ἔγω τάδ’ ἀμειβόμαι·
‘χαίροισ’ ἔρχεο κάμεθεν
κάλναισ’, οἶδα γάρ ὡς σε πεδήπομεν’

αἰ δὴ μή, ἀλλὰ σ’ ἔγω θέλω
ὁμαίσαι[. . .][. . .][. . .]. οᾶ
. . [ ] καὶ κάλι’ ἐπάσχομεν·

πο[ ] οἷς ῥων
καὶ βρ[όδων] ἱχίων τ’ ὑμοὶ
κα. [. ] πάρ ἔμοι περεδῆκαο
... and honestly I wish I were dead. She was leaving me with many tears and said this:’

‘Oh, what bad luck has been ours,
Sappho, truly I leave you against my will’.

I replied to her thus: ‘Go and fare well
and remember me, for you know how we sought you out;

If not, why then I want to remind you
...and the good times we had.

You put on many wreaths of violets
and ro(ses and crocuses?) and...and
you sat next to me

---

1 Or: she said many things to me and this in particular: πόλλα (3) is either the object of ψισδομένα (2) ‘crying many tears’, or refers to the many things that the girl would have said. Furthermore, τόδ’ (3) could refer back to the first extant line or could introduce the girl’s words that are given in direct speech in the next lines.
καὶ πὸ[λλας ὑπα]θύμιδα 15 and round your tender neck you
πλέκ[ταις ἀμφ’ ἀ]πάλαι δέραι put(?) many woven garlands made
ἀνθέων[.] πεποιμέναις from flowers
καὶ π…[.] μύρωι 20 and…with (much?) flowery perfume,
βρενθείωι[.] πεποημμέναις fit for a queen, you anointed yourself...
ἐξαλείψαο καὶ[ βας]ληίωι
καὶ στρῶμν[αν ἐ]τι μολθάκαν
ἀπάλαν πα[.]..ων
ἐξης πόθο[.] νιθων
κωὔτε τις[.]..τι
ἴρων οὐδ[.]..ν
ἐπλετ’ ὁπ[.]θεν ἀμειβόμαν
καὶ στρῶμας ἐπὶ μολθάκαν
καὶ στρῶμας ἐπὶ μολθάκαν
and on soft beds…you would satisfy
there was neither…(nor?)
your longing (for?) tender...
shrine…from which we were absent,
no grove…(nor dance?)…sound ...

Sappho is an internal narrator in both the embedding and embedded narrative, which is reflected in her frequent use of the first-person singular: in lines 2 (με), 6 (ἔγω τάδ’ ἀμειβόμαν), 7 (χάμεθεν, 7 (direct speech)) in the embedding narrative, and in the embedded narrative in line 14 (ἐμοι). Since, unfortunately, the fragment is not complete – at least one glyconic must have preceded the first surviving line¹ – it is unclear who speaks the ‘I’ of the first extant line, the emotional utterance τεθνάκην δ’ ἀδόλως θέλω: the narrator ‘Sappho’ (speaking in the present of the performance)² or the other woman

¹ Trans. Campbell, slightly adapted.
² See Robbins (1990a: 113–8); (1990b) for a more elaborate discussion.
³ It could also be an utterance by Sappho at the moment of the other woman’s departure. Yet this would imply a sharp contradiction between Sappho’s emotional utterance here and her calming words from line 7 onwards. See Howie (1979: 32–5) for the different possibilities. I would submit that it is also possible that the audience gets no immediate information about the identity of the speaker, as e.g. Herington (1985: 53) notes for other poems.
Lyric (speaking in the past at the moment of her departure). Scholars have provided arguments for both options. Without getting too involved in the details of this complex, and possibly unsolvable issue, Sappho is a more likely candidate since in my view it is not plausible that there is no shift of speaker when a speech introduction is inserted (line 3).

Besides the first-person singular, Sappho and other woman in the embedding narrative also use the first-person plural. The latter’s πεπόνθαμεν (4) refers to Sappho and herself when she expresses her unwillingness to leave Sappho (the combination of the two pronouns ἦ μᾶν σ’ (5) strongly suggests that her ‘we’ indeed refers to the two of them). The narrator ‘Sappho’ responds with first-person plurals πεδήπομεν (8), ἐπάσχομεν (11), and ἀπέσκομεν (26). It has often been noted that the other woman uses the first-person plural of πεπόνθαμεν (4) to refer to Sappho and herself, but Sappho changes the reference group of the ‘we’ forms: her πεδήπομεν has σε (8) as object and accordingly Sappho and other members of their community as subject. So, she broadens the scope of the first-person plurals. This is probably true for ἐπάσχομεν (11) and ἀπέσκομεν (26) as well, since there are no (explicit) signals that the referent has changed. The ‘we’ forms in this poem emphasize the bond between Sappho, her narratee, and the other companions.

Why would Sappho want to emphasize the bond between herself, her narratee, and her other companions? Arguably she includes the whole community as the subject of the ‘we’ forms to console the other woman, since the activities in which they participated are not unique to them, and the other woman will enjoy such activities in her new home.

Lardinois also examines first-person singular and plural forms in Sappho and suggests that this poem is concerned with choral performances, as possibly Sappho (or a

---

1 Speakers often express painful separation from someone in the form of a death-wish: Penelope in Od. 18.201–5, 20.61–82, Anacreon fr. 41, Sappho fr. 95. For death-wishes in Sappho, see Boedeker (1979: 40–52, especially 51–2), focusing on Sappho fr. 95. For Penelope as example for fr. 94, see Larson (2010).
2 For a recent overview of the scholars involved in the discussion and their standpoints, see Larson (2010: 179, n. 10).
3 For Sappho’s emotional state at the moment of utterance, see e.g. Rauk (1989: 115). Rauk has argued that Sappho’s poem is not only concerned with the other woman’s emotional state in the past, but is primarily concerned with the speaker’s (i.e. Sappho’s) own state and emotions in the present, at the moment of utterance.
4 E.g. Wilson, L.H. (1996: 127): ‘as the song progresses, it moves from the intimacy of two protagonists to include all sexually mature members of the circle. (…) The final broken fragments hint at other socio-communal activities such as singing and dancing at shrines and groves (94.24–7) and seem again to include all members of the circle’. By contrast, Blass (1902: 468) argues that this first-person plural refers only to Sappho. He refers to Iliad 13.257, where a first-person plural verb and a first-person singular verb are both used by the same, individual, speaker and only for himself, and to the scholiast’s remarks that this variation is characteristic of Aeolic.
5 For this view see Howie (1979: 326–8).
singer/chorus impersonating her) sang this narrative while a chorus danced. One indication is the first-person plural form of πεδήπομεν (8), referring to Sappho and her companions, who may have formed the chorus. These observations are part of his larger argument that some of Sappho’s poems could well have been performed by a chorus (in the present), an issue that is beyond the scope of the present study. Yet, assuming that ‘we’ always includes others than the narrator him/herself, the ‘we’ forms seem to suggest that Sappho talks about activities in which she, the other woman (as an internal narrator an internal narratee), and their companions all participated.

Although her eyewitness status is sufficient to explain her knowledge, it raises questions about it as a source of knowledge because Sappho and the other woman look back on the past in markedly differently ways. The other woman views it negatively (ὡς ὡς ὄμεν ὦς ἔθεν πεπόνθαμεν, 4), focusing on the immediate past (the moment when they heard about their forthcoming separation), while Sappho tries to comfort her by evoking more joyful memories from the past (καὶ καλ’ ἐπάσχομεν, 11). The two women’s contrasting perspectives show that recollections, especially emotional ones, are eminently subjective. The fact that perspectives on the past (and future) may vary is an important theme in this poem.

2.2. Pindar’s Pythian 1

As mentioned above, the Pindaric narrator is never an internal narrator. Yet in Pythian 1 he uses the phrase τέρας (... θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι, which may remind one of the Homeric θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι (‘a marvel to behold’) and suggest an eyewitness perspective. This ode, celebrating Hieron’s victory in a chariot race, narrates the story of Typhoeus, who is now confined under Mount Etna and shoots up fire:

(18) τέρας μὲν θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι, θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι, οἶον Αἴτνας ἐν μελαμφύλλοις δέδεται κορυφαῖς καὶ πέδῳ, ... (P. 1.26–8)

It is a marvellous wonder to see, and a marvel even to hear of from those present. Such a one is confined within Aetna’s dark and leafy peaks and the plain, ...

---

10 Cf. Boedeker (2012: 24–5), who, in her discussion of the ways in which the Herodotean narrator establishes credibility, also refers to this passage, which ‘demonstrates that evocation of the “same” past depends on subjective variables’ (p. 25).

11 The Homeric parallel has also been noted by Kollmann (1989: 136) ad 26. For the phrase in Homer, see de Jong (2014a [1987]: 48–9.
In _Pythian_ I Mount Etna’s eruptions of lava, which are sent up by the monster Typhoeus, are a marvel to see. Apart from the phrase θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι, visual and auditory details suggest the perspective of an eyewitness. For instance, the narrator mentions the rocks that are hurled down into the sea ‘with a crash’ (σὺν πατάγῳ, 24).

The explanation for his eyewitness perspective is that Mount Etna is present in his here and now (cf. νῦν, 17), i.e. the world outside the ode’s narrative part, and even outside of the ode itself, as τοῦτ᾽ ... δρος (30) suggests. Extra-textual elements are notoriously difficult and problematic in Pindar, since often the exact performance situation(s) are unknown. Yet τοῦτ ... δρος ’may well refer to the (actual) Mount Etna because its (first) performance was almost certainly in the city of Aetna with the volcano visible to the audience. The facts that it is a location within the story-world of the ode, in the ode’s lyric frame and in the field of view from the location of the performance explain the narrator’s eyewitness status.

So the phrase τέρας μὲν θαυμάσιον προσιδέσθαι, θαῦμα δὲ καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι (26) recalls Homer’s θαῦμα ἰδέσθαι for divine phenomena, but the Pindaric narrator uses it to refer to a natural phenomenon.

There is some uncertainty about παρεόντων (26). Some scholars interpret it as a generic genitive absolute: ‘when men are present’ (trans. Gildersleeve). This would mean that it is a marvel not only to see the volcanic streams of Mount Etna (in this case we may even include the narrator and narratees in παρεόντων), but also to hear them. An argument in favour of this interpretation is that the passage is concerned with ‘seeing’ and ‘hearing’ (e.g. σὺν πατάγῳ, 24). Others argue that the genitive depends on ἀκοῦσαι: ‘a wonder even to hear of from those present’ (trans. Race). This interpretation suggests that those who had not seen the eruption would consider it a marvel to hear about from eyewitnesses.

The second interpretation is preferable for several reasons. There is a metrical caesura between δε and καί (26), which makes it plausible that καὶ παρεόντων ἀκοῦσαι is a unity. Moreover, in the second interpretation, the marvellous nature of the volcanic eruptions is emphasized: they are a wonder to see, and even if one has not seen them, they are still a wonder to hear of from others who have seen them. It is logical to add that something can be heard of when one has not seen it, and such a statement is found in other texts.

---
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12 See e.g. Morgan (2015: 139–15) for different possibilities of performance situations.
13 I learn from Currie (2012: 298) that there may well have been heightened volcanic activity in the 470s BCE, as the scholia indicate. This would mean that the audience – indeed – was familiar with Etna’s eruptions.
14 Moreover, Currie (2012: 298) distinguishes no less than five strands in which the location of Aetna is important in this ode (performative, athletic, mythological, geological and political).
15 See Kollmann (1989: 136–7) _ad_ 26 for a brief overview of secondary literature on this issue.
including Odysseus’ compliment to Demodocus (Od. 8.491: ὡς τέ ποι ἢ αὐτὸς παρεὼν ἢ ἄλλου ἀκούσας)\(^7\) and Plato’s *Phaedo* 109d ‘(just as if someone who lives at the bottom of the ocean should never have seen its surface) and should never have heard about it from anyone who has seen it’; μηδὲ ἄλλου ἀκηκοὼς εἴη τοῦ ἑωρακότος.

Morrison, in his book on reperformances of Pindar’s odes, gives a related reason to favour the second interpretation. The phrase is especially relevant for audiences of this ode’s reperformances, who may not be familiar with Mount Etna’s eruptions: ‘Pindar’s poetry has the power to evoke for distant secondary audiences even the magnificence of the flaming lava Typhoeus sends upwards from his prison’.\(^8\) Pindar’s poetry is then one of the ‘sources’ available those who have not seen the volcano erupt.

---

\(^7\) Here, παρεὼν is used for the person who has seen it.

\(^8\) Morrison (2007, 100–1).
3. EXTERNAL NARRATORS APPEALING TO OTHER NARRATORS

While the Muses authenticate the knowledge of the primary narrator in epic, sub-
chapter 2.1 argued that lyric narrators become less dependent on them. The lyric Muses
chiefly compose and disseminate a lyric poem as a whole, rather than only providing
knowledge of the past for its narrative part. Although the lyric Muses differ from Homer’s
in this respect, lyric narrators do seem to have inherited their omniscience from their
Homeric counterpart because the narrator embarks on the narrative without indicating
a source in most lyric poems that contain a narrative. Arguably this unmotivated
omniscience is due to the narrators’ status *qua* chorus or singer, just like the Homeric
primary narrator (in his case aided by the Muses) was elevated above ordinary speakers:
they do not need to explain how they know what they tell.

Sometimes lyric narrators do explain how they know what they tell. As discussed
above, the narrator in Simonides’ *Plataea Elegy* referred to Homer as the one who has
made Achilles famous (see pp. 77–80) and Pindar often draws attention to the
immortalizing power of poetry and the wide distribution of traditional stories. The lyric
narrator’s narrative knowledge, then, often seems to be based on what earlier poetry and
traditional stories have ‘transmitted’. This section examines narrators’ appeals to older
poetry and traditional stories, or more in general, to ‘other narrators’.

It investigates appeals to (anonymous) reported narrators and to poets, both when
they are mentioned at the beginning of narratives and when they are held responsible
for a particular piece of information within a narrative. As in epic, one of the main
questions regarding the function of other narrators is whether they are used as an
authorizing device. When narrators say that they have received information from others,
they may seem to shift the responsibility of the truth of the information away from
themselves. Scholars frequently assume that lyric narrators attribute information to
other narrators in order to indicate that they do not believe it or doubt it.¹ However,
others have suggested that appeals to other narrators generally have an authorizing
function in lyric (‘others say so, and hence it is true’),² like they often have in Homer. It
has also been shown that in historiography that reported narrators can have such an

¹ E.g. Farnell (1961: 259).
² E.g. Schmid (1998: 160): ‘Usually, speeches and explicit focalizations (…) offer a prestigious pedigree for his
(i.e. Pindar’s) version of myths in the public domain, which, as a result, appear not as the product of his
gratuitous originality but rather as common knowledge endorsed by tradition’.
authorizing function and confirm the narrator’s own utterances. Yet others hold an intermediate position that Pindar’s attitude towards other narrators is inconsistent. For instance, he often does not trust information from earlier poets. In addition, the appeals to other narrators in his odes raise broader issues about the narrator’s knowledge of the past. For example, it has been argued that the appeals to reported narrators are intended to show that the Pindaric narrator (like other mortals) lacks certain knowledge about the distant past, and that the distant past is not the epinician poets’ primary province.

The main aim of this section is to examine the function of appeals to other narrators in the narratives of lyric. Since it is mainly concerned with the subject of narrative authority, it distinguishes between instances in which the narrator does not explicitly question the story’s truth (which means that the reported narrators may have an authorizing function; 3.1) and those in which he does (which a priori means that the reported narrators do not have an authorizing function; 3.2). In both sections I include appeals to specific poets/poems and to non-specified, or reported, narrators, who are typically introduced by φασί, λέγουσι, λέγεται, and phrases such as ὡς λόγος and λόγος ἐστι. In 3.3 I discuss the use of the first-person plural by poets when they refer to events from the distant past.

### 3.1. Appeals to other narrators

---

1 Westlake (1977) already leaves this possibility open for Thucydides: ‘while almost all suggest some degree of uncertainty, there may be other shades of meaning which are in some cases equally or more important’ (p. 346); Harrison (2000: 25–30, 248–50) states that by referring to sources Herodotus is asserting that he is critical, and that on some occasions he may report stories that he does not himself believe. Yet it does not necessarily suggest doubt or distance on Herodotus’ part. Gray (2003), on Xenophon, argues that the subject of these citations are mostly eyewitnesses and that the major function of citations is to validate content that the reader might find too great to be believed; de Bakker (unpublished dissertation: 160–78) states that Herodotus also uses informant-speeches to support his ambition to establish historiographical authority; viz. to make claim of adequate research, to present variant versions, for information of the distant past, which he received aurally, or to aggrandize parts of stories; Pelling (2006: 157, n. 59) suggests that the informants indicate that the story is still told by others and therefore deserves more than the narrator’s own validation; cf. Gray (2001) on Thucydides; de Jong (2004c: 108–9) on Herodotus. A rather radical stance towards Herodotus’ dealing with sources has been taken by Fehling (1971).


5 Mackie (2003: 71); cf. e.g. p. 70: ‘turning back ... to those Pindaric passages in which the poet introduces myths with φασί, λέγουσι “they say”, and like expressions, we might conclude that the mythic past is represented in epinician poetry as an area concerning which mortals do not by nature have certain knowledge’.
The following table provides an overview of the appeals to other narrators without doubt or criticism:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poem and line</th>
<th>Words used</th>
<th>Place, function and other remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sappho 58.9 W</td>
<td>ἔφαντο</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sappho 166 PLF</td>
<td>φαίσι</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative (frag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcaeus 42.1 PLF</td>
<td>ώς λόγος</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcaeus 339 PLF</td>
<td>ώς λόγος ἐκ πατέρων δρωφρε</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative (?) (frag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcaeus 343 PLF</td>
<td>φαίσι</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative (frag)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mimnermus 14.2 W</td>
<td>ἐμεῦ προτέρων πεύθομαι, οἳ μὲν ἱδον ...</td>
<td>Introduction of narrative; narrator has information from eyewitnesses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theognis 1287</td>
<td>φασίν</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonides 11.16–7 W</td>
<td>[δς παρ’ ἵστη λοκάμων δέξατο πειρίθω] [ων]</td>
<td>End of mythical narrative; Homer has made Achilles and the Trojan War famous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonides 564 W</td>
<td>ὅτω γάρ Ὄμηρος ἡθὲ Στασίχορος ἄεισε λαοῖς</td>
<td>Homer and Stesichorus have sung about Meleager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simonides 579 W</td>
<td>ἐστὶ τις λόγος</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. O. 2.28</td>
<td>λέγοντι</td>
<td>Reference to the tale of Ino to support gnome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. O. 6.29</td>
<td>λέγεται</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. O. 7.54–5</td>
<td>φαντὶ δ’ ἀνθρώπων παλαίαι</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. O. 9.49</td>
<td>λέγοντι μάν</td>
<td>Specific piece of information within narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. P. 1.52</td>
<td>φαντὶ</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. P. 2.21</td>
<td>φαντὶ</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. P. 3.88</td>
<td>λέγονται</td>
<td>Specific piece of information within narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. P. 6.21</td>
<td>φαντὶ</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. P. 12.17</td>
<td>φαμέν</td>
<td>Specific piece of information within narrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. N. 1.34</td>
<td>λόγον</td>
<td>Introduction of mythical narrative</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The table shows that lyric narrators often appeal to reported narrators anonymously and at the start of a narrative section within their poem. In many lyric narratives, especially outside the Pindaric corpus, they mark the transition to a narrative about someone in the past to whom someone in the present is compared: e.g. Sappho fr. 58 (καὶ γὰρ τὰ τίθωνον ἔφαντο ... 'Tithonus once, the tale was ...'), Mimnermus fr. 14 (οὐ μὲν δὴ κείνου γε καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμὸν | τοῖον ἐμεῦ προτέρων πεύθομαι ... 'Not indeed was that warrior’s might and courageous heart | like this, so have I learned from my forebears...'), Theognis 1287–8 (ἀλλὰ σ’ ἐγὼ τρώσω φεύγοντά με, ὡς ποτέ φασίν | Ἰασίου κούρην ἔδει χάνειν Ἱππομένην ... 'but I will wound you when you flee me, even as they tell that the daughter of Iasius once fled ...'). Thus one function of the appeals to reported narrators is introductory. They signal that the narrator is going to tell a story and draw on the (distant) past for an illustration of the present.

Compared with these non-epinician lyric poets, Pindar generally introduces embedded narratives more smoothly and refrains from indicating a source: relative pronoun + ποτέ + aorist indicative verb (e.g. ‘the gray-coloured adornment of olive, which once (τὰν ποτὲ, 13), Amphitryon’s son brought (ἐνέικεν, 14) from the shady springs of Ister (…’), O. 3.12–4), after which he continues the narrative about Heracles bringing the olive tree to Olympia. When he does indicate a source, he can maintain this construction by replacing for instance, ποτέ by a verbum dicendi (+ inf.): e.g. ἅ τοι Ποσειδάωνι μιχθεῖσα Κρονίῳ λέγεται | παῖδα ἱόπλοκον Εὐάδναν τεκέμεν. (Pitana,) who, they say, lay with Cronus’ son Poseidon and bore a daughter, Euadne of the violet hair. (O. 6.29). It is difficult to
say why he appeals to other narrators in such passages (P. 1.52; 2.21; 6.21; N. 7.84). In this particular passage in Olympian 6, he arguably wanted to indicate that the race that originated with Pitana and Poseidon (the Iamids, named after Iamus, the son of Eudane) is well known from traditional stories; thus it is called πολύκλειτον later in the poem (71).

On the other hand, Pindar’s appeals to other narrators, especially poets, are sometimes more conspicuous. A typical example is found in Nemean 6. Pindar ends the narrative about Achilles by saying that he follows (ἕ πομαι, 54) older poets (παλαιότεροι, 53), who have composed poems about him:

(19) καὶ ταύτα μὲν παλαιότεροι
βδόν ἄμαξιτον εὑρον· ἔπομαι δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ἔξων μελέταν... (N. 6.53–4)
_The older poets found in such deeds as those a highway of song, and I myself follow along, making it my concern;..._

Pindar then turns to the occasion of this ode, the victory of Alcimidas. His mention of this ‘highway of song’ shows that the topic of Achilles is popular among poets, but it also implies that, when someone has performed heroic deeds, those deeds are spread by poets and thus become famous. Thus he underscores the power of poetry to spread stories – and, by extension, also his own ability, _qua_ poet, to make the _laudandus_ famous (57–63). This is new vis-à-vis the Homeric narrator, who does not emphatically place himself in the tradition of earlier poets or singers, but indicates the Muse as source. In the same vein, the Simonidean narrator highly admires Homer in his _Plataea Elegy_ (see pp. 77–80), his knowledge of the story of Achilles and the Trojan War is taken for granted because Homer spread it widely, and he refers to Homer to present himself as his successor. Hence another function of the appeals to other narrators: drawing attention to the narrator’s abilities as poet, who can promulgate someone’s fame.

Parallels occur outside the narrative sections where Pindar merely _refers_ to earlier poets’ narratives. Thus, he may point to the wide distribution of a story about certain events or people by mentioning that poets have written about them:

(20) Νέστορα καὶ Λύκιον Σαρπηδόν’, ἀνθρώπων φάτις,
εξ ἐπέων κελαδενών, τέκτονες οἷα σοφοί
ἀρμοσαν, γινώσκομεν. (P. 3.112–5).
_We know of Nestor and Lycian Sarpedon, still the talk of men, from such echoing verses as wise craftsmen constructed._

---

6 See p. 106 for a possible reason why reported narrators occur in P. 6.21.
Since poets (τέκτονες σοφοί) have spread stories about Nestor and Sarpedon, they have become famous and their exploits are common knowledge. By the first-person plural γινώσκομεν (115), the narrator appeals to the knowledge of people in general, including the audience: ‘we (all) know the story of Nestor’ because of earlier poets. The implication here is, again (like in Nemean 6), that Pindar, as a poet, will do the same for the laudandum.

Outside narratives, Pindar even mentions the older poets by name. Thus in Isthmian 4 he praises Homer for having rehabilitated Ajax. The Greek warriors in Troy had voted to give the armour of Achilles to Odysseus instead of Ajax, but Homer reversed this bad judgement when he ‘made Ajax honoured among mankind’ (ἄλλ’ Ὅμηρός τοι τετίμακεν δι’ ἀνθρώπων, 37). Such a ‘bad judgement’ also needs to be reversed in the case of the laudandum Melissus: his family, the Cleonymidae, it appears, had recently endured losses in war (16–8), and Melissus seems to be contemptible to look at (ὀνοτὸς μὲν ἰδέσθαι, 50). By doing for Melissus what Homer has done for Ajax (cf. προφρόνων Μοισᾶν τύχοιμεν, κεῖνον ἅψαι πυρσὸν ὕμνῳ καὶ Μελίσσῳ, ‘May I find the favour of the Muses to light such a beacon-fire of hymns for Melissus too’ (sc. just like Homer did for Ajax), 43–4), he will make Melissus honoured among mankind. The mention of Homer qua poet serves to draw attention to Pindar’s own abilities as (epinician) poet.

This mention of Homer is illustrative of the phenomenon of narrators naming other poets from the last third of the sixth century, when West wrote that ‘[t]he epics are no longer treated as free-standing records of the past, but as the artistic creations of an individual, to be praised or criticized’. However, Pindar and Bacchylides seldom mention specific poets for narrative authority. In most cases when specific poets are mentioned by name and with an authorizing function for Pindar’s and Bacchylides’ utterances, gnomai are ascribed to them. Although poets are mentioned by name

---

7 These two facts confronted the epinician poet with a ‘challenge’, as Boeke (2004) argues. See this publication for more background information on the Cleonymidae and Pindar’s dealing with it.


9 In Isthmian 6.67 (Ἡσιόδου (…) τοῦτ’ ἔπος), the laudandum’s grandfather Lampon is said to recommend the wise utterance of Hesiod, to work hard, to his sons during their training. The narrator probably alludes to Works and Days 412. In the same vein, the narrator in Pythian 4.277–8 (τών δ’ Ὅμηρος καὶ τόδε (…) βῆμα) recommends the laudandum to take Homer’s wise saying to heart, viz. that a messenger brings honour to every affair. The narrator in Bacchylides’ Ode 5.191–3 (Βοιωτὸς ἀνὴρ τᾷδε φών[ησεν (…)]) ‘Hesiodos’ says that the gnome spoken by Hesiod is important: when the gods favour someone, people favour him too. Scholars have searched for the Hesiodic text to which the narrator refers (See Stenger (2004: 164) for an overview of the scholars involved in the debate and their standpoints), but arguably the narrator only ascribes the
outside narratives, within narratives they mostly remain anonymous (type 'they say'), suggesting mere human report.

At this point, the origins of the stories must be discussed. Sometimes there are indications that the anonymous reported narrators may reflect allusions to specific, well known, and identifiable poems. For example, ἔφαντο in Sappho’s Tithonus poem (58.9) arguably signals an allusion to a specific poem, possibly the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite, in which Tithonus remains a singer even in his old age (237–8). In addition, φαντί in Pythian 6.21, where Cheiron’s advice for Achilles is mentioned, arguably signals an allusion to the Precepts of Cheiron, attributed to Hesiod. This also occurs outside narratives: despite the anonymous form of προτέρων in Pythian 3.80, the Pindaric narrator may signal an allusion to a specific passage, since the προτέρων’s gnome ‘the immortals dispense to men two pains for every blessing’ (81–2) may well refer to Zeus’ division of fortune in Il. 24.527–33. The gnome of course differs from Homer’s in its details, but Pindar’s modification of it may also be camouflaged by προτέρων (see below, pp. 113–5). These narratives are comparable to Homeric narratives in which reported narrators perhaps also allude to a specific, pre-existing poem (see pp. 57–61). This is often found in Hellenistic and Latin poetry, and it is known as the ‘Alexandrian footnote’.

__gnome__ to Hesiod for authority without having a particular text in mind: ‘Hinter diesen Bezügen auf literarische Texte oder auch anonyme Volksweisheit steht die Absicht, die eigene Meinung mit der Autorität der Tradition zu versehen, damit das Publikum geneigt ist, sie als durch die Zeit erprobt zu akzeptieren’, Stenger (2004: 165). Cf. Alcaeus fr. 360, where Aristodemus delivers a gnome (ὡς γὰρ δή ποτ’ Ἀριστόδαμον φαῖσ’ (…) λόγον | ἐηπην) The other gnomai are delivered by unspecific reported narrators (P. 3.81; 7.19), a mythical character, or by the poetic speaker himself (see below, note 17).

So e.g. Hardie (2005: 28); Rawles (2006: 3); de Jong (2010a: 157–60). West (2005: 6, n. 8) notes that ‘Sappho might have known the Homeric Hymn’. I will discuss this poem in more detail below (pp. 121–123).

Possibly the Pindaric narrator in Nemean 1, too, has a specific poem in mind, when he tells about the young Heracles killing the two snakes sent by Hera. Braswell (1992: 57) suggests Pisander’s Herakleia as a possibility. The narrator characterizes the story he tells as ‘ancient’ (ἀρχαῖον, 34), and the addition that this story comes ‘from among the great heights of his excellence’ (ἐν κορυφαῖς ἀρετᾶν μεγάλαις, 34) suggests that he is going to select a story from the large collection of existing tales available to him. Morrison (2007a: 28) states that ‘the fact that Pindar also uses the tale of Herakles strangling the snakes in another poem, Paean 2, suggests that he did expect it to be known to some degree by his audience, while the fact that the earliest representations of this myth in art are contemporary with N. 1 may be evidence that the myth enjoyed fairly widespread popularity at the time Pindar’s ode was first performed’. No older version than Pindar’s has come down to us.

See e.g. Ross (1975: 77–8); Horsfall (1990); Hinds (1998: 1–2).
these occurrences in archaic poetry suggest that this device is in fact much older than ‘Alexandrian times’.\(^9\)

Why would lyric narrators, who sometimes mention the names of poets in their poems, camouflage poets and poems they allude to in narratives by using an unspecified form (‘they say’, etc.)? They may have been exclusively concerned with the content. In effect, when they use mere verbs of saying (e.g., the examples mentioned in the previous section), they do not present themselves as the earlier poet’s successor. Arguably they did not want earlier poets to have such a prominent place in their poem, but they still wanted to allude to them. Furthermore, as mentioned above (pp. 105-6), specific poets are sometimes mentioned in narratives, but seldom in order to create narrative authority. Instead, the narrator diverges from their stories, or criticizes them (see section 3.2 below). It is therefore conceivable that a story becomes especially liable to criticism if it is ascribed to a specific poet (and thus based on his knowledge) rather than presented as common knowledge. The fact that lyric narrators were adopting and expanding the (often brief) φασί-utterances in epic may also provide part of the answer.

From the origins of the story provided by reported narrators, I return to their function. The two discussed above, to introduce a narrative and to style the narrator as the

---

\(^9\) I do not intend to give here an exhaustive overview of Pindar’s allusive techniques, but I note, in addition, that the words spoken by a mythical character often refer to a specific poem as well, in which this speaker plays a role. Thus in *Pythian* 9.94 Pindar is probably alluding to a narrative poem in which the ‘Old man from the Sea’ converses with someone else. West (2011: 53) gives the conversations of Menelaus with Proteus in the *Odyssey*, and of Heracles with Nereus in the *Geryones* as parallels, and notes that Pindar may well have based the gnome on the latter. The narrator uses this strategy in *Olympian* 6 too, when he repeats to the laudandus the words Adrastus supposedly spoke over Amphiaraurus, which may well have been taken from the epic *Thebaid*; even the original hexameter is almost intact. See West (2011: 53). In addition, in *Pythian* 6.19–27 the Pindaric narrator creates authority for the wise lesson ‘honour Zeus above all, but never withhold due honour from your parents’ by tracing it back to the wise centaur Cheiron who taught it to Achilles, and thus integrates the genre of advice poetry and specifically Hesiod’s poem in his own narrative. See Kurke (1990: 88), mentioned by de Jong (2013: 111–2). Most probably the story finds its origins in Hesiod’s *Precepts of Cheiron* (West 2011: 62) and Martin (1984)), to which the narrator may be alluding, an allusion, again, signalled by φαντί (21). Lardinois (1997: 253) also pays attention to speakers who quote a character’s words as if they derive from the poet himself: ‘The ancients (…) had no qualms in identifying gnomai that are spoken by characters in the poem with the voice of Homer and they may have found the basis for this in actual performances of epic poetry’. As examples he mentions Simonides fr. 18 W, where Glaucus’ saying about the generations of men being like leaves (*Il. 6.146*) is attributed to ‘the man of Chios’, Heraclitus fr. A22 D–K/28c* M, who uses the words of Achilles at *Il. 18.107* to blame Homer himself (see Aristotle, *Eth. Eud.* 7.1235a 26–28), and *Pythian* 4.277, where the narrator seems to quote Poseidon’s words at *Il. 15.207* as a Homeric saying. He, furthermore, refers to Teuger, J. (1890). *De Homero in apoptegmatibus usurpato* (PhD diss. Leipzig), which I have not been able to consult.
successor of earlier poets, imply that their information is authoritative. But can reported narrators also have a stronger and more prominent authorizing function?

Narratives supporting gnomai may shed light on the authority of reported narrators, for example that in Olympian 2. In this ode, mythological examples illustrate the gnome that, although time cannot reverse past events, past trouble can be forgotten 'with a fortunate destiny' (λάθα δὲ πάτωσ αὐτοί εὐδαίμονι γένοιτ’ ἄν, 18). Pindar gives the examples of the two daughters of Croesus (Semele and Ino). For the story of Ino, he uses reported narrators: Ino was fortunate after her death, since 'they say that Ino has been granted an immortal life among the sea-dwelling daughters of Nereus for all time' (λέγοντι δ᾿ ἐν καὶ δαλάσσῳ μετὰ κόραις Νήρης ἁλίαις βίοταν ἀφότον ἄφθιτον | ἰνοὶ τετάχθαι τὸν ἠλών ἀμφί χρόνον, 28–30). To understand how it is related to the gnome, one has to remember her past trouble (she once fled with her son Melicertes, was pursued by her husband Athamas, jumped into the sea, and died) but eventually became fortunate (after death, she was adopted among the Nereids). It illustrates the authorizing function of the reported narrators particularly well: the story would be worthless as an illustration of the gnome if the narrator used reported narrators to express doubt about her happy fortune. On the contrary, he uses them to authorize the narrative, and, by extension, the gnome that it illustrates.

Reported narrators also occur in a narrative supporting a gnome in Bacchylides’ Ode 5. It concentrates on a conversation between Heracles and the dead Meleager in the netherworld, illustrating the gnome that no one is fortunate in everything:

(21) ὡλβιος ὑπ’ ὅινα θεός

μοῖραν τε καλῶν ἔπορεν

σὺν τ’ ἐπιζήλῳ τύχῃ

ἀφνών μιστῶν διήγειν-οὗ

γὰρ τις ἐπιχθονίων

πὰν ἀντ’ α’ ἐυδαίμονι ἐφι. 50

| Blessed is the man to whom God has
granted fine achievements as his
portion and the passing of a life of
affluence with enviable fortune; for no
mortal is fortunate in all things. |

55

τ[οιγάρ π] στ’ ἔρειψιπύλαν

παῖδ’ ἄνικ]α]στον λέγουσιν

δοῦναι Δίος] ἁγκυκεραύ

νοῦ δόματα Φερσεφόνας

tοινισφύρου, 16

| Once, they say, the gate-wrecking,
unconquerable son of thunder-flashing
Zeus went down to the house of slender-
ankled Persephone to fetch up to the
light from Hades the jagged-toothed
dog, son of unapproachable Echidna. |

---

15 See Stenger (2004: 121–72) for the relationship between the poem’s narrative and this and other gnomai.
16 I read, with Campbell (1992), τοιγάρ π], instead of Maehler’s τον γάρ π].
The narrative tells how the deceased Meleager recounted his unfortunate fate to Heracles, so it adds force to the *gnome*. In addition, *λέγουσιν* suggests that this story circulated within society, which means that it is well known and belongs to common knowledge. The mention of the broad distribution of the story confers authority on the story itself and on the *gnome*, since it implies that both are widely accepted.

When reported narrators are cited within narratives, they are frequently held responsible for particularly surprising and remarkable, often superlative, claims (e.g. in *O*. 9.49 (the flood of the whole earth); *P*. 3.88 (Peleus and Cadmus have attained the highest happiness of men); 12.17 (Perseus was born from a golden shower); *N*. 3.52 (Heracles as a six-year-old boy performs great deeds); *B*. 5.155 (the only time Heracles cried)). In none of these instances there is any suggestion that the reported narrators’ information is doubted or criticized (in this respect, *B*. 5.155 presents a more complex example, to which I will come back (pp. 116–7)). Therefore, unless the narrator explicitly expresses doubts or critique as he occasionally does (see section 3.2 below), the (unspecific) reported narrators in these cases authorize the almost unbelievable elements of a story.

Comparing these narrative parts with the non-narrative parts of poems, I note that Pindar also occasionally appeals to other speakers to praise the victor.⁷ Thus in *Pythian*...
5 he himself praises Arcesilas (ἐρέω, 108) but also recapitulates what citizens say (λεγόμενον, 108), which increases the authority of his own praise:

(22) λεγόμενον ἐρέω·
κρέσσονα μὲν ἁλικίας
νόον φέρβεται
γλῶσσάν τε. ... (P. 5.108–11) 18
I shall say what has been said [by others]: he cultivates a mind beyond his years, and tongue as well; ...

However, contrary to the odes' narrative parts (with the exception of Olympian 1 (pp. 125–30)), when he praises a victor, the poet explicitly presents himself as the speaker without referring to the words of others, thus drawing attention to his epinician task:

(23) φαμὶ καὶ σὲ τὰν ἀπείρονα δόξαν εὑρεῖν, ... (P. 2.64)
I proclaim that you have won that boundless fame of yours, ...

In the majority of these instances, the Pindaric narrator uses first-person singular verbs, which is an important difference between his odes' narrative part and lyric frame.

At this point we may discuss the argument proposed by Mackie, who, as mentioned above, concluded that by φαμί, λέγοντι and like expressions, ‘the mythic past is represented in epinician as an area concerning which mortals do not by nature have certain knowledge’.19 Of course, there is a major a priori difference between the victory of the laudandus in the immediate past and the story of the distant past, of which eyewitness knowledge would be impossible. In addition, as noted above, there is a

---

18 Cf. I. 2.12–3 (οὐκ ἄγνωτ᾿ ἄείδω | Ἰσθμίαν ἵπποισι νίκα; ‘not unknown is the chariot victory that I sing’). This technique, whereby not only the poet but also other people pronounce the praise of the laudandus, thus ‘objectifying’ this praise, may be compared to that employed in passages like P. 2.18–20 and B. 13.84, where the poet places the praise in the mouth of ‘the maiden of Western Lokroi’ and ‘a proud maiden’ respectively. For this technique, see Maehler (1982(2): 265) ad 13.84, who sees in it a development of the Homeric tis speeches. See Power (2000) for B. 13. Other voices and Pindar’s own go hand in hand (outside a narrative) in Pythian 9, too, where the poetic speaker himself and Cheiron praise the laudandus’ city Cyrene with similar words. Especially the similarities between their description of the land of Libya (lines 6a–8 and 56–8) are striking. The overlap has been discussed by Grethlein (2011: 400), who says that ‘[t]he agreement of Chiron’s words with the authorial (i.e. the Pindaric narrator’s) account demonstrates and verifies the god’s knowledge of the future’. Yet I would stress that the two accounts are bi-directional, and that Cheiron’s words also add force to the narrator’s own.

19 See the introduction to this sub-chapter, p. 101.
difference between the present (i.e. praise) and past (i.e. narrative) with regard to the use of reported narrators. Yet the reported narrators cannot be intended to show that the Pindaric narrator (like other mortals) would lack specific knowledge about the distant past. There are, for example, no indicators of uncertainty. Moreover, the idea that the Pindaric narrator would express his lack of knowledge about the distant past is contradicted by the reported narrators’ authorizing function and the odes in which he himself corrects the information they transmitted. Both are discussed in this section.

Another example in which reported narrators create authority is Mimnermus fr. 14, in which the narrator appeals to earlier men (προτέρων), whose witnessing of the events increases their authority. He learned from them about a warrior who fought against the Lydians in a previous generation, whom he juxtaposes with a lesser warrior in the present:

(24) οὐ μὲν δὴ κείνου γε μένος καὶ ἀγήνορα θυμὸν
τοῖον ἐμεῖς προτέρων πεύθομαι, οἱ μὲν ἔδω
Λυδῶν ἱππομάχων πυκνὰς κλονέοντα φάλαγγας
"Ερμιόν δὲ πεθίον, φώτα φερεμμελήν (Mimn. 14.1–4 W)

Not indeed was that warrior’s might and courageous heart
like this, so have I learned from my forebears, who saw him
throwing into confusion the serried squadrons of Lydian cavalymen
across the plain of the Hermus, a man wielding an ashen spear.\(^{29}\)

The contrast seems to be modelled on that between Diomedes and his father Tydeus in Agamemnon’s speech in \textit{Iliad} 4 (see pp. 57–9), especially since both narrators seem to base their knowledge on what eyewitnesses transmitted.

However, Meineke proposed that ὅς should be ὅς (2), and Grethlein recently adopted and defended this.\(^{29}\) This ὅς would refer to the narrator, ‘I’, and ἔδω would be the first-person singular rather than the third-person plural, with the narrator as the subject and thus eyewitness of the events he relates:

\(^{29}\) Trans. Bowie. For the double accusative of the object of perception in combination with πεύθωμαι see e.g. Hdt. 5.15.

\(^{29}\) I print the text and translation of Grethlein (2010: 64–5). Grethlein (2007: 104) does not print the new text (his proposal), but writes: ‘Meineke writes: \textit{fortasse Mimnermus scripsaret ὅς μὲν ἔδω}, which he accepts. I assume that ὅς is a misprint for ἔδω. I do not understand Bowie (2010: 59): “Recently, however, Grethlein has suggested that the relative pronoun in line 2, ὅς, “who” (plural) should be emended to ὅς, “when”. First, ὅς is not plural; secondly, the text usually has ὅς (which – indeed – is plural) not ὅς. If Grethlein did meant ὅς, this would not affect my argument.'
Now the narrator would praise a contemporary soldier by juxtaposing him with past, epic, soldiers. As such, the epic model would be inverted: not only would the narrator ‘Mimnermus’ reverse the comparison of generations, he would also claim to have seen the hero, which may be interpreted as a reaction to Agamemnon’s remark in the Iliad that he has not seen Tydeus. Grethlein argues that προτέρων refers to epic poetry because of the allusion to Homer, and he states that the idea is that Mimnermus even surpasses Homer: ‘Mimnermus’ bases his information on his eyewitness knowledge, whereas the Homeric narrator has only heard his story from the Muses. If this were true, the narrator would not only claim to have eyewitness authority contrary to Agamemnon but also, as Grethlein argues, contrary to the Homeric primary narrator.

However, this cannot be the case. Instead, in passages that involve the narrator’s (direct) perception, he usually refers to a person he has seen with ὅδε or οὗτος, rarely with the demonstrative pronoun ἐκεῖνος.23 Although ἐκεῖνος is not used in the clause dependent on ἴδον in the poem, the anonymous hero is nonetheless referred to by κείνου (1), which implies that the narrator has not seen him with his own eyes. Therefore, οἵ must be retained (2).

So, in some instances, a narrator’s appeal to other speakers has an authorizing function: it suggests that he is going to tell a (traditional) story, which existed in this form before the current poem was composed. In some poems this suggestion of an old, pre-existing, story does not seem to correspond with reality.24 A good example is Nemean 3. It is a recurrent theme in Pindar’s odes that the victory of a laudandus ‘proves’ that he possesses the same talents as his ancestors, and that he has confirmed the innate excellence of his clan or even surpassed it.25 In Nemean 3, a story (ἔπος, 52) of earlier poets (προτέρων) is cited to validate his claims about the miraculous speed of the young Achilles:26

(26) τὸν ἑθάμβεον Ἀρτεμίς τε καὶ θρασεῖ’ Ἀθάνα,
External narrators appealing to other narrators

κτείνοντ᾽ ἐλάφους ἄνευ κυνῶν δολίων θ᾽ ἑρκέων·
ποσὶ γὰρ κράτεσκε. λεγόμενον δὲ τούτο προτέρων
ἐπος ἔχω· (N. 3.50–3).

Artemis and bold Athena marvelled to see him slaying deer without dogs or deceitful nets, for he overtook them on foot. I have this story as it was told by former poets.

Farnell states that the reference to earlier authorities is made ‘in apology for his statement of the boy’s miraculous fleetness’ (which implies that Pindar does not believe it). Yet while the speed indeed seems to be the reason why the narrator refers to older poets, it seems more likely that the earlier authorities support the story and emphasize the boy Achilles’ excellence and the wondrous nature of his accomplishments.

Yet who are meant by προτέρων? Perhaps epic poets, which is suggested by the story’s main character Achilles. However, while Achilles’ extraordinary running skills were well known since Homer, no earlier version of this story of the young Achilles is known to us. Here, Pindar may be using his usual strategy of alluding to older poetry to authorize a story that he himself had newly invented.

In the ode currently under discussion, Nemean 3, this has a special effect. Homer stated that Achilles, as an adult warrior, killed and outran (human) enemies. Pfeijffer has shown that the narrator employs a vocabulary that is highly reminiscent of epic diction in Nemean 3, for example using a verb for slaying beasts (κτείνοντ᾽, 51) that is also used for killing men. The passage thus suggests that Achilles’ accomplishments as a child are the same as his accomplishments in war. His youth thus prefigures his warlike actions in the Trojan War, narrated in the Iliad. This is important for the theme of the innate excellence of the laudandus’ clan (cf. 40–2, 64), which seems to be constant: the warlike qualities of the adult Achilles were already present when he was a young boy and therefore must have been inborn.

---

27 Farnell (1961: 259) ad 52, emphasis added.
28 Pfeijffer (1999: 335); we only now from the Iliad that the young Achilles was taught by Cheiron (II. 11.831–2).
29 Cf. LSJ sub κτείνω A: ‘usu. of men, less freq. of slaying an animal’, although I should add that in more than half of the instances of the verb mentioned by Slater’s lexicon (sub κτείνω), animals are killed instead of men (men: O. 2.38; 7.29; Paean 6.119; animals: P. 4. 249 (snake); N. 1.62 (said of Heracles slaying beasts); 3.51 (passage under discussion here); I. 6.48 (Heracles slayed the Nemean lion)).
In the same vein, the supposedly ‘old tale’ (ἀρχαῖον ... λόγον, 34) in Nemean 1 about the young Heracles killing snakes arguably contains Pindar’s own innovations. This reveals the authorizing function of reported narrators well, since Pindar uses them to embed a newly invented story into the tradition. Likewise, in Olympian 6.29, the Pindaric narrator deftly introduces a new component of the story of the Iamids by λέγεται in order to enhance its authority. In addition, although φαντὶ in Isthmian 8.46 suggests that the story of the marriage of Peleus and Thetis is known from tradition, it may in fact contain elements that Pindar invented, such as Themis’ lengthy speech. In these passages, Pindar exploits the device of the reported narrators to camouflage the fact that he has adapted or invented a story (or details of a story).

A similar and especially instructive case is presented by Olympian 7. The narrator recounts the coming into existence of the island of Rhodes after he has related in reverse chronological order the colonization by Tlapolemus and the institution of fireless sacrifices for Athena:

(27) φαντὶ δ’ ἄνθρώπων παλαιὰν

ρήσιες, οὕτω, ὅτε χθόνα δατέοντο Ζεὺς τε καὶ ἄθανατοι,

φανερὰν ἐν πελάγαι Ῥόδον ἔμμεν ποντίῳ, … (O. 7.54–6).

The ancient reports of men tell that when Zeus and the immortals were apportioning the earth, Rhodes had not yet appeared in the expanse of the sea, ....

The narrator goes on to explain that Helios was absent from the allotment and therefore asked to have Rhodes when it would rise from the sea. Helios then laid with the Nymph Rhodes, and three of their grandsons bore the name of Rhodian cities. Scholars suggest that this narrative is in fact not an ‘ancient report’, but a new one, fabricated by Pindar. Others argue that the narrative is not entirely new. First, there are references to the division of the world among the gods that had been known from the Iliad. Furthermore, according to Hellenistic antiquarian record, the Telchines settled the island and moved to other countries when it sank. Helios eventually dried the island with his beams and laid with the Nymph Rhodes, who gave the island its new name. Although this story is often regarded as Hellenistic, Kowalzig argues convincingly that it was part of an older tradition, which Olympian 7 alludes to. This is, for example, suggested by the narrator’s

---

31 See e.g. Pfeijffer (2004: 222).  
33 See e.g. Burnett (2005: 115).  
34 E.g. Young (1968: 87); Verdenius (1987: 74); Pfeijffer (2004: 221–2), who refers to this passage as his first example of reported narrators that disguise innovation.  
35 Il. 15.89–93, where Poseidon speaks.  
use of the word ὀξεῖάς (70) to refer to Helios’ sharp-piercing rays, which possibly alludes to his drying of the island. Also, Kowalzig suggests that Helios may have had a cult on the island before Pindar composed this ode. Although she assumes that with φαντὶ δάνηρῶποι παλαιι | ῥήσιες (54–5) Pindar indeed refers to actual, pre-existing stories, it may be more accurate to speak of this ode’s narrative as a newly invented combination of traditional elements. The fact that they many of the story’s elements have been well known before Pindar’s ode gives his account authority, and the new combination derives authority from the reported narrators. Such a mixture of old and new is, in my view, typical of Pindar’s poetic style, where often (allegedly) old accounts about the distant past are newly combined and/or modified in order to praise the laudandus in the present.

In Isthmian 8, the narrator indicates again (like in Nemean 3; see above, pp. 112–3) that poets have spread stories about Achilles’ ‘youthful excellence’:

(28) καὶ νεαρὰν ἔδειξαν σοφῶν στόματ’ ἀπείροισιν ἀρετὰν Ἀχιλέος·
   Zeus and the other gods agreed with the marriage of Peleus and Thetis) and the
   mouths of wise poets have revealed Achilles’ youthful excellence to those unaware
   of it.

As mentioned above, no poem about the young Achilles is known to us. And although there is no consensus about the year of the first performance of Nemean 3, it was in all probability later than the premiere of Isthmian 8, which excludes the possibility that Pindar is alluding to his own poem here. Why then, does the narrator refer to poetry about the young Achilles? I submit that Pindar suggests that poetry about the young Achilles exists because the laudandus Cleandrus was presumably young (see e.g. lines 65b–70). The narrator projects Cleandrus’ youth upon Achilles, and suggests that, as other poets made the young Achilles famous, Pindar will make Cleandrus famous. Furthermore, Pindar seems to imply that when Cleandrus will perform deeds as great as Achilles’ when he is older.

In the examples above of narrators appealing to other narrators to verify their stories with the implication that they are pre-existing, it is highly unlikely that the primary narratees (i.e. the audience) were supposed to ‘correct’ the version of the story told by the poet, for example with their knowledge of other versions. On the contrary, if they remembered (contradictory) older versions, the poet could presumably count on their
flexibility and willingness to accept his modifications. A poet, then, could carefully select the events he wanted to tell in his poem and innovate details.

However, in two poems (Bacchylides’ Ode 5 and Alcaeus fr. 42) there may be evidence that the poet assumes the audience to have foreknowledge of the events he recounts and that the context exhorts them to remember the wider ramifications of the stories.

I begin with the reported narrators in Bacchylides’ Ode 5. After listening to Meleager’s story, Heracles laments Meleager’s unfortunate fate and acknowledges that it is best for men never to be born. Heracles asks Meleager if he has any sisters he could marry, whereupon Meleager suggests Deianeira. Again, the reported narrators are quoted in line 155 (they been mentioned in line 57 at the beginning of the narrative, see pp. 108-9), introducing the claim that this was the only time the hero Heracles, ‘fearless in battle’ (ἀδεισιβόαν, 155), cried:

(29) φασὶν ἀδεισιβόαν
Άμφιτρώωνος παῖΔα μοῦνον δὴ τότε
τέγξαι βλέφαρον, ταλαπενήδεος
πότινον οὐκετίροντα φωΤός·
καὶ νιν ἀμείβομενος
τάδ’ ἔριν. “Θανατοῖσι μὴ φύναι φέριστον
(30) μὴ’ ἄελιον προσιδεῖν
φέγγος· ἀλλ’ ὦ γάρ τίς ἐστιν
πράξις τάδε μυρόμενος,
χρῆ κεῖνο λέγειν ὅτι καὶ μέλλει τελεῖν.
ἡρὰ τις ἐν μεγάροις
Οἰνῆος ἀρηϊφίλου
ἔστιν ἀδμήτα θυγάτρων,
σοὶ φυὰν ἀλιγκία;
τὰν κεν λιπαρὰν
〈ἐ〉θέλων ἕτειμαν ἅκοιτιν.”
(Β. 5.155–70)

They say that the son of
Amphitryon, fearless of the
battle-cry, shed tears then and
only then, pitying the fate of the
grief-suffering man. And in
answer to him spoke thus: ‘Best
for mortals never to be born,
ever to set eyes on the sun’s
light. But since there is nothing to
be achieved by weeping over it,
one should speak rather of what
he means to accomplish. Is there
in the place of Oeneus, dear to
Ares, an unwedded daughter, like
you in your stature? I should
willingly make her my radiant
wife.’

37 Cf. van Erp Taalman Kip (1993), who devotes a chapter to the issue of the audience’s foreknowledge in the
case of tragedy. She concludes that while the audience was acquainted with the story material and the
tragic poets sometimes appealed to their foreknowledge, if a poet did not invite the audience to take any
information from outside the play into account, he could be fairly sure that they did not do so.
As mentioned above (p. 108-9), the narrative of Meleager illustrates the *gnome* that no one is fortunate in everything (50–5). Yet there is more. It is well known, but not stated here, that Heracles will eventually die by the hands of his wife Deianeira. It is noteworthy that, in this respect, Heracles’ fate parallels Meleager’s and also illustrates the *gnome*. Heracles actually sets his own death in motion *at this very moment* in the ode, when he asks Meleager if he has a sister he could marry. Deianeira’s name (173) alone is already sufficient to signal the ominous allusion. This conversation, then, is not the only occasion when Heracles shed tears, and the reported narrators’ claim that Heracles wept only once can be supplemented (even corrected) by the narratees, who can imagine that he would weep at least once more. In this particular narrative, *φασίν* (155) exhorts the primary narratees to remember the wider ramifications of this story, giving it a particularly poignant effect. It is important to mention that the exhortation of the narratees to use their foreknowledge to supplement or correct information is not suggested by *φασίν* alone but rather by its context.

To sum up, Bacchylides’ *Ode* 5 demonstrates that, while poets normally do not assume that the primary narratees will use their foreknowledge, sometimes the context can exhort them to use it to supplement the narrative.

Some hundred years earlier, a particularly complex instance of reported narrators in the opening of Alcaeus fr. 42 is introduced by ὡς λόγος:

(30) ὡς λόγος, κάικοι δὴ
Περράμῳ καὶ παῖσι
ἐκ σέθεν πίκρον, πῦρ
Ἴλιον ἱραν. (Alc. 42 PLF, 1–4)

*As the story goes, [because of] evil [deeds] … for Priam and his sons from you, …, bitter …, with fire … holy Ilium (acc).*

The poem mentions Helen (she is probably addressed in lines 2–3), who caused much grief for the Trojans. After these introductory lines, her alliance with Paris and the

---

38 This ode’s allusion to Heracles’ death caused by Deianeira is well known and has been discussed by many scholars, e.g. Lefkowitz (1969: 86–7); Burnett (1985: 146–7); Roberts (1997: 259–62). See e.g. Stenger (2004: 154–7) for the view that the audience will not only remember Heracles’ death, but also his apotheosis: in this respect he also parallels Meleager.

39 Differently, Cairns (2004: 240–1) *ad 156–7* suggests that ’B.’s phrasing allows the interpretation that Heracles never wept again for *another’s* suffering (157–8); the next time he weeps may be on *his own* account; emphasis added.

40 Suppl. Page.
disasters it caused for the Trojans is opposed to the marriage of Thetis and Peleus (οὐ τεσσάρων..., 5).

Like in the poems discussed above, ὡς λόγος implies that the story the narrator is going to tell is pre-existing. However, this poem has caused some uneasiness among scholars, since the comparison would imply that both couples enjoyed good fortune but other versions hold that Thetis and Peleus had a very unfortunate relationship with negative consequences. Thetis was, for example, known for her attempt to escape the wooing of Peleus (by turning into a lion, a snake, and other monsters) and leaving Peleus’ house for her father’s immediately after giving birth to Achilles. This presents a quandary: is it plausible that Alcaeus’ audience knew and remembered these other versions? Maybe they remembered that the judgement of Paris, to which the marriage of Thetis and Peleus had led, was as much the cause of the Trojan War as Helen. Or perhaps they thought of Thetis’ and Peleus’ son Achilles as being responsible for as many victims as Helen. In addition, although the narrative suggests otherwise, according to other versions, the gods only – reluctantly – approved Thetis’ marriage to the mortal Peleus and attended their wedding out of fear for Themis’ prophecy that her son would become greater than his father. Furthermore, the mention of Achilles, at the narrative’s end, draws on and depends on tradition for its meaning: his death, for example, is not mentioned in the poem, but he, too, died in the Trojan War. In effect, ξάνθαν (14) arguably recalls Achilles’ famous horses in the Iliad who predict his death (Il. 19.404–24), one of whom is called Xanthus. In short, scholars continue to debate whether the audience should remember the wider ramifications and contradictory versions of the story of Thetis and Peleus in this poem.

---

41 According to the scholiast (T) at Il. 18.434(a), post-Homeric authors (ὁ νεώτεροι) spoke about Thetis’ metamorphoses, in line with Thetis’ remark in the Iliad that she endured the bed of Peleus against her will. So e.g. in Apollodorus Bibl. 3.13.5; frequent in iconography too.

42 See e.g. Blondell (2010: 356). In Il. 1.357–8, 18.35–6 and in the Cypria, Thetis lives with her father. Difficulties arise from the fact that in Homer, the nature of Thetis’ and Peleus’ marriage is ambiguous: there is no suggestion that Thetis left Peleus, or was not a ‘normal’ wife in Il. 16.574, 18.59–60, 332–2.

43 As for example the scholiast (D) on Il. 1.5 writes, Zeus, wanting to relieve the Earth from the burden of the large multitude of people living upon it, executed the plan of Blame (Μώμος), which consisted of the birth of a beautiful woman and the marriage of Thetis to a mortal man: ἐξ ὧν ἀμφοτέρων πόλεμος Ἕλλησί τε καὶ βαρβάροις ἐγένετο. The scholiast adds that this story is found in the Cypria.

44 For the history and different versions of the story of Peleus and Thetis, see Lesky (1956).

45 See Blondell (2010: 358–9).

46 Davies (1986) argues that the audience should not have remembered the details of the myths that are left out, while Caprioli (2012: 29–31) states that the audience will have remembered the wider ramifications of the story of Achilles, but not of that of Thetis. Blondell (2010: 356), too, assumes that the audience will have
The question of whether the audience had to use their (contradictory) prior knowledge would be easier to answer if we knew what Alcaeus wanted to illustrate by this narrative. We do not know this, as it is not made clear in the poem’s introduction. The fragment starts with ὠς λόγος, which is an abrupt opening. It is not easy to find a parallel for ὠς λόγος to begin a poem, since, as mentioned above, reported narrators customarily occur at a point of transition to a narrative section within a poem. Here, it has generated much scholarly debate on the question of whether it is the beginning of the poem or whether the fragment as we have it is incomplete.

Perhaps the problem of the abrupt opening might help solve the issue of the story of Thetis in the poem. Caprioli’s interpretation is that the poem as we have it is complete, but that it was a skolion and sung in succession to another poem: each singer had to take over the skolion from another guest. Each singer tried to outdo the previous and would have picked up where he had left off. Alcaeus fr. 42, then, may be intended to answer and counter a former poem while leaving room for discussion in a future poem.

The issue of performance is beyond the scope of this research. However, there are narrative indications that the poem may well have been part of a sympotic chain, which may shed light not only on the story of Thetis, but also on the function of ὠς λόγος. It is noteworthy that the narrator seems to start his narrative by denoting distance in time and place: ὠς λόγος (1) and [ποτ᾿] (2, according to Page’s supplement: ποτ᾿, Ὦλεν ἦλθεν) signal that he is going to relate a story from the mythical past. However, in lines 2–3 he probably apostrophizes Helen: [*Ωλεν*] (2) and ἐκ σέθεν (3). An apostrophe is perhaps remembered the wider ramifications of the story of Thetis, but she states that these ramifications are not contradictory to the events that are narrated in the poem: Thetis’ unwillingness to marry Peleus only proves her chastity, and it is better for a woman to leave her husband for the palace of her father (like Thetis did) than for another man (like Helen did).


Caprioli (2012: 32–8). Caprioli develops a suggestion made earlier by Jurenka (1994: 229). I should add that I do not agree with everything she argues, but this is irrelevant for my argument now.

For the skolion see Athenaeus 14.694b; Reitzenstein (1893); Harvey (1955: 162–3); Bowie (1986); Griffith (1991: 192–3). For other secondary literature on the skolion, see Caprioli (2012: 35, n.3 8). See, furthermore, for the sympotic context of fr. 42 Page (1955: 280, n. 1); Rösler (1980: 221); Vetta (1984: 486–7).

Although we do not read her name in line 2 of the extant fragment, it is plausible that Helen is apostrophized here, based on the second-person pronoun σέθεν (3) and on the strong possibility that she is mentioned in line 15. See Caprioli (2012: 28, n. i8) for the history of this reading. Differently, Pallantza (2005: 28) argues that not Helen, but Paris is addressed. One of the main arguments against adopting this interpretation is that the ring composition falls away if Paris is addressed.

At the end of Alcaeus’ poem Helen is referred to in the third person, if the reconstructed text is correct: ‘for
the clearest example of metalepsis in ancient Greek poetry: it breaks the boundaries between the here-and-now and a person from the past. This apostrophe collapses the distance in time and space between the poem’s performance and the Trojan War, which was explicitly established by ὠς λόγος, and places the narrator and Helen in a hybrid position between that past and present. Because of ὠς λόγος, it is as though the narrator invites Helen to reminisce with him, and with the benefit of hindsight, about her actions.

The parallels of an apostrophe in combination with a reference to tradition (in other words, of a mythical character being confronted with stories existing in the human world about him/her) are telling: for example, Stesichorus’ Palinode (ⲟὐκ ἔστ᾽ ἔτυμος λόγος οὗτος, οὐδ᾽ ἐβας..., fr. 91a) and Pindar’s Olympian 1 (ὡς Τανάκλου, σὲ δ’, ἀντία προτέρων, φθέγξομαι..., 28–36). Alcaeus’ poem differs from those passages in that he does not openly reject a story. In the collection of skolia transmitted by Athenaeus (Deipn. 14.695c), we come across passages in which hearsay and apostrophe are combined too, for example:

(31) παῖ Τελαμῶνος, Αἶαν αἰχμητά, λέγουσί σε
ἐς Τροίαν ἄριστον ἐλθεῖν Δαναῶν μετ᾽ Ἀχιλλέα (898 PMG)
Child of Telamon, Ajax the spearsman – they say that, after Achilles, you were the best of the Danaans who went to Troy.

This passage does not seem to reject an existing version of a story, but a subsequent poem reacts to this one. It is significant that apostrophe and references to hearsay are typically combined in poems in which, to put it more generally, the narrator reflects – and/or invites his narratees to reflect – on the veracity and appropriateness of a certain story or the reputation of a mythical character. The occurrence of both an apostrophe

---

52 De Jong (2009: 94); forthcoming.
53 Blondell (2010: 353) gives another effect of the apostrophe, saying that it ‘enables the poet to make Helen notionally present at the all-male symposium without giving her a voice, or even a face (which in her case is equally important). Since she is, in fact, neither present nor attainable as an object of desire, she can be conjured by the male imagination without her supreme beauty posing any threat’.
54 I will discuss Olympian 1 further on (pp. 125–30).
56 Trans. Olson (2007), slightly adapted.
57 The next skolion has been transmitted by Athenaeus too, and changes the statement of who was the best into who was the first (Teleman first went to Troy, and then Ajax).
and reported narrators is another argument for the hypothesis that Alcaeus fr. 42, too, may well have been part of a chain of poems, reacting to each other.

I tentatively conclude from these observations that the narrator ‘Alcaeus’ allows (or perhaps invites) his narratees to use their foreknowledge to ‘correct’ and complement his version of Thetis’ story. What is, then, the function of the phrase ώς λόγος? In the first place, it signals that the poem is about mythological subject matter (the introductory function of reported narrators, mentioned above at p. 103). This could be functional because other poems performed at the symposium may not have been mythological. Furthermore, the narrator uses ώς λόγος to create authority for his version of the story, suggesting that it is the consensus. However, this does not mean that Alcaeus does not allow room for discussion at a higher level, and ώς λόγος may be an invitation for others to think about the appropriateness of Thetis as Helen’s foil in the poem. In other words, together with the ‘you’ form it exhorts the symposiasts to delve into mythical stories and to come up with a counterexample.

Finally, I turn to Sappho fr. 58, to which I will refer as the ‘Tithonus poem’. In this poem, the narrator ‘Sappho’ reminisces about her lost youth, which parallels Tithonus’ lost youth after Dawn fell in love with him, carried him off into the past, and he grew old. As such, it is an example of reported narrators having an introductory function, signalling that the narrator turns to someone in the past for a comparison with someone in the present:

(32) καὶ γάρ τις Τίθωνον ἐφαντο βροδόπαχυν Ἀὔων
 ἔρωι φ. ἀθανάτον ἄκοιτιν.

This poem forms a special case amongst those with reported narrators. While table 3.1 shows that almost all reported narratives are introduced in the present tense (‘they say...’), Sappho uses the imperfect tense of a verb of saying (ἔφαντο, 9). The possibility that ἔφαντο signals an allusion to the Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite (see p. 106) does not
explain this, each solution that scholars have proposed is problematic, and there is no consensus about its implications.59

Instances of a verb of saying in the past tense introducing a narrative are rare. Agamemnon in Iliad 4 uses the past tense (ὡς φάσαν, Il. 4.374;) to refer to specific persons in the past, namely the eyewitnesses who were his informants (Chapter 1 (pp. 57–9)). The present tense of e.g. φασί, in contrast, often indicates that the story is currently circulating within society and belongs to common knowledge. However, no specific people in the past are the subject of ἔφαντο in the Tithonus poem. ἐπευθόμεθα (Il. 9.524), in Phoenix’ narrative about Meleager, is not a verbum dicendi although it still refers to other speakers in a past tense. Both Phoenix and ‘Sappho’ are old narrators looking back at a time that may seem far away (cf. πάλαι οὔ τι νέον γε, Il. 9.527), so refer to it in the past tense (because they remember it being told in the past). Regardless, their old age, in my opinion, is insufficient to account for the imperfect tense of ἔφαντο. Occasionally, Herodotus60 and Thucydides also use the past tense of verba dicendi. Westlake examines the instances in Thucydides and distinguishes between source indications in the past tense (‘report or rumour current at the time [of the event]’) and present (‘information … in circulation when he (i.e. Thucydides) was collecting material’).61 However, he notes that ‘there does not, however, seem to be much significance in his (i.e. Thucydides’) choice of tense, and it is seldom clear why he prefers the present to the past or vice versa’; he adds that Xenophon’s practice in the Hellenica is similar.

The problem is difficult, but I (tentatively) suggest that the handling of time in the Tithonus poem as a whole may shed light on the choice of the past tense of ἔφαντο. Stehle examined this handling, concluding that Sappho tends to blur past and present in her poems but that temporal markers are more prominent in the Tithonus poem.62 Because the narrator’s references to her lost youth are marked by two instances of ποτα (11 and 14) and to Tithonus’ lost youth is marked by ποτα (17), Stehle notes that ‘the resonance among the adverbs suggests that Sappho’s youth parallels Tithonus’ youthful beauty

---

59 Thus, Edmunds (2006) argues that the imperfect can be understood as continuing the contrast between the past and present, viz.: ‘(1) what Sappho used to hear about old age but did not grasp’ with (2) what she now understands about old age in general, or (i) what she used to hear and thought that she understood, with (2) her present, contrasting view of her own old age’ (emphasis in the original). I agree that the past tense of ἔφαντο may well be related to the opposition between past and present. Yet Edmunds’ interpretation is not completely satisfactory, since it leads to the question of why Sappho in first instance did not understand old age. Other interpretations have been offered by e.g. Gronewald-Daniel (2004), who read ποτα (9) with ἔφαντο (9): ‘once they said that…’, and Di Benedetto (2004), but these interpretations are not without difficulties either. See for a discussion e.g. de Jong (2010a: 156–7).

60 See de Jong (2010a: 159), who refers to Hdt. 2.20.

61 Westlake (1977: 349).

when Dawn fell in love with him’. The effect is that Sappho’s youth seems so long ago that it almost belongs to the distant, mythical past, and that ποτα gives Sappho’s own youth a ‘mythic quality’. In other words, Sappho’s past is made equal to Tithonus’ past, and by ποτα Sappho melds the myth of the young Tithonus with the memory of her own youth. In my view, the effect of this ‘melting’ is that Sappho’s youth seems long ago. By making Tithonus’ present and past equal to hers, Sappho separates her youth from the present, now she is old.

Could this ‘melting’ together of Sappho’s and Tithonus’ pasts be related to the past tense of ἔφαντο? I begin by noting that Tithonus’ story is related in two different clauses. The first (about his youth in the distant past) is dependent on ἔφαντο, but then the indirect speech construction is abandoned: the sentence that tells about the present (his old age) has an indicative verb (ἔμαρψε (11)). In itself such giving up of an indirect speech construction is not conspicuous; it is for example regular procedure in Homer, and there is no suggestion that the story of Tithonus would not be – in its totality – a traditional story. However, the two clauses on Tithonus’ youth and old age respectively are strongly separated by the particle ἀλλ’ (11), which makes the change in construction more significant. The effect of dropping the indirect speech construction and this particle is arguably that Tithonus’ old age is almost narrated on Sappho’s own account, who herself adds to the story of Tithonus’ youth and kidnapping that he, too (like herself), grew old. In other words, the reported perspective in the second part of the story is less emphasized in favour of her own.

Both Sappho’s and Tithonus’ lives, then, contrast strongly in terms of their happy youth in the (mythical) past in the domain of stories and in the present now that they are old. In this light, can the past tense of ἔφαντο be explained? Sappho could have used a verbum dicendi in the present tense for this story of the past. Yet by using the past tense, Sappho seems to shift Tithonus’ youth to the ‘background’ of the story, presenting it as something that is less relevant now that he Tithonus, like herself, has grown old. The past tense of ἔφαντο, then, separates the past more clearly from the present, like the repetition of ποτα, ἀλλ’ (11), and the change of construction. The present tense would have weakened the contrast between past and present.

3.2. References to other narrators, whose stories are criticized or rejected

63 As in Theognis 1283–94 about Atalanta. Like the narrator ‘Sappho’, the narrator in Theognis introduces a story from the past as a parallel for the present by ποτε and a verbum dicendi (φασιν, 1286). Although Atalanta outran all her suitors (so the story goes), she was (the narrator says) eventually not successful in defeating Hippomenes. The narrator uses this story to illustrate that there is no use in fleeing.
In some of Pindar's poems, the reported narrative is criticized or even rejected:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Words used</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P. O. 1.36</td>
<td>ἀντία προτέρων</td>
<td>Story of Pelops is rejected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. O. 7.21</td>
<td>διορθῶσαι λόγον</td>
<td>Narrator wants to 'straighten' the existing story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. N. 7.21</td>
<td>τὸν ἄθροισθι ... Ὀμηρον</td>
<td>Homer has made Odysseus' story greater than his actual suffering</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P. Paean 7b Sn.-M.</td>
<td>Ὁμῆρου [δὲ μὴ τριπτὸν κατ’ ἀμαξῖτον ] ἰόντες</td>
<td>The narrator will not follow 'Homer's well worn track' (allusion to HH to Apollo)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Appeals to other narrators – criticized or rejected

Although Pindar sometimes highly values older poets and uses them to create authority for gnōmai, as discussed in 3.1, the narrative information that poets have provided is not always trustworthy or adopted.64 Thus in Pindar's Paean 7b on the birth of Apollo, the Pindaric narrator indicates that he will not follow ‘Homer's well worn track’: Ὁμηρου [δὲ μὴ τριπτὸν κατ’ ἀμαξῖτον ] ἰόντες (11–12).65 He probably means that he is going to give an account of the birth of Apollo that is different from that in the Homeric Hymn to Apollo. Paean 7b was first performed on Delos, where the Homeric Hymn had a special status. Seeing that its text was even displayed on a panel on Delos,66 according to the Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi (18), Homer's version would have been firmly established and Pindar may have wanted to emphasize that his version was not the same.

Another example is Nemean 7, in which the Pindaric narrator says he thinks that Odysseus’ story has become greater than his actual suffering because Homer exaggerated

---

64 For lyric poets attacking or criticizing the accounts of others outside narratives, see e.g. Solon fr. 20 Bergk (attacks Mimnermus: according to Diogenes Laertius, Mimnermus would have said that he hoped to die at the age of sixty, Solon would have replied that it is far better to die at age eighty.); fr. 29 W; Simonides fr. 542 PMG (contradicts a gnome of Pittacus, see e.g. Beresford (2008)); fr. 581 PMG (attacks Cleobulus, who had composed an inscription on the tomb of the Phrygian Midas, assuming, wrongly, in Simonides’ view, that Midas’ fame would be imperishable because of this statue, see e.g. Ford (2002: 101–9)); Pindar O. 9.1 (Archilochus; for Pindar's handling with tradition and older poetry in O. 9, see Pavlou (2008)); P. 2.55 (Pindar says that he must avoid being slanderous (the exact opposite of his epinician purposes) like Archilochus, who fattens himself (πιαινόμενον, 56) with hatred. In this ode, Pindar does not seem so much concerned with a specific poem or version of a story by Archilochus, but more with his persona qua poet and the genre of invectives).

65 Rutherford (2001: 247–9), also for other literature (especially n. 6 on p. 247); Fearn (2007: 9–16); West (2011: 60).

66 See e.g. Richardson (2010: 83) ad HH 3.1.
it: ἐγὼ δὲ πλέον ἔλπομαι | λόγον Ὀδυσσέος ἢ πάθαν διὰ τὸν ἁδυεπῆ γενέσθ᾽ Ὅμηρον (20–1).

A few lines later he even uses words and phrases like ψεύδεσι (22) and σοφία δὲ κλέπτει παράγοισα μύθοις (23) for Homer and his poetry. Odysseus is then contrasted to Ajax, who was so under-valued that he committed suicide. The Pindaric narrator’s negative judgement of Homer’s account is understandable given that he is praising Aegina, the home of the Aeacidae and of Ajax’ grandfather Aeacus.

A narrator pronouncing his own judgement while denouncing that of others, as becomes clear from the more pronounced use of the first person (ἐγὼ δὲ ... ἔλπομαι, 20), is also frequently found in mythography and historiography, e.g. in Hecataeus’ Genealogies: τάδε γράφω, ὥς μοι δοκεῖ αληθέα εἶναι· οἱ γὰρ Ἐλλήνων λόγοι πολλοί τε καὶ γελοίοι, ὥς ἦνται φαίνονται, εἰσίν ('I write these words as they seem to me to be true; for the stories of the Greeks, as they seem to me, are many and ludicrous'). Arguably Pindar has been influenced by the mythographers’ tendency to critically assess the truth of stories. Pindar’s criticism of myths can thus be seen in the light of the emergence of mythography.

Poets are also held responsible for spreading false stories in the most famous instance of the rejection of a story, namely Olympian 1. The Pindaric narrator rejects the traditional story of Pelops, who was served by his father Tantalus, in favour of another version:

(33) τοῦ μεγασθενῆς ἔρασσατο Γαίασχος
Ποσειδῶν, ἐπεί νῦν καθαροῦ λέβητος ἔξελε Κλωβώ, ἐλέφαντι φαίδιμον ἐκκαθαρίζον.
ἡ δαματά πολλά, καί ποῦ τι καὶ βροτῶν φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον
βεδαιαμέλεοι ψεύδεις ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μὺσιν.
Χάρις δ᾽, ἀπερ ἄπαντα τεῦχει τὰ μείλιχα ἄνατοις, ἐπιφέροισα τιμὰν καὶ ἄπιστον ἐμήσατο πιστόν ἐμμεναι τὸ πολλάκις·

67 Hec. fr. 1 Fowler, preserved in Ps.-Demetrius, Eloc. 12. Fowler (2001: 101). Cf. e.g. Xenophanes fr. 1, where he refers to the wars of the Titans, Giants and Centaurs as πλάσμα τῶν προτέρων (22), criticizing them because there is nothing ‘useful’ (χρηστόν, 23) in songs about fighting. He, therefore, rejects them on the ground of piety. According to an anecdote, Hieron would have confronted Xenophanes because of his treatment of Homer in his poems, see Gostoli (1999: 20); this article argues that such reproaches of other poets were rather common at the court of Hieron. Freeman (1959: 94) suggests that Xenophanes may have met Pindar in Syracuse.

68 So e.g. Scodel (2001: 135–7), who compares Pindar with Hecataeus.
ἁμέραι δ᾽ ἐπίλοιποι
μάρτυρες σοφώτατοι.
35

ιὲν Ταντάλου, σὲ δ’, ἄντια προτέρων, φθέγξομαι,
ὅποτ’ ἐκάλεσε πατὴρ τὸν εὐνομώτατον
ἐς ἔρανον φίλαν τε Σίπυλον,
μείων γὰρ αἰτία.

υἱὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ’, ἀντία προτέρων, φθέγξομαι,
ὅποτ’ ἐκάλεσε πατὴρ τὸν εὐνομώτατον
ἐς ἔρανον φίλαν τε Σίπυλον,
μείων γὰρ αἰτία.

35

ὅποτ’ ἐκάλεσε πατὴρ τὸν εὐνομώτατον
ἐς ἔρανον φίλαν τε Σίπυλον,
μείων γὰρ αἰτία.

Πελόπης, ὄποτε έπι χρέος, (P. O. 1.25–45)

(Pelops,) with whom mighty Earthholder Poseidon fell in love, after Clotho pulled
him from the pure cauldron, distinguished by his shoulder gleaming with ivory.

Yes, wonders are many, but then too, I think, in men’s talk stories are embellished
beyond the true account and deceive by means of elaborate lies. For Charis, who
fashions all things pleasant for mortals, by bestowing honour makes even what is
unbelievable often believed; yet days to come are the wisest witnesses. It is proper
for a man to speak well of the gods, for less is the blame. Son of Tantalus, of you I
shall say, contrary to my predecessors, that when your father invited the gods to
his most orderly feast and to his friendly Sipylus, giving them a banquet in return
for theirs, then it was that the Lord of the Splendid Trident seized you, his mind
overcome by desire, and with golden steeds conveyed you to the highest home of
widely honoured Zeus, where at a later time Ganymede came as well for the same
service to Zeus.

Although the older myth that Pindar rejects has not survived, scholars have convincingly
argued that the Pindaric narrator adopts older, familiar elements from it but reinterprets
them to fit into his new version. Thus, for example, Pelops was not boiled in a cauldron

69 See e.g. Krummen (1990: 176): ‘Pindar behält offensichtlich Struktur und Material des alten Mythos (...) so
vollständig, wie sie überliefert sind, bei, gibt ihnen aber als ganzes eine neue Erklärung’. This is typical of
Pindar’s poetic style. E.g. in Pykian 3.27–9 he tells the story of Coronis, which was familiar from Hesiod’s
Great Ehoeae. While in Hesiod’s version of the story Apollo hears of Coronis unfaithfulness from a raven.
The raven has disappeared in Pindar’s version of the story, yet by using words that are familiar from the
existing version of the myth, Pindar seems at first sight to be adopting Hesiod’s version: ζω (27) usually
External narrators appealing to other narrators

(λέβη|τος, 26) but bathed in a ‘pure’ (καθαρός, 26) cauldron. As a result, the opening sentence of the narrative suggests that the narrator is embarking upon the well known cannibalistic version of the story, but it soon becomes clear that the narrator is telling another story. The words ἦ θαυματὰ πολλὰ (28) may reflect his narratees’ surprise at this new version.70

Thus such ‘misunderstandings’ are caused by homonymy, and not only allude to the old version but also give an explanation for how the story may have been modified in the course of time. This is a method of undermining the authority of an old version of a story in order to give one’s own that is, as scholars have noted, not uncommon in antiquity since the coming into existence of the mythographical genre.71 As in Nemean 7 (pp. 124-5)), this may reveal the influence of the mythographers on Pindar’s poetry.

In order to understand Pindar’s rejection of the story, the development and ‘transmission’ of the alternative story must be examined, beginning with the event itself. According to Pindar, Poseidon fell in love with Pelops and took him to the Olympus. Out of envy, mortals lied (ἔννεπε κρυφῇ τις αὐτίκα φθονερῶν γειτόνων..., ‘one of the envious neighbours immediately said in secret...’, 47)) that Pelops was boiled and eaten by the gods.

Poets then spread this ‘insulting’ story about the gods, embellished it (to make it seem true) and promulgated it.72 The poets’ role is implied by δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι (‘stories embellished with elaborate lies deceive’, 29)73 and Χάρις (30), which suggest poetry. It is important to note that Pindar does not suggest that the words δεδαιδαλμένοι and ποικίλοις (29), which refer to the poets who embellished and promulgated the false story, in and of themselves imply falseness. On the contrary, he

means perceiving via the ears (‘hearing’), and κοινών (28) generally refers to a companion or partner. This is all consistent with Hesiod’s version. However, the words πάντα ἰσάνι ἐνῷ (30) show that Apollo was omniscient, and that the word κοινών refers to his own mind. In this way, whilst Pindar alludes to the old version, the narratees come to the understanding that Pindar was not propounding the existing myth but a new, revised version. See also Young (1968: 37–8).

70 In this respect it is comparable to ‘ἀπίστον οὐδέν, ὅ τι θεῶν μέριμνα| τεύχει’ in B. 3.57–8, where the narrator probably anticipates critique from his audience for his new version of the story of Croesus’ death; see Stenger (2004: 80).

71 For this tendency in mythography, I base myself on Meliadò (2015(2): 1059). Cf. e.g. Euripides Ba. 286-97, where Tiresias explains the coming into existence of the false story of Dionysus’ birth on the basis of the similarity between ἵρρης (hostage) and μηρός (thigh).

72 The idea of poets making lies look like the truth occurs more often in archaic poetry, cf. e.g. Theognis 733.

73 Race (1997: 49) translates lines 28–9 differently: ‘Yes, wonders are many, but then too, I think, in men’s talk stories are embellished beyond the true account and deceive by means of elaborate lies’. This is not important for my argument.
often calls his own hymns ποικίλα (as a matter of fact, he himself will become famous for his ποικιλία), and he even uses the word δαίδαλλο (105) for this very ode about Hieron. Yet he distinguishes his poetry from that of other poets in that he does not want to offend the gods by calling them gluttonous (γαστρίμαργον, 52).

Finally, the story becomes the topic of human gossip again, but in a far wider circle (βροτῶν φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον, 28).

In rejecting the existing story, the narrator seems to have direct access to the event (Pelops’ abduction). He emphatically introduces the story as his own (φθέγξομαι, 36), in opposition to the device of reported narrators. The other story mentioned in Olympian 1, that of Ganymede, serves to present his own account as true because it indicates that such abductions by gods indeed occurred.

I submit that the truth of Pindar’s account is also reflected in the apostrophe of Pelops: ‘son of Tantalus, of you I shall say, contrary to my predecessors, …’ (ὑἱὲ Ταντάλου, σὲ δ’, ἀντία προτέρων, φθέγξομαι, … 36) and in the second-person singular forms, which occur frequently until line 50. This is an instance of metalepsis: as the narrator addresses his story’s character directly, he steps into his own narrative, thereby eliminating the boundary between the story world and his own world. By this prolonged second-person narrative, he transgresses the narrative boundaries between the event of the distant past (Pelops’ abduction) and the here-and-now, as it were, and ignores the temporal distance between himself and Pelops, as in Alcaeus fr. 42 (pp. 117–21). The ‘you’ form is used in a comparable way in the other famous rejection of a story, that of Helen in Stesichorus’ Palinode (see pp. 74-5). In addition to the ‘you’ form, the narrator also tells the story from

---

74 See e.g. Bundy (1962: 47); Newman and Newman (1984: 39–49); LeVen (2014: 123). The word also occurs O. 3.8; 4.2; 6.82–7; N. 4.14; 5.42, fr. 104.2, mostly in connection with Pindar’s odes.
75 Steiner (2002: 297–314) has argued that Pindar’s target are the poets of invective poetry: gluttony is often associated with this type of poetry (cf. πιαινόμενο used for Archilochus in P. 2.56), where poets consume their ‘food’ in a greedy fashion, violating etiquette. This would mean that the rejection of Pelop’s myth also has generic implications: when the narrator says that he stands off from the charge of gluttony, he means that invective (‘gluttony’) does not have a place in his ‘decorous’ epinician odes. I hesitate to accept this interpretation, since it would imply that poets spread stories that are most fitting for their own character, in this case gluttony, and that their own gluttony is projected onto the characters in their story. In my view, this is rather farfetched.
76 Cf. e.g. P. 3.112, where Nestor and Sarpedon are (now) the ἀνθρώπων φάτις, since poets have spread their story.
77 As e.g. Gerber (1982: 78–80) and Morgan (2015: 259) state.
78 Pace Athanassaki (2004: 327–38), who argues that the unusually long apostrophe to Pelops implies spatial proximity of speaker and addressee, and therefore states that this ode was not intended to be performed in Syracuse. Athanassaki thinks Olympia is the best alternative.
the perspective of the young Pelops, which is evidenced by the denominations of Tantalus (later Τάνταλος, 55) and his mother as πατήρ (37) and ματρί (46). In this ode the apostrophe ‘ignores’, or, maybe more pointedly, ‘bridges’ the distance between the here-and-now of the narrator and Pelops, the distance which was emphasized by the claim that his story was created by envious neighbours and embellished by poets.79 Thus, the apostrophe adds to the story’s authenticity. In this way the Pindaric narrator draws attention to his own ability to recount past events correctly.

Why does Pindar insert a rejection of an ancient version of the story in this ode? He probably uses it to draw attention to a poet’s ability to spread and immortalize any sort of story by making it believable and accessible, regardless whether the stories are true or false. In this way he emphasizes the importance of a poet who gives a reliable account of the events. Furthermore, in my view, the ideas of envious people ‘scandalmongering’ and spreading false stories about Pelops probably have another function, one related to envy. The negative role of envy in Pindar’s odes (with reference to mythical characters and to the laudandus) is well known and has attracted much scholarly attention.80 Recently, Morgan gave new impetus to this line of research, emphasizing that when a laudandus, particularly Hieron, has achieved great glory and been favoured by the gods, he is envied by ordinary men.81 As both Pelops and Hieron had to deal with envious people, the rejection of the story may have an important function related to the analogy between the distant past and present, i.e. between Pelops and Hieron.82

As the narrator addressed Pelops and told his story, he addresses Hieron (τεαῖσι (106), πάπταινε (114), σε (115)) to celebrate his success and to express his hope to celebrate his success again in the future. In itself the second-person form is not particularly significant, since it is often used for a laudandus.83 However, it is significant that a form of δαιδάλλω

82 Analogies between Pelops and Hieron in this ode have long been recognized by scholars: e.g. Gerber (1982: xiv); Sicking (1983: 67–9); Krummen (1995: 96–11); de Jong (2013: 103–5). Examples are: Hieron’s wish is to win a chariot race (which he indeed will; celebrated in Bacchylides’ Ode 3), while Pelops is the model for a victory in a chariot race. Furthermore, they are both the favourite of a god (86b and 106), and both contribute to Olympia’s fame through the help of those gods.
83 See for an overview Griffith (1991: 32, n. 6.4). In the opening of the ode, the narrator uses the third person to refer to Hieron, although he envisages Hieron as being present.
‘embellish, embroider’, which is used for the false story in line 29 (see above), is also used in connection with Pindar’s own ode about Hieron (105). In both cases it refers to poetry (cf. ὑμνων, 105) and occurs immediately before the second-person forms. So, in the case of Pelops and of Hieron, a reference to poetry (+ δαιδάλλω) is followed by an apostrophe. This echo reveals an important difference between Hieron and Pelops: while envious neighbours have made up a lie about Pelops that poets have spread (and that Pindar now corrects), the Pindaric narrator presents himself as the laudator of Hieron’s success, who does not use lies to praise him or make him immortal with his hymns. This demonstrates the importance for a poet to praise a laudandum correctly.

These examples show that a narrator sometimes rejects the stories promulgated by poets. In the final example, Pythian 11.22–8, no reported narrators are quoted, the narrator seems to hesitate between two traditional stories. He asks himself questions about Clytemnestra’s possible motives for killing her husband Agamemnon:

(34) πότερόν νιν ἄρ᾽ Ἰφιγένει’ ἐπ’ Εὐρίπῳ
σφαχέισα τήλε πάτρας ἔιονσεν βαρυπάλαμον ὄρσαι χόλον;
 ἢ ἦτέρῳ λέγηι βαμαζωμένων
ἐννυχοι πάραγον κοιταί τὸ δὲ νέαις ἀλόχοις
ἐχθιστόν ἀμπλάκιον καλύψαι τ’ ἀμάχων

ἀλλοτρίαις γλώσσαις ... (P. 11.22–7)

Was it then the sacrificial slaying of Iphigenia Euripus far from her homeland that provoked her (i.e. Clytemnestra) to rouse up her heavy-handed anger? Or did nighttime lovemaking lead her astray by enthraling her to another’s bed?

That sin is most hateful in young wives and impossible to conceal because of others’ tongues; ...

No answer is provided. The motives are recounted obliquely, possibly because they were well known. The slaying of Iphigenia was known, for example, from the Cypria. The sacrifice of Iphigenia as a motive for Clytemnestra’s killing of Agamemnon appears here for the first time, but it may have already been used in Stesichorus’ Oresteia. In the

84 From a TLG search I learn that forms of δαιδάλλω occur six times in total in the extant Pindaric corpus; O. 1 is the only ode in which the word is found twice, which, statistically, makes the repetition significant. Forms of δαιδάλλω (not necessarily used of poetry) also occur in O. 2.53, 5.21, N. 11.18, and Parth. 2.32.
85 Cypria arg. 8 GEF. For an overview of the tradition of the Oresteia-story, see furthermore Davies-Finglass (2014: 482–91), and Chapter 4.
Odyssey Aegisthus was also presented as the culprit. The narrator may prefer the second motive, given that he emphasizes it with the subsequent gnome on adultery. This motive is also the more reprehensible and condemnable (ἐχθιστόν ἀμπλάκιον, 26).

More importantly: why does he mention two motives in the first place, and why does he frame them as questions? Firstly, using questions is a lively way to express Clytemnestra’s different motives for killing Agamemnon. A second reason is related to the position and moral value that characterize Clytemnestra in the rest of the narrative: the two questions might suggest that Clytemnestra had no valid reason at all to kill Agamemnon.

3.3. Appeals to traditional stories by using the first-person plural

Another way in which narrators refer to stories from the distant past is by using the first-person plural to establish credibility with the audience and refer to their history. For example, Mimnermus narrates the emigration of Ionian Colophon’s founders from the Peloponnese, an event from the distant past, as:

(35) αἰπὺ δ᾽ ἐπεί τε Πύλου Νηληΐου ἄστυ λιπόντες ἰμερτὴν Ἀσίην νηυσὶν ἀφικόμεθα...

After leaving the lofty city of Neleian Pylos we came on ships to the longed-for land of Asia [and]...

He uses the first-person plural to suggest that the Ionians have the same identity as their ancestors from the distant past, and, hence, that he can speak authoritatively about their heroic feats. The same can be found in a fragment of Tyrtaeus, cited by Strabo under the title Eunomia:

(36) ..., ὁλον ἅμα προλιπόντες Ἐρινεὸν ἠνεμόεντα

---

87 Od. 1.28–43; 3.194; 275; 4.529.
88 Race (1990: 179); Hornblower (2004: 297), who compares the passage to Il. 13.741–4, where too, two options are mentioned, and the speaker ‘subtly reveals his own preference for the second option’. Hornblower adds that the question form in Pindar indicates ‘a relatively open attitude to causes’ (298). For more secondary literature, see Finglass (2007: 94) ad 22–27.
89 Cf. Finglass (2008: 94) ad 22-7: ‘The narrator is so horrified by Clytemnestra’s crime that he struggles to find a motive which could possibly explain it’.
90 This is a practice known from historiography, since speakers in Herodotus, too, sometimes refer to their cities’ past deeds in the first-person plural; see Boedeker (2012: 28).
91 See Bowie (2010: 145–8) for this work.
εὐρείαν Πέλοπος νῆσον ἀφικόμεθα. (Tyrt. fr. 2 W 14–5)
... [the Heraclids,] together with whom we left Erineus and arrived in the wide island of Pelops.

To Tyrtaeus and his Spartan narratees, this event is from the distant past and Tyrtaeus is drawing upon a tradition shared by the Spartans. By using the first-person plural, he creates a collective identity that includes themselves and their ancestors.

Tyrtaeus, furthermore, uses ‘we’ forms in a fragment that possibly also belongs to the Eunomia that recounts the Spartan conquest of Messene. He says this took place two generations before his own time:

(37) ἡμετέρῳ βασιλῆϊ, θεοῖσι φίλῳ Θεοπόμπῳ,
δν διὰ Μεσσήνην εἴλομεν εὐρύχορον,
Μεσσήνην ἁγαθὸν μὲν ἄρον, ἁγαθὸν δὲ φυτεύειν—
ἀμφ᾽ αὐτὴν δὲ ἐμάχον ἐννέα καὶ δέκ᾽ ἔτη
νωλεμέως αἰεὶ ταλασίφρονα δυμὸν ἔχοντες
ἀχμηταὶ πατέρων ἡμετέρων πατέρες·
eἰκοστῷ δ′ οἱ κατὰ πίσαν ἐργά λυπόντες
φεῦγον Ἰθωμικοὶ ἐκ μεγάλων ἀρέων. (Tyrt. fr. 5 W).
... to(?) our king Theopompus dear to the gods, through whom we captured spacious Messene, Messene good to plough and good to plant. For nineteen years the spearmen fathers of our fathers fought ever unceasingly over it, displaying steadfast courage in their hearts, and in the twentieth year the enemy fled from the high mountain range of Ithome, abandoning their rich farmlands.92

Whereas in fr. 2 the narrator draws upon a traditional tale, fr. 5 tells about relatively recent events that the narrator would have probably learned about from older Spartans.93 Here, the first-person plural forms also constitute a collective identity, and when the narrator turns to a third-person verb (lines 4–8), he compensates for the loss of the ‘we’ verb by emphasizing that the ‘fathers of our fathers’ conquered the city.

---

4. CONCLUSION

In Chapter 1, we saw how the Muses authenticate the epic narrator's knowledge. In the present chapter, we see that the Muses in lyric poetry are also invoked to provide information about the distant past, but only rarely and especially in narratives with a strong epic flavour. Lyric narrators more frequently ask them to help them with their ode as a whole and to ensure that people in the future will know of the subject about which/whom they sing. They also exploit other characteristics of the epic Muses, calling on them to ‘stand beside’ people to make them famous and to jointly author narratives with the narrator, an idea that was implicit in Homer. In addition, lyric narrators use question-and-answer pairs like epic narrators, who often posed the questions to the Muses. I have argued that some of these questions in lyric are also posed to the Muses, although the narrator does not always invoke them immediately before posing the question.

Lyric narrators do not often narrate events that they have seen themselves, since they mostly narrate events from the distant past. We find a reference to autopsy once, in Pythian 1 (about the Etna), and an internal narrator (and narratee) in Sappho (fr. 94).

In contrast, they often appeal to other narrators. They can be earlier poets (something not yet found in epic), although specific poets are only rarely used to increase narrative authority (they usually bolster gnomai). When narrators mention other poets by name, it is often to criticize their version of a story. However, lyric narrators also allude to earlier poetry by non-specific ‘predecessors’ (e.g. παλαιότεροι). This typically reflects the narrator’s conception of his role and the function of his poetry: it safeguards a story’s existence and authority in the future, which the narrator will do for the subject of his poetry. Lyric narrators can also allude to a poem with a simple ‘they say’.

In addition, the reported narrators often have an introductory and authoritative function: by ascribing utterances to other narrators, they indicate that their own narratives are well known and widespread. The device can be poetically exploited; reported narrators may imply that a story is pre-existing although the poet has newly altered or invented it. In this way, the use of reported narrators can disguise these innovations to give new tales the authority of old stories. It may also prompt the audience to think of the wider ramifications of the story.

Finally, in some poems the narrator uses the first-person plural to refer to a shared history in order to speak authoritatively about events from the past.
3. Choral Odes of Tragedy

This chapter examines the tragic chorus’ knowledge of the past events that they recount in embedded narratives, the ways in which they claim to have that knowledge, and, hence, the basis of their narrative authority.

With regard to their relationship to the past events they recount, there is a significant a priori difference between the narrators in the choral odes of tragedy and in lyric poetry. While most of the lyric narrators are only chorus members, narrators of a dramatic chorus are both members of the chorus (the ‘chorus qua chorus’) and characters in the play: Argive elders, Ajax’ soldiers, Trachinian women, etc. The choral narrators sometimes recount stories from their own past, but far more frequently (especially outside Aeschylus), they recount stories in which they are not involved.

The role and functions of the tragic chorus have been debated since Hegel and Nietzsche, and they remain the subject of intense study and scholarly debate. A major question is the influence of the chorus members’ personal identities on their utterances: do they refer to their own particular situation in the play and to their own past, or do they speak from a more general, omnitemporal perspective, with a moralizing voice, and, hence, as purveyors of wisdom?

The more general perspective becomes clear, for instance, from the many gnomai that the chorus offer and the stories they relate that are not from their own past but thematically linked to the events on stage. Of course, the individual characters can also speak gnomai and comment on the events from a more general perspective, but this seems specific to the chorus because they also form a chorus ‘qua chorus’ in a Dionysian festival. This status ‘qua chorus’ is revealed by the chorus’ occasional references to their own dancing and singing. In addition, the high level of style and the language of many

---

2 For a recent overview of the discussion, see e.g. Rutherford (2012: 221–3).
3 A famous example is τί δεῖ με χορεύειν; (‘Why should I dance?’, S. OT 896). See Henrichs (1994–5); (1996a); (1996b), who refers to it as the chorus’ ‘self-references’. Cf. Calame (1999) about performative aspects of the chorus in tragedy. Kowalzig (2013: 221–51) develops Henrichs’ ideas further, arguing that the chorus by means of self-references connects actors and the external audience in the theatre, thereby merging myth and ritual. For the tragic chorus evoking ritual, see also Stehle (2004), who argues that tragedy can create a ‘metaritual perspective’, where rituals are violated.
of the chorus’ utterances distinguish these utterances from those of the other characters on stage and create the impression that the chorus are purveyors of wisdom.4

On the other hand, the chorus sometimes provide information that is accurate only within the realm of the play, so they may know less than the audience and even make mistakes.5 Scholars also debate the authority of the utterances that arise from the chorus’ role within the play. Some say that the chorus qua characters can also speak as the purveyors of wisdom, since they represent a wider community (something they share with the chorus qua chorus).6 Others point out that choruses frequently represent outsiders, i.e., women, slaves, foreigners, old men, and others whom the democratic city of Athens and its institutional core of adult, male citizen-hoplites has defined as marginal,7 as Gould wrote.8

Recently, scholars have shown an interest in the overall variety and flexibility of the tragic chorus and their capacity to shift between different roles.9 Mastronarde has made an important contribution to this discussion by showing that the chorus even within a play does not have a stable position, role, or identity.10 He states that the chorus’ impersonation of a particular group of characters often leads the original audience to distance itself from the chorus, but it may also have ‘inherited moments of authority based on the larger Greek choral and poetic tradition’, especially in reference to ‘mythic content’.11 When the tragic chorus narrate stories that have a wider exemplary function, often without explicitly connecting these stories to the action on stage, ‘the (tragic) choral voice appears to have command not only of the vast field of myths but also of the

---

4 See Silk (1998), who examines style in order to establish whether the chorus’ statements are authoritative.
5 See e.g. Mastronarde (2010: 106–21); cf. Allan (2000: 197–8). This is an important objection against regarding the chorus as the ideal spectator (Schlegel (1846: 76–7)). See also Burton (1980: 265), who suggests that Sophocles tended ‘in his later plays to use the chorus more and more as an actor instead of a commentator’.
6 Goldhill (1996: 244–56), in response to Gould (1996), states that the audience can also hear the authoritative voice of the community in the chorus’ utterances. Cf. Budelmann (2000: 195–272), who shows that the Sophoclean chorus can speak with the voice of the wider community.
8 See e.g. Kirkwood (1958: 181–214) and Gardiner (1987) for the character of the chorus in Sophocles, Podlecki (1972) for Aeschylus. See also Dhuga (2011), who examines choruses of elders, and argues that they, despite their identity, can be central to the tragic action.
9 E.g. Goldhill (1996: 244–56): ‘The chorus requires the audience to engage in a constant renegotiation of where the authoritative voice lies’ (p. 252); Fletcher (1999), who also discusses a great amount of secondary literature on the topic; Foley (2003), who argues that the chorus’ fictional identity often fades during the course of the drama. A whole book devoted to this topic is Gagné-Hopman (2013), which examines how the Greek tragic choruses constantly ‘mediate’ between actors and audience, different words, songs and dance, genres, etc.
11 Quotations on p. 93 and 91 resp.
subtle techniques by which mythic narrative is deployed by the professional poets. An important point emerges from this line of research: when the chorus turns to narrative, connecting the events on stage to events from the distant past, they inherit the characteristics of epic and lyric narrators.

What do the choral narrators know of the events of the past, how do they explain their knowledge of these events, and how do their different explanations of knowledge affect the narratives in which they occur? Much research has been conducted on the presentation and function of the past in tragedy, but the choral narrators’ knowledge of past events and their authority to recount them in embedded narratives have not yet been systematically examined. This chapter investigates whether the choral narrators of tragedy adopt narrative techniques from their lyric and epic predecessors, considering narratives from the chorus’ distant and immediate past.

By and large, it is organized in the same way as the chapters on epic and lyric: it starts with the Muses, turns to internal narrators and then to appeals to other narrators, and finally to unexplained knowledge. In view of its complexity, Agamemnon’s parodos is examined in the following chapter.

---

12 See e.g. Kyriakou (2011) for the past in Sophocles and Aeschylus; Grethlein (2010: 74–104) for the past in Aeschylus’ Persians; Scodel (2012) for the past in Euripides’ Trojan Women, Orestes and Sophocles’ Electra.
1. Appeals to the Muses

The Muses are mentioned more often in the choral odes of tragedy, and this section investigates only two. I omit the instances in which they are used as a mere metonym for songs or dances, such as in Euripides’ Bacchae: ‘Orpheus drew together trees by his “Muses” (i.e., his songs)’ (Ὀρφεὺς κιθαρίζων | σύναγεν δένδρεα μούσαις, 562–3) or (metonymical) ‘characters’ within the world of the story and thus do not have a function for the chorus as a narrator either, such as in Euripides’ Medea 831, where the chorus sings that the Muses gave birth to Harmonia. The two that remain are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choral ode</th>
<th>Identity of the chorus</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. HF 1016–41 (Ø)</td>
<td>Theban elders</td>
<td>Procne (1021–2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. 511–76 (A)</td>
<td>Trojan women</td>
<td>The taking of Troy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1.1 Muses in the narrative choral odes of Greek tragedy

I start with the story of Procne in Euripides’ Heracles 1021–2. The chorus of Theban elders, acting as external narrators, say that Procne murders her son, Itys (who not mentioned by name) as a sacrifice for the Muses:

(1) μονότεκνον Πρόκνης φόνον ἔχω λέξαι
θυόμενον Μούσαις· (E. HF 1021–2)

I can tell of Procne’s murder of her one child, which (i.e. the murder) is offered in sacrifice to the Muses.

The word θυόμενον is striking. It is a recurrent theme in late antiquity that poets, musicians, etc. make sacrifices to the Muses, e.g. ‘when the musician Erato offered sacrifices to the Muses...’ (Ἐράτωνος τοῦ ἁρμονικοῦ ταῖς Μούσαις τεθυκότος...). Yet, apart from that instance in the Heracles, the earliest example seems to be in the Hellenistic period, viz. in Theocritus’ Idyll 5.83–1, in which Comatas says that he has sacrificed two

---

1 The Muses occur outside choral narratives too. See Torrance (2013: 243, n. 196) for a full list of instances. In addition, the Muses are mentioned in the choral narrative in IA 751–800, where the chorus say that Helen’s birth has been transmitted (and perhaps modified) ‘in the tablets of the Muses’.

2 In S. Ant. 965; E. El. 717 and Hel. 1345 the Muses occur within the world of the story as well.

3 Plutarch Quaestiones Conviviales 3.11. Cf. e.g. Pausanias Graeciae Descriptio 9.29.4; Ps.-Plutarchus Marius 2.4.11; Philostratus Vitae Sophistarum 1.5.9.12.
goats to them. It is significant that Comatas refers to ordinary sacrificial objects (goats), Euripides to a human.

Why are the Muses mentioned here? Procne killed her son Itys in revenge for her husband Tereus raping her sister Philomela. The presence of the Muses leads Bond to suggest that Tereus was captivated by Philomela’s singing. As such, Itys could be said to have been ‘sacrificed’ to the Muses. However, Philomela’s singing does not occur in other versions of this story, so Bond suggests the emendation θρέομενον.

Assuming that the text is correct, the Theban elders probably mean that the divine Muses receive materials for songs as ‘sacrifices’ like the murder of Itys, just like other gods receive animals or food. Bond’s interpretation is often rejected as ‘too cynical’, but it may indeed be accurate. Some scholars refer to a comparable passage from the Trojan Women, where Hecuba says that the Trojan women ‘give songs to the Muses of people in the future’ (μούσαις αἰαίδας δόντες ὑστέρων βροτῶν, 1245), arguably meaning that the Trojan women give subject matter (their own experiences) to later singers. This can be regarded as an instance of metalepsis (the character ‘announces’ the text of which she forms part), since Hecuba breaks narrative boundaries by considering her situation as fodder for a song in the future. Yet the chorus in the Heracles speaks of sacrificing, which, contrary to δόντες in the Trojan Women, normally includes killing. The word θυόμενον might be explained by the fact that Itys’ was actually killed: his murder has become a subject of songs, so he can be said to have been ‘sacrificed’ to the Muses.

Let us now consider why the Theban elders mention the story of Procne. The effect of mentioning Procne’s murder of Itys is that Heracles’ murder of his three children, which the Theban elders now see for themselves (at this moment the three bodies and Heracles himself are disclosed on stage) is presented as even worse than what the they know from songs, since Procne killed only one child (cf. μονότεκνον, 1021). Heracles’ deeds surpass all the songs that the Theban elders know, and therefore they do not know what dirge to sing now (cf. αἰαῖ, τίνα στεναγμὸν ἢ γόον ἢ φθιτῶν ἢ τὸν Ἅιδα χορὸν ἀχήσω; alas, what groan, what wail, what song for the dead, what chorus of Hades shall I raise?; 1025–7). By mentioning the Muses, the chorus refer to their status qua chorus.

---

4 Ταί Μούσαι με φιλεύντει πολύ πλέον ἢ τὸν Δάφνην | Δάφνην ἔγω δ’ αὐτοῖς χείρας θύον πρόν ποι’ ἔθυσα. (‘The Muses love me much more than the singer Daphnis; I have sacrificed two goats to them in the past’, 80–1).
5 Bond (1981: 327) ad 1021f.
6 Wunder has proposed θρέομενον (a rare verb), ‘a subject of lament for the Muses’, which is regarded by Bond (1981: 327) ad 1021f., as ‘the most likely emendation’.
7 Bond (1981: 327) ad 1021f.
Choral odes of tragedy

The only invocation to the Muses in extant tragic choral narrative occurs in the stasimon in Euripides’ Trojan Women 511–4, where the chorus, acting as internal narrators, recount their experiences during the sack of Troy:

(2) ἀμφὶ μοι Ἰλιον, ὦ
Μοῦσα, καὶ νῦν ὄμνυν
ἀείσεν ἐν δακρύοις ὑδάν ἐπικήδειον· (E. Tr. 511–4)
Sing for me concerning Ilium, O Muse, a dirge about Troy, of new-made hymns accompanied by tears.

The invocation of the Muses may surprise, since, logically, one does not need a Muse to recount what one experienced him- or herself. Why, then, do the chorus invoke her?

Like the epic external narrator, the choral narrators present themselves as singers by self-referentially invoking the Muse in the ‘proem’ of their song. Commentators suggest that the invocation emphasizes the strong epic flavour of this stasimon. This could be compared to the mention of the Muse in Pindar’s strongly ‘epic’ epinician odes, such as Pythian 4 (see Chapter 2.1). The subject matter of this stasimon, the fall of Troy, is eminently epic, as are many other elements, such as the tmesis ἀνὰ δ’ εβόασεν (522), genitive ending λίνοιο (537), and a number of epithets.

However, the choral narrators do not present this choral ode as a mere imitation of an epic song, as they highlight that their song is ‘new’ (καινῶν ὕμνων, 512). Scholars have convincingly argued that this statement is metapoetic. Thus, Sansone argues that Euripides is here ‘asserting the role of tragedy as the successor to, even the supplanter of, epic poetry.’ Many elements of the whole trilogy, of which the Trojan Women is the third tragedy, symbolize the replacement of the epic genre by tragedy. According to Sansone, this stasimon incorporates and integrates the epic genre, alluding to Iliad book 2 and 24, and Euripides is deliberately ‘inviting comparison with Homer’ with his invocation to the

---

8 Lee (1976: 164) ad 511–14. Barlow (1986: 184) ad 511ff. adds that ‘an epic beginning signals something important, grand and impressive, and the chorus wish to register some familiar credentials for this’.
9 For these and other epic elements see Barlow (1986: 184) ad 511ff. and Davidson (2001). As a matter of fact, the particle ὦ is not found in epic; Scott (1905: 32–3) notes that Pindar is the first Greek poet to use ὦ of the Muses.
10 For other instances of Euripides explicitly ‘flagging’ his innovations see e.g. McDermott (1991) and Torrance (2013: 219–30).
12 The other two parts, the Alexandros and Palamedes have not survived. For these plays, see e.g. Hanson (1964); Kovacs (1984); (1997).
Muse. Much in the same vein, Munteanu argued that both this choral ode and the play’s many dirges sung by female characters ‘compete with their epic counterparts and refashion them’ by focusing on female victims instead of male victors.

In epic and lyric poems, narrators also posed questions to the Muses (pp. 20–1, 81–2, and 85–9). Such question-and-answer pairs are also found in the choral odes of tragedy, but these questions are not posed to the Muses:

(3) καὶ τότε δὴ τίς ἔν ὁ θέλ- 
ζος πολύπλαγκτον ἄθλιαν 
οἰστροδόνητον Ἰώ; 
⟨δὴ⟩ αἰώνοις κρέων ἀπαύστου 
Ζεὺς... (A. Supp. 571–5)

And who then was it who applied a healing charm to her who had wandered so far in misery, the gadfly-tormented Io? It was he who rules for his eternal lifetime, Zeus...

In the choral odes of tragedy, the narrators pose questions in order to add emphasis to the person that follows (in this case Zeus).

---

16 Cf. S. Tr. 503–14 and E. IA 1036–44.
2. INTERNAL NARRATORS: AUTOPSY

In two stasima, the chorus are internal narrators, and recount stories from their own past (autopsy):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choral ode</th>
<th>Identity of the chorus</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E. Hec. 905–52</td>
<td>Trojan women</td>
<td>Memories of the sack of Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tro. 511–76 (M)</td>
<td>Trojan women</td>
<td>The taking of Troy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table 2.1 Internal narrators*

The relatively small number of internal narrators in the choral odes of tragedy may be explained by the fact that tragedies abound with characters who tell what they are experiencing or have experienced. The chorus, by contrast, often reflects upon these events from a wider temporal perspective. The Trojan women’s experience of the fall of Troy in the *Hecuba* and *Trojan Women* gives background information about the plays’ main character(s), who are, after all, Trojan women.

In the case of internal narrators, it is always relevant to ask whether the narrators narrate according to their experiencing or narrating focalization (see introduction, pp. 14–5). This sheds light on how the internal status of the narrators is exploited. I begin with *Trojan Women* 511–76.

After invoking the Muse, the Trojan women begin their narrative thus:

(4) τετραβάμονος ὡς ὑπ’ ἄπήνας
 Ἀργείων ὀλόμαν τάλαινα δοριάλωτος, … (E. Tr. 516–8)

(I will sing) how I perished and became a wretched captive to the Argives by a conveyance with four feet, …

The Trojan women summarize the story and reveal its ‘outcome’, which shows that they narrate according to their narrating focalization in these lines. They make their personal involvement in the narrative clear with the first-person singular forms. Yet when they begin with the narrative’s earliest chronological event, ὅτ᾽ ἔλιπον… in line 519, they recount the events from a less individual perspective, telling what happened in the city as a whole: e.g. ἀνά δ’ ἐβόασεν λεώς | Τρωϊάδος ἀπὸ πέτρας σταθείς; (E. Tr. 522–3), πᾶσα δὲ γέννα Φρυγῶν | πρὸς πύλας ώρμάθη; … (‘All of Phrygia’s folk rushed to the gates, …’, 531–2). But they continue to use their ex eventu knowledge, e.g. in their reference to the wooden horse as: ‘the fatal snare’ (δόλιον ... ἂτην, 530).

In the antistrophe the Trojan women narrate how the horse was dragged to the temple of Athena and the Trojans celebrated the whole night long. In this passage, too,
they mention perceptible elements that implicitly refer to their eyewitness knowledge, e.g.: ‘to the stone-built temple’ (εἰς ἔδραν | λάϊνα, 539–40), ‘with circling ropes of spun flax’ (κλωστοῦ δὲ ἀμφιβόλως λύσιον, 538), ‘loud the Libyan flute was sounding’ (Λίβυς τε λυσίος ἔκτυπει, 544), etc. The chorus’ joyful tone is interrupted by the reference to the horse as an ‘ambush of the Argives’ (λόχον Ἀργείων, 534) and the precincts ‘fatal to their country’ (φόνια πατρί, 540–1). Here the Trojan women, again, use their ex eventu knowledge to give their narrative a dark undertone.

It is noteworthy that the Trojan women speak from a more individual perspective when they turn from the celebrations in the city to the sack of Troy: ἐγὼ δὲ τὰν ὀρεστέραν | τότ᾽ ἀμφὶ μέλαθρα παρθένον | Διὸς κόραν ἐμελπόμαν χοροῖσι | φοινία δ᾿ ἀνὰ | πτόλιν βοὰ κατέσχε Περγάμων ἐδράς. (In that hour in honour of her of the wilds, Zeus’ maiden daughter, I was singing and dancing about the temple, when a murderous cry throughout the city possessed the dwelling places of Pergamum’, 552–7). The contrast between, on the one hand, the initial joy of the whole city and the focus on collective experiences and, on the other hand, the chorus’ doom and individual viewpoint increases the tragic effect. Although their tone becomes more individual here, however, the chorus narrate events that would have been experienced by all the Trojan women. Thus the chorus of Trojan women both exploit their status as internal narrators (which gives their story the narrative authority of eyewitnesses) and their ex eventu knowledge (which gives their narrative a dark undertone).

The chorus are again internal narrators as they recount the fall of Troy in Hecuba 905–52. The first strophe of this choral ode is narrated according to the chorus’ narrating focalization, like the first two lines of the first antistrophe. When the narrative reaches its chronologically earliest event (916), when the Trojan women are in their bedroom on the night of the fall, they use a more individual tone, and narrate according to their experiencing focalization. This becomes clear from the direct speech in lines 929–32, the attention for details (e.g. the spear on a peg: ξυστὸν δ᾽ ἐπὶ πασσάλῳ, 919) and the fact that the Trojan women think that they are safe. They are arranging their hair (ἐγὼ δὲ πλόκαμον ἀναδέτοις | μίτραισιν ἐρρυθμιζόμαν, 923–4) without realizing that they will soon cut it in mourning. Now, the beams from their mirror seem endless (χρυσέων ἐνόπτρων λεύσσου ἀτέρμονας εἰς αὐγάς, 924–5), but this endlessness stands in sharp contradiction to the imminent fall of Troy. In this case it is in my view right to say that the chorus speak according to their experiencing focalization (contrary to the choral ode in Trojan Women), but here, too, the chorus’ narrative includes an ex eventu utterance at the end of a stanza: ‘with never a thought of the sailor-throng encamped upon the Trojan shores’ (ναῦταν οὐκέθ᾽ ὁρῶν ἄφων | Τροῖαν Ἡλιάδ᾽ ἐμβεβέωτα, 921–2).

1 I follow Sommerstein (Loeb) in reading φόνια instead of Diggle’s (OCT) φονέα.
In this choral ode in the Hecuba, the Trojan women narrate from a more individual perspective than in the Trojan Women. The narrative abounds with first-person singular statements, such as τάλαιν᾽, οὐκέτι σ᾽ ἐμβατεύσω (913), ὀλλύμαν (914), ἐγὼ δὲ πλάκαμον ἄναβας μίτραισιν ἐρρυθμιζόμαι (923–4), ὡς πέσοιμ᾽ (927), με (946), and:

(5) λέχη δὲ φίλια μονόπεπλος

λιποῦσα, Δωρὶς ὡς κόρα,

σεμνὰν προσίζουσ᾽ σύκὴ ἦνυς Ἄρτεμιν ἀ τλάμων

ἀγομαι δὲ σαλαρίαν ἱδοὺς ἀχοῖταν

τὸν ἐμὸν ἄλιων ἐπὶ πέλαγος,

πόλιν τ᾽ ἀποσκοποῦσ᾽, ἐπεὶ νόστιμον

ναίς ἐκνήσεσ᾽ πόθα καὶ μ᾽ ἀπὸ γάς

ἄριστον Πολαδος,

τάλαιν᾽, ἀπείπον ἄλγει, ... (E. Hec. 933–42)

Clad in only a dingle garment, like a Spartan girl, I left my marriage bed and sat, luckless woman, as a suppliant to Artemis the revered, but to no purpose. I was carried away to the sea after seeing my husband slain. Looking back at the city once the ship had set sail for home and sundered me from Ilium, I miserably succumbed to my grief, ...

The Trojan women, in addition, give a detailed account of events that occurred in their own bedrooms:

(6) πόσις ἐν βαλάμωις ἐκεί-

το, ξυστὸν δ᾽ ἐπὶ πασσάλῳ, ... (E. Hec. 919–20)

My husband was lying in our bedroom, his lance upon its peg, ...

(7) ἐγὼ δὲ πλάκαμον ἄναβας

μίτραισιν ἐρρυθμιζόμαι

χρυσῶν ἐνόπτερων λεύσσουσ᾽ ἀπέρμονας εἰς αὐγάς,

ἐπιδέμνιος ὡς πέσοιμ᾽ ἐς εὐνάν. (E. Hec. 923–27)

And I was arranging my hair and binding it in a cap as I gazed into the bottomless depths of my golden mirror, readying myself to fall into bed.

Furthermore, the Trojan women’s individual perspectives and emotional involvement is reflected in their emotional utterances, which occur frequently in this ode: ὁ πατρίς Ἰλιᾶς (‘Oh my fatherland Troy’, 905), the second person form σὺ (905), τάλαιν’, σαλαρίαν ἐμβατεύσω (‘no more, poor city, shall I tread your streets’, 913; they address their city, which no longer exists), and ἂν μήτε πέλαγος ἅλιον ἀπαγάγι εἶς ἄλιν | μήτε πατρίς ἦκοιτʼ ἐς ὕκον (‘may the briny sea not bring her (i.e. Helen) back! May she reach her father’s home!’), 950–1). In this choral ode, too, they exploit their internal status: they narrate what they
experienced themselves, and the information from their \textit{ex eventu} perspective increases the tragic effect.
3. EXTERNAL NARRATORS APPEALING TO OTHER NARRATORS

This section examines (parts of) narratives in which the chorus, acting as external narrators, refer to and even quote other people’s words. As discussed above, reported narrators in lyric can have an authorizing function, but the narrator does not always accept what they say. What is their function in the choral odes of tragedy?

In them, φασί is no longer the most used form (as it was in lyric and epic) and terms such as ἐν λόγοις and λόγῳ are frequent. This indicates that the narrators recount events that they know from traditional stories. I will examine the stories that are introduced by verba dicendi, such as λόγος, verbs of hearing or learning, and stories that are otherwise presented as traditional:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choral ode</th>
<th>Identity of the chorus</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Words used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Supp. 524–99</td>
<td>Danaids</td>
<td>Io’s flight</td>
<td>εὔφρον’ αἶνον, ἀφευδητοῖ λόγῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ch. 585–651</td>
<td>Slave women</td>
<td>Althea, Scylla, and crimes of the Lemnians</td>
<td>ἐν λόγοις, λόγῳ, ἀγείρω</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. Ph. 676–729</td>
<td>Greek sailors</td>
<td>Ixion (676–87)</td>
<td>λόγῳ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Med. 824–65</td>
<td>Corinthian women</td>
<td>Aphrodite</td>
<td>κληζουσιν</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Med. 1282–92</td>
<td>Corinthian women</td>
<td>Ino murders her children</td>
<td>Κλώ</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. 784–833</td>
<td>Phoenician women</td>
<td>Birth of the spartoi</td>
<td>βάρβαρον ὡς ἀκοῦσ᾽ ἔδαην</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyps. fr.1.III.19–32</td>
<td>Women</td>
<td>Europa, Io</td>
<td>ἔκλυον λόγῳ, κλύω</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 Reported narrators and other sources – stories from the distant past

1In addition, utterances such as φασί and λέγουσι frequently occur outside the chorus’ embedded narratives, e.g. A. Pers. 231, 734; S. Ant. 23, 27, 31; OC 695 (about the olive tree); 1573 (about Cerberus); E. Med. 831 (the Muses giving birth to Harmonia); Hipp. 122 (Oceanus); El. 98; 286; 327; Ion 196–7 (Iolaus, in ekphrasis). A particularly poignant effect is produced by φάμαν ἤκουσ᾽ and ἀκούω in E. Tr. 216 and 222 resp., where the chorus of Trojan women anxiously envision the places, only known to them through hearsay, to which they might be brought as slaves. Another noteworthy instance is λέγουσι in E. Andromeda fr. 151: von Bubel (1991: 152) states that λέγουσι implicitly refers to a specific poet’s work (in this sense comparable to the so-called Alexandrian footnote, like we have seen in lyric), viz. to Hesiod: ‘wie auch sonst häufiger teilt Euripides Realien der Mythologie, die hier auf Hesiod zurückgehen, unter Berufung auf eine communis opinio’.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choral ode</th>
<th>Identity of the chorus</th>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Words used</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. A. 355–502 (Ø)</td>
<td>Argive elders</td>
<td>Paris’ taking of Helen; Menelaus’ distress</td>
<td>δόμων προφήται (+ direct speech)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. A j 134–200</td>
<td>Salaminian sailors</td>
<td>Ajax’ madness and slaughter of the cattle</td>
<td>λόγος κακόθρους; λόγους ψιθύρους, κακάν φάτιν (2x), μύθους</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. El. 432–86</td>
<td>Mycenaean women</td>
<td>Achilles’ arms</td>
<td>ἔκλυν τινος ἐν λιμέστιν Ναυπλίοις βεβώτος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El. 699–746</td>
<td>Mycenaean women</td>
<td>Golden lamb; celestial changes</td>
<td>κληθδόνων ἐν πολιαίσι μένει φήμασι, λέγεται</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 751–800 (Ø)</td>
<td>Greek women</td>
<td>Cassandra (757–61); the birth of Helen (784–800)</td>
<td>ἀκούσ, φάτις</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2 Reported narrators and other sources – stories from the immediate past

Scholars note that Euripides has a general tendency to mark, indeed reveal, stories in his plays as *stories*. De Jong wrote, ‘throughout Euripidean drama we come across characters speaking about myths’, and that may well have been inspired by the genre of the mythographical handbook. In other words, the Euripidean narrators in general do not narrate events but *stories about events*, and tables 3.1–2 confirm that this is also true for the choral odes. Yet I should immediately add that the table also shows that other playwrights, too, in a number of times let their chorus not only simply recount the events but also draw attention to the fact that they are narrating *stories*. In fact, these references are just as frequent in Sophocles’ and Aeschylus’ choral odes as in Euripides’, if the discrepancy in the amount of surviving text by the three tragic poets is taken into account.

Reported narrators often seem to be used to explain the chorus’ (sometimes surprising) knowledge of events that are temporally and/or geographically distant: for example, the Phoenician women in Euripides’ eponymous play explain their extended knowledge of the history of Thebes by referring to a foreign story that they once heard.

---

1 De Jong (2010b: 33), emphasis added. Cf. e.g. Wright (2005: 133–57), who calls this phenomenon ‘metamythology’: the “deliberate and self-conscious” manner in which myths are presented’ (p. 136), although he states that ‘it does not appear that metamythology is much to be found outside the escape tragedies’ (i.e. Helen, IT and Andromeda). Torrance (2013) has investigated – and emphasized to the extreme – ‘Metaepoetry in Euripides’, concentrating on the term *mythos* and metapoetically loaded adjectives such as *deuteros*, *dissos* and *kainos*. 
(βαρβαρον ὡς ἀκοὰν ἐδάην ἐδάην, 819). Interestingly, they call this story barbaron, looking at a Greek story from a foreign perspective. Reported narrators of distant events are cited usually for single pieces of information (including appeals to other speakers outside narratives (see note 1 on p. 146)), in particular for the gods: λέγουσι and κλῄζουσιν in Medea 831 resp. 836 introduce stories about Athens (from the viewpoint of the Corinthian women), where the Muses begat Harmonia and where Aphrodite blows breezes). The verb κλῄζουσιν (836) implies a sense of pride, and here the reference to a story adds weight to the status of this local tradition by presenting the event as important for Athens, where the play was performed. Likewise, in Hippolytus 121, the Troezenian women have only hearsay knowledge (λέγεται) about Oceanus, the perennial source of the spring where they do their laundry. In Oedipus at Colonus, the old men of Colonus use λόγος αἰὲν ἔχει (1573) to refer to Cerberus in Hades, where Oedipus will soon be going, but which is a place that they know only from stories.

The following sections examine some of the choral odes in more detail. They are discussed separately to allow for a more elaborate interpretation of each ode as a whole, for which a consideration of the reported narrators has much to contribute. I will first examine the choral odes that contain reported narrators for authorizing functions, then instances where the narrators criticize or doubt the veracity of their information.

3.1. Appeals to other narrators for authority

3.1.1. Aeschylus’ Libation Bearers 585–651: Althaea, Scylla, and crimes of the Lemnians

In the first stasimon of Aeschylus’ Libation Bearers (585–651), the slave women who form the chorus narrate the stories of Althaea and Scylla and allude to crimes committed by the people of Lemnos (on the nature of these crimes, see below). The stasimon has a special status within the Libation Bearers as a whole, since it comes at the centre of the play, indeed of the whole Oresteia trilogy, and it is only in this stasimon that a chorus narrate stories that do not come from their earlier lives. Furthermore, it is the oldest choral ode in extant tragedy in which stories are used to illustrate a play’s main storyline on such a large scale.

---

3 Differently, in Aeschylus’ Persians, the Persians call themselves barbaroi; see e.g. Italie (1953: 46) ad 87.
4 See e.g. Mastronarde (2002: 309) ad 836.
5 Only here is Aphrodite said to have given Athens sweet breezes, see Mikalson (1991: 63). The chorus wonder here how Athens, blessed with the Muses, Harmonia and Aphrodite’s breezes will receive Medea.
The stasimon is difficult to interpret, partly because the text is corrupt in many places. The stories in it corroborate the gnome that relationships are ruined by actions of women: ‘unnatural passion that sways women’ perverts yoked unions, among beasts and among men’ (ἐξωγόνους δ’ ὁμαλίας | θηλυκρατής ἀπέρωτος ἐρως παρανικά | κνωθάλων τε καὶ βροτῶν, 599–601). These words suit wives’ adultery because it ruins marriages, and they are therefore applicable to Clytemnestra, who committed adultery. However, the following examples illustrate ‘unions’/‘ties’ in a wider sense, including family relationships. In this respect the stories are not only related to Clytemnestra’s crime, but also operate on a higher level and are related to the other murders of the Oresteia: Iphigenia’s by Agamemnon and Clytemnestra’s by Orestes.\(^7\)

The first story that corroborates the gnome about the actions of women is that of Althaea (not mentioned by name), who causes the death of her child, Meleager, by burning the torch that is his life-token:

\[
\text{(8) ήστω δ’ ὅστις οὐχ ὑπόπτερος φροντίσω, δαεῖς}
\]
\[
\text{τὰν ἀ παιδολυμάς τάλαινα Θεστίας μήςτο}
\]
\[
\text{πυραγητίν γνά πρόνοι}
\]
\[
\text{σα, καταίθουσα παιδὸς βασιῆν}
\]
\[
\text{βαλὸν ἤλικ’, ἐπεὶ μολὼν}
\]
\[
\text{ματρόθεν κελάδης,}
\]
\[
\text{ξύμμετρόν τε δια βίου}
\]
\[
\text{μοιρόκραντον ἐς ἡμαρ. (A. Ch. 603–11)}
\]

*Let anyone whoever is not flighty in his thoughts know it* (i.e. the meaning of the gnome in 599–601), *by learning of the plan for burning with fire, which the cruel woman, the daughter of Thestius, who destroyed her child, contrived, burning a brand so that it glowed red, a brand that was contemporary with her child from*

---

\(^6\) θηλυκρατής ἀπέρωτος ἐρως has three possible meanings. Apart from the translation given above, it can also be translated as: ‘unnatural female passion that conquers’, and ‘unnatural passion that gives women power’. See Garvie (1986: 208) *ad* 599–602: ‘All are appropriate, and all may be intended’.

\(^7\) Cf. Lebeck (1967), who argues that we must look for wider relevance of these stories within the whole Oresteia: the stasimon not only comes at the play’s centre, but also at the very centre of the whole trilogy, and its stories adopt themes from the whole Oresteia but then in reverse, such as the murder of a son by a mother (the opposite of Clytemnestra’s murder by Orestes), and that of a father by a daughter (the opposite of Iphigenia’s sacrifice by Agamemnon). Garvie (1986: 203) *ad* 585–651 finds some of Lebeck’s ‘mirror-images’ over-subtle, and states that ‘[t]he point is simply that human nature is such that natural relationships are perverted’.
the time he came forth from his mother’s womb and cried, and its age tallying
with his throughout his life to the day decreed by fate.

The preceding *gnome* indicates that the story is introduced as an example of a reprehensible deed. Accordingly, Althaea’s actions are presented in negative terms: she destroyed her own child (παιδολυμάς, 605), even deliberately (πρόνοιαν, 606), and the contrast between the images of (1) the boy crying at the moments of his birth (609) and (2) his death arouses pity for Meleager. The chorus does not use reported narrators here, but δαείς (‘by learning’) instead of a verb of saying or hearing. This word presupposes that what is told is true, and it suggests that the story conveys a message that has to be taken to heart.

After the story of Althaea, the chorus turn to the story of Scylla and refers to it as an existing legend:

(9) ἄλλαν δὲ ἦν τιν’ ἐν λόγοις στυγεῖν,
φοινιάν κόραν,
ἁπτ’ ἔχθρον ὑπὲρ φῶτ’ ἀπώλεσεν φίλον, Κρητικός
χρυσοκήτοισιν ἥρ-
μοις πιθήσασα, θώροισι Μίνω,
Νίσον ἀδανάτας τριχῆς
νοσφίσασ’ ἀπρόβουλω
πνέονθ’ ἀ κυνόφρων ὕπνω,
κιγχάει δὲ νιν Ἑρμῆς. (A. Ch. 612–22).

There us another one in story fit to be loathed, the murderous maiden, who ruined a beloved man at the instigation of enemies, when, yielding to the persuasion of Minos’ gift, a Cretan necklace fashioned of gold, she with her dog’s heart deprived Nisus of his lock of immortality as he drew breath in sleep, having no precautions; Hermes laid hands on him.

Like Althaea’s, Scylla’s deeds are presented as reprehensible, which is most clearly conveyed with κυνόφρων (621). Both are so well known that their names do not need to be mentioned. The chorus introduces this narrative by ἦν τιν’ ἐν λόγοις στυγεῖν (612). By ἐν λόγοις, this phrase suggests that the present story is pre-existing and widespread and that everyone considers Scylla blameworthy. The emphasis on Scylla’s story bolsters the momentousness of her deeds: the chorus is not the only one to tell of Scylla’s reprehensible deeds, as the story is traditional, widespread, and well known. This creates

---

8 Indeed, Stinton (1979: 253) suggests that the story of Scylla is presented as even more reprehensible than that of Althaea, since whereas Althaea kills in anger, ‘Scylla kills treacherously by stealth, for a lover’s bribe’. 9 Σκύλλαν in M is probably an interpolated gloss, see Sier (1988: 201–10) ad 614.
authority for the narrative (many people say so and hence it is true) and suggests that the
story’s wise lessons have been proven in the past and the present.

In the third strophe the chorus turns to the situation in Argos, focusing on
Clytemnestra. The text is corrupt in many places, but it can be deduced that
Clytemnestra’s act is now added to the chorus’ list, since she, too, is a prime example of
a woman who has committed a crime against her kin. Another effect of emphasizing the
traditional status of the stories in this stasimon is that the chorus of slave women know
from their own, direct experience that Clytemnestra has also committed a crime. Yet it
is equal to, or even surpasses, that of the infamous women of the distant past that the
chorus only knows of from stories. In other words, the emphasis on stories qua traditional
stories underscores the gravity of Clytemnestra’s crime in the present.10

The chorus turns to a third example from the past in the third antistrophe, moving
from the crimes of single women to that of an entire population, namely the ‘Lemnian
crimes’:

(10) κακῶν δὲ πρεσβεύεται τὸ Λήμνιον
λόγῳ, γοάτα δὲ δημόδεν κατα-
πτυστον, ἥκασεν δέ τις
tὸ δεινὸν αὖ Λημνίοις πῆμασιν. (A. Ch. 631–4).
The ‘Lemnian’ is pre-eminent among evils in stories. It is lamented by the people
as an abomination, and one compares each new horror to Lemnian troubles.

Some scholars accept a transposition of this antistrophe, reversing the order of the third
strophe and antistrophe so that the story of the Lemnian disasters precedes the stanza
about Clytemnestra. The reason is that in the manuscript, instead of coming as a climax
after the three examples, as would be expected in the classical priamel form, Clytemnestra’s story comes between the second and third example.11 In my view, the
order of the stanzas in the manuscript is particularly apt, since ‘the Lemnian’ is in fact a
double crime: it refers to the Lemnian women who murdered their husbands and to the

10 Differently Newton (1985: 497) (who focuses on the use of examples from the past and not on the chorus’
reference to traditional stories): ‘The ultimate result of the evocation of precedents is to render the horrors
less shocking’ (emphasis added). This interpretation is contradicted by the gnome of the disastrous
consequences of passion and the emphasis on the depravity of the women’s deeds.

11 E.g. Stinton (1979), who argues that the strophe seems to be misplaced in the only manuscript (M) that we
have of this play. Reasons for accepting M’s order of the strophe have been given by e.g. Holtsmark (1966),
who emphasizes the structural parallelism between the gnomic introduction in lines 585–601 and its
Pelagian men who later murdered their Athenian wives. Seeing the double nature of the crime, the story of the Lemnians has a deeper significance for the play, of which the slave women themselves are probably unaware: it entails a crime followed upon by another crime and thus refers to a chain of crimes. The chorus, then, touches upon an important theme of the Oresteia. This is why the order of the strophes is suitable for this play: during this very stasimon the focus of the entire play shifts from Clytemnestra’s crime to Orestes’ revenge, like the chorus in this ode turns from Clytemnestra’s crime in the third strophe to a chain of crimes in the antistrophe.

The ‘Lemnian crime’, which is here merely alluded to, is even more emphatically presented as well known than the preceding two stories. This is suggested by the phrasing of the first part of the sentence (in lines 631–2), where the chorus sings that ‘the “Lemnian” is pre-eminent among evils in stories’. The fact that the crime is referred to merely as τὸ Λήμνιον (631) suggests that it is a well-known and proverbial ‘evil’ (κακῶν, 631) that is bewailed (γοᾶται, 632) by people of the past and present, and hence is widespread. Furthermore the words ἐκασταν ... πήμασιν (‘one compares (gnomic aorist) each new horror to Lemnian troubles’, 633–4) also suggest that the story is proverbial and used for comparison with ξενόν (cf. ἁς, 634). The tendency for men to refer to the story when something cruel happens shows that its truth has been accepted throughout the past. Even the chorus members themselves are now an example of those who compare a horrendous event that they know of to these Lemnian troubles. In addition, perhaps Aeschylus implicitly alludes here to his own (now lost) play about the Lemnian women.

Thus the chorus presents the stories of Scylla and the Lemnian women as traditional in this stasimon in order to create authority: the fact that the stories have been told and retold suggests that their truth, and the wise lesson that they contain, are well proven. Furthermore, the emphasis on the fact that they are traditional underscores the gravity of Clytemnestra’s crime in the present, since it is comparable to, or even surpasses, infamous acts of women in stories of the past.

---

12 Cf. Herodotus 6.138, who mentions that both crimes have given rise to the proverb of the ‘Lemnian crime’. I should add that not all scholars are convinced that the chorus here refer to two crimes: for example, Sier (1988: 221) ad 633f. states: ‘Im vorliegenden Kontext besteht, selbst wenn der sprichwörtliche Ausdruck bereits in der Zeit des Aischylos doppelt motiviert war, kein Zweifel, dass der Chor sich allein auf die Tat der Lemnirinnen bezieht’. For the double nature of the Lemnian crime, see also Lebeck (1967: 183–4).

13 A chain of crimes is also present in Althaea’s story, since she killed Meleager out of revenge of him killing her brothers. Yet this is less emphasized than in the case of the Lemnian women.

14 This effect would be even bigger if Blomfield’s βοῶπαι (‘it is noised abroad’ (LSJ, 4)) is accepted. Cf. e.g. Hdt. 3.39: πρήγματα βεβωμένα ἀνά Ἰωνίαν, and 6.131: ἐβώσθησαν ἀνά τὴν Ἑλλάδαν. Garvie (1986: 218) ad 631–4: ‘the Chorus are concerned with the notoriety of the deed rather than with the lamentation which is long past’.

---
In Aeschylus’ Suppliants 524–99, the chorus of Danaids prays to Zeus for help and protection as they seek refuge in Argos. To strengthen their argument, the Danaids relate the flight of Io. She is the Danaids’ and the Argives’ common ancestress, and she was once rescued by Zeus. The Danaids begin the story with a hymnic appeal to Zeus and ask him to ‘renovate’ it:

(11) τὸ πρὸς γυναικῶν ἐπίδων
παλαίφατον ἁμέτερον
γένος, φιλίας προγόνου γυναικός
νέωσον εὐφρον’ αἴνον’
γενοῦ πολυμήνστωρ, ἔφαπτο Ίοῦς.

Διὰ τοῖς γένοις εὐχαριστεῖν εἶναι
γὰς ποτε τάσσει ένοικοι.

παλαίφον, γενός εἰς ἱγνον μετέσταν,
ματέρος ανθόνυμος ἐπιοπάς,
λειμώνα βούχηλον, ἐνθεν Ἰώ

οίστρω ἐρεμομένα
φεύγει... (A. Supp. 531–42).

Look favourably upon the women’s case, upon our race ancient in story, and renovate the story of your kindness to the woman you loved, the ancestress of our race. Toucher of Io, remember it all! We claim to be of the race of Zeus, once inhabitants of this land. I have come here to the ancient footstep of my mother, who was watched as she browsed on the flowers, to the cattle-pasture meadow, from whence Io, driven by the gadfly, flees...

In line 536 the Danaids refer to Zeus in the third person (instead of the second as in the opening lines), and in the following stanzas they narrate the story of Io’s flight. Παλαίφατον (532) and αἴνον (534) have a clear authorizing function: the story of Io ‘proves’ that the Danaids have racial connections with the citizens of Argos, on which they base their claim to asylum. In addition, they emphasize that they are Zeus’ descendants and therefore should be protected by him. Accordingly, the word γένος and its derivations occur frequently in this passage (527, 533 (2x), 536). Yet the collective identity they create also has an ironic undertone: the Danaids’ future husband-cousins (sons of Danaus’ twin brother Aegyptus) are also descended from Zeus and Io, so the Danaids’ lineage would not automatically give them an advantage.

Near the end of the narrative, when the Danaids emphasize that they are related to Zeus, Io, and the Argives, they refer to their account as a ‘true story’ (ἀψευδεῖ λόγῳ, 580).
The Danaids sing that Io’s son is born and use the word γένος (584) again, but now it is in direct speech from the Earth. Γένος occurs another time in line 588, but it is unclear whether this line belongs to the direct speech:

(12) λαβόσα δ᾽ ἔρχα Δίον ἄψευδεῖ λόγῳ
γείνατο παιδ᾽ ἀμεμφή,

δι᾽ αἰώνος μακροῦ πάνολβον
ἐνδὲν πᾶσα βοᾷ χθὼν,
ἠμισιζόου γένος τόδε
Ζηνός ἐστιν ἀληθῶς:
τίς γὰρ δὲν κατέπαυσεν Ἠ-
ρας νόσου ἐπιβούλους;
Διὸς τόδ᾽ ἔργον καὶ τόδ᾽ ἂν γένος λέγων
ἐξ Ἑπάφου κυρήσαις.’ (A. Supp. 580–9)

And, taking Zeus as her support, according to a true story, she bore a blameless child, destined to unbroken good fortune through his long lifetime. And so the Earth cries aloud, ‘This is in very truth the offspring of life-giving Zeus; for who else could have endured the suffering plotted by Hera? Call this the work of Zeus and this his race sprung from Epaphus and you will hit the truth.’

By claiming that the entire earth announces Zeus’ offspring, the Danaids highlight Zeus’ role as the father of Io’s son Epaphus, the ancestor of the Danaids.

The end of the quotation of Earth is not unequivocal. The words until (and including) line 587 are certainly spoken by Earth, but the following passage could be the Danaids own words or another quotation of Earth. Furthermore, because the verb that introduces this speech is in the present tense, βοᾷ (583), it is not entirely clear when this reported discourse is supposed to have occurred. The ‘you’ form of κυρήσαις (589) is also ambiguous, since it could refer to any addressee at any time. This is an instance of metalepsis, or a blurring of the hierarchy of narrative levels. The effect is that the Danaids seem to co-opt the voice of the Earth to add force to their request for Zeus’ protection and that the entire earth is proclaiming the Danaids’ genealogy. The fact that the Danaids and Io/Epaphus belong to the same race is also illustrated by the similarity of the words γένος τόδε (584) (referring to Epaphus, the son of Io) and τόδ’ ἂν γένος (588) (referring to the Danaids). Thus the quotation of the Earth with a metaleptic ending more strongly authorizes the chorus’ claim to be related to the Argives, Io, and Zeus, like παλαίφατον (532), αἶνον (534), and ἄψευδεῖ λόγῳ (580).

To complete the picture of the devices that the Danaids use to emphasize their ties to the Argives, Io, and Zeus, they speak of their own race as παλαίφατον (532) and use first-person plural forms in referring to themselves (see passage 11): ἁμέτερον | γένος (532–3);
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εὐχόμεθ᾽ (536); ἔνοικο (536). However, in the next strophe, they begin narrating in the 'I' form: μετέσταν (538). Kaimio explains the 'we' forms by noting that lines 536–7 are part of a prayer (the 'we' form is frequently used in prayers in Aeschylus). Be that as it may, I submit that, by using singular and plural forms, the narrators also emphasize different aspects of their status and identity. When they wish to emphasize that they are Zeus’ and Io’s offspring and want to add force to their prayer in this respect, they use the plural.

By contrast, from line 538 (see above), the Danaids use the singular to emphasize the similarities between Io and themselves rather than their ancestry and ties with Argos. For example, the choral narrators accentuate that they have come to the same place Io did. Just as Io fled from Hera, the Danaids are fleeing from marriage. This bolsters their plea for Zeus to help them like he helped Io. Therefore, they use the first-person singular. There are thus three ways in which the Danaids create extra authority for their claim and narrative: 1) presenting their story explicitly as a story; 2) quoting the Earth; and 3) using 'I' and 'we'.

It is noteworthy that the present tense occurs throughout this narrative stasimon, far more than in any other. The sequence of verbs in the present tense is exceptional for poetry, and even for prose:

13] ἐνθεν Ἰὼ
οίστρῳ ἐρεσσαμένα
φεύχαι ἀμαρτίνος,
pολλὰ βροτῶν δισμειβομένα
φύλα: †θιχὴ† B’ ἀντίπορον
γοιαν ἐν αἰσθ διστέμουσα πόρον
κυματίαν ἀφιεῖ.

And she rushes through the land of
Asia, from end to end of sheep-rearing
Phrygia, and passes through the Mysian
city of Teuthras up the vales of Lydia
and through the mountains of Cilicians
and Pamphylians, speeding over ever-
flowing rivers and deep rich soil, and the
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15] ἐνθεν Ἰὼ
οίστρῳ ἐρεσσαμένα
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pολλὰ βροτῶν δισμειβομένα
φύλα: †θιχὴ† B’ ἀντίπορον
γοιαν ἐν αἰσθ διστέμουσα πόρον
κυματίαν ἀφιεῖ.

And she rushes through the land of
Asia, from end to end of sheep-rearing
Phrygia, and passes through the Mysian
city of Teuthras up the vales of Lydia
and through the mountains of Cilicians
and Pamphylians, speeding over ever-
flowing rivers and deep rich soil, and the

15] ἐνθεν Ἰὼ
οίστρῳ ἐρεσσαμένα
φεύχαι ἀμαρτίνος,
pολλὰ βροτῶν δισμειβομένα
φύλα: †θιχὴ† B’ ἀντίπορον
γοιαν ἐν αἰσθ διστέμουσα πόρον
κυματίαν ἀφιεῖ.

And she rushes through the land of
Asia, from end to end of sheep-rearing
Phrygia, and passes through the Mysian
city of Teuthras up the vales of Lydia
and through the mountains of Cilicians
and Pamphylians, speeding over ever-
flowing rivers and deep rich soil, and the

Kaimio (1970: 37). Yet this explanation of the plural in prayers is not completely satisfactory, since in lines 117/129, 144, 1052 and 1072 the chorus use singular forms in prayers, like in many other choral odes. Kaimio’s argument is mainly based on A.’s Suppliant, and she notes that in Sophocles ‘no tendency to use the plural in prayers can be seen’ (42).

I follow Sommerstein (Loeb) in printing διχῇ between †…†.
land of Aphrodite abundant in wheat. And she arrives, while the winged cowherd was still †... † her with its sting, in the plain of Zeus, rich in all kinds of pasture, the snow-fed meads assailed by Typhoeus' fury, and the water of the Nile untouched by plagues, maddened by undeserved sufferings and agonies inflicted by the hurtful sting, a maenad of Hera. (…)

And who then was it who applied a healing charm to her who had wandered so far in misery, the gadfly-tormented Io?

It was he who rules for his eternal lifetime, Zeus (...) † force† by his painless strength and by his divine breath she is stopped, and in tears she weeps away the grief of her shame.

Scholars often regard the historic present as a means to give expression to or suggest a narrator's eyewitness status (creating an effect of immediacy), which highlights crucial events. However, the Danaids are not internal narrators, and they do not use visual or audible elements to suggest an eyewitness perspective. Indeed, they call their race 'ancient in story' (παλαιφατον, 532) and use the word αἴνον (534), thereby drawing attention to their story qua story.

The imperfect tense is found only in lines 565–75 (ἠσαν, 565; ἐθάμβουν, 570; ἦν, 571), where the Danaids convey the Egyptians' reactions at the sight of Io, 'a half-human beast', from the Egyptian's point of view:

(14) βροτοὶ δ', οἳ γὰς τὸν ἠσαν ἕνομοι χλωρῷ δείματι θυμών 565

See e.g. de Jong (1991: 38–45); Rijksbaron (2006: 129).
And the men who then dwelt in that land (i.e. Egypt) felt their hearts leap with green fear at the unaccustomed sight (i.e. Io), beholding a half-human beast that their minds could not handle, with some features of a cow and some of a woman, and the monstrosity astounded them. And who then was it who applied a healing charm to her who had wandered so far in misery, the gadfly-tormented Io?

While the present tense normally marks significant events within a series of imperfects, in this stasimon it occurs continuously, only once interrupted by a brief series of imperfects.

Other than suggesting an eyewitness perspective, is there a way in which the present tense can ‘bring’ the events of the ode from the past to the ‘here-and-now’ to create immediacy and emphasis? When the story is presented qua story, the present tense seems to draw attention to the events of the story qua events without camouflaging that the Danaids are narrating a story (Io rushes, Io passes through cities, etc.). In other words, they draw attention to the fact that these events exist outside the realm of the particular story that they are currently telling, and thus ‘the story of Ino’ blends with the events within this story. Arguably the Danaids wanted to blur this distinction in order to create authority by presenting Io’s flight as well-known and ‘canonized’. In other words, by using the present tense, the choral narrators present the events as well known: they are not only events in the current narrative, but also in the outside world.

I conclude that this choral ode is a clear example of emphasizing the story qua story in order to create authority for it, both by its appeal to other narrators and use of the present tense.

---

8 I thank Arjan Nijk for our discussions on this passage. I have learned much about the historic present from his talk at the University of Amsterdam in January 2016.

9 This ‘blending’ and the function of the present tense is the subject of the PhD thesis of Nijk (forthcoming).
3.1.3. Sophocles' Philoctetes 676–729: Ixion compared with Philoctetes

Philoctetes has been on his own on an island for ten years. The chorus of Greek sailors pity him as he invites Neoptolemus, who has gained his trust, into his cave. The Greek sailors call to mind the only example they know of someone who suffers as much as he does: Ixion, who is permanently bound to a whirling wheel. By comparing Philoctetes to Ixion, they reflect upon his circumstances from a wider perspective, which is underlined by λόγῳ (676) and ποτέ (677) to tell of Ixion’s punishment and by τοῦδ᾽ (‘him here’, 683), referring to Philoctetes on stage:

(15) λόγῳ μὲν ἐξήκουσί, διπωpta δ᾽ οὐ μάλα, τὸν πελάταν λέκτρων ποτὲ (τῶν) Διὸς [Ἰξιον] κατ᾽ ἀμπυκα δὴ δρομάδα δέσμιον ὡς ἔβαλεν παγκρατίς Κρόνου παῖς; 680
ἄλλον δ᾽ οὖτ’ ἔγωγ’ ὅθα ἱλών ὀδῆ ἐστίδων μοῖρος τοῦδ᾽ ἔχθισε συντυχόντα ὅφος, δς οὖτ’ ἔρξας τν’ οὐ τι νοσφίσας, ἄλλ᾽ ἵσε δὲ ἵσοις ἀνήρ, 685 ἄλλῳ δ᾽ ἀνάξιος. (S. Ph. 676–87)

I have heard in a story, but not actually seen, how the almighty son of Cronus hurled the man who once approached Zeus’ bed, Ixion, bound onto a winged (litt. ‘running’) wheel. But of no other mortal do I know, either by hearsay or by sight, who has met with a more hateful destiny than this man (i.e. Philoctetes), who having done nothing to anyone, done no murder, but being a just man among just men, was perishing thus so undeservedly.

By διπωpta δ᾽ οὐ μάλα (676) the Greek sailors make clear that they have never seen Ixion themselves, but they can tell of his suffering because they have heard stories about it.

---

9 Kitzinger (2008: 106–7) argues how the absence of the names of Ixion, Philoctetes, Neoptolemus and Heracles in this stasimon generalizes the immediate circumstances in the play, ‘making clear that the individual agents and what they do are subordinate to the pattern they illustrate’.

10 Pucci (2003: 241) ad 676 has also noted the distinction between the hearing of the myth of Ixion and the seeing of Philoctetes’ circumstances: ‘la storia mitica è trasmessa oralmente, i partimenti di Filottete sono sotto gli occhi del Coro (ἐσιδών, v. 682).’ However, ἐσιδών refers to the fact that the chorus has not seen other examples like Ixion, and not that they see Philoctetes’ circumstances.

(λόγῳ μὲν ἐξήκουσ᾽, 676). This leads to the question of why they emphasize that they have never seen Ixion and only know about his fate from stories.

Let us take a closer look at the reasons why the Greek sailors mention Ixion in the first place. Apart from the most obvious parallel, i.e. their suffering, scholars note several other parallels between him and Philoctetes. According to Kitzinger, the Greek sailors respond to two features of the story of Ixion. Both men cause their suffering by approaching a prohibited and sacred space, which is emphasized by the use of forms of the same verb (πελάζω): Ixion encroached on Zeus’ bed (πελάταν λέκτρων ... Διός, 677), Philoctetes on the sanctuary of Chryse (Χρύσης πελασθεὶς φύλακος, 1327). Furthermore, they were both punished with agony linked to motion: Ixion on the wheel and Philoctetes by a wound that makes movement painful.

Even if such farfetched interpretations are accepted, it is perhaps more important that Ixion is far from a perfect equivalent of Philoctetes. His story has been told before, for example in Pindar’s Pythian 2.21–52, in which he is introduced as an admonition to others to repay benefactors. After murdering his father-in-law Deioneus, he was ingrateful to his benefactor Zeus, who had brought him to Olympus out of pity, and tried to rape Hera, for which he has received the severe punishment. Several tragedians have written plays entitled Ixion. For example in Euripides’ Ixion, as far as we can tell from what we know of the play, the impious Ixion gets just retribution. Ixion thus seems to be the paradigmatic criminal who is outrageously but nevertheless ‘justly’ punished for his crime. In contrast, Philoctetes committed no crime but undeservedly suffers so badly that he may still be compared, in this respect, to Ixion. The chorus emphasize Philoctetes’ innocence (684–7), and the contrast with Ixion makes him all the more pitiable.

---

Kitzinger (2008: 102–3).

4 For the possibility of the existence of the Ixion story before 500 BCE, see Blickman (1986), who argues that the element of ‘purification’ was of prime importance in the story, introduced into the story between 700 and 500.

5 Aeschylus (fr. 90–3 Radt), Euripides (fr. 424–6 Nauck). Sophocles, Callistratus and Timesitheus have produced plays about Ixion, of which only the titles remain, and only a single word from Sophocles’ Ixion (fr. 296 Radt).

6 That Euripides’ Ixion was characterized as impious appears from Plutarch’s Moralia 196, where Euripides is said to have responded to the criticism that his Ixion would be impious and abominable (πρὸς τοὺς τὸν Ἡρακλείδοροντας ὡς ἀνεπίχους καὶ μικρόν) by saying that he had removed him from the stage until he had him fastened to the wheel. For the play, see e.g. Sourvinou-Inwood (2003: 466–7 and 472–80).

7 Cf. Beer (2004: 143); Austin (2011: 113–114); Murnaghan (2012: 232). Differently, Kitzinger (2008: 133) argues that the chorus are not concerned with the differences between Ixion and Philoctetes: ‘That Ixion intentionally violated Zeus’ bed, while Philoktetes stumbled blindly into Chryse’s temenos, is irrelevant’. 
I argue that the Greek sailors' phrase that they have heard of Ixion 'in story (underscored by the word ἐξήκουσ᾽, which suggests that something is heard at a distance) shows that they must look far back into the past into the realm of stories to find an example of suffering comparable to the pain Philoctetes now endures. In this stasimon (like in the Libation Bearers), λόγῳ underlines the gravity of Philoctetes' situation: the Greek sailors set up the present against the past, since it is comparable to, if not worse than, the worst suffering of which they have ever heard.

3.1.4. Euripides' Medea 1282–92: Ino dies with her children

The chorus of Corinthian women in Euripides' Medea 1282–92 have just heard Medea's children crying for help against her murderous hands, and they struggle to find a parallel for what Medea is doing. They recount the story of Ino, who, as they say, was responsible for the death of her children and is thus partially comparable to that of Medea. Yet, like the story of Ixion in the Philoctetes, the present actions on stage are so extraordinary that, as the Corinthian women claim, it is the only parallel they know:

(16) μίαν δὴ κλώσ μίαν τῶν πάρος
γυναῖκ’ ἐν φίλοις χέρα βαλείν τέκνοις,
’Ινώ μανείσαν ἐκ θεών, ἑκ’ ἡ Δίας
δόμαμ πιν ἐξέπεμψε δεμάτων ἄλλας:
πίνει δ’ ἀ τάλαιν’ ἐς ἀλμαν φόνῳ
tέκνων δυστεβεί,
ἀκτῆς ὑπερτείνασα ποντίας πόδα,
δυον τε παιδίαν συνθανοῦσ’ ἀπάλλυται. (E. Med. 1282–9)
One woman, only one, of all that have been, have I heard of who put her hand to her own children: Ino driven mad by the gods, when Zeus’ wife sent her forth from the house with wanderings of mind. The wretched woman falls into the sea, impiously murdering her children, after stepping over the sea’s edge, she perishes together with her two children.

As Mastronarde observes too, the word μίαν, 'one', which occurs twice in line 1282, is a rhetorical exaggeration, since the chorus could have narrated many stories that are somewhat parallel with Medea’s actions: for instance, Tereus’ story of Procne and Itys, in which Procne kills her son Itys to punish her adulterous husband (the chorus refers to

---

48 Schein (2013: 231) ad 676–83; a parallel is A. Eum. 397. 
it in *Heracles* 1021–2), or the stories of Agave killing Pentheus, or Althaea killing Meleager (narrated in the *Libation Bearers* 603–11). In addition, there are many differences between Ino and Medea. The chorus, then, wanted to present Medea’s actions as extraordinary, and like in the *Philoctetes*, *κλύω* emphasizes the rarity of a parallel instance.

In addition to emphasizing this rarity of a parallel instance, *κλύω* (1282) has another function. The word suggests that the story existed in this form before the chorus narrates it. Yet the story of Ino, as it is narrated here, possibly contains an invention by Euripides, viz. the most important respect in which the analogy is adequate: the murder of two sons by their mother. Until now the issue of mythological ‘inventions’ in tragedy has been omitted in this discussion because the loss of so many texts makes it impossible to determine with certainty whether a story contains new elements made up by a poet and is not genuinely old. As regards this story, numerous variations exist in which Ino kills one (Melicertes) but not both of her sons, as Medea did. Yet the chorus in the *Medea* makes clear that Ino is responsible for the death of two children. In my view it is possible that Euripides changes the story to better parallel Ino’s action to Medea’s.

*Κλύω*, then, camouflages the fact that the narrative contains modifications. This is another function of the reported narrators that is also attested in lyric (pp. 113–5): it is used to present a new (at least, non-canonical) story, modified for the occasion, as

---

33 For the parallels between Medea and these women (including Ino), see Mossman (2011: 351–2) ad 1282–92.
34 See Newton (1985: 502) for the tradition of stories about Ino.
35 Newton (1985: 502) takes this another step further, arguing that the chorus cite an event (Ino killing two sons) of which the audience would know that it never occurred: ‘The spectator is tempted to correct the chorus with the retort, “There is not one woman from the past who ever went to such extremes, not even Ino”. This would make this choral ode comparable to the ode in the *Philoctetes* (see the preceding section, 3.1.3), Bacchylides’ *Ode* 5 (pp. 116–7), and Alcaeus fr. 42 (pp. 127–21), where the narratees were suggested by the reported narrators to correct or supplement the information provided. Yet in my view this interpretation is too far-fetched here: it is well known that the tragic poets, like the epic and lyric poets, innovated freely, and, unlike the poems of Bacchylides and Alcaeus, there are no clear indications that suggest that the information provided needs to be *corrected*, whilst in *Philoctetes*, the chorus only need to remember additional, not contrasting, information. Even more, if the audience in the *Medea* were supposed to remember that Ino in fact did not murder two children, this would lead to the question of why they would not remember that there were other women who are better parallels.
36 Differently Page (1964 [1938]: 172) ad 1284, who states that Euripides ‘cannot have introduced even so slight an innovation in a passing reference intended as a parallel’. This would mean that the chorus are referring to a version which, though now lost to us, the ancient audience would have recognized, a version in which Ino was responsible for the death of her two children. Page suggests that Euripides refers to the version of this story in his Ino (now lost).
traditional. In this respect this passage may be compared to epinician odes of Pindar, in which narrators often refer to reported narrators and other sources when their narrative contains important modifications vis-à-vis old versions of the story.

3.1.5. *Euripides' Electra* 432–86: Achilles' arms

In the choral ode that recounts Achilles' arms in *Euripides' Electra*, the chorus of Mycenaean women have received information about the arms from a Trojan traveller\(^\text{35}\) whom they had met in the harbour of Nauplion:

\[
\text{(17) } \text{ยว} \text{ι} \text{λ} \text{ι} \text{ό} \text{θ} \text{ε} \text{n} \text{δ} \text{΄} \text{ἐ} \text{k} \text{λ} \text{υ} \text{ό} \text{n} \text{τ} \text{i} \text{n} \text{o} \text{s} \text{ ἐ} \text{n} \text{l} \text{i} \text{m} \text{é} \text{s} \text{i} \text{n} \\
\text{Na} \text{u} \text{p} \text{l} \text{i} \text{ο} \text{i} \text{s} \text{i} \text{ be} \text{b} \text{w} \text{ó} \text{t} \text{o} \text{s} \\
\text{t} \text{ά} \text{s} \text{s} \text{ά}, \text{ ὦ} \text{ Θ} \text{έ} \text{t} \text{i} \text{d} \text{e} \text{s} \text{ π} \text{ά}, \text{ } \\
\text{κ} \text{l} \text{e} \text{i} \text{n} \text{ά} \text{s} \text{ ὁ} \text{σ} \text{τ} \text{i} \text{δ} \text{o} \text{s} \text{ ἐ} \text{n} \text{k} \text{ó} \text{λ} \text{ω} \\
\text{τ} \text{o} \text{u} \text{ά} \text{δ} \text{e} \text{ σ} \text{ή} \text{μ} \text{α} \text{τ} \text{a}, \text{ δ} \text{ε} \text{i} \text{μ} \text{α} \text{τ} \text{a} <\gamma\phi> \text{96} \\
\text{Φ} \text{ρ} \text{ύ} \text{γ} \text{ι} \text{α} \text{ τε} \text{τ} \text{έ} \text{χ} \text{ά} \text{θ} \text{ά} \text{i}: \text{ ... (E. } \text{E} \text{l.} \text{ 452–7)} \\
\text{I have heard from a man who came from Troy and disembarked in the harbour of Nauplion that on the circle of your famous shield, son of Thetis, were wrought these signs, a terror to the Phrygians: ...}
\]

The terrifying signs that were wrought on the shield (δείματα | Φρύγια, 456–7) implies the witness of someone who actually looked at the object and was frightened by it. The phrase δείματα | Φρύγια thus may be compared to the expression θαύμα ἰδέσθαι (‘a marvel to behold’), which is found in Homer and expresses the point of view of a human character who looks with admiration at an object.\(^\text{37}\) In this respect, Φρύγια (457) is significant as well; the shield has proved to be frightful for the Trojans, particularly Hector (διμασίν Ἐκτεράεις τροπαῖοι,\(^\text{38}\) 468–9). By citing the description of the Trojan traveller, who actually saw the arms, the Mycenaean women explain how they know what it was like to look at the shield and thus underscore how looking at it was a frightening experience for the Trojans.\(^\text{39}\)

\(^{35}\) So Roisman-Luschign (2011: 157) ad 452; Denniston (1939: 196) ad 452 states it was a Trojan captive.

\(^{36}\) I follow Kovacs (Loeb) here.


\(^{38}\) Text of Kovacs (Loeb).

\(^{39}\) A similar interpretation has been offered by Torrance (2013: 80). See Allan (2013: 166–82) for the function of this choral ode within *Euripides' Electra*. 
3.2. References to other narrators whose stories are doubted or rejected

3.2.1. Euripides’ Iphigenia in Aulis 751–802: Helen

In Euripides’ Iphigenia in Aulis 751–802, the chorus of Greek women in Aulis look ahead to the Trojan War and its aftermath, which will take place in the future (external prolepsis). The Greek women tell about the Trojan women immediately after the fall of the city, as they will discuss their future and ask where they will be brought as slaves:

(18) μήτ’ ἐμοὶ μήτ’ ἐμοὶ τέκνων τέκνοις 785
ἐλπὶς ἄδε ποτ’ ἔλθαι,
ολίν αἱ πολύχρυσοι
Λυδαὶ καὶ Πρυγῶν ἄλοχοι
στῆσον, παρ’ ἰστοῖς
μυθέωσαι τάδ’ ἐς ἄλληλας 790
‘Τίς ἄρα μ’ εὐπλοκάμου κόμας
τέρματα δικτυόν τανύσας
πατρίδος ἄλλωσαν ἀπολωτεὶ;
διὰ ταύτα, τὰν κιόνου δολιχάχενος γόνον,
εἰ δὲ φάτις ἐτύμως ὡς
τῇ τετυχεί Λήδαντὶ δρινιθὺ πταμένῳ
Δίὸς ἵν’ ἄλλαχθη δέμας, ἐτὶ
ἐν δέλτοις Πιερίσιν
μοῦ τάδ’ ἐς ἀνδρόπους
ἡγεμονὶ παρὰ καιρὸν ἄλλοις.’ (E. IA 784–800)

May no prospect come to me, or to my children’s children, such as the prospect that the wealthy Lydian women and the wives of the Phrygians will stir up when they converse at their looms: ‘who will, pulling my fair-haired tresses thereby causing a stream of tears, pluck me from my perished fatherland? And all on account of you, child of the long-necked swan, if it is indeed a true story that Leda bore(?) you to a winged bird, Zeus altered in shape—or (perhaps) tales in the tablets of Muses have brought these things to men falsely and to no purpose.’

The Greek women imagine the Trojan women to be at their looms (788). Women in heroic times conventionally work at their looms (e.g. Andromache and Helen in the Iliad (6.491, 22.440 and 3.125 resp.), and mentioning the looms here reflects their habit of talking and telling stories there to each other (as e.g. in E. Ion 196, 507). As an effect of imagining the captive women at the looms, this symbol of security is disturbed by the war.

In the next lines (794–800), Helen is blamed for the misery that the women in Troy are certain to endure as a result of the war, and the Greek women refer to a story about

---

40 Translation of Hermann’s ῥῦμα.
41 E. IA 784–800 is a variation of Hector’s speech in ll. 6.459–63, where Hector imagines Andromache, after the fall of Troy, working at the looms in Argos or carrying water for another man.
42 See Tuck (2009).
her ancestry but question its veracity. The three different temporal levels in this passage (the Greek women in Aulis, the Trojan women after the fall of Troy, and Helen’s birth) make the handling of time rather complex.

Before turning to the story about Helen’s birth, another issue must be addressed: as the Trojan women’s speech is not capped by a closing remark, where does their speech end? This is an important issue, since lines 794–800, in which the words referring to the story of Helen’s ancestry occur, may be spoken by the Greek women (the chorus) themselves or included in their quotation of the Trojan women’s hypothetical speech. In the latter, the Trojan women in the future would look back at the birth of Helen, which took place before the time in which the play is set (external analepsis within an external prolepsis).

Most scholars assume that there is a sharp distinction between the quoted direct speech and the chorus’ own words, so they argue for putting the quotation marks at the end of either line 793 or 800.43 (I have placed them at the end line 800 because there are no signs that their speech ends earlier). Yet the fact that the boundaries of the direct speech are not clearly marked here is significant, and I prefer to take this as an instance of metalepsis, that is, the merging of the voices of the Trojan women and the choral narrators. It is facilitated by the second-person pronoun σε (794), which is used whether the Greek women (the chorus) or Trojan women are speaking.44 Both the Trojan women and the chorus of Greek women address Helen and blame her for the Trojan War, and thus for Iphigenia’s death.45

Questions are raised as to the truth of the story of the birth of Helen. Although Helen is a contemporary to both the Greek chorus and the Trojan women, they have heard songs about Helen’s birth and raise the possibility that poets distorted the account they know of her birth: ἐν δέλτοις Πιερίσι (‘in the tablets of Muses’, 798); μῦθοι (‘tales’, 799). Doubts about her ancestry are a common motif in archaic and classical poetry.46 For instance, in Euripides’ Helen, a similar disclaimer about the identity of her parents comes from Helen’s own mouth: ‘if that story is reliable’ (εἰ σαφὴς οὗτος λόγος, 21).47 This rational

---

44 In Jakobson’s terms, ‘you’ is an ‘empty’ linguistic sign whose reference changes with every change of speaker in a discourse situation.
45 The blending of voices here has also been noted by Fletcher (1999: 43), who also states that it ‘underscores the Greek wives’ sympathy for the women of Troy and their growing sense of alienation from the Greek military culture at Aulis.’ Cf. De Jong (2003: 98–103) on instances (in)direct speech by a character that melds into the story of the narrator in Pindar and Bacchylides.
46 For example in Steichorius’ Palinode. For an overview of different versions of the myth of Helen, see Wright (2005: 57, cf. 142–5); cf. Blondell (2003). Kannicht (1969: ii, 24) compares the rejection in the IA with E. Tr. 766–71, in which Andromache addresses Helen: ‘offspring of Tyndareus, never were you daughter of Zeus...’ (ἀνήρκτος ἤρινος, εὔποτε ἐλέος, ... 766).
47 For this statement, see Dale (1967).
scepticism about the story is more typical for Euripides’ own time than for the heroic
time in which the play is set, and it may be compared to Pindar’s Olympian 1, in which
the narrator claims that an untrue story has been embellished and spread by poets (and
again apostrophizes the character whose story is doubted (p. 120)). The narrators thus
consider her birth, which took place only decades ago, from the perspective of the
audience in the theatre, as though it were a possibly false traditional tale.

In this choral ode, then, the boundaries between different narrative levels are porous
in multiple ways: both the chorus of Greek women and the Trojan women look back at
the birth of Helen as if it were a traditional tale, and both address Helen. The effect is that
their voices become one, and that we hear the voice of victims of the war in the future.
Furthermore, by referring to the birth of Helen as a (possibly false) traditional story, the
chorus adopts the temporal perspective of the audience in Athens.

3.2.2. Euripides’ Electra 699–746: the golden lamb ode

While Aegisthus is being slain and Clytemnestra’s murder has been planned, the
young Argive women who form the chorus in Euripides’ Electra sing of the golden lamb,
the token of kingship. They sing of how Pan had once endorsed Atreus’ kingship by giving
it to him, but his brother Thyestes stole it after he had seduced his wife.48 Zeus changed
the course of the sun and stars to restore Atreus’ power.

Although Atreus and Thyestes, as Agamemnon’s and Aegisthus’ fathers, respectively,
lived only two generations before the young Argive women, their story is emphatically
presented as ancient:

(19) ...ποτὲ κληθόνων πολιαίσι μένει τ’ φάμαις...49
...it remains/is preserved in ancient (prophetic) sayings that once... (E. El. 700–1).

Mένει underscores the persistence of this story throughout the tradition, and the
introductory phrase disguises the fact that the story that follows is possibly modified by
Euripides because this version of the story (especially the role of Pan) is not previously

48 It is not clear whether Aerope, Atreus’ wife, was actually involved in the thievery, yet the seduction of
Aerope and the stealing of the lamb are tied together here. Cf. Mulryne (1977: 32) and Roisman-Luschnig
49 The Greek text in the one manuscript (L) we have is corrupt in many places. I follow Willink (2005) in
reading the text as printed here for ποτὲ κληθόνων καὶ πολιαίσι μένει φάμαις, and in taking κληθόνων ... φάμαις
as a periphrasis.
attested.\textsuperscript{50} Κληδόνων is a marked word and typically used for prophetic sayings although the Argive women use it here of traditional stories. I will return to it shortly.

Although the young Argive women have not seen the golden lamb and its theft themselves, their narrative is full of details: they tell of the altar fires throughout the town and the music of the pipes. They also directly quote the words of the herald who stood on a stone platform (708–11). In lines 719–23 they jump forward in time, from the festive activities celebrating the golden lamb and power of the house of Atreus, to Thyestes, who had, so we learn in a brief analepsis (720–2), stolen this golden lamb and thus seized power. They also use a historic present: ἐκκομὶ|ζει (722–3) (and perhaps ΑΥΤΕΙ (724) too, if Heath is correct and ἄυτε is intended instead of the imperfect ἄυτε).\textsuperscript{51} The present tense marks an important event within the story, viz. Thyestes’ theft of the golden lamb. The young Argive women again emphasize the traditional status of (a part of) the story in the second antistrophe, now by λέγεται (737), which is emphatically positioned at the beginning of the stanza. The narrators do not seem to give much credence to this story, although they admit that such stories can nonetheless be beneficial:

(20) λέγεται (Δία) – τὰν δὲ πί–
   στιν σμικράν παρ’ ἔμοιγ’ ἔχει –
   στρέψαι θερμών ἄελιον
   χρυσοπόν ἔθραυν ἄμει–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψαντα δυστυχή βροτεί–
   ψα

\textsuperscript{50} I base myself here on Rosivach (1978: 189). For references to information on the accounts of the story of Atreus and Thyestes see also Cropp (1988: 149) \textit{ad} 699–746 and Roisman-Luschnig (2011: 181–2) \textit{ad} 699–706 and 699–746. In the principal versions of the myth, the golden lamb has been delivered by Artemis or Hermes to incite antagonism and enmity of either Artemis towards Atreus’ descendants, or among Atreus, Thyestes, and their descendants. According to Rosivach, Euripides introduced Pan to disregard associations from outside the \textit{Electra}. This keeps the focus on the seduction of Atreus’ wife by Thyestes, which parallels the seductions of Clytemnestra by Aegisthus. In addition, it is, in this respect, noteworthy that the banquet of Thyestes’ children by Atreus is omitted.

\textsuperscript{51} For the difficulty of distinguishing between (augmentless) imperfects and historic presents, see Rijksbaron (2006: 127–49).

\textsuperscript{52} See Hose (1990–1(2): 47–50) for this interpretation of δυστυχή βροτέιψ.

\textsuperscript{53} Text: Willink (2005), with θερμών (L) for θέρμαν (Willink).

\textsuperscript{54} Text: Willink (2005).
It is said that Zeus – though the belief it commands with me is small – turned/reversed the hot golden throne of the sun, changing it with the misfortune of men, as a punishment for mortals. Tales that are fearsome for men are beneficial with a view to the worship of the gods. (The chorus now address Clytemnestra, who is not present on stage.) Of them you had no thought when you killed your husband, you who are the relative of famous brothers.

Lambda (737) refers to an anonymous, impersonal 'source', which stands in marked contrast to έμοίγ' (738), by means of which the chorus of young Argive women come to the fore as narrators and express their personal disbelief of such stories (cf. Pindar and Hecataeus, pp. 124–5).

Do the young Argive women really not believe this story, or are the spectators not supposed to take their expression of disbelief literally? Stinton argues the latter, as such expressions of disbelief are merely used to emphasize the shocking, surprising, and 'truth-is-stranger-than-fiction' aspects of a story. With regard to this passage, he argues that the chorus' negation only applies to Zeus' reasons for reversing the course of the sun, namely 'as a punishment for mortals' (742), and states that the chorus disapproves of but does not deny Zeus' actions: 'though ostensibly an affirmation of faith in divine equity, [the chorus' words] are in reality a condemnation of divine inequity'. However, in my view, his suggestion that the chorus disapproves Zeus' actions is unconvincing – he acknowledges that it is not called for by the context – nor is his claim that it would, therefore, be a statement of Euripides' own view.

Rather, the chorus may very well express real disbelief, as the word μῦθοι (743–4) suggests. Fowler convincingly shows that mythoi mainly denote truthful and authoritative pronouncements in the archaic period, but their authority decreases from the fifth century with the emergence of the genre of historiography and of 'critical inquiry in both history and philosophy'. Although in tragedy myth-words normally retain their

55 Stinton (1976: 79–81); quotation on p. 81. Stinton reads the text as: λέγεται, τάν δὲ πίστιν σμικράν παρ᾽ έμοιγ' ἔχει, ... (737–8), which, however, does not influence the interpretation in this respect. Cropp (1988: 152) ad 737–46, accepting Stinton's interpretation, suggests that, since lines 739–42 'are too much like a restatement of 727–36 (...) and (...) mention not the divine motivation but the phenomenon itself', Weill's τάδε in line 737 should be added (λέγεται τάδε, τάν δὲ...), with τάδε referring to the immediately preceding second strophe, so that, if that is how we are to understand it, the reported perspective also applies to this preceding strophe. I do not consider τάδε as a necessary addition; see also Willink (2005: 19–21) for the phrase.


58 Fowler (2011), quotation on p. 66.
archaic definitions, Fowler notes that in Euripides ‘one may perhaps detect traces of more recent meanings’.

The expression of disbelief (737–8), together with the word μὑθος (743–4), makes it indeed likely that there is room for questions and doubts. Furthermore, Torrance argues that in Euripides the word mythos, which she translates as ‘fiction’, is metapoetically loaded and used by Euripides to draw attention to his own modifications of existing, familiar stories. I will not go so far as she does in translating every instance of the word mythos in Euripides as ‘fiction’. Yet Euripides’ Electra is famous for its intertextual references and mythological innovations, particularly in relation to Aeschylus’ Libation Bearers. In this respect, the chorus’ attitude reflects a theme in this play of rejecting familiar mythoi. The young Argive women do not believe the story of the irreversible change of the sun’s course, especially because it would not have been caused by a strife between two mortals in Argos. As in the IA (p. 165) Euripides again ascribes to the chorus the rational scepticism of myths that is typical of his own time.

From the chorus’ disbelief, I now return to the marked word κληδόνων (700), from which the chorus introduces the story of Ares. Words like κληδόνες are typically used for divine portents, and, specifically for accidental utterances that are unintentionally prophetic. Rosivach argues that κληδόνων carries this meaning here as well, since the narrative’s applicability to the main storyline of the play endows it with significance. This parallel between narrative and play is underscored by many verbal repetitions, words that are used for both Orestes’ arrival and his murder of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus in the play and Zeus’ reversal of the sun’s course in the narrative. The most convincing evidence is arguably the chorus’ reaction to Aegisthus’ shout when he is murdered near the end of the stasimon, referring to it as βροντῆς Διός (‘(as from) the thunder of Zeus’, 748). By using the word κληδόνων, the chorus of Argive women accidently confirm the applicability of the story to the present. Contrary to the Argive women, who fail to comprehend its significance, the audience will probably recognize the story’s parallel to the main storyline of this play. As Rosivach wrote, it ‘is a κληδών in the fullest sense of the

---

61 Comparable observations have been made by Halporn (1983: 109): ‘the dramatic function of the chorus here, as elsewhere in the play, is to suggest a universe and a way of seeing the world that can help explain the state of mind of Electra herself’ and Jouanna (1997). As such the passage could well be compared to Pl. Resp. 33od–e as noted by Fowler (2011: 62, n. 69), in which scepticism about a mythos is expressed, while the mythos itself is still good for piety.
By putting that word in the mouth of the chorus, Euripides reveals the significance of the chorus’ story for the play as a whole.

I suggest that the significance of the word κληδόνων in this stasimon, as shown by Rosivach, is especially relevant for the chorus’ disbelief at the stasimon’s end. The chorus of young women do not believe stories like the one they just related. Yet, on the level of the primary narratees (the audience in the theatre), the truth of the story is insignificant because the story simply announces the main storyline of the play. The chorus questions exactly that part of the story of Zeus’ endorsement of Atreus is about to be paralleled in the play’s main storyline: the restoration of Atreus’ line of power (in the person of Orestes) by the murder of Aegisthus, and later Clytemnestra. Although the young Argive women do not believe the story, κληδόνων suggests to the audience that the power of his line will be restored again.

---

63 Rosivach (1978: 199). In addition, Peradotto (1969) has noted the dramatic potential of such utterances, which are for the characters difficult to interpret, but for the audience a form of dramatic irony.
4. NO EXPLICIT EXPLANATION OF NARRATIVE KNOWLEDGE

In contrast to the instances discussed above, in which where the choral narrators explain the source of their story and/or their knowledge of that source, in most choral odes their omniscience is not motivated. This is not necessary when they are internal narrators (sub-chapter 2). But even when they are external narrators, as they usually are, they rarely indicate how they know about the events they tell. In some cases, it may be because the events occurred recently (and in some of these cases also nearby):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choral ode</th>
<th>Identity of the chorus</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Th. 720–91</td>
<td>Theban women</td>
<td>Laius and Oedipus; the curse on the sons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 355–488 (in 409–46)</td>
<td>Argive elders</td>
<td>Paris’ taking of Helen; Menelaus’ distress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. 681–809</td>
<td>Argive elders</td>
<td>Helen and Troy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. OT 1186–1222</td>
<td>Theban elders</td>
<td>Oedipus’ career</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ant. 100–61</td>
<td>Theban elders</td>
<td>The failure of the expedition of the Seven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. 497–530</td>
<td>Trachinian women</td>
<td>Wooing of Deianeira</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. 821–62</td>
<td>Trachinian women</td>
<td>Deianeira caused Heracles’ death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. 676–729 (in 676–80)</td>
<td>Greek sailors</td>
<td>The suffering of Philoctetes (684–717)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Alc. 569–605</td>
<td>Pheraean elders</td>
<td>Hospitality of Admetus to Apollo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andr. 1009–46</td>
<td>Pharsalian women</td>
<td>Disasters for the Greeks (1009–46)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hipp. 752–75</td>
<td>Troezenian women</td>
<td>Phaedra’s journey from Crete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Andr. 274–308</td>
<td>Pharsalian women</td>
<td>Judgement of Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hec. 620–57</td>
<td>Trojan women</td>
<td>Paris’ judgement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF 348–430</td>
<td>Theban elders</td>
<td>Labours of Heracles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. 1018–66</td>
<td>Phoenician women</td>
<td>The Sphinx and Oedipus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Or. 807–43</td>
<td>Argive maidens</td>
<td>Strife in the house of Atreus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 543–636</td>
<td>Greek women</td>
<td>Paris’ judgement; Helen (573–89)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.1: No explanation – stories from the chorus’ immediate past

No explicit explanation of narrative knowledge

With regard to these narratives, the chorals' unmotivated knowledge is often unsurprising because they relate events that they may have witnessed, e.g., the failure of the expedition of the Seven in Antigone's parodos (100–61). In this ode, the old men of Thebes do not explain their knowledge of how their city has defeated the enemy Polyneices. Yet although the chorus members embody old men of Thebes, who did not participate in the fighting, their close emotional involvement is reflected by the many first-person plural forms:

Who (i.e. the enemy) set out against our land because of the strife-filled claims of Polyneices,
but he went, before his jaws had been glutted with our gore and the fire-god's pine-fed flame had seized our crown of towers.
But since Victory whose name is glorious has come, her joy responding to the joy of Thebes with many chariots, after the recent war let us, be forgetful, and visit all the temples of the gods with all-night dances. And may the Bacchic god who shakes the land of Thebes be ruler!

Although the old men of Thebes did not participate in the actual fighting, the chorals' knowledge of these events is not surprising because of their emotional involvement in it. They can even be assumed to have watched the fighting from the wall (a teichoscopy). Although eyewitness accounts are generally regarded as reliable in tragedy, chorals, as here in the Antigone, never explicitly claim to speak from autopsy (e.g. 'I have seen how...'). So the old men of Thebes are arguably eyewitnesses of the events, as

---

1 Cf. e.g. Page (1938: 12) ad E. Med. 652; Goldhill (1984: 99–207) on the importance of sight in the Libation Bearers; de Jong (1991: 11–2) on the eyewitness status of messengers. Cf. A. Pers. 266–7 (messenger); S. OT 6–7 (Oedipus); Tr. 747–8 (Hyllus); E. Heracl. 390 (Demophon); Supp. 684 (messenger); Tr. 481–3 (Hecuba), where speakers refer to their eyewitness status in order to authorize their account.

2 Outside narratives, albeit occasionally, the chorus do emphasize direct experience: e.g. E. Med. 654–5
suggested by their close emotional involvement. However, they express that involvement in an unusual way, viz. with many 'we' statements (as against 'I'); this is the only narrative choral ode in which they use 'we' thrice. This relatively high frequency can be explained by the ode's paean-like style: the chorus is in a victorious mood and speaks from a collective standpoint, viz. that of the whole city (which they mention thrice by name: 132, 149, 153). Furthermore, by emphasizing the collective identity of the citizens of Thebes, the city is separated more markedly from Polyneices (and hence later also from Antigone), an important theme of the play.

Whereas in the parodos of the Antigone the Theban elders are closely involved in (and has arguably seen) the events, in many choral odes the choral narrators would not have seen the events they describe. It is, for instance, unlikely that the Trojan women who form the chorus in Hecuba witnessed Paris' judgement (629–57) or the Theban elders in Heracles the labours of Heracles (348–450). And, although the chorus of Pharsalian women in Euripides' Andromache clearly would not have witnessed the judgement of Paris themselves, they recount that Aphrodite's words were delightful to hear (τερπνοῖς μὲν ἄκοιτασα, 290). In this respect they inherit lyric narrators' ( unmotivated) omniscience derived from traditional tales, but that is remarkable in tragedy because the chorus is also a character in the play. In this respect, their status qua chorus comes to the fore.

Occasionally, the chorus' knowledge is explained on the basis of the play itself. Thus in Sophocles' Philoctetes 684–717 the chorus members provide a detailed account of the harsh conditions under which Philoctetes lived for the previous ten years, which Greek soldiers like them could not possibly have witnessed. Their knowledge here is explained because Philoctetes himself told them about his plight (285–99).6

6. Kamerbeek (1978: 10): 'the first strophe of the Parodos is more or less a paean of victory'; Burton (1980: 91): 'possibly a paean'; Rutherford (1994:5:126–7); (2001: 110) Antigone's parodos is 'an ode of victory, and could be thought of as a victory παίαν, though no formal features corroborate this'; Swift (2010: 29): 'while the ode has few of the formal features of the paian, it could be seen to play the role of a paian'. For this parodos as a 'false paean', i.e. a paean 'che di volta in volta non riesce compiutamente a realizzarsi, fallendo', see Rodighiero (2012: 132–37): 'Il canto di festa si colloca infatti, nello svolgersi della vicenda, opportunamente al momento di massima gioia, e contribuisce quindi alla creazione di quello scarto all'interno dell'azione drammatica tra una situazione positiva presunta e la catastrofe imminente' (quotations on p. 121).

5. Cf. Differently Gardiner (1987: 84): 'more personal than civic. Their song contains no sweeping prayer for the safety of the state, nor is it a hymn of thanksgiving offered to the gods for the rescue of the city'.

6. Cf. Ussher (1990: 134) ad 710–4: 'their (i.e. the chorus') words otherwise recall the cripple's own description'.

Ibid. ad 710–4: 'their words again recall Philoctetes' own account'.

(ἐἰδομεν, οὐκ ἔτηρον | μῆδον ἐχω φράσασθαι): IT 930–1 (ἐν τοσι βαιμαστοτι καὶ μῆδον πέρα | ταθ' εἴδον αὐθὶ καὶ κόλους' ὀψαγγέλω). The choral narrators could be eyewitnesses in S. Tr. 498–530, but the crucial line, 526, is not clear. Therefore, I assume that the chorus did not witness the events they narrate. In E. Supp. 618–22 the chorus wish to be eyewitnesses.

6. Kamerbeek (1978: 10): 'the first strophe of the Parodos is more or less a paean of victory'; Burton (1980: 91): 'possibly a paean'; Rutherford (1994:5:126–7); (2001: 110) Antigone's parodos is 'an ode of victory, and could be thought of as a victory παίαν, though no formal features corroborate this'; Swift (2010: 29): 'while the ode has few of the formal features of the paian, it could be seen to play the role of a paian'. For this parodos as a 'false paean', i.e. a paean 'che di volta in volta non riesce compiutamente a realizzarsi, fallendo', see Rodighiero (2012: 132–37): 'Il canto di festa si colloca infatti, nello svolgersi della vicenda, opportunamente al momento di massima gioia, e contribuisce quindi alla creazione di quello scarto all'interno dell'azione drammatica tra una situazione positiva presunta e la catastrofe imminente' (quotations on p. 121).

5. Cf. Differently Gardiner (1987: 84): 'more personal than civic. Their song contains no sweeping prayer for the safety of the state, nor is it a hymn of thanksgiving offered to the gods for the rescue of the city'.

6. Cf. Ussher (1990: 134) ad 710–4: 'their (i.e. the chorus') words otherwise recall the cripple's own description'.

Ibid. ad 710–4: 'their words again recall Philoctetes' own account'.

172 | Choral odes of tragedy
I turn to the choral odes that narrate events that do not come from the chorus’ immediate past:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choral ode</th>
<th>Identity of the chorus</th>
<th>Topic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Supp. 1–175</td>
<td>Danaids</td>
<td>Metis (49–68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S. El. 472–515</td>
<td>Mycenaean women</td>
<td>Pelops and Myrtilus (504–15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E. Andr. 1009–46</td>
<td>Pharsalian women</td>
<td>The building of Troy (1009–18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF 1016–41 (M)</td>
<td>Theban Elders</td>
<td>Danaids (1016–8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tr. 799–859</td>
<td>Trojan women</td>
<td>The first Trojan War</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IO 1234–82</td>
<td>Greek slave women</td>
<td>Apollo’s killing of the serpent and his office of prophecy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hel. 1301–68</td>
<td>Greek slave women</td>
<td>Demeter in search for Persephone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. 638–89</td>
<td>Phoenician women</td>
<td>Cadmus defeats the dragon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph. 784–832</td>
<td>Phoenician women</td>
<td>Strifes in Thebes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba. 64–166</td>
<td>Bacchantes</td>
<td>Birth of Dionysus (88–104) and invention of the Bacchian drum (120–34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ba. 519–75</td>
<td>Bacchantes</td>
<td>Zeus’ pregnancy of Bacchus (519–29)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IA 1036–97</td>
<td>Greek women</td>
<td>Marriage of Peleus and Thetis</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: No explanation – stories from the distant past

In many odes the chorus’ knowledge can be explained by the fact that they tell stories that belong to the common memory of their community, such as for example in the two choral odes in the Bacchae, and the story of Pelops and Myrtilus narrated by the chorus of Mycenaean women in Sophocles’ Electra (472–515, cf. ἐκ τοῦ ὅπατος ὀίκου, 514). Likewise, their knowledge about the first Trojan War (Tr. 799–859) can be explained because the story would have been well known in Troy. Indeed, they sing that Telamon once attacked their city (ἐκπέρσων πόλιν ἁμετέραν τὸ πάροιθεν, 806–7), using the first-person plural to create a collective identity that extends chronologically. In other words, their forebears’ participation in the Trojan War justifies their knowledge about it.

Another example is found in Iphigenia in Aulis, in which the chorus of Greek women recount the wedding of Peleus among the gods on the slopes of Mount Pelion in detail:

\[(22) \delta \delta \varepsilon \Delta \alpha \phi \sigma \nu \iota \varsigma, \Delta \iota \varsigma \varsigma \lambda \eta \kappa \tau \rho \omega \nu \tau \rho \phi \eta \mu \alpha \nu, 1050\]  

\[And \ Dardanus’ \ son, \ a \ beloved \ object \ of \ pleasure \ of \ Zeus’ \ bed, \ the\]

---

7 Rutherford (2007: 20); e.g. in the choral odes in the Bacchae.
Phrygian Ganymede, poured a drink-offering from the mixing bowl into golden cups. And while along the white-gleaming sand Nereus’ fifty daughters were whirling in a ring, they celebrated the marriage with their dancing. Holding fir trunks, their heads wreathed with leaves, the troop of Centaurs came, mounted on horses, to the feast of the gods and the mixing-bowl of Bacchus. And they cried loudly: ‘...’

The Greek women were not present at that wedding, but they provide a detailed account of all of the attendees and even quote the Centaurs’ words. Here too, the chorus inherits the (unmotivated) omniscience of lyric narrators.

Another example is Euripides’ Helen:

Once upon a time the mountain-dwelling Mother of the gods rushed on swift feet along the wooded glens and the gushing of streams of water and the deep-thundering breakers of the sea in longing for her vanished daughter whose name is never spoken.

When the mother ceased from her wild wandering toil, searching for the treacherous †...† abduction of her daughter, she passed through the snow-nurturing peaks where the nymphs of Ida keep watch, she hurled herself in grief down the stony corpses filled with snow.

The chorus consists of Greek slave women, and their account of Demeter’s search for her daughter gives them the characteristics of omniscient narrators. Thus, they follow Demeter rushing through forests, rivers, etc., and relate her thoughts and emotions.
Although it does not require supernatural insight to understand that Demeter was in sorrow, the Greek women offer the audience an intimate glimpse of her profound grief and implicitly embed her focalization in their narrative, such as when speaking of ‘the treacherous abduction of her daughter’ (θυγατρὸς ἁρπαγὰς δολίους, 1321–2). This may be the closest example in this category of choral odes to a description of a character’s inner thoughts. It is worth noting that such presentations of someone’s thoughts occur more frequently and elaborately in epic and lyric.

Occasionally, the choral narrators express uncertainty. Thus, for example, they do not know of Athena’s role and Ajax’ delusion in S. Ajax 172–81. Their uncertainty has a function on the level of the play’s plot: because of their lack of knowledge, the chorus cannot inform Tecmessa about these events and she can thus provide her own interpretation.8

More often, ‘denial’ of knowledge serves rhetorical purposes. An example is found in a choral ode in Euripides’ Andromache, in which the Pharsalian women convey their amazement that Apollo and Poseidon abandoned Troy to Ares after having built walls around it, thereby causing its destruction:9

(24) ὃ Φοίβε πυργώσας τὸν ἐν Ἑλῳ εὐτείχη πάγον
καὶ πόντε κυκνέως ἵπποις διφρεύ-
ων ἄλιον πέλαγος,
τίνος οὐνέκ’ ἄτιμον ἄργα-
νον χεροτεκτοσύνας Ἕ-
νυαλίῳ δοριμὴστοι προσθέν-
τες τάλαιναν τάλαι-
ναν μεθέτεσεν Τροίαν; (E. Andr. 1009–18)
O Phoebus, who built high the fair-walled rock of Troy, and you, Lord of the Deep,
who ride your chariot with wave-dark horses over the briny sea, why did you
deprive you hand of its cunning craftsmanship, and put it to the service of Ares,
Lord of the Spear, and thereby let slip luckless, luckless Troy?

They could provide a concrete answer like: ‘because Laomedon refused to reward Apollo and Poseidon, which he had promised’. But they do not. Instead, they continue with a second-person narrative (addressing the gods) about the many victims of the war, concluding with the phrase: ὃ δαίμων, ὃ Φοίβε, πῶς πείθομαι; (‘O God, O Phoebus, how can

---

I believe it?”, 1036). This shows that the presentation of the world of the gods as obscure is primarily meant to express the chorus’ dismay.\footnote{Comparable questions are found in E. Ph. 784–5. The two passages belong to the category of ‘epiplectic questions’ in Mastronarde (1979: 13). Such questions, which typically express amazement, sorrow or dismay, often occur in the extant choral odes, cf. e.g.: A. Th. 738–9, 771–7, S. \textit{Ot} 1204–12, Tr. 835–9, E. \textit{Andr}. 299–300, 1036, \textit{Med}. 1290–2, Or. 831–3.}
5. CONCLUSION

In most tragic embedded narratives, the chorales narrators have a detailed knowledge of events of the distant past but do not explain the source of their knowledge. Although their access to the inner thoughts of other characters is not extensive, their knowledge is unrestricted so that they can vividly relate events from which they were absent, like lyric narrators. When the chorales narrators do lack knowledge, this has a function on the level of the plot of the play, or it is a rhetorical device to express their amazement about the gods’ actions.

In the Trojan Women (511-76), the chorales narrators do not invoke the Muse to authenticate their knowledge (her usual epic function) because they narrate from autopsy. Instead, they do so to emphasize the narrative’s similarities with, or deviations from, epic poetry. In lyric, the Muses are mostly invoked to signal epic subject matter, aid in the song’s composition, and guarantee fame for the song (and its topic), not to authenticate the narrator’s knowledge of the distant past in particular. This idea ties in with the stasimon in the Trojan Women and an example in Heracles (1016-41): by invoking the Muse, the narrators draw attention to the song qua song. As such, the invocation to the Muses is one of the chorus’ self-referential utterances, in which they refer to their own status qua chorus.

Like in the Trojan Women, the chorales narrators have witnessed the events they narrate in the narrative stasimon in the Hecuba (905–52). Both odes about the fall of Troy contrast celebration with the subsequent desolation of the city. The chorales narrators celebrate the Trojans’ supposed victory, which is narrated from a rather limited perspective, but with ominous utterances that foreshadow the Trojan’s eventual defeat and between narrating and experiencing focalization. These shifts signal that their festive mood was based on false beliefs, which arouses pity for the Trojan chorus.

The chorales narrators also quote other narrators. The narrators mainly create authority for the chorus’ narrative, as reported narrators suggest that the stories are well known. The poets, in turn, use this device to disguise invented traditions. The reported narrators may produce several additional effects. As in lyric, in the narrative stasima in Libation Bearers, Philoctetes, and Medea, the narrators explicitly compare the present to the mythical past by using reported narrators. In the chorales odes of tragedy, it also underscores the exceptionality of an extreme situation on stage when the character’s situation is worse than what the chorus knows from stories. In addition, in E. Electra (432-86) the chorales narrators convey eyewitness reactions to Achilles’ arms by means of their informant. On the other hand, the chorales narrators may use reported narrators to spawn doubts as to the story’s veracity, as in E. Electra (golden lamb ode, 699-746) and the Iphigenia in Aulis (751-802). Their critical stance creates authority for themselves as
narrators. In addition, in the choral ode his Electra, Euripides signals the significance of the chorus’ words for the play with κληδών. Finally, the chorus’ temporal perspective on traditional stories often merges with that of the spectators, since the choral narrators present stories from their immediate past as belonging to a distant, traditional past.
4. The Chorus’ Authority, Knowledge, and Silence in Agamemnon’s Parodos

The parodos of the Agamemnon is not only the longest extant choral narrative, but arguably the most complicated, especially because of its complex handling of time, metaphors, and what Peradotto called its ‘calculated verbal obscurity’.

It occupies an important position within the Agamemnon: as Barrett wrote, its ‘magisterial display of narrative possibilities expresses in short order some of the play’s most pressing concerns’.

It is unsurprising that its narrative techniques, particularly its handling of time, have received ample scholarly attention in the substantial amount of literature about the parodos. Thus, Barrett shows that it contains a ‘complex and subtle manipulation of temporal elements’.

Schein focuses on the temporal and spatial vagueness of its lyric part, which is unclear about when and where the events took place.

He argues that in this respect, the chorus’ riddles and prophetic perspective resembles those of seers such as Calchas, who is quoted in the parodos, prophesying troubles for Agamemnon’s house.

In addition, Grethlein, who also compares the chorus’ temporal perspective to Calchas’, states that the chorus ‘present the past as a panopticon in which various levels of time are tangled up with each other’.

The parodos poses major challenges to the subject of narrative authority as well. What is the basis of the chorus’ narrative authority? Were the Argive elders, who form the chorus, eyewitnesses of the events in Aulis that they relate? Like most tragic choruses, they do not explain how they learned the information they share, although their striking and controversial line 248 at the end of their narrative, that they did not see ‘what happened next’, might imply that they have eyewitness knowledge of the events until that moment:

(1) 
τὰ δ’ ἐνδει τεύχων οὐ τε οὐνενέπω
τέχναι δὲ Κάλχαντος οὐχ ἀκραντοί. (A. Aga. 248–9)
What happened next I did not see and (therefore) do not tell, but the skills of Calchas do/did not remain unfulfilled.

5 Grethlein (2013: 78–99); quotation on p. 85.
On the basis of this line alone, many scholars assume that the Argive elders were indeed at Aulis.\(^6\) Others argue that they were not,\(^7\) for instance because they say that they stayed at home during the Trojan War due to their old age (70–5) and do not suggest that they went as far as Aulis. This chapter begins by addressing the following questions: have the Argive elders witnessed the events in Aulis? If so, why do they draw a veil over the end of their story? If not, how do they know what they tell?

An investigation of the chorus’ (narrative) authority in the parodos would be incomplete without a discussion of their own famous claim at the beginning of the parodos’ lyric part:

\[\text{(2) κύριός εἰμι θροεῖν ὁδιὸν κράτος αἴσιον ἀνθρώπων ἐκτελέων· ἔτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνευστεί πειθό, μολπάν ἀλκὰν σύμφυτος αἰών ... (104–7).}\(^8\)

I am authorized to tell aloud about the commanders, in charge of men in their prime, who met with auspicious signs on the road – for still by divine favour the life born with me breathes persuasion over me, the strength of songs...

How should we interpret these words, and why do the chorus claim to be ‘authorized to tell’ here? Does this refer to the chorus’ narrative authority (as eyewitnesses), as scholars often assume? Other possibilities have been suggested, for instance authority based on the chorus’ rank/status and the authority of the chorus qua chorus. Or could the words be related to the chorus’ prophetic nature, which is suggested by their handling of time?

I will first investigate whether the Argive elders witnessed the events, and then I will examine the chorus’ claim at the beginning of the parodos.

---


\(^{8}\) For remarks on the text and translation, see passage 3.
1. DID THE CHORUS WITNESS THE EVENTS IN AULIS?

The Argive elders do not clarify whether or not they went to Aulis. In order to determine whether they narrate events that they actually saw, I will examine how they narrate the lyric part of the parodos (104–257). As external narrators can narrate as if they were eyewitnesses (see e.g. Chapter 3.4), an eyewitness-like style is not proof of eyewitness status. To examine if the chorus are eyewitness, I will first examine the passage of the omen of the eagles (1.1), turn to the preparations of Iphigenia’s sacrifice (1.2), and finally investigate the end of the narrative (1.3), where the chorus breaks off. The question of whether the chorus are eyewitnesses is central to each of these points.

1.1. The omen of the eagles (104–59)

In the preceding anapaestic part of the parodos, the Argive elders pointed out that they were too old to contribute to the war and stayed behind in Argos (72–5). They did not indicate that they might perhaps have gone to Aulis.

At the beginning of the parodos’ lyric part, the chorus announces the subject of the narrative, namely the departure of the Greek army for Troy:

(3) κύριός εἰμι θρείν δῆλον κράτος αίσιον ἀνδρῶν
 ἐκτελέων· ἐτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνεύει
 πειθώ, μολπᾶν ἀλκάνον σύμφυτος αἰών·
 ὅπως Ἀχαιῶν διήρονον κράτος, Ἑλλάδος ἠβας
 ξύμπρονα ταχάν, 105

1 I assume that the omen took place in Aulis, wherefore I have translated μελάθρων (116) as ‘dwelling’, instead of ‘palace’. Although it is almost universally assumed that the omen and Calchas’ explanation of it were situated in Aulis, there remains room for discussion: Sommerstein (1996: 87–94) argues that the omen must have taken place in Argos, against which Heath (2004) comes with objections. Raeburn-Thomas (2011: 80) ad 116 note that he words βασιλεῖσι νέων suggest kings currently commanding the flotilla, which, in my view, is a strong argument in favour of Aulis.

2 Although, of course, orthographical distinctions did not exist for the Athenian audience, I read πειθώ (West’s Teubner edition (1990)) instead of Πειθώ (Page’s OCT (1972)). In my view, πειθώ is here an abstract noun and there is no reason to assume that is personified. For a discussion on the differences – but also lack of a hard dichotomy – between personified and abstract/secular meanings of the word in general, see Buxton (1982: 30–57). I will come back to the meaning of this word in sub-chapter 2.

3 Μολπᾶν ἀλκάν (106) is put between daggers in Page’s OCT (1972), but I think there is not sufficient reason to doubt the text here. In West’s Teubner edition (1990), the MS reading is accepted and printed without daggers. Differently Denniston-Page (1957: 78) ad 105–7, who suggest μολπᾶ δ’ ἀλκάν.
The chorus' authority, knowledge, and silence in Agamemnon's parodos

I am authorized to tell aloud about the commanders, in charge of men in their prime, who met with auspicious signs on the road — for still by divine favour the life born with me breathes persuasion over me, the strength of songs — how a swooping bird-omen sent the double-throned commanders of the Achaeans, the single-minded leadership of the youth of Hellas, with avenging spear and hand against the Teucrian land, after the king of birds had appeared to the kings of the ships — one of them black, and the other with a white tail — near their dwelling at the side of the spear-wielding hand in a very conspicuous place, devouring a hare carrying unborn offspring, after they had hindered her from her last flight. Sing sorrow, sorrow, but may the good win out!

I leave the introductory claim of authority (104–7) aside for now and immediately turn to the narrative. It starts smoothly in line 108 with the relative clause (ὅπως…). Lines 108–12 repeat and elaborate upon ὅδιον (cf. πέμπει…Τρευκρίδ’ ἐπ’ αἶαν), κράτος (cf. Ἀχαιῶν δίθρονον κράτος) and ἀνδρῶν ἐκτελέων (cf. Ἑλλάδος ἥβας) in lines 104–5. The Argive elders move back in time by means of the aorist participles φανέντες (117) and βλάψαντε (120). They explain that two birds appeared, devouring a pregnant hare. The narrative turns to an independent construction after line 121 and proceeds in chronological order.4 Because of this fluent transition, it is not clear where the chorus’ knowledge is based on.

Are the Argive elders eyewitnesses in this passage? They mention the birds’ colours (the one black and the other with a white tail, 115) and the place of their appearance (the right side of the Atridæ’s dwelling, where everyone, including the Argive elders if they were indeed present, could clearly see them, 117–8). In spite of these visual details, little information is provided about the exact location. As Fränkel notes, ‘of the geographical position of the μέλαθρα we are here told nothing at all’;5 it is not even specified that the

---

4 This kind of fluent transition from introduction to narrative is familiar from lyric poetry (e.g. Pl. P. 3.1–11; 4.1–11). See also p. 103.
5 Fränkel (1950(2): 77) ad 116.
omen took place in Aulis.° Despite this geographical vagueness, however, the otherwise detailed narrative has particular emphasis on the birds’ appearance, colour, and activity, which at least raises the possibility that the Argive elders truly are eyewitnesses.

An additional argument would be the Argive elders’ explanation of the omen, which actually is a quotation of Calchas’ prophecy (126–55) that the Atridae will capture Troy but Artemis’ anger will be aroused, and she will demand another sacrifice (which will eventually lead to Agamemnon’s death). Although they have to rely on Calchas’ allusive explanation, the Argive elders must have a premonition that Agamemnon’s household is not safe from disaster, since they add that Calchas offered prayers for the royal household (σῖκως βασιλείας, 157) rather than for the expedition. This means that the omen is two-sided: it is auspicious (αἴσιον, 104) regarding the expedition because Troy will fall, but inauspicious regarding the royal household.° By mentioning Calchas’ prayers for the household and their anxiety throughout the parodos (for example in the refrain αἴλινον αἴλινον εἶπέ, τὸ δ’ εὖ νικάτω, 121, 139, 159), the Argive elders show that they are more concerned with the royal household than the expedition. Thus they reveal the perspective of the inhabitants of Argos, who are loyal to the king. If they narrate with their own focalization as Argive elders and from an eyewitness perspective, this would indeed suggest that they really narrate what they have seen.

The chorus’ knowledge in this first strophe may significantly be opposed to Cassandra’s later in the Agamemnon (1072–1330). She narrates the murder of Thyestes’ children, who were cooked by Atreus (1095–7, 1184–97, and 1214–25), and prophesizes Agamemnon’s death, like the chorus via Calchas in the parodos. There are important similarities between the two passages. For example, their words receive some kind of divine authority, since the Argive elders claim that πειθώ is breathed upon them from the gods (I will come back to the meaning of this word in the next section), while Cassandra narrates the events that Apollo shows her, although she questions whether she will be believed (εἴ τι μὴ πείθω, 1239). However, Cassandra’s narrative acts as a counterpoint to the Argive elders’ in that she narrates omnisciently and ‘sees’ the events (1201) because she is inspired by Apollo (1215, 1241), which gives her a clear vision of the past and future.° By contrast, the Argive elders arguably merely narrate what they have (literally) seen, and their narrative in the parodos is characterized by doubts, anxiety, and uncertainty.

---

° See n. 1 on p. 181.

° For the emphasis on the house in the parodos, see also Goldhill (1984: 46) and Raeburn-Thomas (2011: 84) ad 156–9.

° In this respect, the word μέρση’ (157) is aptly chosen, since it does not necessarily have a negative content, but often has one; cf. Fränkel (1950: 95) ad 156f.

° This difference is also mentioned by Rutherford (2007: 3).
The Argive elders’ and Cassandra’s words may well show different narrative possibilities (autopsy of an omen and divine ‘inspiration’) for the same event (Agamemnon’s death).23

In this first passage of the lyric parodos, we get a first, albeit minor, glimpse of the way in which the Argive elders access the events they narrate: the eyewitness details, like the location and colour of the birds, the dependence for the meaning of the omen on Calchas’ speech, and the focus on the household, implies narration from the Argive elders’ perspective as eyewitnesses.

1.2. The preparations of Iphigenia’s sacrifice (228–47)

I pick up the thread of the parodos after the Hymn to Zeus, where the narrative proceeds, and examine the Argive elders’ presentation of the preparations of the sacrifice of Iphigenia (228–47). The Argive elders first recount Agamemnon’s decision to sacrifice his daughter. Καὶ τὸθ’ (184) introduces the ensuing narrative as an example of the preceding general law of πάθει μάθος in the Hymn to Zeus.24 The passage begins with the headline of the narrative, the so-called ‘header-device’:25 Agamemnon ‘breathed along

23 The parallel between Cassandra’s and the chorus’ narrative is only suggestive. Yet considering that both the chorus and Cassandra refer to Iphigenia and Agamemnon respectively ‘falling/caught in robes’ at the moment of their death (chorus: πέπλοισι περιπετή; 234; Cassandra: ‘after she (i.e. Clytemnestra) has caught him in robes’, ἐν πέπλοισι (... λαβὼν, 1126–7) (cf. Lebeck (1964: 41)), and that the verb δρεῖν is used of both the chorus’ (104) and Cassandra’s utterances (1137 and 1140) it is, when taking all together, not implausible that there is a intended parallel between these two narratives. More in general, also their dramatic and poetic functions may be compared to each other: both the chorus and Cassandra refer to the death of Agamemnon in the future (147–55, 1246), and announce the next murder: for the chorus this is Agamemnon (τεύξῃ (subj. Artemis) θυσίαν ἑτέραν etc., 150) after the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and Cassandra announces Orestes’ revenge upon Clytemnestra (ἥξει … ἡμῶν ἄλλος αὖ τιμάορος etc. 1280) after her own ‘sacrifice’ (1277–9).

24 Although the issue is not crucial for my argument, I should add that scholars disagree on the function of καὶ τὸθ’” (184). E.g. Wilamowitz (1914: 166) and Bollack (1981(2): 256–62) believe that the words refer back to the situation before the Hymn to Zeus. The temporal adverb would have the function, after the interruption caused by the Hymn to Zeus, of making contact again with what preceded, and continuing the account of events in Aulis. Καὶ τὸθ’ may indeed fulfill this function, but only to a certain degree, for although the audience is carried back to what they have already been told (the events in Aulis), they are not taken to the particular point reached just before the Hymn to Zeus, i.e. the speech of Calchas. Other scholars, therefore, argue instead that the sentence introduced by καὶ τὸθ’ is an example of the general statements that are expressed in the Hymn to Zeus, and thus with καὶ τὸθ’ a special case is ranged under a general law (Fränkel (1950(2): 114) ad 184, who sees a parallel with Ag. 399, Goldhill (1984: 28), and Raeburn-Thomas (2011: 89) ad 184–91). Kranz (1999: 308) states that καὶ τὸθ’ (184) is cataphoric, only introducing the subsequent narrative, and is taken up again by ἐδει (188). I favour the second interpretation, i.e. that with καὶ τὸθ’ the case of Agamemnon is ranged under a general law.

25 De Jong-Nünlist (2007: e.g. 35, 236).
with the events that struck against him’ (187) and dared to sacrifice his daughter in order to appease the winds. In the following lines, the Argive elders go back in time to tell about the events leading up to this decision. From line 228, they recount the events that followed, namely the preparations for the sacrifice.

With regard to the first half of the narrative on these preparations (228–38), there are a variety of interpretative issues. Therefore, I begin with the passage itself and my translation:

(4) λιτὰς δὲ καὶ κληρόνας πατρίως

παρ᾽ οὐδὲν αἰώνα παρθένοιον τ᾽

ἐβέντο φιλόμαχοι βραβής;

φράσεν δ᾽ ἀξίοις πατήρ μετ᾽ εὐχάν

δίκαια χιαίρας ὑπερθέ βωμών

πέπλοιοι περιπετῆ παντὶ δυμῷ

προνωπὶ λαβεῖν ἀέρ-

δην, στόματός τε καλλιπρο-

ρου φυλακῇ κατασχεῖν

φθόγγον ἀραῖον ὡς

βίας χαλινῶν τ᾽ ἀναύδῳ μένει. (228–38).

The war-thirsty chieftains did not care for her (i.e. Iphigenia’s) prayers and cries of ‘father’, nor for her young age. The father instructed the sacrificial servants after a prayer to seize her and lift her up wholeheartedly above the altar like a goat, with her robes falling around her, her head hanging, and to restrain speech that might lay a curse on the house by applying a guard of her fair-prowed mouth.

Agamemnon orders his servants to lift and gag Iphigenia. One of the obscure parts in this passage occurs in lines 233–4. The word περιπετῆ is especially difficult to interpret, since it may have a passive meaning, i.e. that Iphigenia’s robe fell around her (as in my translation, cf. 239), or an active meaning, i.e. Iphigenia falls around and grasps Agamemnon’s robe in supplication. Accordingly, παντὶ δυμῷ describes either the sacrificial servants who seize and lift Iphigenia with all their heart or Iphigenia herself, who grasps at Agamemnon’s peplos in supplication with all her heart. Lebeck states that both meanings of the words are present.
However we interpret περιπετη, some of the events discussed in this line are not part of the order given by Agamemnon, even though lines 232–8 are syntactically dependent on φράσει. Surely Agamemnon would not have ordered that Iphigenia’s robe should fall around her or that she should grasp his. Nor is it likely that he would compare her to a goat (232). This means that the Argive elders do not merely narrate what Agamemnon ordered, but what they themselves saw and thought while his orders were being carried out. This is another indication that they witnessed the events. From καλλιπρόφορος (236), too, the perspective of eyewitnesses emerges: the adjective is usually used of ships, but here it describes Iphigenia’s mouth. This reflects a view of Iphigenia when she is in a horizontal position, when her mouth is her front part.⁴⁶

The negation in lines 229–31 suggests the perspective of people who had expected that the chieftains would respond to Iphigenia’s prayers, cries, and young age. The words suit the Argive elders in particular because of the mention of Iphigenia’s young age. The Argive elders have more than once stressed their own old age (79–5, 106, cf. 583–4), and Iphigenia’s young age, therefore, might have attracted their personal attention. In addition, the motivation for the gag, viz. to prevent a curse on the house (rather than on the expedition, as one might expect), reveals a standpoint that would suit the Argive elders as eyewitnesses; as mentioned above, they also focused on the house rather than the expedition when they related the omen (157).⁵⁷ Furthermore, their references to Agamemnon as ‘father’ (πατήρ, 231; cf. 244) and Iphigenia as ‘daughter’ (225) show that the Argive elders, probably fathers themselves, watch from a fatherly perspective. These words, then, reveal the focalization of the Argive elders as they were looking at the events.

The narrative proceeds:

(5) κρόκου βαφὰς δ’ ἐς πέδον χέουσα
ἐβαλλ᾽ ἐκατόν δυτῆρ̣-

the same event’ by the onlookers, including Agamemnon, and by Iphigenia. In my view, Iphigenia is not focalizing, since there are no further indications in the rest of this passage that this is so. It is for instance unlikely that she would have occupied herself with her ‘young’ (229) age, the ‘goat’ (232), and that it was to prevent a curse on the house that the sacrificial servants had put a gag over her mouth (237). Since I do not recognize her perspective in the other words in the passage, it is unlikely that she would be focalizing in line 234.

⁴⁶ About the meaning of this line, too, discussions exist: I follow e.g. Lebeck (1964) (see especially n. 11) and Raeburn-Thomas (2011: 93) ad 233–4 in interpreting this line as Iphigenia being face-down after the sacrificial servants have lifted her up, not at the moment when they seized her, so e.g. Fränkel (1951(2): 134) ad 233.

⁵⁷ See above, p. 183.
While letting her saffron-dyed robe hang to the ground, she struck each of her butchers with a piteous glance shot from her eyes, standing out as if on a painting, wanting to address them, for she had often sung at the banquets in her father’s dining chambers, and with her virgin voice lovingly honoured her dear father’s prayer for blessing at the third libation.

These words make a strong appeal to the senses. The comparison of Iphigenia to the most conspicuous figure on a painting (πρέπουσά θ᾽ ὡς ἐν γραφαῖς, 242) again suggests that the Argive elders are eyewitnesses, as does the description of the piteous glance in her eyes: although she turned her eyes to Agamemnon or the chieftains (240–1), they did not see the piteous glance (on the contrary, they were ‘war-thirsty’: φιλόμαχοι, 230). Rather, her eyes won the pity of other bystanders, possibly the Argive elders in particular.

In lines 242–7, the chorus mentions Iphigenia’s desire to address her butchers. Now we enter her mind (embedded focalization, introduced by προσεννέπειν, 243), and she recognizes her butchers from her father’s dinner parties. The result is very poignant, but the words reveal the focalization of the Argive elders. They express above all their view on these events, not Iphigenia’s foremost concern: she probably did not care for her ἁγνᾷ (…) αὐδᾷ (245) when she was about to be sacrificed, nor for Agamemnon’s prayer at the third libation at his dinner parties. Yet it is unsurprising that the Argive elders, who may also have been guests at Agamemnon’s table, would mention this personal reminiscence of Iphigenia’s life.

---

18 Cf. e.g. Ferrari (1997: 3–4).
19 The comparison of Iphigenia to a figure on a painting is particularly apt, because both are not able to speak; see e.g. Thalmann (1985b: 228).
20 I therefore do not agree with e.g. Sommerstein (2009: 29, n. 53) and Raeburn-Thomas (2011: 95) ad 242–3, viz. that ἐπεῖ would introduce the reason why Iphigenia would be able to ‘address them by name’. προσεννέπειν does not necessarily entail address by name. I would argue that the reason why she would want to address them is that she recognizes her butchers from her father’s dinner parties.
21 Differently Schein (2009: 396), who argues that the chorus members do not return to their own viewpoint until line 248.
22 In this respect this passage is comparable to that in Hec. 568–70, where Thalcybius recounts Polyxena’s sacrifice, for which see de Jong (1991: 28): ‘while it may be true that Polyxena did her best to fall down gracefully, ‒ this at least was visible ‒ the motive which Thalcybius ascribes to her (modesty) seems to be based on his preoccupations rather than hers. She had just bared her breasts and her concern was not to
I conclude that the scene of the preparation of the sacrifice provides additional arguments in favour of the Argive elders having witnessed the events in Aulis.

1.3. The end of the narrative (248–9)

Immediately after line 247 the Argive elders stop their eyewitness report and famously end their narrative on the sacrifice of Iphigenia by her father Agamemnon before the sacrifice occurs. This is an ellipsis, in the narratological sense of the word. The chorus merely sums up the event and its implications for the future:

(6) τὰ δ᾽ ἐνδέκα ἐξῆν οὔτε ἔδον οὔτε ἐννέπων
tέχναι δὲ Κάλχατος οὐκ ἀκραντοί. (A. Aga. 248–9)

What happened next I did not see and do not tell, but the skills of Calchas do/did not remain unfulfilled.

The narrative technique that is employed here is somewhat comparable to Pindar’s Abbruchsformeln (break-off formulae), i.e., during the narrative the narrator interrupts himself and breaks off the narrative. Yet here this device is exploited to an extreme degree because the omitted event, the sacrifice of Iphigenia, is of great importance.

As mentioned above (pp. 179–80), this is one of the crucial passages for the question of whether the chorus members were present. Why do they say that they did not see ‘what happened next’? Denniston and Page assume that the Argive elders were present and state that τὰ δ᾽ ἐνδέκα (247) refers to the events after the departure from Aulis, since they could hardly have missed the sacrifice itself. This cannot be the case, however, as it implies that the sacrifice of Iphigenia – not an unimportant event – is entirely passed over and that the omission itself is not even mentioned.

Many scholars emphasize the poignant effect of the chorus’ silence. Some scholars assume that the chorus was not present (thus Rutherford states that the event is too horrible to tell: ‘the contrast is rather between what they did not see, but do narrate, and
what they did not see and do not narrate because it is so horrible\textsuperscript{26} while others do not discuss the issue of the chorus’ presence at all (Raeburn and Thomas state that ‘[t]he narrative breaks off in appropriate reticence (...). The elders dare not actually say ‘Then Agamemnon took a knife and slit his daughter’s throat’. Rather, they sum up the event in a euphemistic litotes’).\textsuperscript{27}

Fränkel far more plausibly concludes that τὰ δ᾽ ἐνθεν κτλ. ‘indicates that the Elders have themselves experienced in Aulis the events which they have so far been telling’.\textsuperscript{28} However, he does not explain why the Argive elders have not seen Iphigenia’s sacrifice. It may be that the words ‘not having seen it’ suggest eyewitnesses who close/avert their eyes because something is too horrible to see, and, therefore cannot relate the terrible act. It supports the argument that the Argive elders were at Aulis, and several parallels in Greek tragedy support this interpretation.\textsuperscript{29} This would also account for Clytemnestra’s utterance later in the play that the Argive elders should have opposed Agamemnon when he sacrificed Iphigenia (1412–30).

This would be the first of several instances in the \textit{Agamemnon} where the Argive elders pass over or hush up horrible events. Thus, Gantz states that the Argive elders are consistently unable to face the truth about Agamemnon’s death.\textsuperscript{30} Gantz goes very far in arguing that it is this futility motif in the play that characterizes the Argive elders, yet in my view it is accurate to say that the Argive elders rarely dare to offer unwelcome information. Thus the Argive elders imply – but do not say aloud – that they are frightened of Clytemnestra and feel that Agamemnon is in danger when he comes home, and they suspect goings-on in the palace because Clytemnestra might not have forgiven him for sacrificing Iphigenia.\textsuperscript{31} In the same vein, when Cassandra prophesizes Agamemnon’s death in line 1246, the Argive elders tell her to \textit{keep silent}: εὔφημον, ὦ

\textsuperscript{26}Rutherford (2007: 14), emphasis in the original.

\textsuperscript{27}Raeburn-Thomas (2011: 95) ad 248–9.

\textsuperscript{28}Fränkel (1950(2): 141) ad 247.


\textsuperscript{30}Gantz (1983). I do not agree with his interpretation on p. 68, where he states that the chorus ‘assume coreponsibility with the “actors” – Agamemnon, Klytaimnestra, Aigisthos – for the continuing chain of bloodshed’.

\textsuperscript{31}E.g. 548–50, 615–6, 807–9. Even after Agamemnon’s murder, they express doubts on whether this has really happened; his scream does not provide evidence enough for them (1366–7). This characteristic of the chorus is underlined if we accept Sommerstein’s (2009: 166–7, n. 292) reading and literal translation of ταύτην ἐπαινεῖν πάντοθεν πληθύνομαι, | τρανῶς Ἀτρείδην ἴδειναν κυροῦνθ ἐπιστρέφει ἔπως ἂν (1370–1), viz. that they dare not say that Agamemnon is murdered: ‘I am being filled from all sides to approve that (proposal), to know clearly that Atreus’ son is – however’. The \textit{choréutes} wanted to say ‘to know that he is dead’, but euphemistically stops the sentence. For another instance of the chorus’ silence, see lines 498–502 with Schenker (1991).
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τάλαινα, κοίμησον στόμα (1247). This idea is also reflected in the restraint of Iphigenia's speech in the parodos to prevent a curse on the house and in the watchman's refusal to continue speaking (36–9): by 'concealing'/'not seeing' dangerous or disturbing events, the Argive elders attempt to suppress their existence and thus tries in vain to prevent their consequences.

One could especially compare the Argive elders' attitude in the parodos to that in the first stasimon. At first they seemed convinced by the beacons' report that announces the fall of Troy and began a hymn of thanksgiving; near the end, they are sceptical (475–92). In this respect the first stasimon entails an apparently curious change of mind. While it has been regarded as inconsistent, something that undermines the unity of the chorus' personality, it is probably consistent with their personality. Van Erp Taalman Kip shows how the Argive elders gradually move from optimism about the fall of Troy to pessimism, since it will cause Agamemnon's death, and therefore quasi-mockingly question the report of the fall without disbelieving it. The Argive elders' doubts about whether Troy has actually been defeated is really a form of hope. This initially optimistic tone, but subsequent questioning and suppressing of horrible events, is strikingly similar to the chorus members' attitude in the parodos, where they start to narrate as optimistic eyewitnesses, but then stop because they closed their eyes.

So far, I have argued why the Argive elders say that they did not see the events that followed the preparations for the sacrifice: they averted or closed their eye because the events were too horrible to see. This is an explanation on the level of the chorus as old Argive men. But there may be another reason for this abruption, one on the level of Aeschylus (in addition to creating a poignant effect). Several other poets told a version of the story of Iphigenia in which Artemis rescued her from the sacrifice (by substituting

32 This withholding of information is not restricted to the chorus; cf. the watchman in lines 36–9.
33 See e.g. Gruber (2008: 286) for the connection between Iphigenia's silence and the chorus.
34 E.g. Denniston-Page (1957: 114) ad 475ff.: ‘taken with what precedes it is completely out of joint’. See Fletcher (1999: 33, n. 12) for further secondary literature.
35 Van Erp Taalman Kip (1971: 97): [d]e val van Troje is van een vreugdevol tot een bijna dreigend nieuws geworden, and 'hun twijfel is een vorm van hopen'. In a similar vein, Fletcher (1999: 33) argues that this change in the chorus' point of view coincides with a change from an aristocratic perspective, concerned with the royal household, to that of the common populace, 'who resent the war fought for another man's wife', in the choral ode.
36 Cf. the chorus' attitude in the third stasimon, especially in lines 1025–9, for which see e.g. Thalmann (1982a); (1982b); Ræburn-Thomas (2001: 177–179) ad 1025–9. The lines are difficult to interpret, but the chorus members seem to be saying that they would want to express fear and warn Agamemnon, but are silent because the divine pattern of justice (τεταγμένα | μοῖρα μοῖραν ἐκ θεῶν, 1025–6) makes such speech vain.
her for a deer\(^37\) or immortalizing her as Artemis by the Road or Hecate\(^38\), which was later adopted by e.g. Euripides in his Iphigenia among the Taurians.\(^39\) In the Agamemnon, Iphigenia’s death is one of the main reasons for Clytemnestra to kill Agamemnon, so Aeschylus could not use a variant in which she survives. Yet letting the Argive elders avert their eyes at the exact moment when, in other versions, she would be rescued by Artemis, may be analysed meta-dramatically as a very sophisticated manner of choosing a particular version of the story\(^40\) while not excluding others.\(^41\)

1.4. Possible counterarguments

Now that I have argued that the Argive elders saw the events they narrate, I should address the arguments against this hypothesis. Two are particularly compelling. First, since the Argive elders say at the start of their narrative ‘for still by divine favour the life born with me breathes persuasion over me’ (ἐτί γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνεύει | πειθώ, (…) σύμφυτος αἰών, 105–6), some scholars argue that the chorus narrate with divine inspiration and receive information from the gods,\(^42\) and are, therefore, not literal eyewitnesses. But these words do not suggest that this is the case. Even in texts as early as Homer, gods often breathe something in or over men. For example, a god is frequently said to breathe (e.g. ἐνέπνευσεν) strength, energy, or fury (e.g. μένος) into warriors to spur them on.\(^43\) In Hesiod’s Theogony, words comparable to the chorus’ phrase famously refer

\(^37\) In the Cypria (in Proclus’ summary, 8).
\(^38\) E.g. (Ps.) Hesiod fr.234; Stesichorus fr. 178.
\(^39\) Scholarly debate exists about the question whether Iphigenia was substituted, or actually killed, was the original one. See e.g. Dowden (1989: 207, n. 15). For the different versions of Iphigenia’s story, see e.g. Hulton (1962: 364–68); Dowden (1989: 10–24); Aretz (1999: 47–229).
\(^40\) It is noteworthy that Nicander will use the idea of bystanders looking away to ‘facilitate’ the substitution, in Ant. Lib. 27.2–3: Ἀγαμέμνον ἔτι διδοκαὶ σφάγιον οὐκ ἢτοι αἰτίας τῶν ἰχθυῶν, πρὸς ἄν τὸ βωμὸν ἄγισαν οἱ μὲν ἀριστεῖς οὐ προσέβλεψαν, ἀλλὰ πάντες ἔτρεψαν ἄλλη τὰς ὄψεις. Ἀρτέμις ἔτι ἄντι τῆς Ἱερευναίσα παρὰ τὸν βωμὸν ἔφηκεν μόσχον, οὐκ ἢτοι προσωτάτω τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀπήγαγεν εἰς τὸν Εὔξεραν λεγόμενον Πόντον παρὰ Θόαντα τὸν Βορυσθένους παῖδα.
\(^41\) Griffith (1990: 206–7, n. 53), although he acknowledges that it would break ‘the chain of motivations in Agamemnon’ (p. 207), suggests that the Proteus, the satyr-play that followed upon the Oresteia, may have followed the version of the story in which Iphigenia was rescued by Artemis, thereby clearing up the problem of Artemis’ cruelty in Agamemnon’s parados.
\(^42\) E.g. Groeneboom (1944: 142) ad 104–7: ‘in beide gevallen (i.e. in Agamemnon 104–7 and Lysistrata 557) is sprake van een inspiratie onder goddelijken invoed’; Ferrari (1997: 41): ‘the figure of the inspiration as a pneumonia that produces song is common for poetic inspiration and the mantic powers of the Pythia and conveys – literally or metaphorically – possession of the seer by a divine spirit’; Rutherford (2007: 14, n. 46): ‘lines 105–6 strongly suggest that they narrate with divine inspiration’.
\(^43\) If. 5.597, 10.482, 15.60, 262, 17.456, 19.159, 23.110, Od. 9.381, 24.520.
to poetry: δηττον’ ἐνέπνευσαν δὲ μ’ ἀοιδὴν (‘they (i.e. the Muses) breathed into me a divine song’, 31). (Later) verbal parallels of the phrase θεόθεν καταπνεύει (105) are found in Euripides’ Rhesus (387), a comic fragment of Plato (189.15), and Aristophanes’ Lysistrata (551). In the passages in Plato and Aristophanes, a god breathes nemesis and desire, respectively, upon someone or something. In Euripides’ Rhesus a god breathes upon Rhesus, thus giving him a striking appearance. The god is the subject of the verb καταπνεύω in Euripides and Aristophanes. In Plato’s fragment nemesis itself is the subject and θεόθεν is added, which parallels the syntactic construction in the parodos, although the receiver of the divine breath, i.e. the chorus, is not expressed in the parodos.

Since verbs such as καταπνεύω and ἐμπνεύω govern such a wide range of objects, they do not automatically entail divine poetic inspiration. Therefore, θεόθεν καταπνεύει (105) is not necessarily related to knowledge received from a divine source, much less to divine inspiration or possession by a god. Rather, in the parallel passages in Aristophanes and Euripides, the phrase with καταπνεύω deals with the effect that the breathed-upon person has on others, rather than an inner characteristic of this person such as knowledge. For the chorus it is πειθώ, persuasive power, that comes over them from the gods, so that they can convince others. The next section will address the effects and functions of θεόθεν καταπνεύει and πειθώ.

Another argument against the hypothesis that the Argive elders were eyewitnesses is more practical: if they were at Aulis, why did they go, and how could they have returned to Argos after the fleet left for Troy? I assume that the desire to let the chorus narrate events they actually saw, with the natural restrictions, has taken precedence over narrative logic as to this practical matter. These restrictions include a limited understanding of the omen and its implications for the future, the inability to narrate events outside their scope, and a particularly poignant style that often comes from autopsy. We will see some effects of this way of narrating in the next section. In this

44 E. Rhesus 387: θεός, ὄ Τροια, θεός, αὐτὸς Ἄρης ὁ Στρυμονίων πᾶλος ἀοιδὸς Μούσης ἤκου καταπνεύει σε. (The chorus on the appearance of Rhesus, in dazzling armour:) ’As a god, o Troy, a god, Ares himself, this son of the Strymon and the singing Muse has come to breathe upon you’; Plato 189.15: μὴ σοι νέμεσας θεόθεν καταπνεύεσθαι (reading a cookbook): ’(and do not slice up the sea perch or the speckle fish or sea bream or shark), unless nemesis from the gods breathe upon you’; Aristoph. Lysistrata 551: ἀλλ᾽ ἂν περὶ τοῦ γλυκόμυρου ἔρως χρὴ ᾑδερεῖν εἰρεθεῖτο ἤμοι κατὰ τῶν κέλπων καὶ τῶν μηρῶν καταπνεύσῃ: ’but if Eros of the sweet soul and Cyprian Aphrodite breath desire upon our thighs and breasts, (... then I believe all Greece will one day call us Disbanders of Battles’).

45 I take, with e.g. West (1999: 44) and Raeburn-Thomas (2011: 79) ad 105–7, σύμφωνος σιῶν as the subject, πειθώ the object, and μαλάπν ἀλκάν as standing in apposition. For other possibilities, see e.g. Fränkel (1950(1): 64) ad 105, Denniston-Page (1957: 78) ad 105–7, and Bollack (1981(1): 128–30) ad 105–107.

46 I have left forms of πνεύμα of gods out of account (e.g. Septem 115), which would have produced an even greater variety of possible objects.

47 Cf. Fränkel (1950(2): 65) ad 110: ’There is no suggestion here of a ἰδρόν πνεύμα’. 
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respect it may be significant that the Argive elders are unclear about the location of the events when they embark on their narrative (which might have sparked the question of why/how they went there), so that the fact that they are in Aulis is not foregrounded.

So, several arguments may be presented in favour of the chorus of Argive elders as eyewitnesses in Aulis. They give a personal account of the events leading up to the sacrifice is suggested by, for instance, the mention of Iphigenia’s youth, the visual details they relate, and their personal reminiscence of Iphigenia’s life when she sang at Agamemnon’s dinner parties. Moreover, they avert their eyes like real eyewitnesses of horrible events. Is this eyewitness status also the basis for the chorus’ emphatic claim of authority at the start of the lyric part of the parodos?
2. **The chorus’ claim of authority**

I return to the chorus’ claim of authority at the beginning of the parodos’ lyric part:

(7) κύριός εἰμι ἐθροεῖν ἔθιον κράτος αἰσθον ἀνδρῶν ἐκτελέων· ἔτι γὰρ τεθέν Καταπνεύει
πειθὼ, μολπὰν ἀλκὰν σύμφωνος αἰών· (A. Aga. 104–7).

*I am authorized to tell aloud about the commanders in charge of men in their prime who met with auspicious signs on the road – for still by divine favour the life born with me breathes persuasion over me, the strength of songs (– how...).*

Scholars disagree on the exact meaning of the words κύριός εἰμι ἐθροεῖν and suggest a variety of bases for the chorus’ claim to authority that are not necessarily mutually exclusive: the Argive elders’ old age and rank, their eyewitness status (as discussed in the preceding section), and the word-power to influence what happens, which they would have inherited from pre-tragic choruses (their authority qua chorus). First I set out to define as precisely as possible the characteristics of, and the basis for, the authority that the chorus claims to have by κύριός εἰμι (ἐθροεῖν), and then I turn to the rest of their claim.

The adjective κύριος, when used of human beings or gods, means ‘having rightful power or authority’. The word is applied to people of high political status, such as kings (e.g. E. Suppl. 1189; Pi. O. 1.104), Zeus (Pi. I. 5.3), or to people with high positions within the household, for example unmarried women’s guardians, masters of slaves, etc. (e.g. in Euripides’ *Andromache*, Menelaus claims to have more authority (κυριώτερος γεγώς, 580) over Andromache than Peleus has). The adjective κύριος, therefore, is related to the status and rank of the character of whom it is used and denotes socio-political and/or domestic authority.

Because of these connotations, the Argive elders cannot be referring to their eyewitness status. Rather, Rose’s suggestion that ‘[t]he Elders’ age and rank gives them the right to tell the story and be believed’ seems to be correct. The Argive elders had already emphasized their old age in lines 70–5, and this theme recurs when they say that

---

41Rose (1958: 12) *ad* 104.
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πειθώ, persuasive power, is breathed upon them by their old age (σύμφωνος αἰών, 107). This raises the question of the Argive elders’ rank.63

In the Agamemnon, king Agamemnon is absent and Clytemnestra and Aegisthus wield (domestic and socio-political) authority in his stead. The Argive elders are not powerless either, since, as old men loyal to the king, they appear to be authorized to consult with Agamemnon and Clytemnestra. Even more, in lines 1412–25 Clytemnestra feels compelled to defend herself for the murder on Agamemnon when the chorus threaten her with political repercussions, which Podlecki concluded ‘has something of a lawcourt atmosphere’. In the same vein, the Argive elders critically speak to Aegisthus in lines 1612–6. These scenes show that the chorus exerts socio-political and domestic authority. Podlecki argues that the Argive elders ‘become spokesmen for a more abstract Justice and warn of the dangers inherent in transgressions against it’ during the play although they prove to be unable to prevent the murder of Agamemnon or the sacrifice of Iphigenia, and are, at the end, forced to retreat by Aegisthus and his guards.61

The Argive elders’ authority expressed by κύριος, then, seems especially related to speaking. This authority to speak may be connected to the dichotomy between men and women in the play, and between the Argive elders and Clytemnestra in particular. The Argive elders often speak in a patronizing tone to Clytemnestra, such as in lines 1399–1403: ‘we are shocked at your tongue, how bold-mouthed you are, since you utter such a boastful speech over your husband’ (θαυμάζομέν σου γλῶσσαν, ὡς θρασύστομος, ἕτες τοιῶθ’ ἔποιεις θράσυστομος λόγον). It is often emphasized that Clytemnestra is a woman, although she is also compared to a man, e.g. by the watchman who calls her ἄνδρόβουλον (11). Clytemnestra herself highlights her status as a woman: τοιαῦτα τοι γυναικὸς ἐξ ἐμοῦ κλύεις (348), ὧδ᾽ ἔχει λόγος γυναικός, εἴ τις ἀξιοῖ μαθεῖν (1661). In Greek tragedy, women conventionally speak more persuasively and debate more freely than in real life in classical Athens, where the right to (political) debate in public was denied them.65 Yet

60Forms of authority in tragedy in general have been examined by Griffith (2005: 333–51), from which I have benefitted greatly for the following discussion. Griffith distinguishes four different, often conflicting, fields in which people may have authority. These are the social/political, domestic, religious and epistemological/cultural fields, although these fields may overlap each other and are not stable. He shows that several forms of authority are already present in the beginning of the lyric part of the parodos. Griffith does not pay particular attention to the nature of the chorus’ (claim of) authority in the parodos.
63See Griffith (1995: 81) for the fluctuations of class, status and authority that the chorus displays.
64Cf. lines 592 and 1251. See Raeburn-Thomas (2011: xlii–xliii) for the relationship between men and women in the Oresteia.
65See Buxton (1982: 10–8) on the right to speak freely in classical Athens; Roisman (2004) on women’s free speech in Greek tragedy. In her discussion of the Agamemnon (pp. 102–3), Roisman focuses on Cassandra.
the theme of women not having as many rights as men with regard to speaking is also attested.\textsuperscript{66}

The Argive elders’ authority to speak is also expressed by πειθώ. In the anapaestic part of the parodos, the Argive elders had emphasized their old age, which is why they did not go to Troy ten years previously. Instead of warlike strength, they claim to have πειθώ, verbal strength (cf. ἀλκάν, 107), which increases their authority because it comes from the favour of the gods. As Buxton has shown, πειθώ is a notion of central importance in classical Athens and often contrasted with βία, violence: reliance on persuasion implies ‘that between a given group of people there exists a tacit or openly-acknowledged agreement to exclude the use of violence in favour of the use of language as the approved means of getting one’s way’.\textsuperscript{67} Therefore, the most plausible interpretation of the Argive elders’ claim of authority in the parodos is that they refer to their power and authority in the socio-political and domestic sphere, namely to their right to speak as elderly, high ranking men.

The Argive elders’ age- and gender-entitled authority and household rank may not be the only meanings of κύριός εἰμι (104). We have seen in an earlier section that Euripides shows the significance of the chorus’ narrative for the play as a whole by putting the word κληδόνων in the mouth of the chorus in E. Electra 700 (see pp. 165–9). Likewise, κύριος may well signal that what the chorus is about to relate is important for the play. It is arguably no coincidence that the word occurs again later in the parodos (although it does not refer to humans or gods), namely in the Hymn to Zeus, when the Argive elders say that Zeus has ‘laid down “learning from suffering” to be valid’: (Ζῆνα, 174) τὸν πάθει μάθος | θέντα κυρίως ἔχειν (177–8). The phrase means that πάθει μάθος is an authoritative law, to which everyone is subjected. This law is made valid by Zeus, and the chorus’ authority also involves a god (θεόθεν, 105).\textsuperscript{68} The similarities, in my view, imply that everyone is ‘subjected’ to the chorus’ words. This means that κύριος operates on two levels: the Argive elders refer to their status and rank, and, at a higher level, it signals that what the chorus is about to relate is important. Indeed, it forms the basis for the whole trilogy. Their narrative forms the background of the play, and Agamemnon’s killing of young innocents in Troy and the sacrifice of Iphigenia are essential for showing how the murder of Agamemnon fits into the Oresteia, where murder and revenge are important themes.

\textsuperscript{66} E.g. S. Αἴας 293: γυναιξὶ κόσμον ἢ σιγῇ φέρει. See Griffith (2005: 342), who mentions Clytemnestra as an example of ‘outspoken and disruptive figures’. In addition, Pindar’s Partheneion fr. 94b is instructive, where the parthenoi imply that they speak less fulsomely in recounting the praises of the Aeoladai than men would; see Stehle (1997: 98).


\textsuperscript{68} This parallel is also noted by Goldhill (1984: 28).
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The narrative in the parodos important not only in this thematic respect, as it also announces what is about to occur in the Agamemnon. Calchas’ prophecy in particular contains much important information for the play. The direct form of his speech allows the Argive elders to pass on more information than they know themselves. Thus, near the end of his prophecy, Calchas expresses the wish that Artemis may not urge ‘another sacrifice, one that knows no law, unsuited for feast, a worker of quarrels, born together with it,’ without fear of the husband (θυσίαν ἕτεραν, ἄνομόν τιν, ἄδαιτον, | νεικέων τέκτονα σύμφυτον, | σὺ δειψήφοξα, 149–152). The audience can recognize a foreboding of Clytemnestra’s murder of Agamemnon, which is later also suggested by ‘an “unforgetting” child-avenging Wrath’ (μνάμων Μῆνις τεκνόποινος, 155). In this way, the chorus announces, albeit vaguely and unwittingly, the play’s central events. The strength of this prophecy could not have been transmitted if the chorus provided a mere report of Calchas’ explanation instead of the direct speech. The chorus’ initial claim of authority signals that the narrative contains information on which the audience may rely.

Going further, there may be other signals that emphasize the importance of the information that the chorus provides in the parodos. Thus, ἰροεῖν (104), although it often merely means ‘to tell/speak’, is a more powerful and marked verb than, for instance, λέγειν, since it is associated especially with people crying out loud (e.g. A. Choe. 828 and Eum. 513) and addressing more than one person (e.g. S. Ajax 67). Although in tragedy the verb is often associated with suffering, it can also be applied to joyful events: in Bacchylides Ode 3, an immense crowd excitedly cried out (ἄροζει, 9) when Hieron won a chariot race. Ajax uses it in Sophocles’ eponymous play, where it is marked since it refers to the last words that Ajax utters before he throws himself on his sword, addressing Salamis, Athens, and Troy: ‘this is the last word Ajax speaks (ἄροεί, 864) to you’. In Hippolytus, the Nurse refers to Phaedra’s initially unclear utterances and delirious speech as: ὃ παῖ, τί ἰροεῖς; (212), while she uses e.g. λέγειν for clear utterances (e.g. πῶς ἂν σύ μοι λέξεις ἀμή χρῆ λέγειν; 345). Significantly, it is applied to Cassandra’s utterances later in the Agamemnon (1137 and 1140) when she bewails her impending death. In these instances, ἰροεῖν is not only more powerful than e.g. λέγειν, but it is also used for words whose true meaning and import are not immediately clear to others. Because of these general connotations of ἰροεῖν, the verb in the parodos may denote that the words that the chorus utters in the parodos may denote that the words that the chorus utters are somehow powerful, important, and not limited to one meaning.

69 I accept Van Erp Taalman Kip’s (1986) interpretation of σύμφυτον.

70 For the dialogue between Phaedra and her Nurse in Hippolytus, see e.g. Karydas (1998: 115–80). She mentions that the verb ἰροεῖν ‘is an onomatopoetic word referring primarily to the rustling noise of leaves of trees with the wind; Phaedra is dreaming of trees, and the Nurse hears the sound of the leaves in her speech’ (p. 125, n. 36).
Πειθώ (106) has a comparable function: the Argive elders, as just mentioned, have the power to persuade, which their age bestows upon them by favour of the gods. Πειθώ is one of the recurring themes in the Oresteia. It has already received ample scholarly attention,71 so I will single out only a few especially telling examples taken from the Agamemnon. Clytemnestra immediately interprets the beacon fires to mean that Troy was sacked, even though people – including the chorus (πειθοῖ, 87) – do not believe her and ask why she was so convinced (πεισθεῖσα, 591). Clytemnestra, in turn, persuades Agamemnon to walk into the palace over the purple fabrics (cf. πιθοῦ, 943). In addition, the chorus sings that she should persuade Cassandra (πειθοῖ, 1054, cf. the chorus speaking to Cassandra: πειθοῖ ἂν, εἴ πειθοῖ· ἀπειθοῖς δ᾽ ἱσως, 1049) to follow Agamemnon into the palace. Cassandra does not succeed in convincing the chorus that her prophecy of Agamemnon’s death is true (μὴ πείθω, 1239). This means that the chorus touches upon an important theme even in the parodos. However, the word presupposes someone who can be convinced. In the absence of characters on stage during the parodos,72 this can be no other than the audience, who are thus suggested to note the wider implications of the chorus’ narrative.73 The signalling of the importance of this information for the play to follow ties in well with the chorus’ prophetic nature, which is suggested by the handling of time (see the introduction to this chapter).

I conclude from the observations above that the Argive elders appeal to their status (high rank/old age/male) with κύριός εἰμι θροεῖν, while Aeschylus highlights the importance of the chorus’ narrative for the play, in which πειθώ (106) also has a function. I will now turn to the rest of the chorus’ claim of authority. They present their persuasive power (πειθώ, 106) as the ‘strength of song’ (μολπᾶν ἀλκάν, 106). Because Μολπᾶν refers to the fact that they are singing, it is a self-reflexive expression of the kind discussed by Henrichs (1994–5), by which choruses refer to their status qua chorus in the theatre (see the introduction to Chapter 3). A comparable utterance is the refrain ἀἴλινον ἀἴλινον εἶπέ, τὸ δ᾽εὖ νικάτω (121, 138, 159). Ἀἴλινον is associated with dirges, but τὸ δ᾽εὖ νικάτω shows that the chorus members cling to their hope that ‘the good’ will win, just as many archaic choruses tried to positively influence future events by their prayers. This refrain

71 See Buxton (1982) for πειθώ in tragedy in general. Although he states a full account of this theme in the Oresteia would require a book on its own (pp. 3–4, 105), and focuses instead on the first stasimon and the carpet scene in the Agamemnon and on several passages in the Libation Bearers and Eumenides. Collard (2002: xxxvii) mentions Clytemnestra’s credence of the beacon-message, Clytemnestra trying to persuade Cassandra. See ibid. xxxvii–iii for πειθώ in the Libation Bearers and Eumenides.

72 I assume that Clytemnestra is not on stage. For a discussion on this point see Taplin (1977: 280–5). Yet even if she were on stage, it is very unlikely that she is the one that the chorus would want to convince.

73 Comparable suggestions have been made by scholars e.g. Käppel (1999: 74); Gruber (2008: 286). I am not persuaded by Bollack (1981(1): 128–32) ad 105–107, who argues that the chorus members want to convince themselves.
illustrates a repeated pattern in the *Agamemnon*, where a character's speech, especially that of the chorus, logically leads to ominous and negative utterances, which are suppressed by (a somewhat forced) expression of hope.\(^{74}\)

The chorus members claim that ‘the strength of song’ (μολπᾶν ἀλκάν, 106) is breathed upon them by their old age (σύμφυτος αἰών, 107). This means that there is an interweaving of the chorus’ identity as Argive elders and their status *qua* chorus. What is the relation between old age and songs? This combination also occurs in the second stasimon in Euripides’ *Heracles* (637–700), a choral ode with the characteristics of an epinician ode,\(^{75}\) in which the theme of old age in contrast to youthful strength is frequently found.\(^{76}\) Youth implies physical strength, while old age is often compensated by deliberation and counsel (cf. e.g. Nestor in the *Iliad*). Parry, whose view has by now been widely accepted, argues that the chorus members in the *Heracles* enjoy the compensation of song rather than of deliberation, and use that power to reveal the *aretē* of young men (in this case of Heracles), like epinician poets.\(^{77}\) So the chorus in the *Heracles* presents choral performance self-referentially as a compensation for old age.\(^{78}\)

The theme of old age and song is taken much further in the *Heracles* than in *Agamemnon’s* parodos, in which the chorus’ introductory words have no epinician connotations. Yet, in the parodos, contains a comparable interweaving of the chorus’ dramatic identity as old men with their extra-dramatic function as a chorus: the elders lack physical, warlike strength. In addition to the verbal strength of the Argive elders, as discussed above, it may also be contrasted with the power of song (the level of the chorus *qua* chorus).

The combination of the chorus *qua* character and *qua* chorus also occurs in the third stasimon of the *Agamemnon* (975–1034), which is sung immediately after Agamemnon has walked over the purple garment into the palace. In the first strophe, the chorus members say that fear has penetrated their ‘portent-seeing heart’ and ask why does my song, not prompted by orders or payment, prophesy? ([τίπτε μοι, 975] μαντιπολεῖ δ᾽ ἀκέλευστος ἀοιδά, 978–9). They refer to their own singing. In the first antistrophe, they distinguish what they know from autopsy from the anxious hymns that their heart sings:

\[^{74}\text{Cf. Stenger (1991: 69–73); Raeburn-Thomas (2011: 80) ad 121; Grethlein (2013: 80).}\]

\[^{75}\text{See Parry (1965); Swift (2010: 129–31). In tragedy the theme of old age in contrast to physical strength occurs in Eur. fr. 5:9 as well.}\]

\[^{76}\text{See Parry (1965: 365) for an overview.}\]

\[^{77}\text{Parry (1965). Cf. the chorus members’ self-reference in 110–1 as a γέρων ἁοιδός (although γέρων is a conjecture), who exists in words alone, with Dhuga (2011: 81): ‘physically decrepit yet lyrically effectual.’}\]

\[^{78}\text{Cf. Henrichs (1996: 55); see n.23 on the same page for more secondary literature.}\]
The chorus’ authority, knowledge, and silence in Agamemnon’s parodos

(8) πεύθομαι δ’ ἀπ’ ὀμμάτων
νόστον, αὐτῶν ἀυτὰμαρτὺς δὲν
τὸν δ’ ἄνευ λύρας ὁμώς ὑμνῳδεῖ
βρὴν ὑμνὼς αὐτοδίδακτος ἔσωθεν
ἀρμός, ... (988–92).

Of his (i.e. Agamemnon’s) homecoming I learn with my own eyes and am my own witness. Yet still my heart within me, self-taught, sings the lyreless dirge of the Erinys, ...

The chorus’ old anxieties about Agamemnon’s homecoming can be forgotten now they have seen him themselves. Yet they refer to their song as a dirge, which indicates that they still fear for his safety. As in the parodos, in this stasimon the chorus refer to events that they know because they actually saw them in their capacity as Argive elders (the auspicious omen followed by Iphigenia’s sacrifice and Agamemnon’s return) and to events to come in Agamemnon. They express their ominous forebodings in song, drawing attention to their status qua chorus.

Scholars have often paid attention to the power of words in tragedy: when something is said, it is conjured up and practically certain of fulfilment. In their narrative in the parodos, the chorus indicates what will probably happen when Agamemnon arrives in the palace. This power of words is not restricted to, but may be associated in particular with, the chorus. Their claim of authority thus operates on more than one level: their words derive from their identity as Argive elders and from a higher level behind their identity (as a chorus).

79 See Thalmann (1985a) for lines 1025–9.
3. Conclusion

I have argued that the Argive elders are eyewitnesses of the events in Aulis, which gives them narrative authority, but that they averted their eyes and refrain from reporting the actual sacrifice, which parallels their attitude in other passages in the Agamemnon. In addition, I suggested that the Argive elders’ choice to close their eyes can be considered a very sophisticated device employed by the poet for choosing a particular version of the myth.

The Argive elders themselves claim authority as old men of high rank, but Aeschylus also signals to the audience the significance of the narrative for the play and trilogy by using words such as κύριος, θροεῖν, πειθώ, and μολπᾶν ἄλκαν in the introduction to the narrative (104–6).
Conclusion

This study has investigated how the tragic poets adopted and developed narrative techniques used by their lyric and epic predecessors. It has strengthened the thesis of the continuities between epic, lyric, and the choral odes of tragedy by showing in detail that tragedians developed and exploited the narrative techniques available to them from Homeric epic via lyric on the basis of a great number of passages. In particular, it examined techniques that are related to the subject of narrative authority and sought to show that such an investigation can enrich the interpretation of the (embedded) narratives in these three groups of texts.

The main goal was to examine narrators' knowledge of events they tell: how do they claim to have the authority to recount a story? I have used the parameters of 'I' versus 'we', metalepsis, and focalization to investigate 1) narrators appealing to the Muses; 2) internal narrators (autopsy); 3) external narrators (appealing to other narrators); and 4) narrators who do not explicitly motivate their knowledge. In conclusion, I will now summarize the findings on these subjects per category, with reference to examples in which this approach has been particularly fruitful.

1. Appeals to the Muses

Because the Homeric primary narrator has the identity of a professional singer and his mortal hearsay knowledge (kleos) is authenticated by the Muse, both the Iliad and Odyssey start with an invocation to the Muse. It is the Muse's task to give eyewitness authority to the (external) primary narrator, and his omniscience can be regarded as the result of her aid.

The Muse is also mentioned in relation to the other professional singers in the Odyssey, Demodocus, and Phemius. They are the primary narrator's alter ego's (and, as such, add to our understanding of how the primary narrator sees his own role and function). Demodocus is said to be able to narrate events he did not witness as if he did witness them, so his narratives have eyewitness authority. There is no clear division between the tasks of the narrator and the Muse; they are both involved at the same time (double motivation). Demodocus' narratives are instances of metalepsis: because his words are indirectly quoted, it is unclear whether we hear his or the primary narrator's 'voice', so they effectively become one. I have argued that one of his songs could also be read as being issued by the Muse, which reflects the double motivation of Demodocus' narrative, and, by extension, also that of the primary narrator.
By invoking the Muse the Homeric narrator presents himself, like Demodocus and Phemius, as a professional singer. His invocations also reflect his concern with promulgating the *kleos* of warriors: as a goddess, the Muse makes the warriors’ fame eternal. *Kleos* often implies that something exists in poetic form, hence the close relationship between the narrator *qua* professional singer, the Muse, and their task of promulgating the *kleos* of warriors. This idea is also reflected in the questions that the narrator poses to the Muse about which warrior was the first to kill someone. Their effect is that this warrior gets special attention and his fame is promulgated.

In lyric, the Muses’ involvement no longer automatically guarantees the narrative’s truth. Lyric narrators are typically omniscient but do not ascribe this omniscience to the help they receive from the Muses. However, lyric poets, to different degrees, adopt characteristics from the Homeric Muse, e.g. invoking her at the beginning of a poem, ascribing superior knowledge to her, and posing questions to her. I argued that even when the narrator does not mention the Muse explicitly, she can be the addressee of his questions. The Muse is found in odes especially with an epic ‘flavour’, such as *Pythian* 4 and Stesichorus’ poems. As such, she can be regarded as a means by which the narrator places himself in the tradition of earlier (epic) poets.

In general, lyric narrators draw more attention to their status *qua* singers/poets and their active role in composing the poem than the Homeric narrator did. In addition, they are explicit about the double motivation of their poem and present it as the result of their collaboration with the Muse, although they are flexible in this, too, seeing that they do not *always* mention her. Thus I have discussed Pindar’s use of ‘we’ to refer to the narrator and his Muse which reflects the narrative’s double motivation. Like in Demodocus’ song in Homer, the narrators’ and Muses’ voices blend in *Nemean* 5. Because the Pindaric choral narrators mention the Muses (in the plural) singing at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis but do not signal the end of their song, the Muses and narrators seem to sing together in the following part of the ode.

Lyric poets have adopted and amplified the Muse’s association with the immortalizing power of the poets’ own poetry and their self-conscious role as dispensers of *kleos*, both of their topics and of themselves. Thus, in epinician odes, the Muse is often mentioned in connection with the *laudandus*. The narrator’s songs make the *laudandus* enter into the world of ancient heroes and take his place alongside them, so he acts in a role parallel to Homer and other poets (and their Muse) because their songs made the ancient heroes famous.

In Greek tragedy, the choral narrators are often omniscient. They appeal to the Muse only once, in *Trojan Women* 511–76. This invocation emphasizes the strong epic flavour of the ode (which could be compared to the mention of the Muse in the ‘epic’ lyric poems), as Euripides signals his deviations from accounts of the fall of Troy in epic through it. Since the Trojan women are internal narrators who tell about events they
experienced themselves, their perspective of the Muse changes: in epic she was invoked only because she could transmit eyewitness knowledge about events of the past, in lyric and tragedy she is also invoked because that information is given to the Muse to become available for later singers. The Muse is mentioned in another choral ode (E. HF 1016–41), in which the narrators also refer to the idea that subject matter was given to the Muse for transmission to later singers. This coincides with the idea that the Muse adopts events and people so that their fame becomes eternal. In addition, question-and-answer pairs appear in the choral odes of tragedy. The questions are not posed to the Muse, but, like such pairs in epic and lyric, the effect is that they emphasize the person who is asked about.

In sum, the role of the Muse evolves from the authenticator of the epic narrator’s knowledge (with responsibility for promulgating warriors’ kleos) to the signaller of epic flavour (who promulgates kleos as the collaborator of the more self-conscious lyric narrators) to a goddess who is seldom invoked in narratives in tragedy. When she is mentioned, she represents traditions of stories which may bring to the fore comparisons with epic.

2. Internal narrators: autopsy

Homer’s epics abound with internal narrators. These narrators automatically have narrative authority, since they narrate what they have seen themselves. They rarely state their eyewitness status explicitly, but it is clear from their own role in the story. Significantly, only Odysseus mentions his eyewitness status, and only when he is disguised as a beggar and creates extra authority for his lies in (largely false) narratives.

Internal narrators in epic typically speak in the ‘I’ form, showing their own role in the events. Sometimes they emphasize their role by using ‘I’ frequently. They use ‘we’ to refer to a whole group. In epic, the identity of a ‘we’ group can change during the course of a narrative, and I have noted some of its effects. For example, narrators use the ‘we’ form to emphasize that their narratee was also involved in the narrative. This may reinforce the narrator’s authority, since the narratee can endorse what the narrator is saying. Secondly, the use of singular rather than plural forms can also highlight a particular person’s actions within a group. In Iliad 2, Odysseus quotes Calchas’ prophecy in his narrative about the events before the departure from Aulis. The effect of the ‘we’s’ in Calchas’ directly quoted speech is that he seems to speak directly to Odysseus’ narratees.

Narration from autopsy has restrictions, since, by their nature, internal narrators cannot know about events from which they were absent or read the thoughts of other characters. Yet they often circumvent these restrictions (e.g. by using ex eventu knowledge or inference) or even break narrative logic. When narrators give information
they logically could not have had, this information has an important function for the narrative. When they do admit to restrictions in their knowledge, this can ratchet up the tension, engage the (secondary and primary) narratees, and emphasize the importance of an event that first seemed coincidental.

Internal narrators in epic sometimes speak according to their narrating focalization and use *ex eventu* knowledge to bring forward, and thus highlight, certain events. When a narrator narrates according to his experiencing focalization, he uses his restricted understanding of the events at the moment when they occurred. This is particularly engaging, since it invites the narratees to experience the events together with him. Thus in *Od*. 15.403–86 the narratees learn of the depravity of the Phoenician pirates’ plan by seeing its result through the eyes of the young Eumaeus.

Internal narrators are rare in lyric because most of these narratives are set in the distant past. The Pindaric narrator once refers to his ‘seeing’ within a narrative: in *Pythian* 1, he has seen Mount Etna, which is both within and outside the storyworld. The narrator’s eyewitness perspective emphasizes the wondrous nature of the events he relates. Pindar arguably even took into account the fact that the audiences of this ode’s re-performances may not have seen Mount Etna, since he adds that Mount Etna’s eruptions of lava are marvellous to hear about from someone who has seen them.

Another instance of an internal narrator is ‘Sappho’ in her fr. 94. We have seen that epic narrators sometimes emphasized their narratee’s involvement in the events in order to create authority. In Sappho fr. 94, too, the narrator talks about events of the past in which she and her narratee participated. However, in contrast to epic, the narrator and narratee look differently at their past, showing that different views about it can exist. Sappho’s narrative also illustrates the effects of semantic instability of ‘we’. Sappho and her narratee, a departing woman, use singular and plural personal forms to emphasize different aspects of their relationship: the woman uses ‘we’ in referring to herself and Sappho, whereas Sappho uses ‘we’ to refer to a larger group, probably as a means to console the other woman.

Although many narratives in the choral odes of tragedy are set in the immediate past (from the perspective of the chorus), there are only two clear instances of internal narrators: both in Euripides, dealing with the fall of Troy (in *Hecuba* and *Trojan Women*). In these narratives, the chorus’ status *qua* characters comes to the fore as the members recount their own past. They relate how they were captured, which makes these narratives different from that of e.g. Nestor and Odysseus, who had an often heroic role. Especially in the choral ode in *Hecuba*, the chorus members speak from an individual perspective. They use ‘I’ for their experiences during the fall of Troy and ‘we’ for the supposed victory, which shows their involvement in the narrative and produces a tragic effect. The relatively small number of choral narratives related by internal narrators is arguably explained by the fact that tragedies are full of characters who recount what they
are experiencing or have experienced themselves. The chorus, by contrast, typically reflect upon these events from a wider perspective and in a longer span of time.

The internal narrators of choral narratives can speak according to their experiencing and narrating focalization. In the second part of Euripides’ *Hecuba* 905–52, about the Fall of Troy, the chorus of Trojan Women narrate according to their experiencing focalization. Yet they include *ex eventu* utterances to draw attention to their narrative’s unhappy outcome, which gives their narrative a tragic effect. In Euripides’ *Trojan Women* 511–76, the chorus of Trojan women use a comparable combination of memories of the sack of Troy and utterances based on their *ex eventu* knowledge. Since they use more *ex eventu* utterances and make less of an impression of experiencing again the events they narrate, their focalization can be regarded as narrating focalization. These *ex eventu* utterances give the narrative a dark undertone.

In the parodos of the *Agamemnon*, the question of whether the Argive elders were eyewitnesses of the sacrifice of Iphigenia in Aulis is difficult to answer. On the basis of their way of narrating, I argued that the Argive elders were indeed eyewitnesses of the events. I have also drawn attention to the idea of closing or averting one’s eyes to avoid a horrible sight, which may explain why they abruptly stop their narrative. It may also reveal the sophistication of Aeschylus’ choice of that particular version of a pre-existing story. Furthermore, I have argued that the Argive elders’ introduction of the lyric part of the parodos (κύριός εἰμι θροεῖν, 104) does not refer to their status as eyewitnesses, but as old men.

To conclude, many differences exist between epic, lyric, and tragedy with regard to internal narrators. They occur frequently in epic (e.g. Odysseus, Nestor), where the narrator often has an active role in the story he tells because he speaks about his own heroic actions. In other instances, the narrator emphasizes his narratee’s involvement in the events. Internal narrators are seldom found in lyric and only in a few choral narratives in tragedy, where their own individual (but shared) past comes to the fore. In these narratives, the narrators have a more passive role.

3. External narrators appealing to other narrators

In three instances, the epic primary narrator refers to information he received from others. This brings his human perspective to the fore and explains why two references to hearsay occur in similes in which the narrator relies on the primary narratees’ general knowledge to help them visualize the events of the main storyline. In one, the reported narrators corroborate a superlative reputation (*Il. 17.674*); in the other, they are used for events far away (*Il. 2.783*). In addition, the primary narrator once relies on other speakers for information about Mount Olympus (*Od. 6.42*). The narrator’s foregrounded human
Conclusion

perspective here arguably serves to emphasize the differences between the pleasant circumstances of Olympus and the harsh circumstances of the human world, in particular those of Odysseus. It is, furthermore, noteworthy that the primary narrator relies on reported narrators only for specific pieces of information (instead of whole episodes).

Secondary narrators in Homer rely on reported narrators both for specific pieces of information within narratives and for longer episodes. In the latter, narrators mostly appeal to reported narrators for stories about their own or the former generation of heroes. Reported narrators are often used when a narrator needs to explain how he knows about events from which he was absent (typically nostoi in the Odyssey, elements of Odysseus' lies, and the stories about the former generation of heroes in the Iliad). When they are used for specific pieces of information, they typically provide information about people and events far away. Reported narrators thus compensate for the lack of information based on autopsy, but in most cases they have an extra authorizing function. In three narratives the reference to other narrators is part of the explicit presentation of the story as a paradigm, which also reveals this authorizing function. And on the level of the communication between the primary narrator ‘Homer’ and his narratees, they arguably signal allusions to pre-existing stories or camouflage modifications.

The knowledge of lyric narrators about the past often seems to be based on what older poetry and traditional stories have ‘transmitted’. This is made explicit by the narrators’ references to reported narrators, who can have an introductory function: they signal that the narrator is going to tell a story, and often that this story of the (distant) past is meant to illustrate the present. Like the Homeric narrators, these reported narrators in lyric back up superlative information and allude to earlier poetry (instead of mentioning the poem by name, they signal this allusion by a mere reference to hearsay). Pindar in particular refers to earlier poets and underscores the power of poetry to spread stories – and, by extension, also his own ability, qua poet, to make a laudandus famous.

(Anonymous) reported narrators often have an authorizing function, which becomes especially clear from the narratives that illustrate and support gnomai, or when reported narrators are used for specific pieces of information. It is also revealed when they camouflage that some elements in a narrative are newly invented or that the narrative has been adapted for the occasion. In addition, reported narrators and their context in lyric sometimes exhort the audience to remember the wider ramifications of a story. I have argued that in Sappho’s fr. 58 the reported narrators separated the present and past more strongly by using the past tense.

Pindar sometimes does not follow the story handed down to him. The most elaborate rejection is that of the story of Pelops in Olympian 1, where he blames envious neighbours for having modified the events and older poets for having spread this false tale. In this
respect, the parallel with Hieron is important: both Hieron and Pelops have to deal with envious people distributing false stories. This underlines the importance of an appropriate and reliable account of the events, viz. by Pindar. In addition, Pelops is apostrophized. This seems to be a recurring feature in poems where stories are questioned or rejected. This could be explained by the fact that the spreading of a false story implies other people ‘standing between’ the events and the false story. This distance between the narrator and the events is again bridged by the apostrophe.

Tragic choruses, too, often appeal to reported narrators. I have distinguished several functions of these appeals. Sometimes a tragic poet, Euripides in particular, stresses the chorus’ narrative’s status as artefact (a story qua story). This emphasizes the momentousness of an event (implied by its wide distribution), underscores the gravity of the present (by comparing it with a story from the past), and camouflages innovations, like in epic and lyric. Furthermore, references to reported narrators explain the chorus’ knowledge of events that occurred in the distant past and/or far away.

Reported narrators often have an authorizing function in tragedy, but in two cases the narrator questions the information that they provide. The authoritative function becomes clear in the choral ode in Aeschylus’ Suppliants, for example, in which the Danaids, who form the chorus, tell the story of Io. They bolster their story about their ancestral ties with Argos by referring to it as a well-known. In addition, I noted that the Danaids speak of their own race with first-person plural forms when referring to themselves, i.e. when they wish to emphasize that they are Zeus’ and Io’s offspring and want to add force to their prayer in this respect. By contrast, they use the singular to emphasize their similarities with Io.

In the choral odes of tragedy, we have seen two instances of the blending of voices (metalepsis). The result of both is that a voice that is not the chorus’ (i.e. the reported narrators’) merges with that of the chorus. Thus in Aeschylus’ Suppliants 524–99, the Danaids quote the earth, but the end of the quotation is not unequivocal. The effects are that the Danaids seem to co-opt the voice of the Earth to add force to their request for Zeus’ protection, and the entire earth seems to proclaim the Danaids’ genealogy. Also, in Euripides’ Iphigenia in Aulis 753–802, the chorus of Greek women quote the Trojan women immediately after the fall of Troy but do not indicate the end of their speech with a closing remark. Thus they or the chorus could be responsible for questioning the story of Helen’s parents. The effect is that both the Trojan women and the chorus of Greek women address Helen and blame her for the Trojan War and thus for Iphigenia’s death.

I conclude that reported narrators in epic are used when the primary narrator wants to emphasize his identity as a human being and when the secondary narrators want to create authority for their narrative about events they have not seen. They often occur in lyric and tragedy, too. When the narrators mention that they rely on others’ words, they do so to achieve various effects: to create authority (e.g. for a superlative reputation or
for camouflaging adaptations and modifications of the story), to transition to a narrative part in a poem (especially in lyric), to emphasize the momentousness of an event (especially in tragedy, but also in epic and lyric), to underscore the gravity of the present (especially in tragedy), or, on the part of the poet, to signal allusions. In some narratives, the context exhorts the audience to remember the wider ramifications of a story (especially in lyric) or the reported perspectives spawn doubts as to the story's veracity (in lyric and tragedy). In the latter case, narrators create more authority for their own narrative (and for themselves as narrators) by being critical about their material.

4. No explicit explanation of narrative knowledge

When secondary narrators in epic narrate about the gods or other divine creatures, especially when the gods do not directly influence the situation at the moment of speaking, they are typically omniscient without motivation. This can be explained by the tales' wide dissemination. How the (mortal) narrators know them and how they were transmitted, then, are less important.

Lyric narrators rarely explain how they know about the events they tell. But because they introduce their narratives with reported narrators in some poems, they may be expected to have learned about them from tradition. Furthermore, they do not need to motivate their knowledge, since, although they do not always invoke the Muses at the beginning of their poems, because they inherited their unmotivated omniscience from their Homeric counterpart. Arguably they do not need to motivate their knowledge because of their status qua chorus or singer, just like the Homeric primary narrator (in his case aided by the Muses) was elevated above ordinary speakers.

The narratives in which tragic choruses do not explain their knowledge can be divided into two categories: narratives about events from the immediate and from the distant past. With regard to the immediate past, the suggestion is that they know from direct observation. Especially when the chorus members show close (emotional) involvement in the events, their knowledge need not be explained. Although the chorus will rarely have seen events from the immediate past, they nevertheless display the characteristics of omniscient narrators. With regard to the distant past, they often narrate as omniscient narrators. In both cases, they arguably inherited this unmotivated omniscience from their epic and lyric predecessors.

To sum up, we have seen four ways in which narrators in epic, lyric and the choral odes of tragedy explain how they know the events they tell, and we have seen how the tragic poets have adopted and – developed – techniques from their epic predecessors, via lyric poetry.
Bibliography

Text editions and translations used

*Text editions and translations: unless otherwise stated. Translations: often adapted. In the case of poets not mentioned here, I have indicated the edition and translation used at each passage.

**Iliad**
- Text: Monro, D.B., and Allen, T.W. (OCT, first edition 1902; reprint 1954);

**Odyssey**
- Text: Allen, T.W. (OCT, first edition 1908; reprint 1954);

**Pindar**

**Bacchylides**
- Text: Maehler, H. (Bibliotheca Teubneriana, 2003);

**Stesichorus**

**Aeschylus**
- Text: Page, D. (OCT, 1972);

**Sophocles**

**Euripides**
I have not used the translations mentioned above in A. A. and E. El. 737-46. In these cases, I use my own translations, although I have borrowed the translations of some phrases from Raeburn-Thomas (2011).

References


Bibliography

---. (2013). The Pindaric First Person in Flux. CA, 32, 243-82.


---. (2013). Choral Intertemporality in the *Oresteia*. In R. Gagné and M.G. Hopman (Eds.), *Choral Mediations in Greek Tragedy* (pp. 78-99). Cambridge.

(Original work published in 1993)


---. (forthcoming). Narrative Apostrophe and the Pindaric ‘You’.

Erzähler über das lyrische Ich zur dramatis persona. In P. Riemer and B. Zimmermann (Eds.), Der Chor im antiken und modernen Drama (pp. 61-88). Stuttgart and Weimar.


Boston.


(Original work published in 1993).
---. (1990s). Sappho Fr. 94: A Further Note. Phoenix, 44, 381.
(Studien zum antiken Drama und zu seiner Rezeption, Neue Serie Band 12). Tübingen.

---. (2012). Debating the Past in Euripides’ Troades and Orestes and in Sophocles’ Electra’. In J. Marincola, L. Llewellyn-Jones and C. Maciver (Eds.), Greek Notions of
the Past in the Archaic and Classical Eras: History without Historians (pp. 113-26). Edinburgh.


Summary

Narrative Authority: From Epic to Drama

At the centre of this thesis are the narratives in epic, lyric, and the choral odes of tragedy. Previous scholarly work has argued that there are continuities between these genres and shown that the choral odes of tragedy contain many characteristics of epic and lyric. A prime example is Herington's *Poetry into Drama* (1985). The aim of this project is to make a contribution to this line of research by investigating if and how the tragic poets adopted – and developed – narrative techniques from their epic and lyric predecessors.

The argument focuses on the subject of narrative authority, or the competence that a narrator claims to have to give a reliable account of events. This form of authority is based on the relationship between the narrator and his narrative as well as his knowledge of the events in his narrative. I argue that an investigation of this subject can help interpret epic, lyric, and tragic texts. Discussions and analyses of texts, therefore, are an important part of this thesis.

In the introduction, I provide an overview of publications on the continuities between epic, lyric, and the choral odes of tragedy, and on the narrative characteristics of lyric and tragic poetry. Then I present my research questions and methodology. With regard to narrative authority, I distinguish the four most common. Firstly, narrators can be aided by the Muses, omniscient goddesses. Secondly, ‘internal narrators’ may recount what they have seen themselves. Thirdly, those without personal knowledge may base their accounts on others’ reports. Fourthly, some do not give an explanation of how they gained their knowledge of the topic.

I also present three dominant narrative concepts. The first is ‘I versus we’. An internal narrator may emphasize his own role in the story by using ‘I’ frequently or by using ‘we’, for example when the narratee was present or when he experienced something with others. Secondly, focalization (narrative perspective) is important: narrators may tell a story as if they are experiencing the events or from a later point of view, equipped with *ex eventu* knowledge. Lastly, I address metalepsis, or the breaking or blurring of narrative boundaries. This includes episodes when it is unclear whether a narrator or one of his characters is speaking and of *apostrophe* (when the narrator addresses a character).
Chapter 1 examines the aforementioned topics in Homer’s epics. Both start with the primary narrator invoking the Muse. The primary narrator also poses questions to the Muse. The answer of these questions comes from the Muse and from the narrator himself. Thus the narrator presents himself as a professional singer. The Muse is also mentioned in relation to the two other singers in the Odyssey, Demodocus and Phemius. Although the narrators have not seen in person the events they recount, the Muse’s contributions give them the authority of eyewitnesses.

The (ordinary) secondary narrators are not assisted by the Muse. Often they are internal narrators who recount events that they have seen. To contribute to the understanding of the authority of internal narrators, I investigate how they refer to themselves and their narratees. These narrators use ‘we’ to involve the narratee more closely into the story, which creates authority. By contrast, when they use ‘I’, they emphasize their own or someone else’s (heroic) role within the group. Internal narrators do not automatically have the authority to recount events they have not seen, but often they circumvent or break such restrictions.

When narrators are not eyewitnesses, they may refer to someone who acts as their narrative source. These ‘reported narrators’ often have an authorizing function (‘other people say so, hence it is true’). On the part of the primary narrator ‘Homer’, the reported narrators arguably signal allusions to pre-existing poetry.

Finally, narrators may not need to explain the source of their knowledge. If this is the case, the source of their knowledge is often evident. This also occurs in narratives told by (omniscient) gods and stories about gods that do not directly influence the narrator's own situation.

Chapter 2 examines lyric. The Muse is often found in lyric, especially in odes with an ‘epic flavour’ (e.g. Pi. Pythian. 4). Questions posed to the Muse occur frequently in lyric, and also a reference to the omniscience of the Muse and multiple references to the close collaboration between a narrator and his Muse can be found. Unlike in epic, the Muse is not mainly used to authenticate the narrator’s knowledge, but to function as a goddess who gives the poems and their subjects eternal fame.

Internal narrators are relatively scarce in lyric. One of the rare examples, which also includes an internal narratee, is Sappho (fr. 94). Another example is found in Pindar’s Pythian 1, where the narrator refers to ‘seeing’ Mount Etna. Mount Etna is a location not only within the storyworld, but also in the ode’s lyric frame and probably within the field of view from the location of the performance.
Appeals to other narrators are more common. These reported narrators often have an introductory function. Especially the Pindaric narrator alludes to earlier poetry to reflect his conception of both his own role and the function of his poetry: older poetry has safeguarded a story’s existence and authority for the future, and he will do the same for the subject of his poetry. Lyric narrators can also signal an allusion to a poem with a simple ‘they say’, and they can disguise modifications of a story by appealing to reported narrators. When an apostrophe is combined with reported narrators, the narrator often reflects (and urges his audience to reflect) on the veracity and/or relevance of the story (e.g. Alcaeus fr. 42, Stesichorus’ *Palinodes*, Pt. O. 1). The narrator in Sappho fr. 58 uses a *verbum dicendi* in the past tense. I argue that this emphasizes the contrast between past and present.

Chapter 3 focuses on the choral odes of tragedy, in which narrators mention the Muse only twice. In *Trojan Women* 511–76, the chorus invokes the Muse in order to emphasize similarities with, and also deviations from, epic poetry. The role of the Muse changes: she does not so much authenticate the narrators’ knowledge, but rather ensures the topic’s and poem’s fame. The idea of the Muse ensuring someone’s fame ties in with the stasimon in *HF* 1061–41.

The chorus often reflects upon the events on stage from a wider perspective, also in a temporal sense. Internal narrators, hence, occur rarely in the choral narratives, except when the choral narrators’ own history is the topic of their ode (Euripides’ *Hec*. 905–52 and *Tr*. 511–760). As internal narrators, they combine different narrative perspectives (*experiencing* and *narrating focalisation*) to explain how they experienced the fall of Troy while reminding their audience of their story’s unfortunate ending. The choral narrators customarily use first-person singular forms when they narrate their fate but plural forms for the city’s initial joy.

Next, I analyse choral odes in which narrators quote other narrators. The chorus uses these other narrators mainly to create authority: reported narrators suggest that the topics are well known. The poets, in turn, use this device to disguise invented traditions. Several additional effects may be produced by reported narrators. Like in lyric, in *Libation Bearers* 585–651, *Philoctetes* 676–729, and *Medea* 824–65, the narrators make explicit comparisons between the present and mythical past by using reported narrators. Yet, in the choral odes of tragedy, this explicitness additionally underscores the exceptional situation of a character on stage, since this is even worse than what the chorus knows from stories. In E. *Electra* 432–86, for instance, the chorus conveys eyewitness reactions to the arms of Achilles by means of their informant. On the other
hand, reported narrators may be used by narrators to spawn doubts as to the story’s veracity, as in E. El. 699–746 (golden lamb ode), and in IA 751–800. The critical stance taken by the narrators creates authority for themselves.

In most tragic embedded narratives the chorus members do not explain how they know the events they tell. In these cases, they probably tell a traditional story or narrate what they have seen. This unmotivated omniscience may have been inherited from epic and lyric narrators.

In the parodos of Agamemnon, the subject of Chapter 4, the Argive elders do not explain how they know what they tell. I argue that the presentation of the story by the chorus of Argive elders suggests that they have seen the events they narrate, and that they closed their eyes at the moment when Iphigenia is sacrificed. Then I argue that the Argive elders’ claim of authority at the beginning of the parodos’ lyric part is based on their old age and status. The poet, in turn, signals to the audience that the story is reliable enough to form the basis of the Agamemnon, even of the whole Oresteia trilogy.

In the conclusion, I summarize my research findings per category (appeals to the Muses, internal narrators (autopsy), appeals to reported narrators, and no explicit explanation) in order to provide an overview of the development of narrative techniques from epic to the choral odes of tragedy.
Samenvatting

Narratieve Autoriteit: van Epos tot Drama

In dit onderzoek staan de verhalen in het epos, lyriek, en in de tragische koorliederen centraal. In het verleden zijn veel overeenkomsten tussen deze genres onderzocht. Studies hebben aangetoond dat de tragische dichters kenmerken van hun epische en lyrische voorgangers hebben overgenomen en verder hebben ontwikkeld. Hiervan is Herington’s *Poetry into Drama* (1985) een belangrijk voorbeeld. Ik lever een bijdrage aan deze lijn van onderzoek door te bestuderen of de tragische dichters verteltechnieken van hun voorgangers hebben overgenomen en hebben ontwikkeld.

Ik richt me op het onderwerp narratieve autoriteit. Dat wil zeggen, de autoriteit die een verteller heeft om op een betrouwbare manier over gebeurtenissen te vertellen. Dit is gebaseerd op de relatie van de verteller tot de gebeurtenissen in zijn verhaal, en, meer specifiek, op de kennis die de verteller van deze gebeurtenissen heeft. Ik laat zien dat onderzoek naar dit onderwerp ons kan helpen bij het interpreteren van de epische, lyrische en tragische narratieven.

In de inleiding geef ik eerst een overzicht van het onderzoek dat al gedaan is naar de verbanden tussen het epos, lyrische genres, en de koorliederen in de tragedie, en van onderzoek naar de narratieve kenmerken van lyrische en tragische poëzie. Vervolgens zet ik mijn methodologie uiteen. Ik verdeel de basis voor narratieve autoriteit in vier categorieën. Ten eerste kunnen vertellers hun kennis van gebeurtenissen toetsen aan de Muzen, alwetende godinnen. Ten tweede kunnen vertellers over gebeurtenissen vertellen die ze zelf hebben meegemaakt; in dat geval zijn ze interne vertellers. Als vertellers de gebeurtenissen die ze vertellen niet zelf hebben gezien, kunnen ze, ten derde, vertellen wat ze gehoord hebben van anderen. Ten vierde geven sommige vertellers geen expliciete verklaring van hun kennis van het verhaal, hoewel het voor hun toehoorders duidelijk kan zijn hoe ze de gebeurtenissen weten.

Binnen deze vier categorieën zijn met name drie narratieve concepten van belang. Het eerste concept is het verschil tussen het gebruik van ‘ik’ en ‘wij’ door de verteller. Wanneer een verteller vertelt wat hij heeft meegemaakt kan dit gereflecteerd worden in een hoge frequentie van ‘ik’-vormen. Misschien gebruikt hij ook ‘wij’-vormen, als degene tot wie hij spreekt bijvoorbeeld ook aanwezig was bij de gebeurtenissen, of als hij iets samen met anderen heeft meegemaakt. Daarnaast is het vertelperspectief van
belang: vertellers kunnen een verhaal vertellen alsof ze het op dat moment meemaken (experiencing focalization), maar kunnen ook vanuit een later standpunt vertellen (narrating focalization). Het derde concept is metalepsis. Metalepsis is het doorbreken van narratieve grenzen tussen het verhaal zelf en de vertelsituatie: wanneer het bijvoorbeeld niet duidelijk is of bepaalde woorden gezegd worden door de verteller, of door een personage in het verhaal. Of bijvoorbeeld wanneer een verteller een personage direct aanspreekt (apostrophe), waarmee hij de grenzen tussen het verhaal en de vertelsituatie doorbreekt. Dit kan verschillende effecten hebben.

In hoofdstuk 1 onderzoek ik de hiervoor genoemde onderwerpen in de Homerische epen. De primaire verteller van deze epen heeft de identiteit van een professionele zanger, en beide epen beginnen met een aanroep van de Muze. Daarnaast stelt de primaire verteller de Muzen vragen, die direct gevolgd worden door het antwoord. In de Odyssee worden ook de twee andere professionele zangers, Demodocus en Phemius, in verband gebracht met de Muzen. Wat betreft narratieve autoriteit worden de Muzen vooral gerelateerd aan het vertellen van een 'ooggetuigewaardig' verhaal. Met andere woorden, ook al heeft de primaire verteller de gebeurtenissen niet gezien, hij kan ze toch vertellen met de autoriteit van een ooggetuige.


Wanneer vertellers geen ooggetui gen waren, verwijzen ze soms naar een persoon van wie ze het verhaal gehoord hebben. Deze persoon geeft autoriteit aan het verhaal. Ook vertellen ze algemeen bekende verhalen. Door dit expliciet te vermelden krijgt het verhaal autoriteit, omdat erin besloten ligt dat andere mensen dit verhaal ook zo vertellen. Daarnaast is het mogelijk dat dit soort inleidingen een verwijzing signaleren naar oudere epische verhalen over hetzelfde onderwerp, of kunnen de inleidingen camoufleren dat de verteller het verhaal heeft aangepast.

Tenslotte zijn er verhalen zonder verwijzing naar de bron van het verhaal. Vaak is het in deze verhalen duidelijk hoe de verteller weet wat hij vertelt, zijn dit verhalen
verteld door (alwetende) goden, of verhalen over goden die geen directe invloed hebben op de situatie van de (menselijke) verteller.

In hoofdstuk 2 komt lyrische poëzie aan bod. De Muze komt veel voor in lyriek, vooral in odes met een epische ‘kleuring’, zoals de vierde Pythische Ode van Pindarus. De combinatie van vragen en antwoorden uit het epos komt terug, maar ook een enkele verwijzing naar de alwetendheid van de Muzen, en meerdere verwijzingen naar de samenwerking van de Muze met de dichter. In vergelijking met het epos worden de Muzen niet voornamelijk gebruikt om de kennis van de verteller te verklaren, maar komt hun functie als de godinnen die gedichten en de roem van personen onsterfelijk maken sterker naar voren.

Interne vertellers komen relatief weinig voor in lyriek. Van Sappho bespreek ik fr. 94, waar de verteller en haar toehoorder verschillend terugkijken op het verleden. Daarnaast verwijst de Pindarische verteller een keer naar zijn status van ooggetuige met betrekking tot de Etna (Pyth. 1). Een verklaring hiervoor is dat de Etna niet alleen een locatie in het narratieve gedeelte van de ode is, maar ook daarbuiten.


Hoofdstuk 3 richt zich op de koorliederen in de tragedie. Hier worden de Muzen slechts twee keer in verband gebracht met een verhaal. Eén keer (E. Tr. 511-76) om de verhouding van dit koorlied tot het epos te benadrukken. We zien met betrekking tot de Muzen een belangrijke verandering: terwijl de Muzen eerder door vertellers gevraagd werden om te helpen bij hun verhaal, worden de Muzen nu ook gevraagd om onderwerpen aan vertellers in de toekomst te geven. Hetzelfde gebeurt in HF 1016-41, het andere koorlied waarin de Muzen voorkomen.

Het koor in de tragedie kijkt in de meeste gevallen van een afstand naar de gebeurtenissen die zich op het toneel plaatsvinden. Soms is hun eigen verleden onderwerp van hun liederen (Hec. 905-52 en E. Tr. 511-76). Met betrekking tot deze
interne vertellers is de combinatie van verschillende vertelperspectieven (experiencing en narrating focalisation) interessant. De koorleden vertelt hoe zij de gebeurtenissen hebben meegemaakt maar herinneren hun luisteraars er tegelijkertijd aan dat het slecht zal aflopen. Bovendien gebruiken ze in E. Tr. 511-76 de ‘ik’-vorm voor hun ongeluk en de meervoudsvorm voor de vreugde die er aanvankelijk was in de stad.

In het derde gedeelte van hoofdstuk 3 bespreek ik de koorliederen waarin vertellers verwijzen naar andere vertellers. De koorleden gebruiken deze vertellers vooral om autoriteit te creëren voor hun verhaal en voor henzelf als vertellers. Het idee is dat als andere mensen het verhaal ook vertellen, het verhaal wel waar zal zijn. Dichters gebruiken deze techniek om hun eigen wijzigingen in het verhaal te camoufleren. Het kan ook enkele andere effecten opleveren. In Choephoroi 585-651, Philoctetes 676-729 en Medea 824-65 maken de vertellers een expliciete vergelijking tussen het heden en het mythische verleden door het gebruik van verwijzingen naar andere vertellers. Dit vonden we ook in lyriek. In de tragische koorliederen echter, onderstreep deze expliciete vergelijking de uitzonderlijkheid van de situatie die zich op het podium afspelde: dit is namelijk erger dan wat het koor uit verhalen kent. In E. El. 432-86 vertelt het koor hoe het was om naar het schild van Achilles te kijken. Dit weten ze omdat ze het gehoord hebben van een Trojaan. Aan de andere kant kunnen vertellers naar andere vertellers verwijzen om twijfels over de waarheid van het verhaal uit te drukken en op te wekken, zoals in E. El. 699-746 en in IA 751-800. Een dergelijk kritisch standpunt creëert autoriteit voor het koor als vertellers.

In veel narratieve koorliederen geven de vertellers geen verklaring van de kennis die ze hebben. Vaak is waarschijnlijk dat ze, ook al noemen ze het niet expliciet, een traditioneel verhaal vertellen, of vertellen wat ze gezien hebben. Het niet noemen van een informatiebron is waarschijnlijk een erfenis van hun lyrische voorgangers.

Het ontbreken van een motivatie van kennis leidt tot enkele belangrijke vragen over de parodos in Agamemnon, het onderwerp van hoofdstuk 4. Hier beargumenteer ik dat de manier van vertellen van het koor suggereert dat ze aanwezig waren, en dat ze hun ogen sloten op het moment dat Iphigeneia geofferd werd. Vervolgens richt ik me op de autoriteitsclaim van het koor aan het begin van het lyrische gedeelte van de parodos. Deze autoriteit berust op hun hoge leeftijd en status, en de dichter maakt hiermee duidelijk dat het verhaal van de vertellers, zonder dat ze het zelf weten, de basis vormt voor de Agamemnon en zelfs voor de hele trilogie.
In de conclusie vat ik de bevindingen per categorie (verwijzingen naar de Muzen, interne vertellers (autopsie), verwijzingen naar anderen, en geen verklaring) samen, zodat de grote lijn van de ontwikkeling van verteltechnieken van het epos, via lyriek, naar de koorliederen in de tragedie duidelijk wordt.