SELF-REFERENTIAL POETICS:

EMBEDDED SONG AND THE PERFORMANCE OF POETRY

IN GREEK LITERATURE

A THESIS

SUBMITTED FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

by

Sarah J. Harden

University College,

University of Oxford

Hilary Term 2012

Word Count: c.95,248

ABSTRACT

SELF-REFERENTIAL POETICS: EMBEDDED SONG AND THE
PERFORMANCE OF POETRY IN GREEK LITERATURE

SARAH J. HARDEN, UNIVERSITY COLLEGE

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
HILARY 2012

This thesis is a study of embedded song in Greek narrative poetry. The introduction defines the terminology (embedded song is defined as the depiction of the performance of a poem within a larger poem, such as the songs of Demodocus in Homer's *Odyssey*) and sets the study in the context of recent narratological work done by scholars of Classical literature. This section of the thesis also contains a brief discussion of embedded song in the Homeric epics, which will form the background of all later examples of the motif.

Chapter 1 deals with embedded song in the *Homeric Hymns* and Hesiod's *Theogony*. It is argued that the occurrence of embedded song across these poems indicates that the motif is a traditional feature of early Greek hexameter poetry, while the possibility of "inter-textual" allusion between these poems is considered, but finally dismissed.

Chapter 2 focuses on Pindar, Bacchylides and Corinna, and explores how lyric poets use this motif in the various sub-genres of Greek lyric. In epinician poetry, it is argued that embedded song is used as a strategy of praise and also to boost the authority of the poet-narrator by association with the embedded performers, who can be seen to have in each case a particular source of authority distinct from that of the poet narrator.

Chapter 3 considers the Hellenistic poets Apollonius Rhodius and Theocritus, and how their interest in depicting oral poetry meshes with their identity as literate and literary poets.

Appendix I gives a list of all the examples of embedded song I have found in Greek poetry.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This thesis was undertaken and completed at University College, Oxford. I am very grateful for the Classics studentship which funded the three years of research I completed there. I also owe much gratitude to colleagues and friends for their help, both academic and otherwise. Warmest thanks are due first of all to my supervisor, Bill Allan, whose support and advice has been invaluable. Special thanks are also due to Adrian Kelly, who has voluntarily read and commented on several parts of this thesis and who has been a source of much support and encouragement. I owe a long-standing debt to Bruno Currie, who suggested this project to me when I was his undergraduate student at Oriel College in 2006. Felix Budelmann gave me extremely useful feedback at my transfer and confirmation of status exams, for which I am very grateful. Many others have heard me give seminar papers based on chapters of this thesis or closely related topics and their comments and feedback have been most useful in stimulating new ideas as well as in avoiding errors; in particular I thank David Sider, Irene de Jong, Evert van Emde Boas, Gregory Hutchinson, Leslie Kurke, Dirk Obbink, Daniela Colomo and Enrico Prodi. Of course any remaining errors remain the fault of the author. The library at University College has been a vital resource in writing up this thesis, and I would like to extend my thanks to the former librarian, Christine Ritchie, for her help in sourcing many books which were unavailable in the Bodleian and for her many kindnesses. Friends and family have also been a tower of strength during the writing and research process; thanks to Bettina Reitz, Glenn Lacki, John-Paul Shepherd, Enrico Prodi and Kelly Shannon for their friendship and encouragement. I would also like to offer special thanks to my mother, Lesley Veronica, whose academic achievements have been an inspiration since my early childhood. The ultimate debt of thanks is due to my husband, Alastair Harden, for his help both academic and otherwise in every aspect of the past three years.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABBREVIATIONS

Abbreviations for Greek authors usually follow those in *LSJ*. Periodicals are abbreviated as in *L'Année philologique*.

AHS	Allen, T. W., Halliday, W. R. and Sikes, E. E. (1936) *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford).
HAp.	*Homeric Hymn to Apollo*
HAph.	*Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*
HDem.	*Homeric Hymn to Demeter*
HH.	*Homeric Hymn*
HHerm.	*Homeric Hymn to Hermes*
HPan	*Homeric Hymn to Pan*
IEG	West, M. L. (1989 [1971]) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci* (Oxford).
LIMC	*Lexikon iconographicum mythologicae classicae* (Zurich).
LSJ	Liddell, H. G., Scott, R. and Jones, H. S. (1996, 9th edt.) *A Greek-English Lexicon* (Oxford).
PMG	Page, D. (1962) *Poetae Melici Graeci* (Oxford).
PMGF	Davies, M. (1991) *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta* (Oxford).
SLG	Page, D. (1974) *Supplementum Lyricis Graecis* (Oxford).
SMBa	Snell, B. and Maehler, H. (1992) *Bacchylidis Carmina cum Fragmentis* (Leipzig).
SMPi	Maehler, H. (post Snell, B.) (1987 & 1989) *Pindari Carmina cum Fragmentis* Pars I & II (Leipzig).

INTRODUCTION

WHAT IS EMBEDDED SONG?

From the *Iliad* onwards, Greek poets depict the performance of poetry within their own work. Achilles famously takes to the lyre in his splendid isolation at *Iliad* 9.186-190; his subject-matter, the famous deeds of men (κλέα ἀνδρῶν 9.189), has long been noted to have self-conscious significance for the subject-matter of the *Iliad* itself, with its central theme of human excellence.[1] The *Odyssey* is replete with bards and bard-like characters, from the court singers at Ithaca and Scheria to Odysseus himself.[2] There is great variation in the length and detail in which embedded songs are depicted in Greek poetry. The contrast between, for instance, the second song of Demodocus (often known as the *Lay of Ares and Aphrodite*), which is an extended narrative of one hundred lines, and the much more abbreviated description of Achilles' performance in *Iliad* 9 immediately illustrates one of the central preliminaries of this discussion: what constitutes an embedded song?[3] Are we entitled to take the performance of Achilles as such, or should we require more details of the song's content? The depiction of a performance of poetry such as Achilles' may be considered the barest and most compressed form of an embedded song; it is an instance

1 Cf. Segal (1992): 12; Frontisi-Ducroux: (1986): 53.
2 For the prominent role of singers in the *Odyssey*, cf. *inter alia* Schadewaldt (1959): 66-86, Fränkel (1962): 6-27, Thalmann (1984): 157-84, de Jong (1987): 44-53, Goldhill (1991): 49-68, Ford (1992): 90-130, Segal (1992) and (1998a): 9-24; Redfield (1975): 30-1 offers a summary of song in both Homeric epics and differentiates between songs performed by amateurs and professional songs.
3 Beck (2012): 32-3 points out that, uniquely among all speech-acts presented in the Homeric epics, the most common way of representing song in these poems is through "speech-mention", by which she means references to the performance of song such as this brief song of Achilles.

where the poet *could* give us more details of what was sung, but chooses not to. The putative narrative of Achilles' song is nonetheless strongly evoked in the two-word description κλέα ἀνδρῶν, which immediately calls to mind epic poetry.[4] Similarly, the paean sung by Achaean youths at *Il.* 1.472-74 is not extensively elaborated beyond the information that they "sing of the far-shooter":

> οἳ δὲ πανημέριοι μολπῇ θεὸν ἱλάσκοντο
> καλὸν ἀείδοντες παιήονα κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν
> μέλποντες ἑκάεργον· ὃ δὲ φρένα τέρπετ᾽ ἀκούων.

Nonetheless, this compressed account of their song immediately calls to mind the genre of *paean* and the subject-matter of Apollo, once more indicating a potential narrative which, although not fully realized, is evoked in the minds of the audience.[5] I am reluctant to give undue importance to length alone as a criterion determining the effect or function of an embedded song, preferring to analyse the embedded song(s) in Greek texts for their meaning and significance without *a priori* assumptions based on their size in relation to the frame narrative.[6] Highly compressed or brief incidences of song within song are perhaps less likely to give rise to extended discussion than more elaborated examples, but they are still of relevance to this study as they illuminate various issues of importance such as the context for embedded song, the identity of the performer, the genre/subject-matter and the function of embedded song. As the following chapters will show, there is considerable variation not only in the length and detail of embedded songs, but also in the manner in which a song may be embedded within a Greek poem. One of the aims of this discussion is

4 Sturgess (1992): 17 has noted that even the most compressed segments of embedded discourse can be argued to function as narratives: "once these mini-narratives are thought of as being contextualized in a completed work...such passages could be seen to take a significant or signifying place in the narrativity of whatever might be their containing narratives".

5 Dué (2006) notes that the most compressed form of an epic micro-narrative is an epithet or patronymic, either of which may imply the existence of another narrative (how the hero came by the epithet, or the story of his birth, for instance). Cf. Nagy (1990): 23 on πολύτλας δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς as a micro-narrative within the *Iliad*.

6 There are various theoretical discussions of whether it is appropriate to categorize embedded narratives by length, cf. Genette (1983): 64 (=1988: 95), Kozloff (1988): 49. Nelles (1997): 136-39 argues against Genette and Kozloff, both of whom (although in different ways) use length alone as a means of interpreting and evaluating embedded narratives: "all embedded narrative has a dramatic impact, if only that of deferring or interrupting the main narrative...all embedded narrative has a thematic function, if only one of relative contrast or analogy" (138).

to offer an analysis of the different techniques of embedding used by Greek poets and the variety of interpretations that may thereby become possible.

TERMINOLOGY AND THEORY

As indicated by the examples above, I use the term "embedded song" to refer to the depiction of a poetic performance within a narrative poem, i.e. the representation of a poem within a poem. The term is based upon de Jong's "embedded story" which she uses for any story embedded in the main story and told by the primary narrator or one of the characters; "embedded song" should thus be defined as a sub-set of the much larger set of examples which make up de Jong's "embedded story", though her own terminology does not distinguish between embedded song and embedded story.[7] I have adapted her terminology because there is a significant difference between a story *spoken* by a character in a poem and the performance of a song, particularly in the context of early Greek song-culture where the poetry in which these songs are embedded was itself performed orally.[8] At the very least such a distinction between poetry and plain speech should be discussed and taken account of, rather than assuming a basic cohesion which may not exist.[9] The fact that a poet has chosen to depict a performance of poetry rather than the narration of a story in speech deserves investigation; the motivations and effects of such a choice will be a main concern of this discussion. In one or two particular cases I do include discussion of passages which are in fact embedded *speeches* rather than song in the rare cases where such instances have particular connections to, or relevance for, embedded songs in the same poem.

7 de Jong (2001): xiii.
8 For the orality of poetry in archaic and classical Greece see Thomas (1995): 104-29, Thomas (1992): esp. 29-51, Edmunds and Wallace (1997); for orality and the Homeric epics see (among many other contributions) Kelly (2007): 1-17, Hainsworth (1968): 1-22, Parry (1971): ix-lxii, Foley (1999), Lord (1953) and (1960).
9 For a discussion of the differences between song and speech in the Homeric epics in terms of their speech-presentation see Beck (2012).

I do not use the term *mise en abyme*, which has been applied to embedded songs by scholars in recent years, since identification of a literary *mise en abyme* usually requires the embedded narrative to reflect the frame narrative in full; so the play-within-a-play at the end of *Hamlet* is a *mise en abyme*, while embedded songs such as those of Demodocus in the *Odyssey* cannot truly be said to function as *mise en abyme* since they reflect only selected elements and themes of the main story.[10] Although a more nuanced reading of the term *mise en abyme* is certainly possible, it seems best to avoid the possibility of confusion by using a term which is less strongly associated with a certain set of characteristics and meanings.[11] Furthermore, by keeping the terminology separate it will be possible to distinguish between embedded songs (which may reflect parts of the main narrative in various interesting and important ways) and instances of *mise en abyme*, which (according to the usual definition of the term) will much more closely reflect the main narrative. Such a distinction allows for greater precision in interpretation. I am here following a distinction drawn by de Jong (although she uses different terminology again) between "mirror-story" and "embedded story", the former being "an embedded story which reflects in its entirety the main story" while the latter "only reflects aspects of the main story".[12] de Jong's "mirror-story" corresponds to the usual interpretation of a *mise en abyme*, and her definitions are useful in showing clearly that there is a pointed difference between these two types of embedded narrative. In fact, examples of "mirror-story" or *mise en abyme* proper in embedded songs are thin on the ground in Greek literature. As the following chapters will show, few embedded songs reflect the "main story" (what I term the "frame narrative")

10 In this I am wary of following the approach of Rinon (2008): 114-126 who argues that the songs of Demodocus can be read as *mise en abyme*, not of the main story but of various themes within the main story. Thus he argues that the first song of Demodocus "is a *mise en abyme* of the interepic dialogue of the *Odyssey* with the *Iliad*". He does not address the conceptual slippage between *mise en abyme* as "a certain part of a literary work that represents the work as a whole" and his later use of *mise en abyme* as a very particular, limited aspect of that work. Cf. Létoublon (1983): 19-36 for a different view of mise en abyme in the *Odyssey*. She admits episodes such as Penelope's dream in *Od.* 19.535-552 to this category. The classic analysis of *mise en abyme* in literature and art is that of Dällenbach (1977).

11 Cf. de Jong (1985): 18 n. 1 "It seems better to reserve the term '*mise en abyme*' for those embedded narratives which reflect the *whole* of the main story".

12 N.B. that the approach of de Jong (2001) quoted above differs in significant respect from an earlier article by de Jong (1985): 5-22 where she uses "mirror-story" in a more general way to mean any embedded story which reflects "something belonging to the main story".

so completely, and preserving a distinction between terminology for each type of embedded song will allow interpretation of the differing significance of each. The term I use for the poem in which an embedded song may be found is "frame narrative": this is a term used by modern narratologists for any narrative that frames an embedded narrative.[13] Thus the *Odyssey* is a "frame narrative", while the songs of Demodocus and Phemius are "embedded songs". In regard to the narrator(s) of the poems I use the term "primary narrator" to refer to the narrator of the *Odyssey* as a whole and the term "embedded narrator" to refer to the narrator(s) of embedded songs.

Although this is a discussion of narrative and of (secondary) narrators, it is not intended primarily as a formalist narratological study. The variation in terminology even between three such prominent narratologists as de Jong, Genette and Nelles (to take only these of many) easily leads to confusion. Wrangling about the possible meaning of various modern labels for narrative phenomena obfuscates interpretation of the texts, the meaning and significance of which is the primary focus of this study. I aim to use terms which are clear and consistent, and which will be useful and meaningful for interpretation of the texts, without re-inventing the narratological wheel.[14]

With that caveat in place, it will be useful to consider briefly the possibilities for interpreting embedded narratives identified by narratologists. The central question is: what might an embedded song (or story, in the case of most narratological studies to date) tell us about the frame narrative in which it is set? Why are embedded songs of interest at all? Before attempting to answer these questions I compare the responses of two scholars on the *Odyssey*:

13 Cf. Abbott (2008): 28-9, 234 for the similar term "framing narrative". Nelles (1997) uses the term "embedd*ing* narrative" which I find potentially confusing when used in close proximity with "embedd*ed* narrative" (my italics). I have tried to choose terms which are clear and also easily distinguished from each other.

14 Even in basic terminology the specific terms used for embedded narrative and the text in which a narrative is embedded vary: thus de Jong (2001): xiii and xv "embedded story" and "main story", Genette (1980): 228-34 "metadiegesis" and "diegesis", Nelles (1997) *passim* "embedded narrative" and "embedding narrative".

> "[the first song of Demodocus] together with the subsequent scenes...is an invaluable testimony to the nature and conditions of ἀοιδή as, ideally, the Homeric poet conceived them."[15]

> "these motifs [of poetry and storytelling] do not tell us about poetry as such, or present us with a specifically 'Homeric' account of song. Rather, they are employed in the *Odyssey* to construct a particular – and relatively optimistic – perspective on the problem of human suffering..."[16]

These two very different interpretations of the songs of Demodocus each offer an interesting and plausible account of the effect and function of the embedded song(s). Their surface incompatibility is caused by the fact that, in most scholarship, the embedded songs in the *Odyssey* (this is also true of Greek literature more generally) have been used by scholars in the process of arguing a particular case rather than analysed in their own right. In fact, I would argue that the two positions quoted above are not mutually exclusive – it is possible for the songs of Demodocus to give an account of Homeric song (although the definition of "Homeric song" would have to be carefully delineated in this case) as well as offering a perspective on human suffering which is an important theme of the epic as a whole. So, rather than beginning with any *a priori* assumptions about what embedded song is capable of, this study seeks to analyse its function in Greek literature primarily through close readings of the relevant texts.

However, modern literary-theoretical studies of embedded narrative(s) offer a set of possibilities for the function and significance of the technique which may usefully be applied to ancient texts. The most basic of these is the impulse of the reader (or in ancient texts, often the audience) to compare the embedded narrative with the frame narrative on various levels. The process of embedding "marks out three sites of potential significance...the two stories, two narrators, and two narratees all offer topoi for comparative analyses."[17] Furthermore, the embedded narrative may confirm or reinforce the themes and concerns of the frame narrative, or it may undermine or contradict the

15 Hainsworth (1988): 349 n.62-103.
16 Mackie (1997): 94.
17 Nelles (1997): 143.

assertions, happenings or themes of the frame narrative.[18] Already in these very general observations the rich potential of embedded songs is clear: they are a locus for (self-) reflection, on the part of both poet and reader/audience, on various aspects of the poetic enterprise.

Genette identifies three functions of embedded narrative in relation to the frame narrative.[19] These are 1) *explicative*, where the embedded narrative is in a direct causal relationship with the frame narrative. In this case the embedded narrative explains the current situation in the frame narrative; 2) *thématique*, where there is no spatial or temporal continuity between the embedded song and the frame, but rather a relationship of contrast or analogy in their themes; 3) a situation where there is no specific relationship of content or causation between the embedded song and the frame, and thus "c'est l'acte de narration lui-même que remplit un fonction dans la diégèse...fonction de distraction...et/ou d'obstruction". Genette's analysis offers a range of functions for embedded narratives which will map usefully on to many of the examples of embedded song from ancient Greek literature, although it will be seen that his categories are not necessarily mutually exclusive in practice.

de Jong, following a later discussion of Genette's, identifies the main function of embedded narrative in ancient Greek poetry as the manipulation of time within the frame narrative: "[t]hey are external or internal analepses or – less often – prolepses". She adds the additional possibility for a further "key function" (such as persuasion of one character by another) within the frame.[20] How far de Jong's privileging of the temporal model reflects the examples of embedded song I have found in ancient Greek narrative poetry will be discussed below. Her intriguing suggestion that embedded songs may perform a "key function" such as rhetorical persuasion within the narrative will also be addressed.

18 Nelles (1997): 143-4; Triviños (1980): 158-159.
19 Genette (1972): 242-3, (1980): 232-3.
20 de Jong (2001): xiii; Genette (1983): 93, (1988): 62-3.

These functions of embedded narrative are not meant to be an exhaustive list, or to limit the following discussion with a concrete set of *a priori* functions, but rather to offer a framework within which to begin interpreting the embedded songs in ancient Greek literature. It may be the case that the embedded songs discussed in this study function in ways not mentioned by the narratologists quoted above. Certainly it is the case that their categories are not absolute: for instance, Genette's three categories of embedded narrative are not in fact entirely separable from one another, and several embedded songs in Greek literature will be shown to operate across his distinctions.

ANCIENT GREEK TERMINOLOGY

As the discussion progresses, it will become clear that the Greek terminology for song(s) as depicted in Greek poetry is often far from precise.[21] For instance, there is no difference in meaning, as far as I have found, between any of the general terms for song in the Homeric poems. Thus we find the ritual *paean* for Apollo at *Il.* 1.472-4 described using the verb ἀείδειν and the noun μολπή and the non-ritual (although not necessarily altogether non-religious) after-dinner entertainments of Phemius described using exactly the same combination of noun and verb at *Od.* 1.151-5. Phemius's performances, which all take place in the same context of the suitors' banquets, are also described using the noun ἀοιδή at 1.421 and 17.605. Appendix I offers a list of all the songs in the Homeric poems and a comparison of any of these examples would show the same unmarked use of song terminology as I have described above. In the individual readings of each embedded song I will evaluate the continuity (or discontinuity) of this tendency to describe different kinds of poetic performance with the same vocabulary. Where differentiation does come into play is

21 West (1981): 113-29 discusses in some detail Homer's use of ἀείδειν and ἀοιδός.

in the use of genre-specific words for song. An awareness of several of the major lyric genres is already clear in the Homeric poems: the *Iliad*, for instance, depicts the performance of paean, *hymenaios* and *threnos*. In that context, the song is largely performed as part of the ritual background of the poem – genre is defined by the occasion and does not become the subject of an overtly self-conscious reflection on the nature of poetic genres, although, as I argue below, the *Iliad*'s use of the genre of female ritual lament (*threnos*) at the end of the poem indicates a keen awareness of the effect of combining elements from different genres, which foreshadows the more self-conscious genre games of later Greek literature.

The scholia, perhaps unsurprisingly, offer little in the way of analytical reflections on embedded song as a poetic phenomenon; their views and comments on specific embedded songs will be discussed where applicable.[22]

Scope and Limitations

This thesis concerns itself with embedded songs in narrative Greek poetry from the Archaic to the Hellenistic era, but it is not meant to be an exhaustive survey of all instances of embedded song in these texts. By including in Appendix I such examples as I have found but have been unable to discuss in detail I hope to have provided as full an account as possible of this phenomenon within the confines of Greek narrative poetry. The reasons for limiting the study to narrative verse only are set out below.

As is by now evident, I am primarily interested in embedded *songs* rather than embedded narratives or speeches. This is not to deny that embedded narratives are of enormous interest and importance, nor even to claim that they do not in many ways share many of the features and interpretative possibilities of embedded songs; even the hastiest glance at embedded narratives such as the *Apologoi* of Odysseus at *Od.* 9-12 or the lying

22 Nünlist (2009) offers an extensive account of the terms and concepts of literary criticism used in the Greek scholia and does not refer to any technical discussion on their part of embedded song (though he does note that they do not seem to recognize the difference between speech and embedded speech, pp.324-5).

tales he tells later in the poem will show the richness of such passages.[23] However, it would be impossible in one study to cover all categories of embedded narrative and retain any reasonable cohesiveness, particularly in the area of Greek literature where direct speech forms such a large part of poems such as the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Embedded songs are a sub-set, as I argued above, of a larger whole which is (in most cases) easily recognizable and distinctive in its own right. The depiction of the performance of poetry within poetry is of special interest because of the inherent potential for self-reflexiveness it creates.[24] This self-reflective aspect comes partly from the fact that (at least for the earlier poems discussed) the poems themselves were orally performed, whether, as has been postulated for the *Homeric Hymns,* at a religious festival or as for Pindar and Bacchylides, at the celebration of a victor's win in one of the athletic contests at the games.[25] Besides the self-referential *performative* possibilities in these passages, the very presence of an embedded poem in itself has the potential to raise, as we saw above, all sorts of questions about the frame narrative, the primary narrator, and the themes of the poem.

Because I am concerned with the relationship of embedded narratives to frame narratives and secondary narrators to primary narrators, I have not included any examples from Greek drama in this study. Although narratological study of drama as narrative is a burgeoning field, it is generally recognized that drama does not have a narrator and is not thus "narrative" in the same sense as epic or lyric poetry. The lack of primary narrator complicates any attempt to classify *embedded* narratives within the whole. Any such attempt would require more space and argumentation than the scope of the current thesis.

---

23 For a discussion of the links between several speech-acts of Odysseus and poetic performance and poetic competition see Kelly (2008). Mackie (1997): 84 notes the frequent similarities between embedded speeches and embedded songs in the *Odyssey*, concluding that "the parallels between the two types of narrative often lead critics to suppose that there is no significant differences between the two", citing Thalmann (1984): 161. She herself argues for significant differences between embedded speech and song in formal terms.

24 Cf. Scodel (1998): 172 (on the embedded songs in Homeric epic) "they are fragile, define the special authority Homeric epic claims for itself, and when we too rapidly demystify them, we fail to see how the epic sees itself". What later poets (who were largely writing for a reading audience) do with this performative heritage when depicting other poets at work will be discussed in the third chapter below.

25 Cf. Thomas (1992): 123; Herington (1985): 3; Bakker (1999): 35-6; Segal (1992): 4 "the poet of early Greece is a singer"; Richardson (1990): 82-3. For the orality or otherwise of the *Homeric Hymns* see the recent summary of Faulkner (2011), with bibliography, also Clay (1997): 491-2, Richardson (1974): 31, Janko (1982): 18-19, Notopoulos (1962) and Lord (1968).

There is an argument to be made for the potential existence of embedded song(s) within narrative text(s) within drama, but again the dramatic context would require a different set of terminology and separate methodology from that required for narrative texts.[26]

I do not include commands to sing (e.g. Pindar *Ol.*9.5-8), or references to the current song (e.g. Pindar *Ol.*100-1), since these references to song are related to the the frame narrative too closely to be considered 'embedded' in the same way as examples such as the songs of Demodocus. I have also omitted from this discussion promises to sing in the future (e.g. Call. *Hymn to Artemis* 138ff., *Arg.* 4.1773-4), or counterfactual embedded songs (e.g. Pindar *N.* 4.13-19, where the poet says the victor's dead father *would* sing of his son, if he were still alive): these 'potential' embedded songs require a separate study for which there was not space in this thesis.

Finally, the Homeric examples of embedded song will form a frame to my whole discussion, although I will not devote a chapter specifically to them. This is due to the richness of earlier scholarship on the songs of Demodocus and the other Homeric examples: unlike some of the embedded songs in the *Homeric Hymns* or later texts, they do not require such detailed initial analysis on my part.[27] Outside this introduction, where I will use the songs of Demodocus as test-cases to introduce the concepts and methodology of the thesis as a whole, the Homeric epics will remain ever-present in the background of the discussion, underpinning as they do all the later texts.

---

26 The recent study of Swift (2010) on embedded lyric genres in tragic choruses deals with many of the relevant passages of interest. Rutherford (2007): 1-39 discusses choral narration of past events in Greek tragedy. Cf. Dué (2006) for a discussion of embedded female laments in Greek tragedy.

27 On the songs of Demodocus see Thornton (1970): 43-5, Macleod (1982): 2-5, Olson (1989), Garvie (1994): 248-250, de Jong (2001): 190-220, Graziosi (2002): 133-42. On the first song of Demodocus see Marg (1956): 16-29, Goldhill (1991): 50; on the first and third songs see Biles (2003): 199-208; Broeniman (1996): 3-13. On the laments of female characters in the *Iliad* see Dué (2002). For scholarship on Iliadic song (especially laments) see the section on the *Iliad* below.

How to embed a poem (1):

The *Odyssey*

The songs of Demodocus offer an excellent starting point for any discussion of embedded song in Greek poetry.[28] These three embedded songs show, firstly, the different methods used to embed a narrative and to discuss the possible relationship (and/or tension) between the primary narrator of the *Odyssey* and Demodocus and, secondly, the connections between these songs and the frame narrative in terms of theme, content and function.

The *Odyssey* is rich in depictions of the performance of song. Besides the songs of Demodocus, the poem also depicts bards at Ithaca and Sparta: Phemius and the un-named bard at Menelaus' palace.[29] This cluster of professional bards emphasizes the role of song in entertainment, at the banquet, in the context of domestic (albeit palatial!) festivities.[30] The domestic and secular (in the sense of non-ritual) role of song is clear too in the brief references to female song-performance: Calypso and Circe sing as they work the loom, and Nausicaa and her maidens sing as they play on the shore, after attending to the dirty laundry. The role of song in religious ritual is only seen in brief hints in the *Odyssey*, such as the fake wedding celebration arranged by Odysseus at *Od.* 23.143-145, where Phemius sings and plays the lyre to avert suspicion of the slaughter of the suitors, and the reported dirge of the Muses at Achilles' funeral at *Od.* 24.60-1.[31] The significance of the contrasting contexts for song in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is discussed further below; for now it is sufficient

28 The Greek text of the *Iliad* quoted is that of Allen (1931), that of the *Odyssey* is Allen (1917-19).
29 Although Menelaus is celebrating the weddings of his children at this feast, the performance of the bard is represented not as the ritual performance of *epithalamion* or *hymenaios* but in the same manner as the performances of Demodocus or Phemius: as entertainment at a party.
30 Cf. Murray (2008): 165 "the *aoidos* [in the *Odyssey*] performs his epic in the banquets of heroes – and apparently nowhere else, certainly not in any festival context."
31 Cf. also the references to women raising a ritual cry (the *ololuge*), although this seems likely to have been a non-verbal utterance, for instance when the women at Nestor's palace raise the *ololuge* at 3.450 (ὀλόλυξαν) during a sacrifice and Penelope engages in the same activity at 4.767 (ὀλόλυξε) after praying for Telemachus' safety, the sense is of a wordless chant or cry (which the onomatopoeic verb itself echoes) rather than of the singing of a poem. Cf. Graziosi & Haubold (2010): 163 (on this verb in book 6 of the *Iliad*) where the *ololuge* is termed a "female ritual cry", also Kirk (1985): 200 "a ritual female shriek or wail". Pulleyn (1997): 178-81 gives a summary of the role of the *ololuge* in Greek prayer and ritual; he too argues that it should be understood as a non-verbal utterance, noting the verb's onomatopoeic quality.

to note that song in the *Odyssey* is largely represented as an activity of leisure which is performed for the audience's pleasure rather than as fulfilling a ritual function.

Demodocus' first song (*Od.* 8.73-82) tells of a quarrel between Achilles and Odysseus and the fatal misinterpretation of a Delphic oracle. This performance is introduced explicitly by the primary narrator as a Muse-inspired song about heroic action: μοῦσ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν (8.73). Demodocus' song is firmly closed off with a concluding line ταῦτ᾽ ἄρ᾽ ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός... (8.83). The poet gives the sense that Demodocus' song is taken from a larger narrative with the partitive genitive οἵμης τῆς (he sang of the glorious deeds of men, *from that song which...*) in line 74.[32] The subject-matter of the song is given in reported discourse, with the introductory ὡς repeated at lines 76 and 79.[33] It is clear that, at this point, Demodocus is not given his own voice in the poem (as, for instance, Odysseus himself is in books 9-12); rather his song is reported and summarized by the primary narrator. This insistence on reported speech shows a concern to distinguish carefully between the embedded song and the frame narrative, and a deliberate avoidance of blurring between the voices of the primary narrator and his embedded narrator.[34] This technique will become familiar in the following chapters as a major method of embedding a song within a frame narrative. An embedded song given in reported speech raises important questions about the dynamic of narratorial control within a poem: here it would be possible to argue that the primary narrator of the *Odyssey* retains control over the poem by reminding us constantly of his own narrative presence.

---

32 So Hainsworth (1988): 351 and Garvie (1994): 253. See too de Jong (2001): 197, Thalmann (1984): 124, Ford (1992): 40-8, Nagy (1979): 18.

33 Beck (2012): 37 argues that the song's "expressive features" in fact give the impression that the narrator's voice and that of Demodocus have merged, however I would contend that the embedding features (markers of reported speech, clear introductory and concluding statements) outlined above give the opposite impression. Her point that the γάρ statements at *Od.* 8.79 and 81 are unusual in that they are not given any subordinating markers is an interesting one, but this in itself is not enough to suggest a merging of narratorial voices here.

34 Beck (2012): 37-40 points out that there is a mixture, in the songs of Demodocus, of words normally associated with character-text and those usually associated with the main narrator, and argues that this gives rise to narrative ambiguity. I would argue that such a mixture is to be expected in the depiction of a figure who is at once a *character* and a narrator of poetry very similar to that of the main narrator. Whether or not this indicates any special ambiguity in their songs is unclear to me.

It is also possible that there is a more complex dynamic of power at work in this passage: the insistence on *Demodocus* as singer of this particular song could be a validation strategy for the story told within it. The quarrel between Achilles and Odysseus mentioned here is not known to us from any other epic poem or fragment. It seems likely that the story is an invention of the poet of the *Odyssey*, a new episode based partly on familiar motifs from other epics (such as the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon which opens the *Iliad*), rather than a reference to a now lost epic tradition.[35] By presenting this new story in the mouth of Demodocus, a bard favoured by the Muses and at the idyllic court of Alcinous, and moreover by situating its performance in front of an internal audience which includes one of the principal participants in the events narrated, the myth is validated and made credible.[36] Not only is the quarrel a 'new' invention of the poet of the *Odyssey*, shifted back in time, giving it the temporal authority of a song sung long ago by someone closer to the action than the primary narrator could claim to be, but its effect on Odysseus, who is reduced to tears by the verisimilitude of Demodocus' account, subtly claims the truth of this new story and its worthiness in being placed alongside the events of the *Iliad*. The latter point is reinforced by the strongly Iliadic tone of the passage, which suggests that the poet is claiming similar if not superior quality for his own heroic song.[37]

35 Taplin (1990): 11 "it is an *ad hoc* invention", Marg (1956): 16 uses the term *Augenblickserfindung*, Olson (1989): 136 n.4 "there is no reason to believe that the story is anything but an invention"; cf. also Finkelberg (1987): 128-32, Hainsworth (1988): 351. On the concept of *ad hoc* invention in oral-derived poetry see Willcock (1977). Garvie (1994): 249-50 disagrees, arguing that the elliptical style of the song implies a well-known subject-matter. However, the elliptical style could also be the result of the embedding and summarizing process, or even a deliberate technique used to give a new story the air of a traditional account. de Jong (2001): xiv notes that embedded stories are often narrated in an "allusive, elliptical style".

36 Of course, Demodocus also gains authority in his isolation from the everyday world (embodied by his blindness) and his closeness to the divine Muses, on whom the blind bard relies in constructing his tales of events (both human and divine) from which he is necessarily de-barred. See Kelly (2008): 194 with bibliography on the relationship between bard and Muse in the Homeric epics.

37 Clay (1983): 104 sees a self-conscious awareness of the manipulation of tradition in this embedded song, arguing that it "seems to demonstrate the poet's freedom to transform traditional themes and motifs into something new".

The second song of Demodocus (*Od.* 8.266-369) is strikingly different from the first, in content and length as well as in terms of how it is embedded in the poem.[38] Like the first song, it is introduced with clear markers of an embedded narrative: the verb ἀείδειν appears plus a direct reference to the lyre and an introductory ἀμφι followed by a summary of the subject-matter to come. After ὡς in line 268, however, the markers of indirect discourse drop away and the narrative continues in the direct style, including the direct speech of the characters within the embedded song. In contrast to the earlier song, here there does seem to be blurring between the voices of the primary narrator of the *Odyssey* and the embedded narrator Demodocus. Until the sudden recall to narrator-text at line 367 (ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός...) there is no reminder of who is singing, and it is easy to see that confusion of speaker might occur – perhaps particularly in an oral context where flicking back a few pages to check who is speaking is not an option.[39] In the second song of Demodocus, then, the narrator uses a different method of embedding, changing almost immediately into an independent construction rather than retaining indirect discourse. This has been read by many scholars as a meaningful attempt on the part of the primary narrator of the *Odyssey* to identify himself closely with Demodocus.[40]

A potential objection to this interpretation is the tendency of Greek narrative in general to prefer to simplify complex grammatical structures, including a preference for direct over indirect discourse. This simplifying tendency is a characteristic of the wider phenomenon of "downslip" in the Greek language which has been extensively discussed by

38 There is a vast bibliography on the second song of Demodocus: as a beginning cf. de Jong (2001): 206-209; Burkert (1960): 130-44, Alden (1997): 513-29, Olson (1989): 135-45, Seidensticker (1982): 59-60, Newton (1987).

39 It is worth noting that the scholia (H Q and T on *Od.* 8.267) seem to regard this song of Demodocus very much as his own composition, to be regarded as distinct from the frame narrative; this allows them to justify the subject-matter which seems to have been considered unworthy of the Homeric poet.

40 Beck (2012) discusses this song of Demodocus and argues, I believe correctly, that it is constructed in free indirect speech, a form which other scholars such as de Jong (2004 a and b) do not believe exists in Homeric poetry. On free indirect speech and the problems of categorizing or even identifying it in literary texts see McHale (1978): 249-287, Laird (1999) (on Virgil) and Collins (2001): 133-5. The most thorough treatment of free indirect discourse is to be found in Fludernik (1993).

Slings.[41] It could be argued that the length of the second song motivates the direct narrative style, that the "blurring" in the voices perceived by the audience or today's reader is a function of the language, pragmatic in origin, and not a result of deliberate poetic self-consciousness. However, this line of argument would necessitate a decision to be made as to the precise moment when a reported speech or song becomes too long to remain in indirect speech. In fact such a differentiation is in practice impossible, since it seems unlikely that there is a strict quantitative boundary which determines which construction should be used and more likely that, despite a wider tendency to simplify where possible, there is still a large element of poetic choice involved in constructing embedded speeches or songs.[42] Moreover, the effect of hearing or reading embedded narratives which are composed in the direct style is so strikingly one of blurring between the primary and secondary or embedded narrator(s) that it seems reasonable to suggest that the linguistic tendency to simplify and a deliberate choice to represent an embedded narrative in direct style are not mutually exclusive. The mixed style of embedded narratives such as the songs of Demodocus (which contain elements suggestive of both reported and direct speech) in itself suggests that a range of options was open to the poet in constructing an embedded song and that factors other than simply length would have influenced his choices. The argument for meaning and significance in the embedding process will have to be made for each example of embedded song in its own context: not every case will necessarily be self-conscious blurring of narratorial voice, but it is important to admit the possibility of such a self-consciousness and to argue for its existence even in the earliest poetry.

Slings has also observed a distinction between written and spoken language in terms of means of expression, and noted that some Greek poetic texts behave more like oral compositions in their expression than written narratives.[43] This observation will be useful in later chapters as I discuss poetry ranging from the oral-derived early Greek hexameter texts

41 Slings (2002): 53-4.
42 As is argued by Beck (2012) in direct reference to the songs of Demodocus.
43 Slings (1999): 61-75.

down to the Hellenistic poems of Theocritus and Apollonius, since one of the major questions that a synoptic study such as this raises is how the poetic treatment of embedded song changes and develops in line with the rise of a literate culture in the Greek world. Whether the orality or literacy of these poems affects how they are embedded will therefore form an important part of the following discussion.

The third song of Demodocus (*Od.* 8.499-520) returns to the theme of the Trojan War with which he began. This song is introduced and prefigured by a request from Odysseus which in itself has many of the features and functions of a poetic proem.[44] Once more the song is introduced and closed with clear boundaries at 499 (ὣς φάθ', ὁ δ' ὁρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἄρχετο, φαῖνε δ' ἀοιδήν) and 521 (ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός). The style of narration is closer to the first song than the second, with repeated markers of indirect discourse at lines 514 (ἤειδεν δ' ὡς...) and 516 (ἄλλον δ' ἄλλῃ ἄειδε πόλιν κεραϊζέμεν αἰπήν). The first 12 lines of the song, from 510 onwards, however, are similar to the independent construction of the song of Ares and Aphrodite, since we get much more detail in the story (compared with the first song, which was summarized very briefly), including a close account of the decision making process surrounding bringing the wooden horse into Troy, and a proleptic statement as to the destruction the horse is fated to bring to the city.[45] This last song of Demodocus is not quite an entirely reported nor entirely independent construction, and shows the variation available to a poet in embedding a narrative even within one short section of the same frame narrative (and even when all the songs are in fact sung by the same character).[46] Such a combined style seems to offer a counter-argument to Slings' downslip as it implies poetic choice rather than grammatical or

44 Cf. de Jong (2001): 215 "Odysseus' description of the song which he requests resembles an epic proem".
45 Cf. de Jong (2004): 215 for a discussion of the focalization in this passage.
46 As Beck (2012): 41 argues, although she is concerned to label the song "free indirect speech".

linguistic imperative is at work in determining the form of speech used in reporting these embedded songs.[47]

Before discussing the wider functions of all three embedded songs within book 8 of the *Odyssey* and the poem as a whole, it is worth noting that certain features occur across the examples which will recur in embedded songs throughout Greek literature, and which should be regarded as constitutive elements of the technique. Firstly, the introduction and conclusion to each song form a ring around the embedded narrative which separates it structurally from the frame narrative.[48] The later examples of embedded song in the *Homeric Hymns* and lyric poetry do not always have both of these structural markers (the closural marker is absent in several later examples), and it is worth considering whether the Odyssean examples represent an early model which is later adapted by poets familiar with Demodocus, or whether the concern to define narrative boundaries is a particularly (Homeric) epic concern. I will return to this point in the following chapters.

Secondly, we have two possible models of embedding a song in terms of the narrative style: the indirect style in which the song is reported and/or summarized by the primary narrator, and the direct style where the song is reported in a largely independent construction after the initial introduction. The third song offers us the potential for a mixed style which contains elements of both direct and indirect constructions. The possible implications of the different styles of narration on the narrative authority of the poem have been briefly sketched, and this too will be a theme which recurs throughout the study.

47 It is perhaps worth considering, too, that epic poetry, sung to the lyre and composed in an artificial metre is unlikely to be subject to the same level of simplifying technique found in everyday speech – and it is speech which gives rise to much of the linguistic theory on which the 'downslip' hypothesis of Slings (2002) is based.
48 The conclusion in every case being the formulaic statement ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός (*Od.* 8.83, 8.368 and 8.521) while the introductions vary in specific content but generally involve a reference to the song about to be performed, a verb of singing or periphrastic equivalent (cf. *Od.* 8.73 Μοῦσ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν..., 8.265 αὐτὰρ ὁ φορμίζων ἀνεβάλλετο καλὸν ἀείδειν..., 8.499 ὣς φάθ', ὁ δ' ὁρμηθεὶς θεοῦ ἄρχετο, φαῖνε δ' ἀοιδήν...).

HOW TO EMBED A POEM (2):

THE ILIAD

The *Iliad* may be contrasted with the *Odyssey* in its depiction of song: while the *Odyssey* depicts at least three professional bards singing, and hints at least one more, the *Iliad* does not show a similarly pervasive interest in the activities of professional bards.[49] Thamyris (*Il.* 2.595-600) shows that the *Iliad* is aware of professional bards, but we get no equivalent to a Demodocus or Phemius in that poem. The mourners at *Il.* 24.720-3, although professional performers designated by the term ἀοιδός, are not represented as bards of the same type as Demodocus and Phemius: their songs are connected with a ritual context and are defined by the occasion.[50] Moreover, we get little detail in either Iliadic representation of what they sang. To these brief depictions of song-performance we may add the *linos*-song sung by the boy on the shield of Achilles, *Il.* 18.570-2.[51] This scene, with the boy singing for an audience of fruit-picking maidens and youths in a bucolic landscape, might seem to fall into the category of song for entertainment rather than ritual. There may, however, be a ritual element to the episode, as the linos-song elsewhere is associated with a ritual lament marked by the refrain *ailinon, ailinon.*[52] Other brief references to the performance of song in the *Iliad* also indicate the importance of song in ritual. The Achaean youths sing a paean to appease Apollo at *Il.* 1. 472-74:

> οἳ δὲ πανημέριοι μολπῇ θεὸν ἱλάσκοντο
> καλὸν ἀείδοντες παιήονα κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν
> μέλποντες ἑκάεργον· ὃ δὲ φρένα τέρπετ᾽ ἀκούων.

---

49 Three professional bards: Phemius, Demodocus and the un-named bard at Menelaus' court, all of whom are depicted singing within the poem in more or less elaborate accounts. To these three we may add the ἀοιδός left to protect Clytemnestra, whose songs are not specifically alluded to in the poem. The *Iliad*, conversely, does not depict the professional performance of poetry. Cf. Murray (2008): 164 "the *Iliad* is not a self-reflective poem".

50 Note that this is, tellingly, the only occurrence of the term ἀοιδός in the *Iliad.*

51 N.B. the possibly interpolated line sometimes inserted after *Il.* 18.604, μετὰ δέ σφιν ἐμέλπετο θεῖος ἀοιδὸς φομίζων, which would offer an example of song as entertainment at the dance within the *Iliad.* For discussion of the authenticity of the line see Revermann (1998): 29-38, who also gives an account of the extensive bibliography on this issue.

52 Cf. Alexiou (2002): 57-8. On Linos see also West (1983): 56-67.

and Achilles commands a paean to celebrate his killing of Hector at *Il.* 22.391-2:

> νῦν δ᾽ ἄγ᾽ ἀείδοντες παιήονα κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν
> νηυσὶν ἔπι γλαφυρῇσι νεώμεθα, τόνδε δ᾽ ἄγωμεν.

Although the songs mentioned thus far are all very brief in compass, their recurring presence in the poem creates a strong impression of the ritual function of song in Homeric society, an impression which is deepened by the striking extended laments for Patroclus and for Hector which cluster at the end of the epic. The particular effect of these more extended laments will be discussed below.

On the other hand, song as entertainment is sparsely portrayed in the *Iliad*: outside the scene(s) on the shield of Achilles, which may also have a ritual connotation, we see Achilles playing the lyre and singing for his own entertainment at *Il.* 9.186-9. He does not have an audience apart from Patroclus, who is present while he sings, although the poet implies that Patroclus may not even be listening to the music and song, for he is "waiting for Achilles, whenever he should stop playing":

> Πάτροκλος δέ οἱ οἶος ἐναντίος ἦστο σιωπῇ,
> δέγμενος Αἰακίδην ὁπότε λήξειεν ἀείδων. (*Il.* 9.190-1)

The clearest example of song performed for entertainment is at the end of book 1, and lies in contrast with the *paean* to Apollo performed by the Achaean youths just before. Immediately after the *paean*, the action moves to the divine sphere (*Il.* 1.493-611) where an argument among the gods is swiftly solved by the jesting of Hephaestus. The end of divine conflict is marked by the performance of an amoebaean song sung by the Muses and accompanied by Apollo. As with most of the other performances of song in the *Iliad*, the content of their song is not elaborated. As many scholars have noted, the laughter provoked by the lame god, in juxtaposition to the intense human suffering depicted earlier in book 1, draws a stark contrast between immortal and mortal in the poem – and so it is too with their respective songs. The human chorus use song as a means to end their suffering by appeasing the god – it is part of their reparation for Agamemnon's abuse of Chryses, along

with the hecatomb. The divine song which closes the book is a pleasurable accompaniment to a banquet, purely for entertainment. That the *Iliad* downplays human song for entertainment is no surprise given the martial and tragic themes of the poem: banqueting and enjoying the songs of a bard are not necessarily activities associated with war, and the fact that the *Odyssey*, which is set largely in domestic and/or palace peacetime contexts, does depict song in a banquet context seems to bear this out. Bacchylides comments on such a division between war and peace at B.14.12-16, suggesting that there may have been a poetic aversion to song in a martial context at least as far back as the early fifth century:

οὔτ' ἐ]ν βαρυπενθέσιν ἁρμο-
ζει μ]άχαις φόρμιγγος ὀμφὰ
καὶ λι]γυκλαγγεῖς χοροί,
οὔτ' ἐ]ν θαλίαις καναχὰ 15
χαλκ]όκτυπος·

The lack of song in a war-time context in the *Iliad* is ironic given the predominance of battle and war as the theme of the dinner-time entertainments sung in the *Odyssey*, and more generally the prominence of war as an activity worthy of being commemorated by bards.

Most of the Iliadic embedded songs discussed so far (whether ritual or for entertainment) are very abbreviated in terms of content. In contrast, the laments for the dead heroes at the end of the poem are far more elaborated, in that we are given detailed accounts of the content of the lament: they are reported in direct speech which is individuated to reflect the character speaking. However, despite this wealth of detail the laments are ambiguously represented.[53] These passages hover tantalisingly between speech and song: their close association with *threnos*, a known genre of sung lyric, implies song; however, the text does not use language usually associated specifically with song, but rather uses unmarked verbs, denotative of speech more generally.[54] Thus Andromache's lament for the dead Hector is introduced and closed as follows:

τῇσιν δ' Ἀνδρομάχη λευκώλενος ἦρχε γόοιο (*Il.* 24.723)

53 Cf. Tsagalis (2004): 27-32 for an analysis of the Homeric lament.
54 For lament as a lyric genre, see Swift (2010): 250-366; Alexiou (2002): 103-4 and *passim*; Dué (2002) and (2007).

...
ὣς ἔφατο κλαίουσ', ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες. (*Il.* 24.746)

At *Il.* 24.760 Hecuba's lament is also closed with the phrase ὣς ἔφατο κλαίουσα, as is Helen's at 24.776. This phrase is not itself a strong indicator of song as opposed to speech. The phrase used of the opening of Andromache's lament, ἦρχε γόοιο, is also shared by Helen at 24.761, and (with a small variation in the verb) by Hecuba at 24.747, although the adjective ἀδινοῦ which qualifies the γόος in both latter cases is replaced by λευκώλενος to further characterize Andromache.[55] Commentators and scholars have treated the passages of lament in the *Iliad* generally as speech rather than song: so Richardson "against this lament [of the professional mourners] are set the individual spoken laments of the women of the family", although later in the same note he refers to the laments as "'praise poems', like later funeral *speeches*" (my italics).[56] The blurring between speech and song is carried over from the *Iliad* itself into its scholarship.[57] Tsagalis argues that the laments of Hector's family and other characters are strongly differentiated from the θρῆνοι sung by the professional mourners at *Il.* 24.720-1 and that the former are definitively not sung: "[t]he γόοι are personal lamentations uttered by the next of kin, and are delivered in speech".[58] Alexiou similarly suggests that the presence of professional singers at Hector's funeral in *Iliad* 24.720-3 is meant to draw a contrast between "the *thrênos* of the professional mourners which was a proper song, and the *góos* of the kinswomen, which was merely wailed."[59] However, she then goes on to refer to the laments of Hecuba, Andromache and Helen as "singing".

55 On the substitution of the adjective in this line see Edwards (1987): 314; Richardson (1993): 352.
56 Richardson (1993): 350. Note that he uses the term "speak" throughout for the utterances of all three women in book 24. Dué (2002) and (2006), on the other hand, assumes that all passages of lament in epic are sung, although she does not offer an argument for those laments introduced by verbs which more usually indicate non-verbal noise such as στενάχω. West (2011): 426 terms these passages "rhetorical laments" which implies speech rather than song. For possible Near Eastern analogues to the laments in the *Iliad* see West (1997): 396-401.
57 Edwards (1987): 314 uses "speak" of Andromache's lament. Macleod (1982): 148-56 similarly does not directly discuss whether the passages are to be read as song or speech.
58 Tsagalis (2004): 5.
59 Alexiou (2002): 12.

The term γόος does not in itself clarify the situation, since it often means simply "weeping", as at *Od.* 16.215-18, where both context and following simile indicate a non-verbal (although noisy!) form of lamentation:

> ἀμφοτέροισι δὲ τοῖσιν ὑφ' ἵμερος ὦρτο γόοιο: 215
> κλαῖον δὲ λιγέως, ἀδινώτερον ἤ τ' οἰωνοί,
> φῆναι ἢ αἰγυπιοὶ γαμψώνυχες, οἵσί τε τέκνα
> ἀγρόται ἐξείλοντο πάρος πετεηνὰ γενέσθαι[60]

Several of the *Odyssey* passages which contain reference to γόος imply that it is the *reaction* to a speech-act rather than a depiction of a speech-act itself:

> ὣς φάτο, τῷ δ' ἄρα πατρὸς ὑφ' ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο (*Od.* 4.113)

with which we might compare

> ὣς φάτο, τοῖσι δὲ πᾶσιν ὑφ' ἵμερον ὦρσε γόοιο (*Od.* 4.183)

In both these cases (and in several other variations on this formulaic phrase indicated in note 46 below) the γόος is the response roused by the emotive speech of another; it is not in itself a speech-act. To some extent it may be argued that the ambiguity in presentation (i.e. the use of verbs which indicate speech generally rather than song specifically) is echoed in the proems to both Homeric epics, since each poem uses a different verb in the invocation to the Muse: ἐνέπω (relate, tell) in the *Odyssey* and ἀείδω (sing) to open the *Iliad*.[61] This could indicate an imprecision in the epic language used of song, and thus allow us to read the laments in the *Iliad* as song despite the terminology used to describe their performance.[62] However, the different verbs in the epic proems could also indicate a difference in situation between the two proems: i.e. that the narrator of the *Iliad* calls directly on the *Muse* to sing, while the narrator of the *Odyssey* asks the Muse to tell him the story, the implication being that *he* sings it, in contrast with the singing Muse of the *Iliad* proem. On the latter interpretation, a strict differentiation between the meanings of the terminology used for speech and song respectively has a significant impact on our reading of the proem(s). The

60 See also *Od.* 4.103, *4.113*, *4.183*, *4.758*, 4.801, *8.540*, 11.212, 17.8, *19.213*, *19.249*, 19.251, 21.57, 21.228, *23.231*, 24.323 [underlined italics indicate instances where γόος is the response to a speech-act of another character].
61 The scholarship on the role of the Muses in the Homeric epics is vast, see *inter alia* Minchin (1995): 23-33, Minton (1960), Maehler (1963), Lenz (1980): 27-40, Walsh (1984), Thalmann (1984), de Jong (1987).
62 Cf. also, among other examples, the use of φάτο at *Od.* 8.519, in the middle of a song.

narrator of the *Odyssey* claims ownership over his own song, the material for which he gets from the Muses, but the words of which are his own. This seems an appropriate reading for a poem in which poetry itself as well as the narration of poetry is a significant theme.[63]

However, the fact that the beginning μοι ἔννεπε is a formulaic phrase, a traditional opening strategy in early Greek hexameter poetry undermines any attempt to place a strong emphasis on the *Odyssey's* use of it in relation to the *Iliad*.[64] The remaining conclusion, that these hexameter poets did not use terminology for speech and song in a differentiating or even particularly precise way is perhaps most evident in the opening two lines of Hesiod's *Works and Days*, where both speech and song terminology are used of the same speech-act:

> Μοῦσαι Πιερίηθεν ἀοιδῇσι κλείουσαι,
> δεῦτε Δί' ἐννέπετε, σφέτερον πατέρ' ὑμνείουσαι. (*WD* 1-2)

The problem of the laments is not one which can be solved here; to some extent whether or not they should be read as songs will remain the preserve of the individual reader or interpreter. What is clear is that, as speech-acts, they fall somewhere between speech and song, since they are closely associated with a ritual performance for which later poetic analogues exist and share many of the formal features of "poetic" lament.[65] Even within the *Iliad* itself personal laments (γόοι) are closely associated with a formal poetic performance which occurs just before the laments of Andromache, Hecuba and Helen in book 24.[66] Thus, it is worthwhile considering the formal features of embedding in these performances and their effect or function within the *Iliad* as a whole.[67]

---

63 Thus Pedrick (1992): 39-62, whose position is also adopted by Satterfield (mainly discussing the *Iliad* proem) (2011): 1-20.
64 For ἔννεπε as a typical opening gambit, c.f. *H.Aph.* 1, *H.Pan.* 1, Hes. *Th.* 114 (a re-invocation at the end of the proem and beginning of the song proper).
65 Tsagalis (2004): 7.
66 As with the Odyssean examples, I will not attempt a line by line analysis of every lament in the *Iliad*: that is a task for another book (and indeed one which has been attempted already by several other scholars). See Alexiou (2002): 11-3, 102-3 for an argument that we should differentiate between *threnos* and *goos* and that the former was the main source for the later literary tradition.
67 In general see Tsagalis (2004), Derderian (2001), Easterling (1991) and Spatafora (1997); for the lament of Briseis see Dué (2002), for Achilles and Briseis, Pucci (1998): 97-112 and Lohmann (1988): 13-32, for Thetis (*Il.* 18.51-63), Slatkin (1991): 17-8, 48-9, 88-9, and for Helen (24.761-776), Pantelia (2002).

If we do read the laments as a kind of song (or a close allusion to song), what kind of poetry would they be? They are not accompanied by the lyre, as are the songs of Demodocus and Phemius in the *Odyssey*; they are spontaneous, driven by the occasion of the death of a loved one; they may be private or public (Thetis' lament (*Il.* 18.51-64) is performed at home with her women, while the laments of Hecuba, Andromache and Helen in *Iliad* 24 are performed before the whole of Troy). Alexiou has identified the formal features of lamentation as similar to a hymn, with a tripartite structure consisting of a) a direct address to the deceased, b) narrative (usually of the past actions of deceased or future faced without him), c) renewed address to the deceased.[68] Not all the laments in the *Iliad* follow this structure, showing that although the poem may be drawing upon a tradition of ritual lament, the Iliadic laments are adapted to their new context. Thus the lament of Thetis at 18.51-63 and the lament of Achilles for Patroclus at 18.316-342 both lack the "address to the deceased" at the beginning of their lament.[69] These two examples are nonetheless described in very similar terms to those of Hecuba, Helen and Andromache, which *do* contain the formulaic elements identified by Alexiou, suggesting either flexibility in the form of lament or that the *Iliad* poet is adapting a ritual form.[70] In these cases the adaptation of ritual lament to new situations (depicting a man singing/speaking a lament which would normally performed by a woman, and using a formal lament for a situation in which Thetis' son has not yet died) gives the scenes in question a heightened emotional power. In particular, Thetis' lament functions proleptically, anticipating the inevitable death of her son which the poem itself will not depict.[71]

---

68 Alexiou (2002): 133.

69 I do not here distinguish between actual lament for a dead hero and prospective lament (i.e. the lament which Thetis sings although Achilles is not yet dead), as this issue does not directly affect my dealings with the Homeric laments. For the effect of Thetis' prospective lament in the poem see Kelly (2012): 211-256.

70 So Thetis' informal lament is introduced by the same formulaic expression as the later ritual laments for Hector (compare Θέτις δ' ἐξῆρχε γόοιο, 18.51 and Ἑκάβη ἀδινοῦ ἐξῆρχε γόοιο, 24.747.)

71 For the female role in ritual lamentation see especially Swift (2010): 304-10, also Dué (2002) and (2006), Alexiou (2002): 4-23 and *passim*. Cf. also Edwards (1991): 269 "Both here and in the other laments in the *Il.* the poet acknowledges the intensely personal and lonely nature of grief." West (2011): 344-5 suspects this passage is an interpolation based on the fact that it is "easily detachable". One might say the same of the songs of Demodocus.

The lament of Andromache for Hector at 24.723-745 may stand as a test-case of the technique of embedding these passages within the *Iliad*. As with the songs of Demodocus, the lament is introduced and closed with clear markers which separate her words from the frame narrative: the formulation used of her speech by the poet is used of several other laments in the poem (including the following two ritual laments for Hector in book 24), τῇσιν δ' Ἀνδρομάχη λευκώλενος ἦρχε γόοιο (24.723); the end of her speech is similarly marked: ὣς ἔφατο κλαίουσ', ἐπὶ δὲ στενάχοντο γυναῖκες (24.746). The response of the women indicates some kind of antiphonal performance, although the nature of the communal contribution is unelaborated and seems likely to have been non-verbal wailing.[72] Finally, the lament of Andromache, like all the other dirges in the *Iliad*, is given in direct speech rather than the reported style which we saw in the *Odyssey* with the songs of Demodocus. Indeed, this direct style of reporting the laments arguably links them more closely with speech than song, since all of the embedded songs in the Homeric epics are in the indirect style.[73] The *Iliad*'s less overt interest in depicting the performance of poetry in comparison with the *Odyssey*, seen in the very brief examples of song-performance which can be identified as such with certainty (such as the performance of Achilles at 9.186-9), could lead to the impression that the *Odyssey* shows an increasing sophistication in terms of its interest in and depiction of poetry. However, the laments at the end of the *Iliad* show that this epic too is capable of depicting and interested in the performance of song, for even if we decide that these laments should not be read as songs proper, their close affinity with ritual performance sets them apart from plain speech.

The laments of Hecuba, Andromache and Helen (and the other laments which cluster at the end of the poem) are, like the songs of Demodocus, in a complex relationship with the frame narrative: they each offer a unique and individual perspective on the death

72 Cf. West (2011): 426 where he interprets the women's response as "the wailing of a quasi-chorus".
73 That is to say, that all the embedded songs in the Homeric epics at least *begin and end* in the indirect style: some (as with the lay of Ares and Aphrodite) have middle portions where the markers of indirect discourse drop away for a time, creating the impression of direct quotation. Such passages are technically "mixed" in character between indirect and direct styles of narration, but are fairly rare in the Homeric poems.

of a hero in the context of the past, the future and the speaker's own human relationship with the dead man.[74]

FUNCTIONS OF EMBEDDED SONG

(i) TIME

One function of embedded song observed in the songs of Demodocus and in the laments of the *Iliad* is the manipulation of time. de Jong notes analepsis and prolepsis as one of the functions of embedded narrative more generally (as opposed to embedded *song* in particular), and it is no difficult task to find examples to support this observation within the *Odyssey*.[75] The following chapters will show that the manipulation of time is a major function of embedded song across Greek poetry.[76] This temporal play may operate both on the level of the story (i.e. the internal time-frame of the poem) and on an external level, on a literary-historical time frame. On an external poetic level, the subject-matter presented in Demodocus' first and last songs (two 'epic' stories of the heroes at Troy) is a way for the poet of the *Odyssey* to display his knowledge of, and skill in narrating, subjects outside the immediate scope of the poem, and in particular to offer a 'mini-*Iliad*' (or perhaps better, an *Iliad*-style epic) within the *Odyssey*.[77] Similarly Demodocus' second song, a 'hymnic' story of the gods allows the poet of the *Odyssey* to contain within his epic an episode which is strongly reminiscent of another genre.[78] This is reminiscent of later, literary Hellenistic genre-crossing and offers this effect as another possible function of embedded song.[79] The

74 Cf. Martin (1989): 86-8, Tsagalis (2004):166-9 and *passim* on the humanizing effect of the laments in the *Iliad*.
75 de Jong (2004): xiii.
76 A function also noted by Genette (1983): 62-3 (=1988: 93).
77 For Iliadic parallels in *Odyssey* 8.73-82 see, among extensive scholarship, Clay (1983): 97-106 & 241-6, Taplin (1990): 111-2, Nagy (1979): 42-58, Marg (1956), Broeniman (1996). Beck (2012): 44 argues that the first and third songs of Demodocus "overlap to some extent the events of the *Odyssey*".
78 Whether the song of Ares and Aphrodite should be classed as a hymn has been debated: the episode, although not terribly dignified in the eyes of some modern scholars, would certainly not be out of place within a *Homeric Hymn* (compare, for instance, the seduction narrative in the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*).
79 Clay (1983): 97 notes that Demodocus' songs are examples of the "range of the art of the epic poet".

laments of the *Iliad* allow the poet to incorporate elements of another poetic genre into the epic, infusing the *Iliad*'s account of the death of Hector and other heroes with the haunting humanity and sense of individual loss inherent in a personal lament.

On an internal level, i.e. from the point of view of the action of the poem, Demodocus' first and last songs both recount episodes from the Trojan War, a topic outside the temporal scope of the frame narrative. The first and last songs of Demodocus prefigure and prepare for the revelation of Odysseus' identity by recalling his past deeds, giving the internal and external audience information from Odysseus' past that we would not get in the course of the poem's own time-frame. Such analepses are also found in speeches of characters, such as the account of Menelaus in book 4 and the episode in the underworld (not forgetting, of course, Odysseus' own first person accounts throughout the poem). Thus the embedded songs of Demodocus manipulate both the internal time-frame of the *Odyssey*, in giving us a flash back to Odysseus' past, and also manipulate external literary time in recreating the Trojan War story while placing the performance of these 'new' versions of the story far back in the time of the myths themselves.

Similarly, in the case of Andromache, Briseis and the other characters who narrate or are narrated in the Iliadic laments, we get intimate details from the 'past' of the characters which would not appear elsewhere in the epic, such as the particular kindness of Patroclus towards the captive Briseis (*Il.* 19.295-300), or the affection Hector showed to Helen despite her unpopularity in Troy (*Il.* 24.766-772). The Iliadic laments are largely analeptic but occasionally they do also look forward in time: so Andromache prophesies her wretched future as a widow deprived of the protection and status conferred on her by Hector, as well as Astyanax's life as an orphan.

Since prolepsis and analepsis can also be achieved through character's speeches as well as song (and in fact are much more commonly presented through speech than song), the manipulation of time is unlikely to be the *only* effect of any individual embedded song,

but rather to be part of a nexus of functions. Thus Demodocus' songs about *Odysseus* do not only tell us about the hero's past actions outside the time-frame of the poem, but also show us that these deeds are, within the hero's own life time, famous enough to be the subject of song.

(ii) SELF-REFERENTIALITY

Scholars of the *Odyssey* have argued that Demodocus is a self-referential cipher for the poet of the *Odyssey*, and it is tempting to see a self-referential significance in poems-within-poems.[80] We should, nonetheless, be wary of assuming that embedded poems or performances of poetry are straightforwardly 'self-referential'. Certainly any attempt to extract biographical details about an author from the depictions of fictional poets within his corpus should be strongly resisted. Indeed, the frequent differences between the secondary narrator(s) of embedded song and the narrator of the frame narrative in terms of gender, age, social class and even ontology (since embedded narrators are often gods) suggests that the relationship between embedded song and frame narrative is often more complex than has previously been recognized. The laments in the *Iliad*, for instance, strongly evoke performances by women of a genre of song quite different in context and function from epic: their main effect is to draw the events and plot of the *Iliad* in a more complex light, filtering the deaths of the heroes through the emotional effect on their families and friends, rather than to make a self-conscious comment on the poet or the nature of the poetic enterprise. A range of potential significances is thus raised by the various possible identities and qualities of the embedded narrators – we might contrast Demodocus with the lamenting women of the *Iliad*, unlike them he sings songs which are close to the *Odyssey* in

80 For this role of Demodocus in the *Odyssey* cf. Rinon (2008): 117; Richardson (1990), Suerbaum (1968): 166 "in einem Sänger wie Demodokos dürfen wir das Spigelbild des Odyssee-Dichters erkennen"(cited by Kelly (2008): 194 n.49), Schuol (2006): 139-62, Graziosi (2002): 138-63.

genre (epic war narrative and hymnic style poetry), he is explicitly an *aoidos* and shares with the primary narrator of the *Odyssey* a close relationship with the Muses.

Nonetheless, one effect of embedded narrative is to cause the reader (or audience) to compare the primary narrator with the embedded or secondary narrator. The identity of the embedded narrator and the features of their presentation may reflect onto the primary narrator in various ways. Some possibilities are suggested already in the representation of Phemius and Demodocus in the *Odyssey*. The privileged position which both characters enjoy and their favourable representation (their adjectives include περικλυτός, ἐρίηρος, θεῖος, all with very positive connotations for their profession) reflect back onto the primary narrator, who is aligned with Demodocus and Phemius in his poetic subject-matter and by his own link with their patrons, the Muses.[81]

That Demodocus and Phemius in the *Odyssey* are to be aligned with the primary narrator is suggested by two specific factors, beyond the mere general fact that they are all poets: firstly, the fictional bards share with the narrator a special connection with the Muses as the source of their poetry, and secondly the clear similarity between the subject-matter of these fictional bards and the content of the *Odyssey* itself.[82] Phemius sings of the *nostos* of the Greeks in a poem where homecoming is the central theme; Demodocus sings of the exploits of Odysseus in a poem centred on the same hero. Richardson interprets the indirect discourse of Demodocus' first and third songs as evidence of a close connection between Demodocus and Homer:

> "The bards within the story are images of himself, and the songs they sing are his own songs. He might have introduced the three songs of Demodokos with the oral equivalent of the beginning quotation mark – 'And the singer sang this song'. That he did not do so is an implied statement of his identification with the Phaiakian

81 For περικλυτός see *Od.* 1.325, 8.83, 8.367, 8.521; for ἐρίηρος see *Od.* 1.346, 8.62, 471; for θεῖος see *Od.* 8.43, 16.252.
82 On the primary narrator of the *Iliad* and the Muses, and what conclusions we may draw from this about the identity of the narrator as a professional singer, see de Jong (1987): 44-53. For the Muses and the primary narrator of the *Odyssey* see *Od.* 1.1, for the Muses and Demodocus see *Od.* 8.62-4, 73. Rinon (2008): 117 notes the connection between Demodocus and the narrator of the *Odyssey* in terms of the subject of their songs.

> singer. He needs no quotation marks because Demodokos' voice and his own blend quite naturally into each other".[83]

There are several problems, however, with this reading of the embedded songs in *Odyssey* 8. Firstly, the indirect discourse, far from allowing a blending of voices between the primary narrator and his embedded narrator, actually emphasizes the co-presence of, and separation between, each party. Throughout the first song of Demodocus we are constantly made aware of the fact that the primary narrator *is reporting* what Demodocus sang. There is little blending between their voices. Secondly, the poet does in fact introduce (and close) all of Demodocus' songs with statements which function as 'oral quotation marks'. Thus at 8.73-4:

> Μοῦσ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸν ἀνῆκεν ἀειδέμεναι κλέα ἀνδρῶν,
> οἵμης τῆς τότ' ἄρα κλέος οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἵκανε…

and 8.83:

> ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός·

It is clear from the text itself that the poet is careful to draw boundaries between the words of Demodocus and the frame narrative, both by introducing and closing the poem with clear reference to who is speaking, and (in the first and third songs, at any rate) by using reported speech, which avoids a possible blurring between narratorial voices. In the second song, as I have discussed above, there *is* a blending of the voices of the narrator and Demodocus, but this is caused precisely by the transformation away from indirect discourse into a more direct style.

Richardson goes on to make the point that the indirect discourse of Demodocus' songs is unusual in Homeric epic, which generally prefers direct speech. He aligns it with the pillow-talk between Penelope and Odysseus at book 23.302-5 and 306-9 (and with Odysseus' full recapitulation of the *apologoi* at 23.310-42), arguing that the indirect speech in this instance represents previous narrative spoken by the poet (i.e. it repeats part of the

83 Richardson (1990): 86.

earlier story of the *Odyssey* itself), and that indirect discourse should be viewed as the mode in which the poet represents his own words within the text: "the only speech paraphrased in indirect discourse is the poet's own".[84] This interpretation is strained, at best: there are problems with aligning the pillow-talk and recapitulation with the songs of Demodocus in that the use of indirect discourse in the former could be seen as resulting at least partly from a reluctance to repeat material which already occurs in books 9-12 of the poem.

In interpreting the use of indirect speech as opposed to direct speech in embedded narratives within the Homeric poems, we have already mentioned Slings' concept of "downslip", that is, the tendency for reported speech to slip from the indirect to the direct style for reasons of grammatical simplification and clarity.[85] I suggested that caution should be exercised in attributing the choice of style (indirect or direct) to the length of the embedded narrative alone, and we saw in the third song of Demodocus that it is possible to achieve a mixed style of narration where both effects are maintained at different parts of the embedded song. Although the recapitulation of Odysseus is speech rather than song, it offers an interesting counterpart to the songs of Demodocus in terms of the style of narration, and further strengthens my contention against length as a meaningful or likely motivation for the poet to choose one particular style of narration over another. Although this recapitulation is fairly long, the markers of indirect speech are maintained throughout (in this case by the repetition of ὡς and a repeated verb of recounting at 23.321), with the effect that Odysseus is restrained by the primary narrator from appropriating the narrative as he does in books 9-12 of the poem.[86] It seems from this example, added to the songs of Demodocus, that the presence or absence of these markers of indirect discourse may depend

84 Kelly (2008) argues that the resumption of control by the primary narrator exemplified in the use of indirect discourse for the recapitulation in book 23 is a sign of Homer's competitive feeling towards Odysseus as an internal narrator and towards other poetic competitors with whom Odysseus is aligned in his characterization as a 'bard'. Cf. also Richardson (1990): 87-8.
85 See above, pp.22 n.41.
86 Although there too the poet of the *Odyssey* has inserted occasional reminders that this section is in fact an embedded narrative, such as the intermezzo in book 11 and Odysseus' qualification as to how he knows about the conversation of Helios, 12.374-90. Cf. Kelly (2008) for the implications of the indirect discourse in the recapitulation.

partially on length, but not entirely, and that the poet can choose to constantly remind his audience of the *reportage*, as in the recapitulation, or not to do so, as in the *apologoi*.

It is worth noting that, as well as using indirect discourse in meaningful ways, Homer here shows the audience in his treatment of the recapitulation that Odysseus is tailoring his account to his audience, as he selects material from his earlier tale of his adventures (leaving out things which may offend Penelope), indicating that there is something more sophisticated going on here than a simple desire to avoid repetition. Furthermore, earlier in the epic, Demodocus' songs, also rendered in indirect discourse, deal with subject-matter which has not (unlike the recapitulation) already been told in the poem and so the motivation for rendering *these* passages in indirect discourse cannot be to avoid repetition.

The connection between fictional bards and the primary narrator should not be overstated in reference to the Homeric examples; the narrator of the Homeric epic is so little characterized that we have little to go on beyond the general correspondences I have set out above. The depictions of the performance of poetry in the *Odyssey* can tell us little of certainty about the conditions of performance for the epic poem itself. Caution must be exercised in concluding that the position of Demodocus and Phemius as privileged court poets reflects in any way a historical reality in the poet of the *Odyssey*'s own time. Instead, rather than seeking historical insight into the performance of epic poetry, I wish to use these embedded songs, and in particular the embedded songs from later texts, to illuminate how poets *thought* about poetry; how they represent its performance, its creators and its reception, and what this can tell us about their view of their own poetry and the poetry of others.

(iii) AUDIENCE AND CONTEXT

The embedded songs of the *Odyssey* reflect not only on the role of the poet but also on the response he provokes in those listening to his performance.[87] If Demodocus reflects to some extent qualities of the poet-narrator, does his audience similarly reflect the intended, actual or idealized audience of the *Odyssey*? The Phaeacian episode (and indeed the song of Phemius at *Od.* 1.325-7) displays a dichotomous audience reaction to bardic song. The contrast between the reaction of the delighted Phaeacians and the devastated Odysseus has been noted by many scholars, many of whom theorize the contrast as representing the difference between aesthetic distance from, and emotional involvement with, the subject-matter of a song.[88] The presence of an internal audience to an embedded song naturally causes the reader/external audience to evaluate that internal audience's response to and reading of the poem. In the case of Demodocus' first song, the intriguingly diverse reactions of his audience(s) might in itself explain the very compressed style of the embedded song: it could indicate that Odysseus' *reaction* to the song is more important than giving details of the song itself.

The wider context of embedded songs within the *Odyssey* may in itself shed light on their significance. In this poem, as I mentioned above, embedded songs almost all share the performance context of a banquet or similarly secular festivity.[89] Furthermore, the performance of song is witnessed largely in an aristocratic setting and the purpose is that of entertainment.[90] In the *Odyssey* ritual and religion are not strongly connected with song, in

87 For an extensive examination of the audience as represented in the Homeric epics, and how much we can clearn about the historical audience of these poems from the internal representations see Dalby (1995): 269-279.
88 Segal (1992): 13, Doherty (1995a): 90-1, Walsh (1984): 3-4; Nagy (1979): 97-101, Rüter (1969): 237. Cf. also Rinon (2008): 125-6, although I disagree with his claim that the contrast between the reaction of the Phaeacians and Odysseus is meant to show that "there is something wrong in regarding poetry as no more than entertainment, as can be deduced from the representation of the Phaeacians".
89 Cf. Segal (1992): 6-7 on the close links between feasting and singing in the Homeric epics.
90 Hainsworth (1988): 349 "the occasion of ἀοιδή is a banquet and its purpose is frankly entertainment"; cf. also Richardson (1990): 84.

contrast to the *Iliad* where ritual occasions are a frequent context for song.[91] The few hints of the connection between ritual and song in the *Odyssey* are rare and undeveloped.[92] The reasons for this contrast are not immediately apparent; the different themes and settings of the poems may partially account for it, since the tragic war-time narrative of the *Iliad* would arguably be less likely to contain extended banquet scenes with singing and dancing. Indeed the content of the shield of Achilles seems to confirm such a reading, since the scenes of peacetime it depicts contain several examples of song, implying that such activities are not always associated with war. The lack of ritual song in the *Odyssey* is harder to explain, particularly since there is no lack of sacrifice or prayer in the poem; it seems that the poet deliberately suppresses the ritual role of song to emphasize its role in aristocratic entertainment and in commemorating the deeds of men for current and future generations. Perhaps this is a deliberate attempt on the part of the *Odyssey* to differentiate itself from the *Iliad* (or other traditional epic poems) where song was more strongly associated with ritual; it could also simply reflect a co-existing song-tradition. In any case, it is important to note at this stage that the representation of song can vary widely even within poems of the same genre.

iv) Thematic Analogy and/or Disruption

Embedded songs can also function as a commentary on the themes of the frame narrative, presenting a different perspective from that in the poem as a whole or, on the other hand,

91 See above, pp. 25-32 for discussion of this point.

92 In several of the possible examples of ritual song it is not clear that a song (in the sense of a sung poem) is actually being referred to as opposed to a ritual cry. Although the women at Nestor's palace raise the *ololuge* at 3.450 (ὀλόλυξαν) during a sacrifice and Penelope engages in the same activity at 4.767 (ὀλόλυξε) after praying for Telemachus' safety, the sense is of a wordless chant or cry rather than of the singing of a poem. The same seems to me to be true of most epic depictions of female grieving, such as the well-known simile comparing Odysseus to a lamenting woman at *Od.* 8.521-31, where the verbs used are κλαίῃσι (523) and κωκύει (527), neither of which evokes song as opposed to non-verbal wailing and crying. Dué (2006): 3 interprets this simile differently: "the listener can easily conjure her song". The alignment between Odysseus and the woman in the simile implies, I argue, that the woman does in fact weep rather than sing an extended lament (since Odysseus himself weeps rather than lamenting Troy in words): cf. also Rutherford (1986): 155-6.

affirming the position of the frame narrative by analogy. Demodocus' first and third songs are not closely linked in terms of theme with the *Odyssey* as a whole, since they function as analepses to Odysseus' past, offering us (and the Phaeacian internal audience) further insight into his character and past deeds prior to his account of his adventures in books 9-12, although their close association with the protagonist and the importance of the Trojan War as the back-drop for the poem makes them far from irrelevant to its plot. The second song of Demodocus, the account of Ares and Aphrodite, does have clear thematic resonance with the general plot of the *Odyssey*. The embedded song's central themes of (female) adultery and (male) revenge and the victory of cleverness over superior strength are echoed in the situation in Ithaca, one essential difference being the chastity of Penelope in contrast with the adulterous Aphrodite.[93] The song also echoes the dispute between Odysseus and Euryalus and the older man's victory over the younger. Divinities, as in the *Iliad*, are shown in the song of Ares and Aphrodite to be immune to the serious consequences which affect humans in similar situations; the divine laughter which greets the climax of the song is disquieting when read in the hindsight of the slaughter of the suitors at the end of the poem.[94] Such thematic mirroring and distortion causes the reader (or audience) to evaluate the response of Odysseus in the closing books of the poem: is it unsettling that our epic hero is implacable in seeking revenge and accepts no offers of reparation? Or is it an inescapable fact of humanity that adultery and other such social crimes have serious and devastating consequences on those involved?[95] The embedded song raises these and other questions and reflections on the themes it shares with the main narrative.

v) Genre-Appropriation

93 For scholarship on the song of Ares and Aphrodite see note 38 above.
94 Although Achilles mentions insurrection among the gods at *Il.* 1.395, we can see from the divine machinery of the *Iliad* itself that the intended revolution had no lasting negative effects. Similarly Zeus laughs with delight at the theomachy at *Il.* 21.437-44 indicating that war for gods is a very different and much less serious concern than for mortals. For divine (and human!) humour in the *Iliad* see Bell (2007): 96-116.
95 For this scene and its significance in the moral character of the gods in the *Odyssey* see Allan (2006): 21-2 with bibliography.

I have noted several times now that embedded song may be used to incorporate material within a poem which is in some way outside its expected remit: this can be in terms of genre (as with the laments of the *Iliad*) or more generally in terms of theme, as with the Trojan War narratives of Demodocus' first and third songs, which are still *epic* poetry, but are outside the main focus of the *Odyssey* as a nostos-poem. The Odyssean examples generally indicate an interest in the representation of epic poetry; the following chapters will show that the *genre* of the frame narrative and embedded song, like the theme(s), may differ from one another and that their generic correspondence or divergence can create meaningful tension within the poem. This quality is suggestive of an awareness of genre-boundaries and competing generic priorities, values and functions which is not necessarily always attributed to the earliest poets.[96]

vi) Digressive or Effective?

Although the songs of Demodocus to some extent all have thematic links to the rest of the poem (the Trojan War stories through their strong association with the protagonist and the Ares and Aphrodite song through its theme of adultery and justice which resounds closely with the situation in Ithaca), it has been argued that they are essentially digressive in nature, in that they do not significantly advance the narrative of the poem.[97] This is most true of the song of Ares and Aphrodite: it may cause readers (or audience members) to reflect anew on a main theme of the poem, but the plot is not advanced by its narration. The same is not so clearly true of the other two songs of Demodocus, however. The Trojan War songs both (through the effect they have on Odysseus) lead indirectly to the disclosure of Odysseus'

96 See Harden and Kelly (forthcoming).
97 Hainsworth (1988): 343 "The content of viii is descriptive rather than narrative, and the story of the *Odyssey* makes little progress". Cf. Scodel (2001): 110 "Bardic poetry [in the *Odyssey*], in contrast, although it is rich with meaning, does not address the immediate situation."

identity, and in this sense the songs of Demodocus do step beyond a simply digressive function in affecting the events of the frame narrative.[98] The level to which embedded songs affect the progress of the plot in the frame narrative will also be a theme of this study. Once more it is possible to see the Homeric examples as models which are picked up by later poets and adapted: the subtle connection between the subject-matter of Demodocus' Trojan songs and Odysseus' eventual recognition may be seen as a model for later embedded songs which have an even more overt connection with the frame narratives in which they are set.

VII) ALLUSION

Embedded songs, by their very nature as depictions of poetry, raise the intriguing possibility that a poet may not be depicting a fictional poet performing an invented song, but in fact incorporating in this depiction the work of another specific poet who may for instance be a contemporary poetic competitor or a predecessor. This possibility will have to be approached with caution for several reasons: in the earliest texts the oral-derived nature of the poetry itself may be seen to put a substantial obstacle in the way of any argument for allusion to a specific text by another.[99] Moreover, the troubled transmission of many Greek poetic texts even from later periods often makes the secure identification of such close textual allusion difficult. As this study progresses from discussion of the archaic poets onto the poetry of classical and Hellenistic eras, the suggestion of poetic allusion becomes less problematic, since it is already a scholarly commonplace that Apollonius or Callimachus allude, e.g., to Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey.* The possibility that the poetic interest in depicting other poets at work could and did extend beyond inventing entirely fictional poets

98 Cf. Mackie (1997): 87, but she overstates the case in arguing that *all* songs in the *Odyssey* "directly affect the action" – in fact the only case where a song directly affects the action is the example she gives to prove this point. See also Richardson (1990): 84.

99 Bibliography on this tendentious issue is predictably vast. For the various difficulties in establishing allusion in the Homeric poems due to their oral-derived nature see *inter alia* Burgess (2001): 133, Danek (2002): 3 and (1998): 13-14, Fowler (2004a): 228, Allan (2005): 14, Willcock (1997): 186, Janko (1981): 225-8. Currie (2006) provides a useful summary of the issues, although from a neoanalytical perspective.

and poems is not one which can be ignored: when and where this particular characteristic of embedded song first begins will be a topic for discussion in the following chapters.

***

This study, then, explores the relationship between embedded songs and their frame narratives, asking what these instances of embedded song can tell us about the poetry in which they appear. Although the embedded songs are each discussed in their own context, the poetic technique is connected to important issues relevant to all the texts discussed such as poetic authority, competitive poetics and self-referentiality, and it offers insight into the poets' own conceptions of various aspects of their own work.

The wide temporal scope of the discussion encourages interrogation of the potential development of this particular poetic technique over time, which in turn allows evaluation of the Homeric and other early Greek examples in the light of the 'literary' Hellenistic ones.[100] This synoptic view begins with the close readings of embedded songs in the non-Homeric early Greek hexameter poets offered in chapter 1, where I consider the function and effect of embedded song in the light of the oral-derived nature of the corpus. Genre is also a major factor in the discussion of embedded songs: not only in their potential to introduce foreign genres into their host narrative, but also in the various ways they are used in different genres. Chapter 2 deals with the lyric poets' use of embedded song and shows that despite some general affinities with its use in epic poetry, concerns of genre play a large role in determining why, when and how a poet chooses to depict another poet in performance. Performance itself is an important theme in my discussion: the gradual development of Greek literature from a song-culture to a largely literate form is highly relevant when considering how poets represent their own art. How the depiction of poetry

100 Indeed, there is no need to argue for a strong differentiation between oral and literate poetry in this regard, given the interplay between these two modes of discourse.

within poetry changes in the light of this development, and what might motivate a literate poet to portray only oral poets at work, will be discussed in chapters 2 and 3. Whether or not there is evidence that the later representations of embedded song are more sophisticated is discussed in chapter 3, where a close reading of the Hellenistic embedded songs is combined with a retrospective re-revaluation of what the earliest Greek texts are capable of and interested in. There it is argued that early Greek hexameter poetry is already capable of the self-conscious reflection so readily ascribed to Hellenistic texts (an argument still not readily accepted by many Homeric scholars).[101] Finally, the appendix offers a list of the embedded songs I have found in the authors I have discussed, including also the further examples of embedded song I have found elsewhere in Greek narrative poetry.

101 A point noted by Bakker (2009): 134, who argues that performance theory can go some way to resolving the refusal of "oralist" scholars to apply features seen as "literary" to Homeric poetry. Cf. the discussion of Currie (2006) with bibliography and that of Foley (1999) and (2002).

CHAPTER ONE

EARLY GREEK HEXAMETER: TRADITIONAL SONGS?

As noted above, a self-conscious interest in song is evidenced already in the *Iliad*. Although the theme is not extensively explored in that epic, there is reference to epic song at *Il.* 6.358, where Helen shows a unique foreknowledge of the current events as a topic for future song and at 9.186-9, where Achilles is depicted singing epic and playing the lyre.[102] The *Odyssey* is much richer in examples of embedded narrative, the songs of Demodocus and Phemius being the most prominent.[103] Several further instances of embedded song occur in the *Homeric Hymns* and in Hesiod's *Theogony*, and it is these non-Homeric examples that form the basis of the discussion in this chapter.[104] The Hesiodic and in particular the Hymnic examples of embedded song have been relatively understudied in comparison with those from the *Odyssey*: Nünlist, for instance, in his chapter on narrators, narratees and narratives in the *Homeric Hymns* does not address inset song in any detail: "secondary narrators do not feature prominently in the Homeric hymns".[105] In addition to the general functions for embedded song identified in the introduction, the embedded songs in the poetry of each period raise their own specific possibilities and problems depending on the genre, context and function of the poetry in which they are embedded. The occurrence of the poetic technique of embedded song across all the sub-genres of early Greek hexameter poetry raises intriguing questions of the nature and capabilities of those genres, of the potential 'traditionality' of embedded song as a feature of early Greek poetry, and the still-controversial (within Homeric studies) possibility of poetic dependence or allusion. So, in

102 Cf. Hainsworth (1993): 88 "Akhilleus the hero sings of the Heroic deeds that he is no longer allowing himself to perform".
103 For embedded song in the *Odyssey*, see above pp.18-24.
104 *HHerm.* 52-62, *HHerm.* 425-33, *HPan* 15-47, *Th.* 11-21 and *Th.* 43-75. For a list of inset songs in Greek poetry see Appendix I.
105 Nünlist (2004): 39. Morrison (2007b) discusses narrators in archaic poetry but does not include a discussion of secondary narrators.

considering embedded songs in early Greek hexameter poetry it is necessary to take account of the oral-derived nature of many of the examples (although this approach could be modified in the case of the later *Hymns*, some of which are generally agreed to be Classical or even Hellenistic).[106] For instance, the recurrence of embedded song across the corpus of early Greek hexameter poetry might be read in the light of the type-scenes and other shared formulae which are a defining characteristic of oral-derived poetry. One explanation for the presence of embedded song in all these poems is the possibility that embedded song should be thought of as a traditional 'type-scene', or more generally that these instances of poems-within-poems are a traditional concern of the hexameter poet, a concern which can be traced from the *Iliad* down to some of the latest hymns.[107] In identifying embedded song as a traditional element of Greek *epos*, we would simultaneously posit for some of the earliest poetry a sophisticated self-consciousness on the part of the poet, who wishes to set his work in the context of the tradition, and is interested in the value and nature of poetry *qua* poetry. Of course certain objections would have to be surmounted, such as whether or not such a self-conscious poetic device can plausibly be 'traditional' in the same way as, for instance, an arming scene, and whether the similarities between these passages can be convincingly compared to the similarities between other types of formulaic scene, and how one might set about proving that these passages have a place among the 'traditional' elements of oral-derived poetry. The possibility of an allusive relationship between these passages will also be considered, in particular the possibility of the Odyssean examples having influenced some of the later hymns, and whether certain of the hymns may be in a competitive and allusive relationship with one another will be discussed. It is also possible that, while all these passages are parallel, they are independent of each other and of any

106 Cf. Janko (1982) for a general discussion; commentaries on individual *Hymns* offer their own accounts of dating, see, *inter alia*, Richardson (2010) for *HHerm., HAp. and HAph.*, Faulkner (2008) for *HAph.*
107 It should be stated at the outset that I will not seek to identify embedded songs as being one of the traditional type-scenes of early Greek hexameter poetry such as arming or chariot journey scenes; such scenes display significant recurrent linguistic similarities in the form of repeated phrases or lines (cf. Arend (1933), Fenik (1968) and Kelly (2007)) which is not the case with embedded songs across the corpus of early Greek hexameter poetry, although I have noted in my brief discussion of the *Odyssey* that the three songs of Demodocus all end with what seems to be a formulaic line. See below, pp. 105-115, for discussion.

specifically *Greek* tradition, i.e. that this feature is something which is 'natural' for a poet to include and something which occurs in independent traditions of world poetry. In this scenario it would be profitable to consider poetry from other cultures, such as the Near Eastern epic *Gilgamesh*, to see if similar instances occur in other poetic traditions. In order to establish which model, if any, is most plausible, I turn now to a close analysis of the embedded songs in question.

1.1 The Homeric Hymn to Hermes: Poetic Authority and Divine Accession

The *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (*HHerm.*) opens, after a short proem in which the god's name, parentage and epithets are adduced, with a scene in which the baby Hermes invents and plays the lyre for the first time (24–64). In emphasizing Hermes' invention of the lyre (and thus those songs which accompany it) the *HHerm.* challenges Apollo's usual pre-eminence in the instrument.[108] This challenge is re-asserted later in the poem in the depiction of Apollo's reaction to Hermes' performance (425–62), and indeed by the very fact that the instrument is granted to the elder god by Hermes in exchange for honours the new god would prefer. Apollo is astounded, and openly admits the lyre's novelty (443–6):

> θαυμασίην γὰρ τήνδε νεήφατον ὅσσαν ἀκούω,
> ἣν οὔ πώ ποτέ φημι δαήμεναι οὔτε τιν' ἀνδρῶν,
> οὔτε τιν' ἀθανάτων οἳ Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσι, 445
> νόσφι σέθεν, φηλῆτα, Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱέ.[109]

This second song of Hermes (425–433), a theogony, calms Apollo's anger and gains the god his coveted position among the Olympian gods, together with a share in Apollo's honours. Three speech-acts of Hermes, including two marked specifically as song (his speech to the tortoise prior to making the lyre out of its shell (24–38), the first song (52–62) and the

108 Cf. *HAp.* 131, where the new-born Apollo claims his predominance over the lyre which already exists before his birth (i.e. could not have been invented by the as yet unborn Hermes). Cf. Càssola (2010): 158. Richardson (2010): 20–1 takes this as evidence of a competitive relationship between the *HHerm.* and the *HAp.*, while Bungard (2011): 147 avers that it is a sign of the friendship between the two deities. On the function of music in the *HHerm.* (and indeed across all the *HH*) see Calame (2011): 334-357, esp. 348-50.
109 The text of the *Homeric Hymns* throughout is that of *AHS*.

theogony (425-33)) will be discussed in the order they appear in the poem, since it is only through the earlier speech-acts that Hermes achieves the poetic authority which so impresses Apollo later in the poem, and which allows Hermes to resolve the central conflict of the *Hymn*: his accession to full status as a god.[110] The first two passages come early in the *Hymn*, when the new-born Hermes, as yet unrecognized by the other Olympian gods, has begun his quest for divine recognition and authority. It is partially through his expertise in song that he achieves the divine honours he craves at the opening of the poem. The prodigious achievement of stealing Apollo's cattle only achieves his brother's anger and resentment; it is the performance with the lyre at 425–433 finally wins Hermes acceptance into the pantheon. The tripartite structure to Hermes' speech-acts within the poem, and in particular the fact that it is his last song which is successful in winning him his coveted prize of a place in the pantheon, suggests that the first songs should be read as introductory or proemic in relation to his final, climactic performance.

In fact, the first two 'hymns' of Hermes (24–38 and 52–62) can be interpreted as proemic in several ways. Firstly, the similarity of his performances to the *Homeric Hymns* in general style, form and content (see detailed discussion of each passage below) would already imply the proemic function which is widely ascribed to this corpus. This is especially attractive given that the two 'hymns' discussed below are in fact performed before the embedded theogonic poem (425–33); structurally, Hermes' hymnic performances act as proems to this later performance.[111] Such an interpretation only partially depends on the general scholarly acceptance of the *Homeric Hymns* as proems or preludes which would have been performed before longer hexameter poems.[112] The *Homeric Hymns*, while

110 Cf. Haft (1996): 43, although with a different focus (on raiding and theft).
111 See below, pp.90-104 for discussion of the Hesiodic proemic hymns at *Theog.* 1–110.
112 A function attested already in antiquity: Thucydides (3.104) deploys the term *prooimion* to denote the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*, whilst Pindar (*Nem.* 2.1–5) claims that reciters of Homeric poetry "usually" begin Διὸς ἐκ προοιμίου (3). This could refer to compositions like the *Homeric Hymns* themselves, though it is noticeable that there are no surviving hymns to Zeus (if we except the beginning of the *Works and Days* and the small – and late – *HH* 23), and it is endlessly debated whether hymns were originally preludes to other songs which then became expanded in scale and independent in performance (some, as Richardson (2010): 2–3 have contended that even the larger *Homeric Hymns* could be deployed in a preludic manner), or whether

functioning as proems to longer (probably epic) performances, are also complete poetic compositions in their own right, and thus they contain recognizable opening features and motifs which function as proems within the hymns themselves.[113] The proemic nature of Hermes' two 'hymns' thus has several possible models of reference, and I would argue that *HHerm.* 52–62 corresponds particularly to the proemic section of an *Homeric Hymn*, since Hermes sings only the *beginning* of a hymn to himself. Perhaps even more importantly, the position and effect of Hermes' performances within the frame narrative also indicate their proemic function, since these two speech-acts are located at the opening of the poem, before the main action, which invites consideration of their function in introducing and foreshadowing what will come later.

The first passage immediately precedes the invention of the lyre by the prodigious new-born Hermes.

A Proto-Hymn to the 'Lyre': HHerm. 24-38.

ἔνθα χέλυν εὑρὼν ἐκτήσατο μυρίον ὄλβον·
Ἑρμῆς τοι πρώτιστα χέλυν τεκτήνατ' ἀοιδόν,
ἥ ῥά οἱ ἀντεβόλησεν ἐπ' αὐλείῃσι θύρῃσι
βοσκομένη προπάροιθε δόμων ἐριθηλέα ποίην,
σαῦλα ποσὶν βαίνουσα· Διὸς δ' ἐριούνιος υἱὸς
ἀθρήσας ἐγέλασσε καὶ αὐτίκα μῦθον ἔειπε·
σύμβολον ἤδη μοι μέγ' ὀνήσιμον, οὐκ ὀνοτάζω.
χαῖρε φυὴν ἐρόεσσα χοροιτύπε δαιτὸς ἑταίρη,
ἀσπασίη προφανεῖσα· πόθεν τόδε καλὸν ἄθυρμα
αἰόλον ὄστρακον ἔσσο χέλυς ὄρεσι ζώουσα;
ἀλλ' οἴσω σ' εἰς δῶμα λαβών· ὄφελός τί μοi ἔσσῃ,
οὐδ' ἀποτιμήσω· σὺ δέ με πρώτιστον ὀνήσεις.
οἶκοι βέλτερον εἶναι, ἐπεὶ βλαβερὸν τὸ θύρηφιν·
ἦ γὰρ ἐπηλυσίης πολυπήμονος ἔσσεαι ἔχμα
ζώουσ'· ἢν δὲ θάνῃς τότε κεν μάλα καλὸν ἀείδοις.

that independence was always at least a potential feature of the genre; cf. Clay (1997): 494–6, Furley and Bremmer (2001): 41–3, and Faulkner (2011): 16–19 for recent discussion and bibliography.

113 Cf. Janko (1981): 9–10, Race (1982): 5–8; Furley and Bremmer (2001): 50–6 for discussion of the formal elements of hymnic openings. That the *Hymns* stand alone as poetic compositions, and thus have proems of their own in addition to their possible function as prooimia, is especially true of the longer *Hymns* (cf., e.g., Richardson (2010) on *HAp.* 1–18, 81), but the shorter ones also have fairly stable 'proemic' motifs.

Although this is technically a speech and not a song, it must be considered in this discussion due to its connection with the following embedded songs, as well as its own intrinsic similarities to an embedded song. This speech functions as a proto-hymn or proem to that later hymn. The first foreshadowing element of Hermes' speech here is his double reference to the tortoise as a singer which rings the passage at lines 25 (ἀοιδόν) and 38 (ἀείδοις). Hermes has just seen the tortoise for the first time and already he anticipates the capabilities of the lyre, capabilities which are almost immediately fulfilled when he uses his new invention to sing a hymn (51).[114] Hermes humorously anticipates the tortoise's skill by this pointed emphasizing of his own priority in inventing the lyre. These future directed statements of Hermes at once accurately predict and effect the next song (52–62). Hermes' statement is also a playful reversal of the usual hymnic promise to sing in the first person plural which is embedded in the formulaic promise (αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς) and found at the end of many of the *Homeric Hymns*, but also seen in various formats elsewhere in that corpus, for instance ἄισομαι (32.19) or μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον (9.9, 18.11).[115] These hymnic future tenses are usually seen as transitional statements which directly foreshadow the 'main' performance to which the *Hymn* would have been a prelude. Hermes' anticipation of the tortoise's future song uses this transitional language to appropriate the role of primary narrator in foreshadowing the performance of 52–62.

A second proemic element of Hermes' speech is the very fact that he is here invoking the lyre, particularly as he addresses it as a goddess as well as a symbol of poetry and song. The invocation of the lyre in this speech takes the place of the invocation of the Muses often found in epic proems, and deliberately so: Hermes cannot invoke the Muses or Apollo, since the narrator of the *HHerm.* claims for Hermes the invention of the lyre and of the song that

114 Càssola (2010): 518 n. 31 notes Hermes' anticipation of the tortoise's future role as musical instrument; cf. also Radermacher (1931): 64–6, who for this reason finds v. 25 "bewußt komisch".
115 Cf. *HH* 2.495, 3.546, 4.580, 6.21, 10.6, 19.49, 28.18, 30.19.

accompanies it;[116] his invocation of the lyre as the symbol of song thus replaces the more traditional invocation of the deities more usually associated with the invention of song and instrument.[117] Hermes uses this first prelude to foreshadow his invention of the lyre and establish his authority over song. This authority progressively intensifies throughout the hymn until he finally achieves his goal of divine recognition through song.

Hermes' speech to the tortoise contains further hymnic markers which indicate its proemic function.[118] The use of χαῖρε followed by several epithet-noun combinations (*HHerm.* 31–32) is instantly recognizable as a version of the *Hymns*' formulaic salutation to the god.[119] Such an address is typically found at the end of a *Homeric Hymn*, i.e. on the moment of transfer between the hymn as proem and the performance of the 'main' poem. The ambiguity in his words is ironic – he greets her for the first time with a speech which looks like a hymnic farewell, and this is a very final farewell since within a very few lines Hermes has killed the tortoise for his own purposes. Hermes' promise to the tortoise (ἀλλ' οἵσω σ' εἰς δῶμα λαβών ὄφελός τί μοι ἔσσῃ, | οὐδ' ἀποτιμήσω· σὺ δέ με πρώτιστον ὀνήσεις 34–5) is a humorous perversion of the singer's promises for the future (another common closural feature in the *Homeric Hymns*) and of the relationship of reciprocity enshrined therein. These χαῖρε-addresses are often combined with requests for reciprocal favour from the god addressed, and Hermes' greeting contains explicit references to the

116 Cf. Apollo's speech at 433f., where he specifically states that Hermes has created something completely new (the Muses as represented by the *HHerm.* do sing (cf. 452) but they are associated with different types of song accompanied by the flute).
117 Necessarily so, of course, for as Clay (1989): 110 comments, "[d]espite his invention of the lyre, Hermes cannot become the patron of poetry." Richardson (2010): 19–20 notes the *HHerm.*'s contradiction of the state of affairs in the *HAp.* and suggests that the later *HHerm.* may be playfully responding to it.
118 Cf. Richardson (2010) on 31, 158: "This ironic address, anticipating the transformation of tortoise to lyre, dignifies her *in hymnic style* with a series of epithets which suggest she is a hetaera or dancing-girl" (our italics); for Gemoll (1886): 198, Hermes treats her as "ein junges Mädchen."
119 Cf., e.g., χαῖρε, ἄνασσα, θεὰ λευκώλενε, δῖα Σελήνη, | πρόφρον, ἐϋπλόκαμος· (*HH* 32.17–18); χαῖρε, θεά, Κύπροιο ἐϋκτιμένης μεδέουσα· | σεῦ δ' ἐγω ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον (*HAph.* 292–3); also *HH* 3.545–6, 4.579–80, 5.292–3, 6.19–21, 7.58–9, 9.7–8, 10.4–6, 11.5,13.3, 14.6, 15.9, 16.5, 18.12, 19.48–9, 21.5, 22.6–7, 25.6–7, 26.11–13, 27.21–2, 28.17–8, 29.13–4, 30.17–19, 31.17–19, 33.18–19. Vergados (2007a): 147 also notes the hymnic quality of the χαῖρε address but does not take the observation further in his discussion of the speech as a whole.

profit he expects to gain from the tortoise, expanding upon the adjective ὀνήσιμον (30) to the 'sign' the tortoise represents for him.[120]

Hermes' status as a god, albeit a god who does not yet have full recognition, reverses the usual power dynamic of a hymn. The tortoise receives only the ambiguous and negatively-formulated promise that Hermes will not *dis*honour her, while Hermes firmly states twice that she will be useful to him. Hermes is deliberately vague here, since he does not make explicit what he will do to honour her, and the end of line 35 (σὺ δέ με **πρώτιστον** ὀνήσεις) makes clear that Hermes will be the one to really benefit from the association. This benefit is not only the ability to sing accompanied by the newly invented instrument, for the tortoise, transformed into the lyre, will eventually directly affect and effect Hermes' accession to full divine honour and his reconciliation with Apollo. The future tenses ἔσσῃ, ἀποτιμήσω and ὀνήσεις (34–5) look forward to his two songs, where this anticipated benefit is realized.

Moreover, the 'epithets' which Hermes uses to address the tortoise are also a hallmark of hymnic style; a god's epithets are usually found clustered at the beginning and end of *Homeric Hymns* in the opening and closing addresses to the god.[121] As with the χαῖρε greeting and the seemingly reciprocal promise of benefit and gain, these epithets are not used by Hermes in a straightforward manner. All of them (...φυὴν ἐρόεσσα, χοροιτύπε δαιτὸς ἑταίρη 31) encode the very benefit he expects to gain from the animal and are humorously proleptic: the tortoise is none of these things as she is now, since these are the attributes she will have when Hermes has transformed her shell into the lyre. The sequence of events as told in the *HHerm.* puts the invention of the lyre before the killing of the cattle of Apollo, a variation on another version of the story in which the dead cattle

120 Cf., e.g., *HH* 15.9 (χαῖρε, ἄναξ, Διὸς υἱέ· δίδου δ' ἀρετήν τε καὶ ὄλβον); also Richardson (2010) on *HAph.* 292–3, 255: "Here there is no final request for favour, as at *H.Dem.* 494 etc., but the word χαῖρε in itself suggests that the deity should be well-disposed."
121 Cf., e.g., *HAp.* 1, *HHerm.* 3, *HDem.* 1–2 for epithets clustering at the openings; also Janko (1981): 10.

furnish parts for the instrument.[122] This proleptic use of the epithets points self-consciously to his precocity: Hermes knows what the lyre will become even before he has invented it, just as he has access to the materials needed to construct the lyre before he has killed the cattle from which they are obtained.

Hermes' (mis)application of hymnic motifs to the tortoise-as-lyre has a humorous as well as foreshadowing effect.[123] The tortoise's shell is mentioned by Hermes as if it were a desirable attribute she obtained somewhere rather than an essential part of her being; it is a possession which the god wants for himself, recalling the τιμή of prophecy and other attributes which the baby god wants to obtain from Apollo and further deepening the impression that this is a (mock) hymn. The reference to the tortoise's realm (ὄρεσι ζώουσα 33) is comparable to the frequent hymnic delineations of the god's home and sphere of influence.[124]

Therefore, this proto-hymn of Hermes anticipates the invention of the lyre with echoes of the future song it will produce. Hermes in fact *mis*uses hymnic elements of address in his speech to the tortoise, perverting the conventional formulae to suit himself. This is unsurprising in the context of the young god's character, as at every stage of the poem he is irreverent, self-serving and precocious. de Jong has noted the predictive or proleptic function that the device of embedded narrative often fulfils within the main

122 Shelmerdine (1984): 202 comments on the illogicality of the sequence, reading it plausibly as a privileging of the lyre over the theft of the cattle: "the poet...has quite deliberately orchestrated his treatment of the lyre's creation to emphasise the importance of the music that results." Cf. also Vergados (2007b): 741 n. 25 on Apollodorus' version of the myth. Contrast Lloyd-Jones (1996): 143, who argues that the version of the myth attested in Sophocles' fragmentary *Ichneutae* has changed the 'traditional version': "all of these [changes to the *HHerm.* version] may easily have been made by the poet to adapt the story to his own purposes."
123 Cf. Bungard (2011): 146–50 for other humourous elements in this speech; Radermacher (1931): 66 is probably too harsh in thinking that, as a result of these elements, "der Spott [sc. of the tortoise] bricht durch".
124 Cf., e.g., *HH* 10.4–5 (Σαλαμῖνος ἐϋκτιμένης μεδέουσα | καὶ πάσης Κύπρου), 19.2–8 (ὅς τ' ἀνὰ πίσεα | δενδρήεντ' ἄμυδις φοιτᾶι χοροῇθεσι νύμφαις...φοιτᾶι δ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα διὰ ῥωπήια πυκνά); also *HH* 2.490–1, 5.292, 6.2–5, 9.3–6, 18.2 etc.; Furley & Bremmer (2001): 54–5.

narrative: Hermes' cheeky 'hymn' to the lyre achieves this effect here by functioning as a proem to the hymn which Hermes goes on to sing to himself.[125]

HHerm. 52-62: *Hermes' hymn to himself*

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τεῦξε φέρων ἐρατεινὸν ἄθυρμα
πλήκτρῳ ἐπειρήτιζε κατὰ μέλος, ἡ δ' ὑπὸ χειρὸς
σμερδαλέον κονάβησε· θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδεν
ἐξ αὐτοσχεδίης πειρώμενος, ἠΰτε κοῦροι
ἡβηταὶ θαλίῃσι παραιβόλα κερτομέουσιν,
ἀμφὶ Δία Κρονίδην καὶ Μαιάδα καλλιπέδιλον
† ὃν πάρος ὠρίζεσκον † ἑταιρείῃ φιλότητι,
ἦν τ' αὐτοῦ γενεὴν ὀνομακλυτὸν ἐξονομάζων·
ἀμφιπόλους τε γέραιρε καὶ ἀγλαὰ δώματα νύμφης,
καὶ τρίποδας κατὰ οἶκον ἐπηετανούς τε λέβητας.
καὶ τὰ μὲν οὖν ἤειδε, τὰ δὲ φρεσὶν ἄλλα μενοίνα.

Following the invention of the lyre, Hermes tries out the new instrument with a song which amounts almost to a 'proem in the middle'.[126] His first attempt is, in content and style, a miniature hymn set within the larger *Hymn*.[127]

The hymnic nature of the passage is clear when Zeus and Maia's sexual relationship is described (57–8) in an allusion to the opening of the frame narrative (νύμφη ἐϋπλόκαμος, Διὸς ἐν φιλότητι μιγεῖσα, | αἰδοίη· 4–5).[128] Sexual intercourse between the gods appears frequently elsewhere in the *Hymns*, even providing the entire narrative impetus of the *HAph.*, and unsurprisingly so, for divine sex and its ramifications are

125 de Jong (2004): 10.
126 For the concept of proems in the middle in Virgil, see Conte (2007): 219–31; for a similar concept in archaic Greek poetry cf. Obbink (2001) esp. 69–72.
127 Cf. Richardson (2010) on 55–61, 163, Vergados (2007a): 87–101 and Clay (1989): 108–111 for discussion of this song and its relevance to the poetics of the *HHerm.* For the theme of music in the *HHerm.* see Kaimio (1974): 29-42.
128 Cf. Nagy (1979): 245 for a different reading of Maia and Zeus' relationship, based on his reading of variants in the Greek text. Nagy takes the allusion to the young men ridiculing each other at the banquet table (*HHerm.* 56) as an indication that the young men sing in particular of Zeus and Maia. I do not think that this is indicated by the text of the poem, which rather seeks to describe Hermes' completely *new* type of song with a performance type which does already exist. The correspondence conveyed by the simile in my view is one of extempore and possibly playful performance rather than one of the specific content of the two songs compared.

essential to the construction of Zeus' hegemony, and the maintenance of a gendered and paternalized hierarchy amongst the immortals.[129]

Another common hymnic subject is revealed when the role of Zeus and Maia as parents is emphasized in Hermes' description of his own birth (59). The birth of the deity is often a subject of the *Hymns,* as most famously in the case of Apollo (*HAp.* 30–130),[130] while Hermes' miniature hymn also contains terminology of praise which indicates its genre: the adjective ὀνομακλυτόν (59) is performative, since the glory of the god and his birth will be increased by the singing of the song, while the verb γέραιρε (a word associated with γέρας, the very thing which Hermes seeks to obtain from Zeus in the poem) also indicates that the gaining of honour through hymnic praise is what is intended by Hermes in this song.

His description of the cave (60–1), however disingenuous it may be, also marks the song as hymnic since a god's home or cultic locale is typically announced at the opening of a *Homeric Hymn.*[131] The description given here by Hermes is in marked contrast to its earlier depiction (*HHerm.* 5–6), where the external narrator notes that the cave is isolated and shady, the scene for a clandestine love-affair between Zeus and Maia. Later, in a confrontation with his mother, Hermes seems disgusted with the cave, calling it gloomy (ἠερόεντι 172) and contrasting their life in it unfavourably with the lives of the gods which are described with a cluster of positive adjectives (πλούσιον, ἀφνειόν, πολυλήιον 171). Indeed, there Hermes states his intention (179–81) of robbing Apollo of the τρίποδας περικαλλέας ἠδὲ λέβητας (179) which his home, according to his earlier song, already contains (τρίποδας κατὰ οἶκον ἐπηετανούς τε λέβητας 61). It would seem, then, that

129 Cf. also *HH* 18.6–7 (also to Hermes), 32.14–15, 33.5; see also the song of Ares and Aphrodite (*Od.* 8.266–366). For the politics of divine sex in early Greek epic, cf., e.g., Bonnafé (1985); Clay (1989) esp. 267–70; also Faulkner (2008): 10–18.
130 Cf. *HH* 11.1, 15.1–2, 16.2–3, 17.3, 18.3, 19.35–6, 27.19–20, 28.4–5, 31.2–3 and 5–8, 32.15, 33.6–7; also Richardson (2010): 4.
131 Cf., e.g., *HH* 1–7, *HAp.* 15, 179–81, *HAph.* 2–3, 10.1, 15.2–3.

Hermes' description of the cave in his song is far from truthful: the adjective ἀγλαά (60) stands in direct contrast to the descriptions of the cave by the primary narrator as παλίσκιον (6) and with Hermes' later description (172). In his own hymn, he presents the cave as a suitable home for a god, like that of Apollo (*HAp.* 443), with the servants of Maia (60) implying a level of luxury and companionship at variance with its negative characterization elsewhere in the poem. Hermes in fact contradicts the proem of the *HHerm.* proper in his glorified account of Maia's cave and re-introduces himself in much grander terms.[132] Hermes' re-telling of the proem of the *HHerm.* is of great significance for the poem as a whole, as a structural analysis of his song will show.

In fact, the song of Hermes can be shown to follow the typical structure of a *Homeric Hymn*, at least up to a certain point, though we suggest that its failure to follow precisely this structural scheme is deliberate and reflects powerfully on the meaning of the song.[133] The standard, tripartite configuration described by Janko begins with the **introduction**, in which (i) the deity's name and epithets (also often those of parents and associated gods)[134] are announced, represented in this song by the topic ἀμφὶ Δία Κρονίδην καὶ Μαιάδα καλλιπέδιλον (57); ἀμφὶ begins a number of *Homeric Hymns*,[135] but any implication that this embedded song should be identified as a hymn to Zeus (and Maia) is removed by the reference in the next line to Hermes' birth. The focus here is clearly on the baby god: he seeks to glorify himself through his divine parentage since this is almost all the scope that he has (as yet) for a song about himself.[136] The hymnic introduction also typically contains (ii) a verb of singing and invocation, here ἄειδεν (54) to introduce the

132 Vergados (2007a): 165 instead sees the song of Hermes as validating and confirming the poet's earlier proem, though Vergados (2011) explores the differences and explains them through focalization, i.e. "the poet may be exploiting here the naiveté of an inexperienced child" (21).
133 Janko (1981): 10–16.
134 Cf., e.g., *HDem.* 1–2, 9.1–2.
135 Cf. *HH* 19.1, 22.1, 23.1; Richardson (2010) on *HHerm.* 57, 164; cf. Radermacher (1931): 76: "*Ein Hymnus ist es ja, den er singt*, aus dem Anfang: ἀμφὶ Δία Κρονίδην" etc. (our emphasis); also Gemoll (1886) on *HH* 6.1, 317, for further references.
136 Cf. also *HH* 7.1, 22.1, 33.1.

frame around the song, and ἐξονομάζων to denote the naming of Hermes' own family tree (59).[137]

By contrast, the next two sections of his song are somewhat deficient when compared with the conventional structure. Any **middle section** contains *inter alia* descriptive attributes often introduced by a relative and/or a mythical narrative about the god, as here in ὡς πάρος ὠρίζεσκον ἑταιρείῃ φιλότητι (58), ἥν τ' αὐτοῦ γενεὴν ὀνομακλυτὸν (59), and ἀμφιπόλους τε γέραιρε καὶ ἀγλαὰ δώματα νύμφης, | καὶ τρίποδας κατὰ οἶκον ἐπηετανούς τε λέβητας (60–1).[138] This, admittedly, may be unimpressive when compared to the complex and often extended mythical or birth narratives in other *Homeric Hymns*, but since Hermes was born only moments before the invention of the lyre, his parentage and birth are the only things he has to sing about. Secondly, the hymnic **conclusion** usually contains salutation, prayers, and transition to another song, but in Hermes' song this whole section is completely missing; he breaks off after the short description of his mother's cave, distracted by unspecified thoughts mysteriously referred to in line 62 (καὶ τὰ μὲν οὖν ἤειδε, τὰ δὲ φρεσὶν ἄλλα μενοίνα). Despite these limitations, Hermes' song is recognizable as a hymn, and moreover one which ends abruptly after the proemic section and a brief attempt at a mythical narrative.

Clay has argued that the miniature hymn of Hermes is a vehicle to its own ends, that it is (at least partly) the means by which Hermes will receive the honours he is aiming for.[139] However, there is no explicitly stated internal audience at this point in the poem (contrasted

137 ἐξονομάζω here used in the sense "utter aloud", "announce" as it is frequently used in the epic formula ἔπος τ' ἔφατ' ἔκ τ' ὀνόμαζε (*Il.* 1.361, 3.398, 5.372, 6.253); cf. Kelly (2007): 388; for Radermacher (1931): 76, the verb "ist ein ὀνομάζειν bis zum Ende", which would point out once more the slight incongruity of Hermes' attempts to glorify himself.
138 Although these lines are not strictly 'mythical' narrative, they operate as such in Hermes' hymn because he disingenuously uses the description of his mother's cave to aggrandize himself. It is a feature of the premature hymn that he does not have much to say for himself as yet, but makes the most of what he has.
139 Clay (1989): 110: "for him, poetry – and all language – constitutes primarily a means to end."

with his later performance to Apollo in which the elder god's reaction is made clear).[140] This robs the song of one expected function of giving pleasure to an audience and removes the potential for the song to impact on the plot. In fact, it is Hermes' second song at *HHerm.* 425–33 which does lead, through the placating effect it has on Apollo, to his goal of achieving recognition from the gods and obtaining *timai* among them.[141] Hermes' first song at 51–62, on the other hand, is not *actively* functional: the situation of the poem or the plot does not change as a result of the hymn. Hermes must go on to effect his miraculous theft and sing again (this time with an internal audience) before he is accepted as a god.

Having observed that Hermes' first song has no obvious functional purpose within the plot of the poem, we must examine what its function might be in other terms. Nünlist has pointed out that in most hymns the god is both an internal narratee addressed by the narrator in the second person singular and simultaneously the 'hero' of the narrative section, spoken of in the third person singular.[142] In this case, Hermes is both the narrator and an internal narratee of the hymn which he sings; that is, he is a narrator who happens to be a god, singing a hymn to and about himself. It is this role, as surrogate narrator, which offers an explanation for the function of the embedded song in the poem as a whole.

Hermes' abortive hymn to himself is immediately followed by an account of his theft of Apollo's cattle (64–153), one of the most famous and spectacular episodes in the mythical traditions surrounding the god. It is striking that his immediate action following the failure of his self-praise is to go and do something extremely worthy of song commemoration, as if he becomes aware that he cannot perform a complete or successful hymn to himself until he has done something wonderful to sing about. What he has achieved with his hymn is a more flattering prelude to which his mythical narrative may be

140 In fact the way that Hermes later hides the lyre in his swaddling clothes suggests that his performance and invention are still meant to be a secret.
141 Cf. Ritook (1989): 335, Clay (1989): 138–143, Vergados (2007a): 90–4, 98–100 for the effect of Hermes' song on Apollo and the implications this has for the role of song within the *HHerm.*
142 Nünlist (2004): 36–9.

attached. Hermes' control over song is already established in his earlier speech to the tortoise, where his use of hymnic language prefigures his invention of the lyre. This control is intensified as he re-narrates the same information given in lines 1–16 of the *HHerm.*, casting himself and his mother in a better light by depicting Maia's cave as a luxurious home and her intercourse with Zeus as a loving relationship. As I argued above, the contrast between the two accounts of Hermes' birth, both in terms of Maia's home (and its status) and of Maia's relationship with Zeus, shows that the re-telling of the proem of *HHerm.* in Hermes' own voice in fact constitutes a new, more flattering proem to the remainder of the hymn which follows. The immediate proximity of Hermes' self-sung hymn to the 'mythical narrative' section of the *Hymn* proper allows Hermes to appropriate that narrative for his own proem. It is his own words which more directly introduce the exploit of the cattle. Hermes' attempt to honour himself too early results in a narratological reversal: the narrative section which should have been inside his hymn, in order for it to be successful, actually appears in the main body of the narrative, while the proem of the primary narrator is supplanted by one of the god's own telling.

The two hymnic performances of Hermes, then, show the god increasing in poetic confidence prior to his later, successful performance before Apollo (425–33). Through his proemic speech to the tortoise he determines the subject of the song which follows, that is, he foreshadows and makes possible his invention of the lyre and his performance of the abbreviated hymn (52–62). In more general terms, his speech to the tortoise is programmatic for the importance of song and Hermes' skill in song to the poem as a whole. Hermes' invention of the lyre and subsequent (albeit abortive) 'hymn to Hermes' re-determines the subject-matter of the narrator's *Hymn to Hermes*: Hermes the character seems aware of, and unsatisfied with, the proem provided by the narrator of the *HHerm.* The playful and self-conscious re-write, as it were, of the original proem displays Hermes' skill as a poet and as a self-advertiser; both these talents will be of great importance in

resolving the conflict of the poem as Hermes, the last-born of the Olympians, struggles for honours among the gods.[143] The usurpation of the role of narrator in his own *Homeric Hymn* fits with Hermes' cheeky and covetous behaviour elsewhere in the poem as he steals his brother's cattle and lays claim to Apollo's *timai,* and also reflects positively on the author of the *Hymn to Hermes* as a sophisticated giver of praise.[144] This is not Hermes' last song in the poem, however, as I noted above, it is his final performance which wins the day and which convinces Apollo to give the baby god what he desires.[145]

HHerm. 422-32: The First Theogony

...λύρῃ δ' ἐρατὸν κιθαρίζων
στῆ ῥ' ὅ γε θαρσήσας ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ Μαιάδος υἱὸς
Φοίβου Ἀπόλλωνος, τάχα δὲ λιγέως κιθαρίζων
γηρύετ' ἀμβολάδην, ἐρατὴ δέ οἱ ἵσπετο φωνή,
κραίνων ἀθανάτους τε θεοὺς καὶ γαῖαν ἐρεμνὴν
ὡς τὰ πρῶτα γένοντο καὶ ὡς λάχε μοῖραν ἕκαστος.
Μνημοσύνην μὲν πρῶτα θεῶν ἐγέραιρεν ἀοιδῇ
μητέρα Μουσάων, ἡ γὰρ λάχε Μαιάδος υἱόν·
τοὺς δὲ κατὰ πρέσβιν τε καὶ ὡς γεγάασιν ἕκαστος
ἀθανάτους ἐγέραιρε θεοὺς Διὸς ἀγλαὸς υἱὸς
πάντ' ἐνέπων κατὰ κόσμον, ἐπωλένιον κιθαρίζων.

Hermes' final, successful performance is not a hymn, but a theogony.[146] This is signalled at 427, when having identified the subject-matter as ἀθανάτους τε θεοὺς καὶ γαῖαν ἐρεμνὴν (426), it is made clear that the origins of the gods are to be the theme: ὡς τὰ πρῶτα γένοντο (428). Although the birth of a single deity is also often a subject of hymnic poetry, the plurality of gods here in itself implies theogonic rather than hymnic context, as hymns are usually addressed to one god, or perhaps two closely related gods (e.g. Demeter and Persephone) rather than *all* of the gods, as here.[147] The reference to black earth (426), in this context of divine origins and birth, also signals theogonic poetry: it is, for instance,

143 Last-born within and for the purposes of the plot of the *HHerm.* Cf. Clay (1989): 96–98.
144 See also Thomas (2009): 259, although his phrasing suggests that the god should be flattered to have been presented as the *poet's* "divine double" rather than the other way around.
145 For the role of music in resolving strife in the *HHerm.* and in other poetry see Görgemanns (1976): 121-2.
146 Cf. West (1966): 15; Scheinberg (1979): 22; Haft (1996): 43, calls it "the first theogony".
147 Of the 33 *Hymns*, only 5 can truly be said to have dual subjects (although various gods such as lovers and parents may be mentioned in other hymns) they are: 13, *Demeter and Persephone*, 17 *Dioscuri,* 25 *Muses and Apollo,* 29 *Hestia and Hermes*, 33 *Dioscuroi*, all of whom have special connections with each other in cult tradition.

reminiscent of the role of Gaia as primeval parent in Hesiod's *Theogony*, where she is the second ever being to appear, the foundation of everything else:

> 'Γαῖ' εὐρύστερνος, πάντων ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
> ἀθανάτων οἳ ἔχουσι κάρη νιφόεντος Ὀλύμπου' (*Th.* 117-8).[148]

The concern with relating each god's sphere and how they were allotted it (...ὡς λάχε μοῖραν ἕκαστος, 427) also recalls theogonic method, as the exposition of how the Olympian gods got their honours and spheres of influence is a primary feature of theogonic poetry; so Hesiod announces in the proem that he will sing of ὥς τ' ἄφενος δάσσαντο καὶ ὡς τιμὰς διέλοντο, *Th.* 112.[149] The concern of Hermes to order his song chronologically, emphasized by the framing effect of the descriptive phrases κατὰ πρέσβιν and κατὰ κόσμον around lines 430-2, which summarize the rest of his song, also implies a Theogonic context; thus Hesiod's *Theogony* is arranged to proceed ἐξ ἀρχῆς (115) in an organized and genealogically chronological fashion.

As with the earlier song at 52-62, Hermes' 'theogony' is carefully introduced and closed off in the narrative. It begins with an elaborate introduction at 418-25 which describes Hermes playing the lyre and the effect of the music upon the listening Apollo, before the song itself is described at 426-33. The verbs for singing and/or honouring continue into the description of the song: so, at line 426 (at which point song proper specifically enters this previously instrumental performance) Hermes is described as singing a prelude (γηρύετ' ἀμβολάδην) and mention is made of the sound of his voice. This is

148 Earth is also a second-generation primeval parent in the *Enuma Elish* (the 'Epic of Creation') suggesting her role as a figure near the beginning of creation is traditional in theogonic poetry, although alternatives were obviously possible as she does not appear in the theogonic line of the *Iliad* 14.201, where Ocean and Tethys are mentioned. Cf. Dalley (2000): 233.

149 The acquisition of honours or portions (*timai* and/or *moira*) among the gods is a frequent theme in the *Theogony*, *contra* Clay (1989): 15, who sees this as a function only of the hymns. It is clear from the list of examples from the *Theogony* below, however, that there is no 'gap' between theogonic poetry and epic which hymns can fill – there are too many similarities between hymnic and theogonic poetry for this to be the case. Cf. Hesiod, *Th.* 141 (Zeus receives thunder and thunder-bolt) 203-6 (Aphrodite receives sexual desire as her sphere, N.B. *moira* at 204), 347-8 (Apollo, Rivers have youths as their responsibility, N.B. *moira* again at 348), 381-401 (Zeus promises to appoint honours (*timai*) to the gods, and gives Styx the honour of being the 'oath' of the gods), 413-452 (Hecate receives earth and sea as her *moira* followed by a long discussion of her various *timai*, including influence over kings, assembly meetings and various livestock), 462 (Cronus wants to defend his *timê* of ruling the gods), 490-91 (Cronus is destined to lose his timê at the hands of Zeus), 517-520 (Atlas' *moira* to hold up sky), 789 (a tithe of Ocean allotted to Styx as *moira*) 881-2 (war with the Titans cast as a struggle for honours, *timai*) 885 (Zeus divided honours, *timai*, between the gods).

followed by κραίνων (427), ἐγέραιρεν ἀοιδῇ (429), ἐγέραιρε (432) and finally ἐνέπων (433). Although we do not get an explicitly closural phrase such as the *Odyssean* ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός· (*Od.* 8.83, 8.367, 8.521) the immediate switch to Apollo's delighted reaction in 434-5 and his speech to Hermes make it clear that Hermes' song ends at 433, and there is no sense in which his song remains open-ended. This kind of transition, while superficially less clear-cut than the line used to end each of the songs of Demodocus, leaves no doubt in the audience's minds that the embedded song is over and that the rest of the poem continues in the voice of the primary narrator. Such a transition, effected by the narrator re-asserting his voice with speech-markers or phrases only compatible with the frame-narrative will be seen also in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*.[150] The embedding of Hermes' songs is thus broadly similar to the technique used to describe the songs of Demodocus in the *Odyssey*, which are firmly introduced and closed off with specific markers of indirect speech. The repetition of verbs of singing and honouring throughout the 'theogony' of Hermes serves as a continuing reminder that this is Hermes' composition and does not allow a sense of blurring between narratorial voices (i.e. between the poet-narrator of the *HHerm.* and the character and internal narrator Hermes). As with the earlier song(s), this emphasis on Hermes as the creator of the embedded song increases the poet's own authority, as he reports the words of the divine creator of lyre-sung verse, claiming priority as well as a divine source of knowledge for his art.[151]

The genre of this last song of Hermes is not irrelevant: his previous two 'songs' were both modelled on hymns, so we might wonder why the poet of the *HHerm.* has chosen to have Hermes sing a miniature theogony at this stage in the poem.[152] The relevance of such a subject-matter to the god's actions within the poem must be part of the explanation: Hermes is himself engaged in obtaining his *moira* in the *HHerm.* – this is his, and thus the

150 See below, pp.81-90 for discussion of this.
151 Cf. Vergados (2011): 101 "Hermes is not only the inventor of the instrument but the founder of the hymnic genre".
152 Thomas (2009): 270 notes some correspondences between the language of Hermes' theogony and earlier passages from the poem, however he also notes the essential shift in focus and function here.

poem's, *telos*. Thus the *HHerm.* must be (almost) completed before a thorough theogony can truly be sung, as the accession of Hermes to the pantheon will change the current *status quo*. As Hermes' hymn earlier in the poem was a means of self-authorizing, so the theogony he sings here is similarly self-fulfilling. Jaillard has argued persuasively that the verb κραίνων at line 427 should be translated as "authorizing", in which sense the same verb appears at *HHerm.* 531 and 559.[153] This reading of the verb would fit well with Hermes' behaviour and motivations elsewhere in the poem, and deserves more consideration than is granted it by Richardson in his recent commentary on the hymn: he dismisses the idea because it "gives [Hermes] too much power". However, as is shown by my reading of the earlier speech-acts of Hermes above, appropriating as much power as possible is precisely the god's *modus operandi* throughout the hymn.[154]

The genre of this theogonic embedded song could also be interpreted as the poet's way of engaging in a competitive manner with another genre of hexameter poetry. The poet here advertises the fact that, although he is engaged in the composition of a hymn, he can also compose theogonic poetry, and he can include enough of the necessary elements to achieve audience recognition of the theogonic genre of his miniature song in just a few lines. This technique is also witnessed in the *Odyssey*, where the songs of Demodocus deal variously with hymnic and Trojan War material, which I argued above advertises the poet's capability for such poetic subjects not included in his main narrative.[155]

Unlike his earlier performance, to which there was no witness, the theogony is heard by Apollo, whose reaction is described in detail.[156] The rapturous reaction of Apollo to the song in contrast with the hastily-abandoned hymn of 51-62 seems to confirm this last song

153 Jaillard (2007): 199-204.
154 Richardson (2010): 207.
155 See Burkert in Wright and Jones (eds.) (1997) and above, pp.18-24 for discussion of the songs of Demodocus.
156 Cf. Thomas (2009): 259 "Apollo's reaction to Hermes' second song (a theogony) therefore in part expresses optimisim that *Herm.* will delight its audience."

of Hermes as the climax of his performances. The direct effect the theogony of Hermes has on the plot of the poem means that in the *HHerm.*, unlike in the *Odyssey*, embedded songs are effective rather than digressive in function. Even the earlier, abortive self-hymn can be seen as effective rather than digressive, since it re-introduces the poem in a manner more flattering to the god and immediately precedes the main 'narrative section' of the frame narrative, rather than introducing new, digressory material (contrast, for instance, the lay of Ares and Aphrodite in the *Odyssey*.) Thus song is re-cast by the poet of the *HHerm.* as a means of achieving one's goals as well as a method of memorializing those achievements.

In the *HHerm.,* then, the embedded songs are used as a strategy of praise, for by presenting Hermes as the true inventor of the lyre and the songs sung to the lyre (and thus claiming his superiority over Apollo) the poet achieves a fresh and novel way of praising his chosen god. The songs are also a means of generating poetic authority; the poet claims to know how the lyre was invented and the songs that were first sung upon it. Moreover, by having the god sing within his own hymn the poet implies divine status for his song beyond that merely inspired by the Muses. The poet also exploits the conventions of early Greek hexameter poetry (such as the traditional features of a proem) to great effect in establishing his own poetic authority.

Embedded song is also used as a strategy of praise in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan* (*HPan*), although in this poem the god does not usurp narrative control himself, but is hymned by a divine chorus of nymphs. Their song forms a substantial part of the poem, and is printed in full below (with a few preceding lines for contextualization).

1.2 *THE HOMERIC HYMN TO PAN:* THE SONG(S) OF THE NYMPH CHORUS

σὺν δέ σφιν τότε νύμφαι ὀρεστιάδες λιγύμολποι
φοιτῶσαι πυκνὰ ποσσὶν ἐπὶ κρήνῃ μελανύδρῳ
μέλπονται, κορυφὴν δὲ περιστένει οὔρεος ἠχώ·
δαίμων δ' ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα χορῶν τοτὲ δ' ἐς μέσον ἕρπων
πυκνὰ ποσὶν διέπει, λαῖφος δ' ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφοινὸν
λυγκὸς ἔχει λιγυρῇσιν ἀγαλλόμενος φρένα μολπαῖς
ἐν μαλακῷ λειμῶνι τόθι κρόκος ἠδ' ὑάκινθος
εὐώδης θαλέθων καταμίσγεται ἄκριτα ποίῃ.
ὑμνεῦσιν δὲ θεοὺς μάκαρας καὶ μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον·
οἷόν θ' Ἑρμείην ἐριούνιον ἔξοχον ἄλλων
ἔννεπον ὡς ὅ γ' ἅπασι θεοῖς θοὸς ἄγγελός ἐστι
καί ῥ' ὅ γ' ἐς Ἀρκαδίην πολυπίδακα, μητέρα μήλων,
ἐξίκετ', ἔνθα τέ οἱ τέμενος Κυλληνίου ἐστίν.
ἔνθ' ὅ γε καὶ θεὸς ὢν ψαφαρότριχα μῆλ' ἐνόμευεν
ἀνδρὶ πάρα θνητῷ· θάλε γὰρ πόθος ὑγρὸς ἐπελθὼν
νύμφῃ ἐϋπλοκάμῳ Δρύοπος φιλότητι μιγῆναι·
ἐκ δ' ἐτέλεσσε γάμον θαλερόν, τέκε δ' ἐν μεγάροισιν
Ἑρμείῃ φίλον υἱὸν ἄφαρ τερατωπὸν ἰδέσθαι,
αἰγιπόδην δικέρωτα πολύκροτον ἡδυγέλωτα·
φεῦγε δ' ἀναΐξασα, λίπεν δ' ἄρα παῖδα τιθήνῃ·
δεῖσε γὰρ ὡς ἴδεν ὄψιν ἀμείλιχον ἠϋγένειον.
τὸν δ' αἶψ' Ἑρμείας ἐριούνιος εἰς χέρα θῆκε
δεξάμενος, χαῖρεν δὲ νόῳ περιώσια δαίμων.
ῥίμφα δ' ἐς ἀθανάτων ἕδρας κίε παῖδα καλύψας
δέρμασιν ἐν πυκινοῖσιν ὀρεσκῴοιο λαγωοῦ·
πὰρ δὲ Ζηνὶ καθῖζε καὶ ἄλλοις ἀθανάτοισιν,
δεῖξε δὲ κοῦρον ἑόν· πάντες δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἔτερφθεν
ἀθάνατοι, περίαλλα δ' ὁ Βάκχειος Διόνυσος·
Πᾶνα δέ μιν καλέεσκον ὅτι φρένα πᾶσιν ἔτερψε.
Καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε ἄναξ, ἵλαμαι δέ σ' ἀοιδῇ·
αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς

Before the song of the nymph chorus at *HPan* 27-47, which in itself constitutes a large portion of the *Hymn to Pan*, the scene is set in the description of a dance through the mountains. The interest of the poet of the *HPan* in poetry as a theme of his song is thus made clear even before the nymphs begin their extended song. Already in line 3 the adjective χορογηθέσι[157] indicates the musical theme which will dominate the rest of the poem. Pan is depicted as roaming the countryside in companionship with singing and dancing nymphs, who are specifically singing of *him* (*HPan* 4-7):

157 The reading of West (2003) – the MS alternative χοροήθεσι would still emphasise the musical theme.

αἵ τε κατ᾽ αἰγίλιπος πέτρης στείβουσι κάρηνα
Πᾶν᾽ ἀνακεκλόμεναι νόμιον θεὸν ἀγλαέθειρον 5
αὐχμήενθ᾽, ὃς πάντα λόφον νιφόεντα λέλογχε
καὶ κορυφὰς ὀρέων καὶ πετρήεντα κέλευθα.

Although the verb κέλομαι does not necessarily introduce song, in the context of the nymphs, who are strongly associated with choral performance throughout this poem, it seems likely that a song rather than speech is indicated here.[158] It is important to note that this verb is not exclusively used of speech, since it is found in lyric addresses to gods elsewhere in Greek literature: there is no inherent obstacle to the representation of song in this case, and in fact the occurrence of this particular verb in lyric songs addressed to gods elsewhere supports the identification of this address to Pan as song.[159] The nymphs' song to Pan blurs into the main narrative of the poem (this is a feature which will be repeated in their later song at 27-47): it is not clear in line 5 whether the further details of Pan's attributes are part of their address or an elaboration on their theme spoken by the primary narrator. I would argue that it is deliberately left ambiguous (as it is later in the poem with their main song), since this blurring between the voices of the nymph-choir and the primary narrator increases the authority of the poet, whose singing becomes indistinguishable from that of a divine chorus, and intensifies the praise to the god, since both a human poet and a divine chorus utter his hymn.

If we treat lines 5-7 as an account of what the nymphs sing to Pan, then these lines of the poem begin to look very much like a *mise en abyme*, another hymn to Pan embedded within the larger *HPan.* These lines contain many of the features of the opening section of a hymn: the god is named, with a verb of invocation (Πᾶν᾽ ἀνακεκλόμεναι 5), followed by a list of some of his attributes and spheres of influence, he is the god of pastures, with splendid shaggy hair (νόμιον θεὸν ἀγλαέθειρον | αὐχμήενθ᾽ 5-6). The relative clause introduced in line 6 is also a typical structural feature found near the beginning of many *Homeric*

158 Thomas (2011): 159 also reads this passage as an inset song.
159 Cf. Soph. *OT* 159 and Aes. *Supp.* 591 (both sung addresses to gods), contrast *Il.* 18.391 and *HDem.* 21.

Hymns, usually it introduces the mythical narrative about the god, or as here, is used to introduce details of the god's allotted *timai* and his or her typical haunts.[160] Reading these lines as a *mise en abyme* may offer an explanation for the *HPan*'s highly unusual delay in naming Pan – the poet here has the nymphs re-start his hymn (which did not begin by naming the god) with a proem-in-the-middle very much like that of Hermes at *HHerm.* 51-62.[161] The nymphs here 'correct' the poet who has, most unusually, neglected to name Pan in his opening line – so Hermes 'corrected' the poet of the *HHerm.* in re-performing a more flattering proem for his own hymn. If a song-performance by the nymphs is at least evoked, if not explicitly described here, then their later song (explicitly introduced with the term ὑμνεῦσιν in line 27) is foreshadowed in much the same way as Hermes' final, successful performance at *HHerm.* 425f. is introduced by his proemic hymn earlier in that poem. This more oblique evocation of hymnic performance also foreshadows, right at the beginning of the *HPan,* the blurring between the voices of nymphs and primary narrator which will end the poem (lines 26-47) and creates the impression of continuous and polyphonic choral praise to the god.

In lines 14-18 the musical theme is continued, as Pan's pre-eminence in the performance of music is explicitly mentioned, and comparison is drawn between Pan and a nightingale (16-18):[162]

> ...οὐκ ἂν τόν γε παραδράμοι ἐν μελέεσσιν
> ὄρνις ἥ τ' ἔαρος πολυανθέος ἐν πετάλοισι
> θρῆνον ἐπιπροχέουσ' ἀχέει μελίγηρυν ἀοιδήν.

It is the reference to the bird's exceptional ability for song – indicated by the adjective μελίγηρυν, juxtaposed to the term ἀοιδήν (which usually refers in Homeric poetry to the

160 For the relative pronoun as a structural feature of hymns see e.g. *HH.* 6.2, 9.3, 12.1, 14.3, 18.3; cf. too Janko (1981): 10-11, Richardson (2010): 4.
161 See above, pp. 56-62 for discussion of this.
162 *AHS* 406 "The bird is the nightingale". Germany (2005): 199-200 discusses the comparison and the possibility that it allusively 'echoes' the nightingale at *Od.* 19.518-21. Gemoll (1886): 338 "Es ist natürlich die Nachtigall gemeint."

songs of human or divine bards rather than the music of birds or other animals)[163] which suggests that the bird is used here as a metaphor for the most excellent of singers.[164] The noun θρῆνον explicitly marks the character of her song as mournful lament, a familiar attribute of the nightingale. Hesiod uses the nightingale as a metaphoric representation of the ἀοιδός in his fable of the hawk and the nightingale, and it fulfills the same metapoetic function here.[165]

In the opening lines of the passage quoted above (19-27) Pan is represented as surrounded by the nymphs' music and song, whose connection with song is emphasized by the combination of the adjective λιγύμολποι (19) followed very closely by the unelaborated depiction of their singing (μέλπονται 21). The reference to their chorus in line 22 continues the theme of music, capped by the depiction of Pan "rejoicing in their shrill song" (λιγυρῇσιν ἀγαλλόμενος φρένα μολπαῖς 24). The insistence on the present tense throughout this passage (19-27) in all the verbs and participles creates the impression that the nymphs and Pan are engaged in a constant, never-ending chorus – this is their habitual and recurring pastime. Song is thus identified as the major concern of the god, while his bucolic habitat (also a very important feature of Pan's identity) is emphasized as the location of the chorus, which takes place in a flowery meadow surrounded by mountains (19-21, 25-6).[166]

Within this depiction of an eternal chorus of nymphs is embedded a second motif which shows a self-conscious interest in poetry: the description of Echo at line 21 (κορυφὴν δὲ περιστένει οὔρεος ἠχώ). It is difficult to prove conclusively that Echo is here

163 Cf. for instance *Il.* 24.807 (professional lamenters at a funeral), *Od.* 8.43, 479, 487 (Demodocus). In the other direction, as it were, N.B. that the adjective is applied to human utterance at *Thebaid* fr. 4 (West) Ἄδρηστον μελίγηρυν.
164 As indeed the bird is understood throughout Greek literature. Cf. Hes. *WD* 200-212, Sappho fr. 136, Theognis 939-42, and Aelian *De Natura Animalium* 5.38 with the comments of Nagy (1996): 33-6. For the nightingale as a motif of poetic self-reference in the late 5th century see Barker (2004): 185-204.
165 Cf. West (1978): 204-8. For another interpretation of this passage see also Nelson (1997): 235-247, with the bibliography in her first note.
166 See note 188 below for references to Pan as a bucolic god.

personified as a nymph, rather than the phenomenon.[167] However, the un-personified phenomenon is equally useful for a metapoetic interpretation, of 'echo' signalling allusion, or in an oral context, perhaps reperformance.[168] Echo is placed in the same area as Pan and the chorus of nymphs, in the mountains, where she will echo everything they are about to sing. Echo's presence in the vignette of the chorus thus reflects an interest both in an internal audience for the nymphs' song and in the *HPan*'s reception – does the poet of the *HPan* want his version of the god's birth to be the one which everyone repeats, the authoritative version? The possibility that the *HPan* may allude to the *HHerm.*, which will be discussed below, would open up another meta-poetic interpretation of the presence of Echo, as a tongue-in-cheek marker of the allusiveness of what is to follow – just as Echo repeats what the nymphs say, they 'echo' the *HHerm.*[169]

Of course it is possible to argue that Echo is a traditional figure associated with Pan, and that this in itself justifies her inclusion in the poem; however, it is not clear how early in mythic tradition Echo became associated with Pan, as the *HPan* is potentially one of the earliest sources we have on the matter.[170] It is not enough, given the absence of solid dating criteria, to argue that Echo's 'traditionality' explains her presence. Similarly, the image of a bird singing could be a reminder of the Arcadian associations of Pan with nature and the countryside, but this explanation is also unsatisfactory given the emphasis placed on the bird's ability for song in a competitive context and the place of the nightingale in literature and myth as a metaphor for the poet.

---

167 Germany (2005): 189.
168 *LIMC* s.v. Echo 16 suggests that in artistic sources we cannot be sure of a stable tradition of Echo and Pan depicted together; only this one item, a lamp from Corinth dated c.200 A.D., is certainly identified as showing the couple. The literary tradition of their association is strong but mainly Hellenistic (cf. Germany (2005): 188 n.6 for a list of Hellenistic poetic references to Echo and Pan, esp. Moschus poem 6), although a personified Echo (without Pan) appears at Pindar *Ol.* 14.20-1.
169 Germany (2005) also comments on the double 'echo' here, but he refers to possible allusion to the *Odyssey* rather than another *Homeric Hymn*.
170 This problem is exacerbated by the fact that the date of the *HPan* is difficult to ascertain. Thomas (2011) n.50 also argues that there is no need to see a reference here to Pan's relationship with Echo, pointing out that the first explicit reference to this union in myth is not until Callimachus fr. 685 Pf.

The nymphs begin their performance with a song which looks very much like a theogony. They sing of all the blessed gods and of high Olympus, then narrow their focus to a narrative which is clearly a hymn, and contains many motifs common in the corpus of *Homeric Hymns*: the birth of a god, the relationship between his parents, his appearance when he was born and his accession to Olympus.[171] Although the song is effectively a hymn to Pan, it is initially focused explicitly on Hermes (28-9):

> οἷόν θ' Ἑρμείην ἐριούνιον ἔξοχον ἄλλων
> ἔννεπον ὡς ὅ γ' ἅπασι θεοῖς θοὸς ἄγγελός ἐστιν...

This delay in naming the god who will in fact be the subject of the hymn echoes the opening of the frame narrative itself, since Pan's name does not appear until line 5 of the *HPan*: it is the name of Pan's father Hermes which appears in line 1: Ἀμφί μοι Ἑρμείαο φίλον γόνον ἔννεπε Μοῦσα. This is highly unusual in the *Homeric Hymns,* which seek to name the relevant god as soon as possible.[172] With this unique retardation, the poet chooses to emphasize the paternal relationship of Hermes and Pan.[173] This emphasis on Hermes (an established god already according to this hymn) as Pan's father could simply be a strategy of praise – similarly, Hermes wishes everyone to know that his father is Zeus in the *HHerm.*, since this relationship with the more famous god is one of his most impressive attributes.[174]

Unlike the miniature hymn to Hermes (*HHerm.* 51-64), the nymphs' song takes up a substantial portion of the whole hymn – it is preceded by a formulaic opening and an extended description of the chorus which in itself contains several motifs strongly evocative of song-performance and the musical theme. Their song is clearly introduced and

171 We might compare the *HHerm.* and indeed *HH* 18 (also to Hermes) which deals with the god's birth, his parent's relationship and his accession to Olympus. Cf. Sowa (1984): 147-197 for an extensive treatment of this theme in the *Homeric Hymns*, Janko (1981): 13 "Many myths include the birth of the deity – thirteen out of twenty examples do so".
172 Of all the 33 *Homeric Hymns* only two (*H.*14 (to the Mother of the Gods) and *HPan*) do not begin with the god's name in the first line. I discount *HH.* 1 (to Dionysus) in this statement due to its badly damaged state. Cf. Thomas (2011): 153.
173 This emphasis on Hermes has also been read as a marker of allusion – the poet of the *HPan* is signalling his close and competitive relationship with the *HHerm.* Cf. pp. 75-81 below for discussion of the possible allusion between the *HPan* and the *HHerm.* and see also Janko (1982): 185, Thomas (2009): 297-99, Thomas (2011): 165-70.
174 Cf. *HHerm.* 57, where Hermes chooses this fact to begin his self-hymn.

differentiated from the frame narrative with the verb ὑμνεῦσιν (27) followed by two further markers of reported speech: a second verb of speaking (ἔννεπον) and an introductory ὡς (both in 29). After this fairly clearly articulated opening, however, the markers of indirect discourse drop away as the song proceeds, stylistically at least, as if it were narrative in the voice of the poet. We have seen this technique already in the second song of Demodocus, where the middle section of the narrative of Ares and Aphrodite lacked markers of indirect speech and thus appeared identical to the style of the frame narrative.[175] However, in the case of Demodocus (and also in both of Hermes' songs in the *HHerm.*) the end of his songs and the return to the voice of the primary narrator is always specifically indicated, leaving no doubt as to the extent of the embedded songs within these poems. In the *HPan* we get no such closure. If we compare the end of the *HPan* briefly with the endings of some other embedded songs the contrast is clear.

> ...πάντες δ' ἄρα θυμὸν ἔτερφθεν 45
> ἀθάνατοι, περίαλλα δ' ὁ Βάκχειος Διόνυσος·
> Πᾶνα δέ μιν καλέεσκον ὅτι φρένα πᾶσιν ἔτερψε.
> Καὶ σὺ μὲν οὕτω χαῖρε ἄναξ, ἵλαμαι δέ σ' ἀοιδῇ·
> αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ καὶ σεῖο καὶ ἄλλης μνήσομ' ἀοιδῆς. (*HPan* 45-9)
>
> ταῦτ' ἄρ' ἀοιδὸς ἄειδε περικλυτός (*Od.* 8.83)
>
> καὶ τὰ μὲν οὖν ἤειδε, τὰ δὲ φρεσὶν ἄλλα μενοίνα. (*HHerm.* 62-4)

In the *HPan*, we get no specific statement that the nymphs' song is over; rather the poem ends immediately after Pan's climactic accession to Olympus and naming ceremony, and is left with only the formulaic closing lines familiar from almost all of the *Homeric Hymns*.[176] Even these final two lines of the poem are not in themselves incompatible with a choral performance, since the choruses of tragedy and Pindar often use the first person singular.[177] With nothing conclusively separating their song from the end of the poem, it is the nymphs' voices with which the audience are left with at the close of the poem, uncorrected, as it

175 See above, pp. 18-24 for discussion of this passage.
176 Cf., e.g., χαῖρε, ἄνασσα, θεὰ λευκώλενε, δῖα Σελήνη, | πρόφρον, ἐϋπλόκαμος· (*HH* 32.17–18); χαῖρε, θεά, Κύπροιο ἐϋκτιμένης μεδέουσα· | σεῦ δ' ἐγω ἀρξάμενος μεταβήσομαι ἄλλον ἐς ὕμνον (*HAph.* 292–3); also *HH* 3.545–6, 4.579–80, 5.292–3, 6.19–21, 7.58–9, 9.7–8, 10.4–6, 11.5,13.3, 14.6, 15.9, 16.5, 18.12, 19.48–9, 21.5, 22.6–7, 25.6–7, 26.11–13, 27.21–2, 28.17–8, 29.13–4, 30.17–19, 31.17–19, 33.18–19.
177 For this choral "I" see note 347 below.

were, by the voice of the poet. Their divine choral praise of Pan blends with the voice of the primary narrator who began his hymn with a beautifully evocative description of their choral activities. This narrative blurring extends the technique of embedded songs beyond that seen in the *HHerm.* or the *Odyssey*, where blurring of narratorial voices may take place *during* an embedded song, but the inset song as a unit is nonetheless strongly separated from the frame narrative by use of markers of indirect speech at its beginning and end. The poet of the *HPan* achieves an obvious benefit from this blurring since it increases both the value of his praise of the god through association with divine songs of praise, and also increases his own poetic authority.

The nymph chorus also allows the poet to include a song from outside the time-frame of his main 'narrative section' (which shows Pan haunting the mountains and woods and rejoicing in the nymphs' various performances). Their song, as with many embedded narratives, is an analepsis, telling of Pan's conception and birth. The question of authority is also a pertinent one in this particular aspect, since the poet is narrating theogonic matters, which are outside ordinary human knowledge he uses the nymph chorus to guarantee the veracity and accuracy of his account. In this light, the presence of Pan as an internal audience to this choral hymn should not be forgotten. His delighted reaction to the nymphs' songs is emphasized just before their account of his birth, (λιγυρῇσιν ἀγαλλόμενος φρένα μολπαῖς 24). Although his presence is not re-asserted later in the poem, his approval of the nymphs and delight in their songs underwrites all that follows, confirming the success of the *HPan* in achieving its goal of pleasing the god before this hope has even been mentioned.

The inset song in the *HPan* differs in an important respect from those already discussed in the *HHerm.* While the poet of the *HHerm.* has a single singer embedded within his poem, the *HPan* is partially narrated by an explicitly female chorus who are

dancing while they sing. The different choice of internal narrator has a significant impact on the effect which the device has in each case. The *HHerm.* attributes the first hymn and first theogony to Hermes as a baby, allowing Hermes to aggrandize himself through song, and fulfilling his characterization as a precocious god who appropriates everything he can for himself. Song in the *HHerm.*, placed in the hands of a god who wants to climb the divine social ladder, is the factor which defines and stabilizes divine identity and status.

The *HPan* depicts a quite different scenario, a chorus spontaneously honouring their god, in an Arcadian setting typical of that god. By placing part of the narrative section of his hymn into the mouths of the nymph chorus, the poet evokes a very different act of song, that of a maiden chorus at a cult festival, such as those described by Alcman in his *Parthenaia.*[178] Such an effect is achieved also in the *HAp.,* where the song of the Delian maidens at the festival of Apollo is described (155-164). It is possible that an echo of a festival of Pan, in which maidens would sing his praise and dance in a chorus, is being evoked here. However, the nymphs can also be associated with the Muses, who are frequently depicted singing in a divine chorus in early Greek hexameter poetry, notably in the proem to Hesiod's *Theogony* and in the *HAp.*188-206.[179] Furthermore, the presence in the poem of the nymphs adds the final layer to a narrative which is rich in varying voices: the external narrator, Pan's own music, the Nightingale, Echo and the nymphs all have a say in this poem, which gives it a complex layer of polyphony, perfectly appropriate for a god associated with musical revels, the companion of Echo and the inventor of the syrinx.

ALLUSION OR TRADITIONAL REFERENTALITY: THE *HHERM.* WITHIN THE *HPAN*

178 Cf. Alc. Fr.1 *PMGF.*
179 Such an association can only deepen the poetic authority gained by portraying the nymph chorus. Cf. also *Il.* 1.604f., *HAp.*186-206. For the role of nymphs as Pan's dancing and singing companions see Larson (2001): 31-4, 96-8.

The unusual emphasis on Hermes in the *HPan* has led critics to look for connections between this poem and the *HHerm.* And indeed, similarities are not hard to find. For the first 7 lines of the nymphs' song (after their theogonic opening), it appears that they too are singing a hymn to Hermes, since their opening statements are highly similar to the opening lines of the *HHerm.* itself:

> οἷόν θ' Ἑρμείην **ἐριούνιον** ἔξοχον ἄλλων
> ἔννεπον ὡς ὅ γ' ἅπασι θεοῖς θοὸς **ἄγγελός** ἐστι
> καί ῥ' ὅ γ' ἐς **Ἀρκαδίην** πολυπίδακα, **μητέρα μήλων**,
> ἐξίκετ', ἔνθα τέ οἱ τέμενος **Κυλληνίου** ἐστίν (*HPan* 28-31)

> Ἑρμῆν ὕμνει Μοῦσα Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱόν,
> **Κυλλήνης** μεδέοντα καὶ **Ἀρκαδίης πολυμήλου**,
> **ἄγγελον** ἀθανάτων **ἐριούνιον**... (*HHerm.* 1-3)[180]

This dense cluster of formulaic attributes and the reference to Cyllene signals a hymn to Hermes in both cases: yet what follows in the *HPan* is not a hymn to Hermes, but an account of the birth of Pan. The similarity between the *HPan* and the *HHerm.* continues in the following lines, in which the nymphs begin to sing of the desire of Hermes for the nymph daughter of Dryops, and his union with her. Similarly, in the *HHerm.*, Hermes sings (51-62) of his parents' union, and this relationship is also described in the opening lines of the poem (3-5, 33-4). Thus the audience might expect that a hymn to Hermes would follow the nymphs' introduction. It seems that by setting up this false introduction to Hermes (and indeed also by the focus on Hermes in line 1 of the *HPan*), the poet is deliberately playing with audience expectations – the focus will shift to Pan, once he is born.

Several scholars have argued that these verbal correspondences are evidence of an intertextual, or at least closely allusive relationship between the *HHerm.* and the *HPan.*[181] However, these largely formulaic similarities alone are not enough to establish whether or not the *HPan* is specifically alluding to the *HHerm.* and setting his hymn up in competition

180 Thomas (2011): 165-6 prints these same correspondences, after Janko (1982): 185.
181 Janko (1982): 185 "the opening of *Herm* provides a literary *terminus ante quem*, as it has influenced 28ff." Cf. too Thomas (2011): 165-70.

with the earlier poem.[182] Indeed, a comparison with the other extant *Homeric Hymn* to Hermes (*HH* 18) undermines the idea that the *HPan* is alluding directly to the *HHerm.*

> Ἑρμῆν ἀείδω Κυλλήνιον Ἀργειφόντην
> **Κυλλήνης μεδέοντα καὶ Ἀρκαδίης πολυμήλου,**
> **ἄγγελον ἀθανάτων ἐριούνιον** ὃν τέκε Μαῖα
> Ἄτλαντος θυγάτηρ Διὸς ἐν φιλότητι μιγεῖσα
> αἰδοίη· (*HH 18.*1-5).[183]

The recurrence of a set of very similar terms in *HH.*18 1-5 would suggest that the poet is rather using his audience's awareness of the traditional epithets, locales and attributes of Hermes in hexameter hymns to misdirect their expectations and create a novel, surprising introduction to his own hymn to Pan, since there is nothing to suggest that he should be alluding in particular to the *HHerm.* as opposed to *HH.* 18, or indeed merely using traditional language in the way I have suggested. The effect of this deliberate and self-conscious misdirection is more than simply to create an innovative opening, however. If we read the nymphs' song as beginning in the fashion of a hymn to Hermes, then the figure of Pan usurps their hymn, appropriating for himself the praise which initially seems directed at his father. His birth from Hermes' union with Dryops' daughter transforms the hymn, the climax of which is now the accession of Pan to Olympus and the joyous reaction of the older gods at his arrival. Indeed, if we read the nymphs' song as *structurally* (if not actually) a hymn to Hermes (in that its introduction and first part of its narrative are focused on this god, and not on Pan), then Pan's conception and birth are cast as the "achievement" of Hermes deemed worthy to form the narrative section of his hymn, the action which defines him as a god in the same way as the cattle-theft or invention of lyre function in the *HHerm.* This, of course, is directed ultimately at praising Pan, who is lauded as his father's proudest achievement as well as portrayed as the darling of all Olympus.

---

182 Although scholars disagree on the dates of the two poems, the general consensus seems to be that, whatever the specific dates of each poem may be, *HPan* is later than *HHerm.*: Janko (1982): 36-41, 185 Thomas (2011): 169 and also Thomas (2009): 297-9 (On *HHerm.* and *HPan*) and 20-9 (on *HHerm.*), Càssola (1997): 364. Of course this uncertainty of dating makes all conclusions on the dependence of one poem on another vulnerable but this should be no barrier to reasoned speculation.

183 Words in bold show close association or repetition in both *HPan* and *HHerm.*, while underlined portions correspond only to the *HHerm.*

These two poems share similarities on a more general level than the verbal echoes set out above. Pan, like his father in the *HHerm.*, is a precociously developed child, born with a fully-grown beard (ἠϋγένειον, 39); his divine nature is clear in the reaction he inspires in his nurse, who is terrified and runs away (φεῦγε δ' ἀναΐξασα, λίπεν δ' ἄρα παῖδα τιθήνη, 38).[184] During the course of the nymphs' song Pan is brought to Olympus for the first time to be introduced to the other gods, as is Hermes in the *HHerm.* However, there are also important differences between the poems in terms of plot: almost immediately after his birth Pan is warmly received on Olympus and named by the gods. He thus achieves, seemingly without conscious effort, the status which Hermes has to strive and bargain for in the *HHerm.* (yet another strategy of praise!)[185] While Hermes is overtly concerned with receiving *timai* in the *HHerm.*, openly discussing which attributes he wishes to steal from his brother Apollo, Pan's attributes are not actively given to him within the *HPan.*[186] Some of his characteristics are hinted at, however: his physical description as a bestial god (36) and the hare-skin garment given to him by his father (43) both indicate his rural sphere and imply too his animal aspect as a half-human, half-beast deity. His association with fear is shown in the Nurse's terror when she beholds him, while his connection with Dionysiac ritual is hinted at in the glancing reference to Dionysus' particular joy at his birth (46).[187]

---

184 The human terror that is caused by divine epiphany is a minor motif of the *Homeric Hymns.* Cf. *HDem.* 281-2 (Metaneira fears Demeter's wrath), *HAph.* 182 (Anchises fears Aphrodite), *HH.* 7.47-9 (Sailors flee Dionysus). Cf. Faulkner (2008) *ad loc.* and 93-90, 234-6, Richardson (1974): 251-53.

185 This in itself could be seen as a competitive strategy similar to that used by the poet of the *HHerm.* who seeks to praise the god by implying that it was originally Hermes and not Apollo who invented the lyre. So the poet of the *HPan* (if an awareness of the *HHerm.* is accepted) has Pan acknowledged by a loving father and immediately ascending to Olympus, a clear one-upmanship in comparison with Hermes in the *HHerm.* Of course, if the poet of the *HPan* was not aware of the *HHerm.* then the contrast may be coincidental, but the general contrastive effect may still be felt, since the quest for honour is still typical – cf. Sowa (1984): 147-97.

186 Cf. *HHerm.(inter alia)* 173-4, 491-5.

187 For Pan as the god of goatherds and shepherds and his Arcadian locale cf. Pindar Fr. 95 *SM*, for his worship in the mountains cf. Soph.*Aj.* 694ff., for his half-human, half-goat form most sources are Hellenistic and later (see comments by Boardman in *LIMC* v.8.1 p.940) although he is represented with a goat's head on the name-vase of the Pan Painter (c.470 BC, Boston 10.185, *LIMC* s.v. Priapos 6) and a *skyphos* by the Penthesilea Painter (c.460 BC, Boston 01.8032, *LIMC* s.v. Aphrodite 1158). Some early sources associate him more generally with a semi-bestial form, in Pindar fr.95-96 he is a polymorphic dog; for Pan as the originator of a kind of divine terror cf. Eur.*Rhes.* 36f., Paus. 10.23.7; as a Dionysiac reveller cf. a krater fragment dated 490 B.C. (*LIMC* s.v. Pan 4, Amsterdam 2117). This Dionysiac association, along with Pan's theriomorphism will reach their zenith in the Hellenistic period.

Despite these differences of nuance, there are obvious general parallels in the story-patterns of the two poems: both hymns detail the birth of a new god, parented by a male god who is already a member of the Pantheon who has slept with a rural-dwelling nymph; in both hymns the baby is prodigious, giving signs of his divinity immediately; again, in both, the child is brought to Olympus and received by the gods. This similarity in the general movement of the story could potentially also suggest an allusive relationship between the poems. However, the birth of a god and his accession to Olympus is a common theme of theogonic and hymnic poetry.[188] Given the uncertainty in the date of these two poems, any firm conclusions would perhaps be rash. If the *HPan* is Hellenistic then an intertext with the *HHerm.* or another poem is not problematic, but if we allow an earlier date for Pan, it seems much more likely that these similarities are a product of the traditional themes inherent in oral-derived poetry rather than a deliberate attempt on the part of the poet of the *HPan* to allude to his predecessor. Although the close verbal similarities between the two poems are superficially impressive, the language is traditional in tone and could easily be a coincidence of shared formulaic language used when referring to the same god in different hexameter hymns. What the poet does seem to be doing is using a traditional set of epithets and terminology typical of hexameter hymns to Hermes in order to misdirect his audience to achieve the effects discussed above – he need not necessarily be alluding to the extant *HHerm.* in order to be capable of composing poetry in this self-conscious and sophisticated manner. After using these traditional elements taken from traditional hymn(s) to Hermes, he then surprises his audience (twice) with a hymn to Pan.[189]

There is one further potential index of allusion between the *HPan* and the *HHerm.* which should be considered. In both these hymns there are embedded songs. These inset songs are performed in praise of the very god to whom the main *Hymn* is addressed (and

188 Sowa (1984): 147-197; cf. also 283 where she gives a useful scheme of the theme, termed "the young god consolidates his power".
189 As the poet of the *HHerm.* uses his audience's awareness of traditional proemic forms to re-introduce the poem with an inset proem sung by Hermes. On the generic conventions of the *HH* see Clay (2011): 232-253.

indeed in both poems divinites are portrayed as singing theogonies also). This is striking, and raises the question of whether the (almost certainly) later *HPan* has appropriated this motif from the *HHerm.* This would effectively be a kind of 'narratological allusion', with the later poet alluding not only to the specific words used by another poet but to an unusual poetic and narrative device used in the earlier poem. Embedded songs are not as straightforwardly vulnerable to the objection of traditionality as the other two possible indices of allusion between these poems, for the device, although found in several instances in Greek hexameter poetry, is not so common as to be unremarkable.

Indeed the development of the device in the *HPan* as compared to the *HHerm.* could be suggestive of a playful and competitive allusive relationship: not only does the *HPan* extend the range of the blurring technique already found in the *Odyssey* and the *HHerm.*, but could also be seen to re-work the function of embedded song as found in the *HHerm.* Hermes' hymn to himself is (as has been noted above) abortive – he has not yet done anything which he can sing about – and the following narrative in the poet's voice supplies the missing portion of Hermes' hymn. By containing the climactic narrative portion of his hymn within the embedded section sung by the nymphs, the poet of the *HPan* makes his embedded hymn a success – he needs to add nothing to the nymphs' song. In the *HHerm.*, it was argued above, the theogony which Hermes sings at 425f. is a statement of his own place in the divine world, and clearly implies that a theogony could not have been sung before this time since such a poem would not have been complete without Hermes. If we were to accept that the *HPan* is alluding to the *HHerm.* here, the birth of Pan and his accession to Olympus disrupts the completeness claimed by the *HHerm.*; using the same story-pattern, the *HPan* adds to, or 'corrects' the *HHerm.*, by implying that Hermes' theogony was premature, as Pan deserves and here receives a place within a divine cosmogony.

Whether or not we can argue for narratological allusion between the *HHerm.* and the *HPan* depends on how traditional the motif of embedded song(s) is in early Greek hexameter poetry. Were it possible to show that the very inclusion of an embedded song in a hexameter poem is in fact a traditional element on a par, let us say, with the story-pattern of the birth of a god and his accession to power, or even on a par with the traditional type scenes familiar from the Homeric epics such as arming scenes, then the *HPan* could not be said to be alluding to the *HHerm.*, but rather re-deploying a traditional element of early Greek hexameter poetry in constructing his own praise poem to the god.[190] The traditionality of this motif cannot effectively be assessed until the remaining examples of embedded song in the *Homeric Hymns* and indeed in the poetry of Hesiod have been considered. However, we may foreshadow our later discussion: embedded songs do not appear to be formulaic devices marked by the repetition of set words or phrases, in the manner of the type-scenes such as arming or cooking in the Homeric poems, since we can see in the examples from the *HHerm.* and the *HPan* that various words for introducing and closing the embedded songs are employed in the different poems, with no fixed phrases used, and the content of the embedded song obviously varies entirely between examples.[191] We will thus return to this question of the traditionality of embedded songs within early Greek hexameter poetry after the following discussion of the motif's further instances.

1.3 THE *HOMERIC HYMN TO APOLLO*: (IM)MORTAL SONG

The *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*'s depiction of a chorus of Delian maidens has inspired almost as much scholarship as the songs of Demodocus, to the extent that it might be

190 Cf. Sowa (1984): 15-16 for a discussion of type-scenes and themes in the *Homeric Hymns*. She acknowledges that differentiation between a type-scene and a larger story pattern or theme is often difficult, but offers a very useful definition of each component.

191 *HHerm.* 54 θεὸς δ' ὑπὸ καλὸν ἄειδεν, 62 καὶ τὰ μὲν οὖν ἤειδε; 425-6 τάχα δὲ λιγέως κιθαρίζων | γηρύετ' ἀμβολάδην, ἐρατὴ δέ οἱ ἕσπετο φωνή, 434 παντ' ἐνέπων κατὰ κόσμον, ὑπωλένιον κιθαρίζων. *HPan* 27 ὑμνέουσιν δὲ θεοὺς μάκαρας καὶ μακρὸν Ὄλυμπον. Of course, this is not the only model of traditionality.

thought that there was little left to say about this famous passage.[192] However, this discussion will tread relatively new ground in its focus on the particular techniques of embedding, and on the relationship of this embedded song both to the other songs in this hymn and to the inset songs found elsewhere in the *Homeric Hymns*. Similar themes of poetic authority and strategies of hymnic praise are raised by the embedded songs in this poem, although in contrast to the *HHerm.* and the *HPan*, the focus on *human* praise in the first embedded song of the *HAp.* creates different nuances from the divine songs of praise in these other *Hymns*.

πρὸς δὲ τόδε μέγα θαῦμα, ὅου κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται
κοῦραι Δηλιάδες Ἑκατηβελέταο θεράπναι·
αἵ τ' ἐπεὶ ἂρ πρῶτον μὲν Ἀπόλλων' ὑμνήσωσιν,
αὖτις δ' αὖ Λητώ τε καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιραν,
μνησάμεναι ἀνδρῶν τε παλαιῶν ἠδὲ γυναικῶν
ὕμνον ἀείδουσιν, θέλγουσι δὲ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων.
πάντων δ' ἀνθρώπων φωνὰς καὶ κρεμβαλιαστὺν
μιμεῖσθ' ἴσασιν· φαίη δέ κεν αὐτὸς ἕκαστος
φθέγγεσθ'· οὕτω σφιν καλὴ συνάρηρεν ἀοιδή.
ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ἱλήκοι μὲν Ἀπόλλων Ἀρτέμιδι ξύν,
χαίρετε δ' ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι· (*HAp.* 156-166)

The song(s) of the Delian maidens are introduced and set apart from the frame narrative with words for singing (ὑμνήσωσιν, 158; ὕμνον ἀείδουσιν, 162), while the end of the description of their performance is closed off with the type of transition already familiar from *HHerm.* 434-5: the primary narrator ends the focus on their song and excellent singing abilities by first commenting on the quality of their song (οὕτω σφιν καλὴ συνάρηρεν ἀοιδή 164) and then by addressing the maidens directly (χαίρετε δ' ὑμεῖς πᾶσαι 165), thus making it clear that what follows is his own, and not their, song. The vocabulary used of their singing again indicates a certain imprecision of ancient song terminology: while they *hymn* Apollo and the other gods, as we would expect, the use of ὕμνον ἀείδουσιν and later ἀοιδή (164) for their epic and mimetic songs shows the terminological flexibility. Their song never blurs into the main narrative as in the *HPan* or Demodocus' song of Ares and Aphrodite: the narrator retains his voice throughout.

192 Cf. *inter alia* Marx (1907): 619-20, Sale (1961): 75-89, Miller (1979): 173 -186 and Miller (1986): 57-65, Graziosi (2002): 63-66, Peponi (2009): 39-70, Stehle (1997): 182-5, Wilamowitz (1920): 450-2.

This choral song is wide-ranging, beginning with what looks like a hymn to Apollo and his closest relations among the gods, Artemis and Leto. The girls also perform what seems to be epic poetry, singing of ἀνδρῶν τε παλαιῶν ἠδὲ γυναικῶν (160).[193] Their mimetic ability is praised, in a line that seems to suggest that the girls' song could be mistaken for the speech of those around them (164).[194] The performance of the Delian girls is part of a wider description of the festival on Delos (*HAp.* 144-54), rich in details of the participants, people's appearances, and the events held. Given that the *Homeric Hymns* purport to be oral performances at festivals of the relevant god, we might wonder why the (or better, *an*) oral performance context is so deliberately embedded within the poem, since the audience would have been aware of the nature of the festival they were attending.[195] However, the conversation between the narrator and the girls that follows their song gives one clue to why the *HAp.* encodes its own performance within itself. The speaker asks the maidens to praise him, and in return, he will carry their fame abroad (174-5):

> ἡμεῖς δ' ὑμέτερον κλέος οἴσομεν ὅσσον ἐπ' αἶαν
> ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις εὖ ναιεταώσας·

The speaker envisages many future re-performances of the words he has just sung at 157-64, since he will tell men across the world of the excellence of the Delian girls' chorus. Thus in the *HAp.* the presence of a supposedly historical ritual context is actually the creation of a timeless ritual song which can be enacted anywhere the poem is re-performed, and which encodes within itself the essential character and flavour of the (notional) original.[196] The frame narrative, a solo hymn, is imbued with the qualities of a communal ritual performance.

193 *AHS* (1936): 224, Richardson (2010): 107, Sale (1961): 87.
194 These lines have provoked much debate; cf. Calame (2011): 350-2. Peponi (2009): 39-70, Bing (1993): 194-6 and Richardson (2010) *ad loc.* for discussion of the several interpretations of this problematic description.
195 On the difficulty of establishing a performance context of the *Hymns* see Clay (1989): 3-16, Richardson (2010): 2-3, Bremer (1981): 212. Garcia (2002): 5-39 argues that despite this difficulty, the *HH* should still be seen as having a clear ritual function.
196 Cf. Clay (1989): 52 where she refers to the narrator's promise to celebrate the Delian maidens as a promise to disseminate "a portable version of the composition performed on Delos".

Such an evocation of a representational performance context within a hymn is a technique more readily associated with the hymns of Callimachus than the *Homeric Hymns*. But whereas the Callimachean hymns seek to re-create an absent performance context for poetry that is written (at least for the most part) to be *read*, the *HAp.* evokes another type of oral performance within itself, appropriating the authority and effect of a female ritual chorus to augment its praise to the god.[197] The song of the Delian girls is depicted as part of a recurring festival for Apollo, a traditional event held at Delos. The maidens' song in honour of Apollo contained within the *HAp.* adds to the depth of praise for the god in much the same way as the nymph chorus functions in the *HPan*, although there is an important difference of nuance in the *HAp.*, since the authority of the Delian maidens comes from their ritual role as a female chorus (and their excellence in song), rather than their divinity.[198]

Despite the fairly abbreviated description of their song (in comparison with the performances of Hermes and the nymphs in the hymns discussed above), it is still possible to identify the inherent possibility of further effects of embedding – for instance their song contains an analeptic narrative, telling of the men and women of old, which implies an intriguing connection between hymnic and heroic poetry, postulating the same performance context and performer(s) for both. This interest in other genres of song beyond that of the frame narrative is characteristic of embedded songs, as we saw with Hermes' theogony above.

197 On this performative fictionality in the Callimachean Hymns cf. Bulloch (1985): 3-13, esp. 5 "The *Bath of Pallas* is not a hymn written for a ritual but a literary poem skillfully designed to create the illusion of a ceremony being performed, on the same phenomenon in the Callimachean fragments see Depew (1992): 313-30. Cf. also Bulloch (1977): 97-123. For this interest of Hellenistic poets in creating "performance" contexts for their written works, see Chapter 3 below.

198 For the festival on Delos see Richardson (2010): 104, Nilsson (1906): 144-49, Parker (1996): 151. For the authority of the female chorus see Swift (2010): 173-240; Calame (2001): 7-18, 141-69 and *idem* (1994): 25-40 discusses the functions of female choruses outside the *parthenaion*.

The maidens' festival performance is quickly followed by a performance of the Muses led by Apollo himself, whose prowess in musical performance becomes the topic of the hymn at line 182, only a few verses after the narrator has made his promise to the maidens that he will carry their fame abroad (174-6). The significance of the contiguity between the human and divine song (linked already by their close association in each case with Apollo), and the connections between these two performances, have been underestimated. The divine performance will be seen to echo the human one: as the human maidens (and the narrator) sing of the gods, so the gods sing of humans.[199] The shift from human to divine performers in this second song offers a different perspective on the human relationship with the gods from that seen in the religious worship at Delos in the earlier choral song.

SPLENDID ISOLATION

αὐτίκα δ' ἀθανάτοισι μέλει κίθαρις καὶ ἀοιδή.
Μοῦσαι μέν θ' ἅμα πᾶσαι ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ
ὑμνεοῦσίν ῥα θεῶν δῶρ' ἄμβροτα ἠδ' ἀνθρώπων 190
τλημοσύνας, ὅσ' ἔχοντες ὑπ' ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι
ζώουσ' ἀφραδέες καὶ ἀμήχανοι, οὐδὲ δύνανται
εὑρέμεναι θανάτοιό τ' ἄκος καὶ γήραος ἄλκαρ· (*HAp.* 188-93)

The song of the Muses is introduced by an elaborate description of Apollo playing the lyre as he ascends to Olympus, in particular the beautiful sound of the instrument is emphasized (184-5):

τοῖο δὲ φόρμιγξ
χρυσέου ὑπὸ πλήκτρου καναχὴν ἔχει ἱμερόεσσαν.

The immediate reaction of the gods to Apollo's arrival also implies that his playing is extremely compelling, irresistible even, since they are described as "immediately" (αὐτίκα 188) turning their attention to the *cithara* and to song. This contextualization of the divine

199 Richardson (2010): 111 observes that "the elaborate description of celebration mirrors the scene of the Delian festival": I would argue that the contrasts between this divine performance and the preceding human one are more meaningful than their similarities.

song can indeed be aligned with the detailed festival-description to which the song of the Delian maidens forms the climax. Both songs are given fully realized settings and internal audiences.

As with the song of the maidens, the song-vocabulary used shows the flexibility available to an early Greek hexameter poet – the Muses' song is introduced with ὑμνέουσιν, although their topic includes mortals as well as gods, and is also described with the participle ἀμειβόμεναι which implies an amoebaean or antiphonal structure.[200] The paratactic closural technique familiar from the *HHerm.* is employed to end their song – the narrator begins to describe the wider scene, including the dancing and the response of the divine audience, before returning to his praise of Apollo directly.

The Muses' song is concerned with the contrast between gods and mortals: the gods have δῶρ' ἄμβροτα (190) and are immortal, while men are doomed to death (193-4). Mankind suffers toil which is specifically said to be sent from or caused by the gods, a disquieting statement in a divine song, since the gods, the cause of human pain, view accounts of this suffering as entertainment for the divine audience on Olympus (note the reaction of Zeus and Leto: οἱ δ' ἐπιτέρπονται θυμὸν μέγαν 204). Man seems almost to be criticized for his failure to surmount death in the adjectives ἀφραδέες καὶ ἀμήχανοι (192), and this portrayal is sharply contrasted with the beautiful scene of musical revelry on Olympus in the following lines (194-203), where no disjointed element is permitted. This is emphasized by the description of Artemis (οὔτ' αἰσχρὴ μεταμέλπεται οὔτ' ἐλάχεια 197), where the negative formulation serves to point the difference between gods and the wretched mortals of the earlier lines. The idealized beauty of the divine chorus and of the introduction to this song of the Muses (where Apollo's lyre-playing is evocatively described) only makes its human focus more pointed.

200 Cf. Richardson (2010): 113.

The function of song in ensuring the fame of mortals is a theme of epic from the *Iliad* onwards, and here we see it in operation both in the song of the Delian maidens (who *remember* men and women of olden times (160)), and here in the Muses' song which seems almost entirely focused on mortal affairs, for the θεῶν δῶρ' ἄμβροτα (190) appear only as a foil to the extensive suffering of mankind. There is some irony in this presentation of an immortal song with mortal subjects, who supposedly cannot find "a cure for death or a remedy for old age" and yet through a place in the song of the Muses can and do defeat both. This song of the Muses and description of a divine chorus is set as a contrastive doublet to that of the Delian maidens: both choruses sing of gods and men, but the Muses focus on the gulf between immortals and mortals while the Delian maidens do not explicitly do so, they simply sing of both. The divine chorus is highly idealized, its participants are metonymy and metaphor of the components for successful music and dance (containing not only the Muses and Apollo, but the Graces and Harmonia), and their perspective is that of eternity as they sing of the imperishability of the gods in face of mortal death and decay. The second, idealized chorus of Apollo and the Muses may even implicitly provide the divine antecedent for the mortal practice – the ritual in Apollo's honour thus reflects his own habitual behaviour. It is of course no coincidence that Apollo, a god so closely associated with poetry and the lyre, is honoured by the hymnist with not one, but several songs. The narrator of the *HAp.,* as in both other *Homeric Hymns* discussed above, gains authority as a narrator by this claim to knowledge of divine song. Later in the *HAp.* Apollo is once again portrayed at the head of a chorus, and once more the performance functions as the antecedent for a human ritual practice (514-9):

> …ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν ἄναξ Διὸς υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων
> φόρμιγγ' ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔχων ἐρατὸν κιθαρίζων
> καλὰ καὶ ὕψι βιβάς· οἱ δὲ ῥήσσοντες ἕποντο
> Κρῆτες πρὸς Πυθὼ καὶ ἰηπαιήον' ἄειδον,
> οἷοί τε Κρητῶν παιήονες οἵσί τε Μοῦσα
> ἐν στήθεσσιν ἔθηκε θεὰ μελίγηρυν ἀοιδήν.

This performance, led by Apollo, is part of an explicitly aetiological narrative in which the god himself establishes conventions of his cult worship at Delphi.[201] Apollo directly tells his human acolytes to sing the *Ie Paieon* at 500, as the climax to a ritual sequence involving an altar, prayers and libations. The *HAp.* thus offers an aetiology of a different genre of song in honour of Apollo, tracing it back to a mythical narrative about the god and his interaction with mortals.[202] This snapshot of the 'first' paean allows the poet of the *HAp.* to evoke a second strand of Apolline worship within his own hexameter hymn: the paean encapsulates a similar sense of communal worship, values and concerns to the chorus of Delian maidens.[203] Swift points out the dual nature of the paean, which is a song performed both in times of trouble to ward off disaster and in times of celebration, such as at a wedding or symposium.[204] This paradox is inherent in the *HAp.*'s representation of mortal interactions with the divine, for the jubilant mortal chorus of Delians is immediately followed by a song of the Muses which focuses on the suffering of mortals and their ineluctable deaths. We might wonder, from a modern perspective, what the point of the mortals' pious worship is, if their reward is only pain and death. Rather than indicating a bitter strand in this hymn of praise, however, the rather bleak lot of mortals and the isolation of the gods from any suffering (or often even any compassion) is a traditional theme of early Greek hexameter poetry, and it is not the case that the suffering of his human worshippers should be read as reflecting badly on Apollo.[205]

All three of these *Homeric Hymns* (*HHerm., HPan, HAp.*) contain divine or divinely-led performances of song, with the additional, entirely human chorus of maidens in the *HAp.* In every case, the divine song can be seen to increase the authority of the primary

201 Cf. *HAp.*490-501 where Apollo instructs the Cretans to pray around an altar, make a libation to the gods and follow him to the future location of the temple. Calame (1995): 16 calls it "la procession paradigmatique des Crétois".
202 So also Richardson (2010): 147 n.514-9. For the role of paean more widely in Greek literature see Rutherford (2001): 3-136, Swift (2011): 62-103.
203 For the community aspect of paean see Rutherford (2001): 61-3.
204 Swift (2011): 63.
205 See *HDem.* 256ff. with the discussion of Richardson (1974) *ad loc.* and also Griffin (1980): 189-92.

narrator, who is shown to have access to divine song: to be able to quote it accurately, or even to blend his own voice with that of a divine performer, lends credibility to the content of the framing song (especially in the case of hymns where the narratives are of divine affairs not easily accessible to human narrators) as well as implying the excellence of his poetic skills.

The embedded songs have more individually nuanced functions in each case: in the *HHerm.* the poet uses proemic conventions to allow Hermes to re-introduce his own hymn, as well as making song the means by which Hermes effects his ascension to Olympus; in the *HPan* the nymph chorus adds weight and immediacy to the praise for the god, and evokes one of his traditional locales and habits, that of bucolic pursuits in the company of nymphs; while in the *HAp.*, human ritual praise (rather than divine praise) of the god is emphasized with the maiden chorus complimenting the praise of the primary narrator: the festival-within-a-poem created by the first embedded song becomes a permanent, exportable and re-performable festival to Apollo which the narrator will re-enact every time he performs the poem. The song of the Muses reflects on the power of song to give mortals, otherwise doomed to death, a kind of immortality, which is perhaps a comment on the immortality of the Delian maidens' song which has just ended only a few lines before the performance of the Muses. Apollo's own pre-eminence in and association with song is also demonstrated by this performance, and by his later role in establishing the paean as part of his ritual worship at Delphi (513-19).

While these three hymns contain the most extended and elaborated examples of embedded song, there are several more *Homeric Hymns* which also depict the performance of song, and a brief look at these poems suggests a possible explanation for the occurrence of embedded song in the *HAp., HHerm.* and *HPan,* for it is only in hymns to gods otherwise closely associated with song that embedded songs seem to occur. The shorter *HH* 21 to

Apollo features a swan "singing" in honour of Apollo, as well as a reference to the close connection between Apollo and the singing bard.[206] *HH* 27 to Artemis portrays her as the leader of a divine chorus very similar to that of the *HAp.*: here the Muses sing a hymn to Leto, and Artemis' close relationship with her brother Apollo is explicitly evoked both by the location of the song-performance (in Apollo's house, *HH* 27.14-15) and by the subject of the embedded song.[207]

The clustering of embedded songs in poems dedicated to gods who themselves have mythical connections with song suggests that a desire to tailor the hymn to suit the characteristics of these particular gods may motivate the embedded songs in these hymns, for the mythical traditions surrounding each god would naturally suggest song as a topic to the hymnist. This may be an answer to those who would see direct allusion between these poems, although of course the two 'explanations' for these embedded songs are not mutually exclusive. Before returning finally to the knotty problem of allusion in the *Homeric Hymns*, we should consider the *Theogony* of Hesiod, for it has been argued that this poem is a direct inspiration for the *HHerm.*, and a fuller discussion of this issue across the corpus will only be possible if we have first considered the prominent and important role of embedded songs in the *Theogony*.

1.4 HESIOD'S *THEOGONY* 1-75: POETIC AND PROEMIC AUTHORITY

The account of the narrator in the proem to the *Theogony* is augmented by the inclusion of three inset songs sung by the Muses, as well as a description of the narrator's meeting with

206 *HH* 21.1 Φοῖβε, σὲ μὲν καὶ κύκνος ὑπὸ πτερύγων λίγ' ἀείδει (N.B the Greek idea of the swan-song before death Aesch. *Ag.*1145, Plato *Phaedo* 84e).
207 Cf. also *HH* 26, to Dionysus, which contains a divine revel (although no elaborated song) reflecting the association of Dionysus with music and revelry in cult.

them in which he quotes their speech to him directly.[208] The complexity of the proem has attracted much scholarly attention, and warrants consideration as a whole before any close reading of individual embedded songs is attempted.[209] The outline below summarizes the main narrative components and changes in voice throughout the proem.[210]

208 For the *Theogony* proem's hymnic structure and affliations cf. Friedländer (1914): 1-16, van Groningen (1958): 258-60, Minton (1970): 357-77, Janko (1981): 20-22, Thalmann (1984): 134-3, Nagy (1990): 56-9.
209 Cf. Clay (2003): 49-72, Rengakos (2009): 205-212. Johnson (2008): 231-5 offers an interesting reading of these three embedded songs functioning as a priamel which serves as a foil to the *Theogony* proper.
210 For voice in the *Theogony* see Stoddard (2004).

'NARRATOLOGICAL' ANALYSIS: *THEOGONY* 1-75

1-10 Primary poet-narrator: Invocation of the Muses, description of the Muses' haunts and dance.

11-21 **Description of the Muses' song (praise for the gods). No explict closural phrase**

22-25 Primary poet-narrator: an account of 'Hesiod's' poetic investiture by the Muses.

26-9 **The Muses'direct speech to 'Hesiod', closed off by ὥς ἔφασαν**

30-35 Primary poet-narrator: Muses' gifts to him and their instructions, including paraphrase of their further speech to him during his investiture as a poet.

36-43 Primary poet-narrator: a second hymnic beginning invoking the Muses (Μουσάων ἀρχώμεθα) followed by attributes and praise of the Muses' song.

44-52 **Muses' song: several markers of indirect discourse; no explicit closural phrase**

52-64 Primary poet-narrator: Relative connection to the story of Muses' birth and attributes which leads into another song.

65-7 **Muses' song: laws and habits of the gods; no closural phrase.**

68-71 Primary poet-narrator: description of the effect of the Muses' song.

71-74 **Muses' song (only clear at line 75): focused on Zeus and Zeus' role in *Theogony* in establishing the role of the other gods.**

75 Primary poet-narrator: strongly closural phrase indicating that preceding lines have in fact been sung by the Muses (ταῦτ' ἄρα Μοῦσαι ἄειδον Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι) followed by extended hymn to the Muses sung by the narrator (75-104).[211]

This breakdown of this first part of the proem shows that throughout the first 75 lines of the *Theogony* the narrative voice frequently changes between the external narrator (self-styled as 'Hesiod') and the internal narrators (the Muses) and that it is not always clear where one narrator breaks off and another begins. Due to this complicated narrative arrangement, it may not always be clear, particularly in an oral context to a listening audience, which

211 N.B. the scholia on the *Theogony* show a flicker of early narratology here (Di Gregorio (1975): 16), commenting that the poet switches from the descriptive or narrative form to the mimetic first-person form.

character (primary poet-narrator or chorus of Muses) is speaking.[212] As I argued above with reference to the *Homeric Hymns* dedicated to gods already associated with music and song, it is perhaps unsurprising that the Muses, goddesses of song, are here depicted singing, or that we get an account of what they sing.[213]

The overall effect is of a close interweaving between primary and reported narrators, created in particular by having the Muses sing several times throughout the poem, with their reported songs interrupted by descriptions and comments from the primary poet-narrator, rather than isolating their song to one particular section. This melange of songs combined into one proem strengthens the impression created by the collaborative first-person plural ἀρχώμεθ' with which the poem begins. Clay has argued that this plural, in contrast to the singular ἄρχομαι of the *Homeric Hymns* implies that the poet of the *Theogony* considers his song to be a joint effort, a collaboration between himself and the Muses.[214] The subsequent proem, as we shall see, is certainly evidence of this.

THE MUSES' FIRST SONG

THEOGONY 11-21

The first section of the *Theogony* proem (lines 1-34) structurally forms a miniature hymn in itself, with the Muses as the divine subject. That lines 1-34 should be read as a unit is indicated by the transition in lines 35-6:

212 The scholia on the *Theogony* (cf. Di Gregorio (1975): 5, 11, 16) note the occurrence(s) of the Muses' songs in the proem, but as with the *Odyssey* scholia, the embedded songs are largely taken at face value.
213 Cf. Stoddard (2004): 66, although she is wrong in her statement that this depiction of the Muses is "unique in comparison to the *Homeric Hymns* in that the attributes it describes are verbal utterances rather than physical characteristics" – as my arguments on pp. 49-89 above have shown, the *Homeric Hymns* do indeed depict the attributes of e.g. Hermes to include the god's verbal utterances.
214 Clay (2003): 50-2, *contra* Stoddard (2004) : 66-9 who argues that Hesiod strongly differentiates himself from the Muses in his proem: "The narrator of the Proem deliberately sets himself up as the guiding force behind the poem and makes it clear that, while the Muses are his revered patronesses, he is to be considered substantially responsible for the *Theogony*" (67).

ἀλλὰ τίη μοι ταῦτα περὶ δρῦν ἢ περὶ πέτρην;
τύνη, Μουσάων ἀρχώμεθα...

The self-conscious comment on the subject of the current song from the narrator, which seems to call a halt to the previous topic, is followed by an explicit statement of re-starting his song once more, the verb ἀρχώμεθα echoing line 1 of the poem as the song begins anew.

The hymnic conventions of the proem have been discussed by several scholars, and need not be elaborated here beyond the basic features: the naming of the god(s) in the first line, followed by ἀρχώμεθ' ἀείδειν, closely recalls the formulaic ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν which appears in the same line-end position at line 1 in 8 of the 33 *Homeric Hymns.*[215] The relative pronoun in line 2 is followed by a list of attributes and areas of influence which is also typical of the hymnic genre.[216] The proem then continues with a description of the Muses performing choral dances and singing on Mount Helicon, the scene of their epiphany to the narrator when they grant him the power of song (*Th.* 22-35). Such a depiction echoes the frequency of depictions of song and dance in *Homeric Hymns* dedicated to gods associated with these activities, and is beginning to look like a potentially typical element of hymns to such gods, although precisely how we should define such traditionality will not be clear until we have a detailed picture of the form of the Muses' songs in this proem.

We have here a miniature hymn to the Muses, then, in which they are depicted singing a choral song about the other gods. Before we turn to their performance, it is worth considering the other components of this hymn, for they will inform any reading of the embedded song it contains. Following Janko's typology, the "mythical narrative" section of this hymn to the Muses would be supplied by Hesiod's account of their meeting with himself (the *Dichterweihe*), introduced in the typical manner by the relative pronoun αἵ

215 *HH* 2, 9, 11, 13, 16, 22, 26, 28. For the hymnic nature of the *Th.* proem cf. primarily Friedländer (1914): 1-16 with the bibliography cited in note 208 above.
216 Cf. Janko (1981): 11-16.

(22). The difference in the verb tenses between the account of their singing and the following *Dichterweihe* has been variously interpreted, but it seems to me that the shift from the present/imperfect (used during the song) to the aorist (used of the encounter with Hesiod) is to distinguish between *habitual* activity (the Muses singing of the other gods), which is thus defined as an attribute of the Muses as goddesses of song, and an action of theirs which occurred once, a remarkable action, comparable to the theft of Apollo's cattle in the *HHerm.,* or the birth of the baby god in the *HPan.*[217] Hesiod thus praises himself simultaneously with the Muses, since his poetic investiture becomes worthy of inclusion in a hymn to the goddesses.

The Muses' song is introduced with an elaborate description of their choral dances and the beautiful sound of their voice (*Th.* 5-10), followed by the verb ὑμνεῦσαι and the various subjects of their song in the accusative case. At the end of their song, the structure of the narrative is slightly complicated, since it is not immediately evident that the Muses' song has ended at 21, and until the με at 24 the change of narrator is not clear; the identity of the female group indicated by αἵ is not made explicit until line 25 (Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες). The oblique closural method of ending their song (as opposed to using an explicit phrase as at line 75, ταῦτ' ἄρα Μοῦσαι ἄειδον Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι) has the effect of temporarily merging the voice of the primary poet-narrator, 'Hesiod', with that of the Muses: for a few moments their songs overlap with one another in the audience's perception.

This has an obvious significance for Hesiod's presentation of his own poetry, implied to be of such a quality that it almost could have been sung by the Muses themselves. Such narratorial blurring of voice will be seen to be a feature of the *Theogony* proem, and

217 Clay (2003): 56-7 and Stoddard (2004): 60 both see the change of tense as the move from divine (eternal) to human (necessarily limited) time. West (1966): 161 comments that the relative and the ποτε are both characteristic of the transition to "the myth in choral lyric", although he does not make the specific link with the *Homeric Hymns*.

is not here affected by the initial presentation of the Muses' song in indirect discourse rather than in direct speech. This is largely because, after the initial introductory ὑμνεῦσαι, no further markers of indirect discourse remain, thus allowing the slippage between narrators that occurs in lines 21-3.[218] Thus I would seek to widen the approach of Stoddard, who argues that by rendering the Muses' song in indirect speech Hesiod is "demonstrating his control over the poem": this may well be part of the reason Hesiod chose to depict their song in indirect discourse, but his deliberate obfuscation at the end of their song suggests that he is as interested in the effect of blending his narrative voice with that of the Muses as he is in distinguishing himself from them.

The genre of processional song of the Muses, printed in full below, is difficult to interpret (*Th.* 9-21):[219]

ἔνθεν ἀπορνύμεναι κεκαλυμμέναι ἠέρι πολλῷ
ἐννύχιαι στεῖχον περικαλλέα ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι,
ὑμνεῦσαι Δία τ' αἰγίοχον καὶ πότνιαν Ἥρην
Ἀργείην, χρυσέοισι πεδίλοις ἐμβεβαυῖαν,
κούρην τ' αἰγιόχοιο Διὸς γλαυκῶπιν Ἀθήνην
Φοῖβόν τ' Ἀπόλλωνα καὶ Ἄρτεμιν ἰοχέαιραν
ἠδὲ Ποσειδάωνα γαιήοχον ἐννοσίγαιον
καὶ Θέμιν αἰδοίην ἑλικοβλέφαρόν τ' Ἀφροδίτην
Ἥβην τε χρυσοστέφανον καλήν τε Διώνην
Λητώ τ' Ἰαπετόν τε ἰδὲ Κρόνον ἀγκυλομήτην
Ἠῶ τ' Ἠέλιόν τε μέγαν λαμπράν τε Σελήνην
Γαῖάν τ' Ὠκεανόν τε μέγαν καὶ Νύκτα μέλαιναν
ἄλλων τ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων.

The structure of the catalogue is fractured since there seems to be no organizing principle in the list of the gods and their attributes. Although Zeus and Hera head the list, together with Zeus' daughter Athena, the other children of Zeus and Hera do not follow, but instead we find Zeus' children by Leto, followed strangely by an older god, Poseidon; several very minor deities are then mentioned, and the group is ended with Oceanus and Night, both

218 Stoddard (2004): 67 (cf. Kelly (2008) for a similar technique in Homer).
219 Stoddard (2004): 67 refers to the Muses' song here as their "theogonies", while West (1966): 156 notes the difficulty, as does Clay (2003): 54-6.

examples of the primeval forces identified in theogonic poetry as the parents of the gods.[220] The group of minor figures in the centre of the list (Dione, Leto and Iapetus), as well as the patterning of older and younger Olympian gods in lines 14-16 (Poseidon, Themis, Aphrodite and Hebe, in that order), prevent a coherent reverse reading of the deities from primeval to Olympian. Unlike the *Theogony* itself, which proceeds from the primeval deities from whom everything else came and proceeds along a genealogical and chronological principle, this list of the gods contains no apparent chronological organization.[221]

Thus Hesiod's objective in the *Theogony*, set out at 108-113, is to tell of how the gods were born, and ὥς τ' ἄφενος δάσσαντο καὶ ὡς τιμὰς διέλοντο, | ἠδὲ καὶ ὡς τὰ πρῶτα πολύπτυχον ἔσχον Ὄλυμπον (*Th.* 112-13). Similarly Hermes sings ὡς τὰ πρῶτα γένοντο καὶ ὡς λάχε μοῖραν ἕκαστος (*HHerm.* 428). The Muses' song at *Th.* 11-21 does not follow such a pattern. The particular relationships between all of the gods mentioned are not made clear, and it contains some obscure figures, such as the nymph Dione (who figures in the *Iliad* as the mother of Aphrodite, but in other traditions is a minor figure), while more important members of the pantheon such as Hephaestus and Ares have no place.[222] The gods are apparently already in possession of their statuses – thus Poseidon's special association with earthquakes and his tenure of the earth is mentioned (γαιήοχον ἐννοσίγαιον 15). Although the use of 'typical' epithets for gods is not necessarily enough on its own to disqualify the Muses' song from theogonic status (in fact, technically 'anachronistic' use of the gods' typical epithets is fairly frequent in the *Theogony*[223]), without the specific references to divine birth, genealogy and succession, a list of gods with their epithets does not explicitly qualify the Muses' song as a theogony.

220 Cf. *Th.* 123-5, *Il.* 14.201. For the obscurities in this song see Schlesier (1982): 152-3, Clay (1989): 325-7 and Rudhardt (1996): 33-4.
221 For the organising principle behind the *Th.,* cf. *Th.* 116. Hamilton (1989): 12 argues that this song of the Muses is deliberately chaotic; cf. also Clay (2003): 54-7.
222 Cf. West (1966) *ad loc,* Bremmer (1996): 19.
223 E.g. at *Th.* 454 where Hera is described at her birth as "golden-sandalled", an obviously anachronistic use of the epithet.

The song of the Muses' has been read as a 'table of contents' for what is to come. Any such interpretation must, however, be less schematic than many such attempts have been in the past in order to escape refutation, for as I have noted above, easy correspondence between the song of the Muses and the *Theogony* proper is difficult to establish.[224] Rather than setting up a bland or straightforward list of contents, Hesiod is cleverly programmatic in the song of the Muses, giving away part, but not all, of his subject-matter. He lists only some of his characters, with the inclusion of some very minor players such as Dione and Iapetus (which latter figure suggests the Prometheus strand of narrative which does in fact follow), whose role in the poem is not as important as their inclusion here would suggest. In fact, the very inclusion of Dione, who is unimportant in Hesiod's later scheme of things is another way in which the poet sets up false expectations. Because he includes her, in close proximity not only to Aphrodite herself, but also to Leto, the mother of two other major Olympian gods, the audience may expect her role later in the *Theogony* to reflect her identity in the *Iliad*, as Aphrodite's mother.[225] Hesiod will in fact offer another conception of Aphrodite's origin in which she has no mother.[226] Such deliberate reticence (i.e. a refusal to engage with structural foreshadowing) is to some extent a standard feature of early Greek hexameter proems, or at least a result of their traditionally compressed and elliptical 'advertisements' of the song to follow.[227]

It is possible that in choosing to present their song as potentially theogonic in character, but lacking the organization and structure of his own work which almost immediately follows, Hesiod is engaging in a competitive discourse with the very ideological

224 Aly (1966): 54 n.1, Kirk (1960): 84-5.
225 Cf. West (1966): 156, 157.
226 Hes. *Th.* 188-206. Cf. Furley (2011): 218-9.
227 For the traditional components of the proem in early Greek hexameter poetry cf. Harden and Kelly (forthcoming); for misdirection in the *Odyssey* proem see Pedrick (1992): 39-62 with the extensive bibliography in her first footnote.

source of his poetry, the Muses themselves.[228] His later, very specific request to the Muses in the re-invocation at 104-115, in which he stresses the importance of *order* in the requested tale of divine birth and origins (note especially ὡς τὰ πρῶτα 108, 113; ἐξ ἀρχῆς 115) could thus be seen as a correction of the Muses' earlier, more confused song of the gods and their attributes.

However, such an interpretation would demand that proems always correspond exactly to the following songs, which is not at all the case, since both the *Odyssey* and the *Iliad* proems contain material which scholars have seen as inconsistent with the following narrative.[229] Given the fact that in all three cases (*Iliad, Odyssey* and *Theogony*) the proem is to some extent 'contradicted' by what follows (probably due to the elliptical nature of the proemic summary, which by necessity leaves things out or leaves itself open to misinterpretation), it seems unlikely to be a polemic feature of the *Theogony*. Hesiod does not necessarily compete with or display mastery over the Muses, but aligns himself with them: by placing their first song at the beginning of his own, he shows his connection with the Muses, a connection which is only deepened as we see the same divine characters appearing in his poem – we conclude that the Muses are the source of his information on such mysterious and otherwise inaccessible matters such as divine origins and succession. Hesiod's knowledge of the Muses' songs is what validates him as a skilful and truthful poet, and by portraying the Muses song *before* the *Dichterweihe* he prefigures an explicit statement of this knowledge with a display of it.

The immediate proximity of the following account of their didactic role in regard to Hesiod – and in particular the specific reference to a καλὴ ἀοιδή which they taught the

228 Cf. Stoddard (2004): 64 "Hesiod seems to be openly denying total reliance on the Muses by effectively rejecting their style of cosmogonic poetry for his own", similarly, Clay (2003): 71-2 seems to suggest that Hesiod should be read as "correcting" the Muses here. Contrast Pedrick (1992) who argues that the Muse 'corrects' the poet-narrator of the *Odyssey* in her response to his request for song, and Satterfield (2011) who argues similarly for the *Iliad* proem.
229 See Pedrick (1992) and Satterfield (2011) with further bibliography in both.

poet – narrator of the *Theogony* – suggests that this song taught to Hesiod is the very song sung by the Muses in 11-21. The same locale is identified both for the performance of their song and for the teaching and investiture of Hesiod, linking one with the other even more strongly, and the fact that the teaching of Hesiod and the singing of the song at 11-21 both take place on Helicon suggests that this song is itself one which the Muses taught to Hesiod. The lack of explicit audience for their song (unlike their next song which is performed for Zeus, *Th.* 36, 51) could further suggest that the poet-narrator is their listener. Thus Hesiod uses this first embedded song very clearly as a means to increase his own poetic authority and to guarantee the veracity of his version of events. Expanding on the traditional invocation to the Muse(s) found in the Homeric epics by reporting the Muses' song in indirect discourse allows Hesiod to represent his relationship with the Muses as particularly close, and to represent his poetry as directly descended from theirs.

THE MUSES' SECOND SONG

THEOGONY 44-52

At 36, then, there is a new beginning signalled by a repetition (with slight variation) of the opening formula Μουσάων ἀρχώμεθα. In what forms a fully realized introduction to the song at 44f. their attribute of excellence in song is praised with description of its beauty and the pleasure their performance gives to their father Zeus.[230] Indeed, although an elaborate account is given of their song from line 44f., at 38 the narrator tells us that they sing τά τ' ἐόντα τά τ' ἐσσόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα, which embraces a wider remit than theogonic poetry, but does not exclude it. Thus Hesiod indicates that the Muses' performance encompasses more than he goes on to detail at 44f.

230 Such an introductory section is found before their first song, at *Th.* 1-10, and indeed the circumstances of the song and dance are lavishly described both before and after the performance of the Muses in the *HAp.*, cf. lines 182-206.

The second song of the Muses (printed in full below) is introduced with the verb-noun combination κλείουσιν ἀοιδῇ and begins with a theogonic theme (44-52):

> ...αἱ δ' ἄμβροτον ὄσσαν ἱεῖσαι
> θεῶν γένος αἰδοῖον πρῶτον κλείουσιν ἀοιδῇ
> ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὓς Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ἔτικτεν, 45
> οἵ τ' ἐκ τῶν ἐγένοντο, θεοὶ δωτῆρες ἐάων·
> δεύτερον αὖτε Ζῆνα θεῶν πατέρ' ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν,
> [ἀρχόμεναί θ' ὑμνεῦσι θεαὶ † λήγουσαί τ' ἀοιδῆς,]
> ὅσσον φέρτατός ἐστι θεῶν κάρτει τε μέγιστος·
> αὖτις δ' ἀνθρώπων τε γένος κρατερῶν τε Γιγάντων 50
> ὑμνεῦσαι τέρπουσι Διὸς νόον ἐντὸς Ὀλύμπου
> Μοῦσαι Ὀλυμπιάδες, κοῦραι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο.

Like Hesiod at 116f., the Muses tell of the births of the race of the gods, this time (unlike in their first performance) showing a concern for chronological organization. This is reflected in the use of the adverbs πρῶτον (44) and δεύτερον (47) and of the phrase ἐξ ἀρχῆς (45) which indicates the same starting point as Hesiod later takes at 115 (N.B. the similar **ἐξ ἀρχῆς**, καὶ εἴπαθ', ὅτι **πρῶτον** γένετ' αὐτῶν). All of the chief elements of their song reflect the concerns of the *Theogony*.[231] The similarity in content and language suggests a programmatic function for this song and implies a close relationship between the *Theogony* of Hesiod and the divine theogony of the Muses.[232] However, as in the earlier song of the Muses, their version does not tell the entire story of the larger narrative to come, for although they are said to begin ἐξ ἀρχῆς, they do not here begin as early as Hesiod himself will at line 116; Earth and Sky are second and third generation respectively, with Chasm bearing Earth and Earth the mother of Sky. The repeated markers of indirect discourse throughout the song (ἀρχόμεναί θ' ὑμνεῦσι θεαὶ † λήγουσαί τ' ἀοιδῆς 48 and ὑμνεῦσαι

231 The Muses' song of the gods and Zeus are generally accepted to reflect the subject-matter of the *Theogony* (cf. for instance West (1966): 172) but the inclusion of the giants and men seems to have caused unnecessary confusion. West (1966): 173 comments "the Giants had neither ancestry nor descendants" – though this is contradicted by their appearance as the children of the gods in the *Theogony* itself (γείνατ' Ἐρινῦς τε κρατερὰς μεγάλους τε Γίγαντας 185). Although men are not the primary subject-matter of the *Theogony*, they appear throughout in the discussion of the gods; for instance in the 'hymn to Hecate', the goddess's role in helping various categories of humans is adduced (*Th.* 429-449), or in the story of Prometheus (*Th.* 535f.) where the link between gods and men is emphasized at the outset by the narrator: καὶ γὰρ ὅτ' ἐκρίνοντο **θεοὶ θνητοί τ' ἄνθρωποι**.

232 N.B. too the correspondences between between *Th.* 45 ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὓς Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ἔτικτεν and line 106 οἳ Γῆς ἐξεγένοντο καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος, in which latter context Hesiod is specifically invoking the Muses' aid with the topic of his own song.

51) prevent any strong sense of blurring between the voices of the divine choir and the narrator.[233]

With the relative connection in line 53, the subject of the poem shifts to a narration of the Muses' birth. Although it seems most plausible that the narrator speaks these lines, giving the external audience more information about the group who have just been singing and referring to the Muses in the third person (*Th.* 52, 64), the close proximity with the song of the Muses and the grammatical and structural dependency of Hesiod's own section of the proem upon their song (Hesiod's story of the Muses' forms the 'myth' of the hymn beginning at *Th.* 35) again emphasizes the closeness of his performance to theirs through the very ease with which the two narrators are made to interchange.[234] As we have come to expect by this point, Hesiod's myth, dependent as it is upon the embedded song described just before, itself contains a description of the Muses singing (65-7). Their subject-matter here is once more theogonic in nature, since they sing of the gods' νόμοι and ἤθεα.[235] The present tenses, μέλπονται (66), κλείουσιν (67), ἰεῖσαι (67) all indicate that this is the eternal function and behaviour of the Muses, rather than a specific performance at a given context.

This a-temporal performance is immediately interrupted by the narration of the performance of a specific song, at a specific time. From the present tenses of the digressive, descriptive song at 64-7, Hesiod shifts into the past (68-9):

> αἳ τότ' ἴσαν πρὸς Ὄλυμπον, ἀγαλλόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ
> ἀμβροσίῃ μολπῇ…

The song which follows this description of their performance (as with their earlier two songs, the loveliness of their dance is mentioned as well as the divine location of their

233 For the problems with the often athetised line 48 see West (1966): 172-3 with bibliography. Even if this line is corrupt, the Muses' song is ringed with clear markers of indirect discourse, making any strong sense of blurring between narrators difficult to perceive.
234 West (1966): 180 argues that, although the similarity between line 51 and 37 is a neat ring composition which marks the end of the paragraph, the following birth narrative is "a transition rather than a break".
235 Cf. *Th.* 112, 233-6, 402-3, 406-8, 917, with West (1966) *ad loc.*

song)[236] is not obviously spoken by the Muses until the closural phrase at 75, which makes us (or the listening audience) suddenly aware that the previous lines were in fact part of the Muses' song. In order to make the transition clear, the whole passage is printed below (68-75):

> αἳ τότ' ἴσαν πρὸς Ὄλυμπον, ἀγαλλόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ,
> ἀμβροσίῃ μολπῇ· περὶ δ' ἴαχε γαῖα μέλαινα
> ὑμνεύσαις, ἐρατὸς δὲ ποδῶν ὕπο δοῦπος ὀρώρει 70
> νισομένων πατέρ' εἰς ὅν· **ὁ δ' οὐρανῷ ἐμβασιλεύει,**
> **αὐτὸς ἔχων βροντὴν ἠδ' αἰθαλόεντα κεραυνόν,**
> **κάρτει νικήσας πατέρα Κρόνον· εὖ δὲ ἕκαστα**
> **ἀθανάτοις διέταξε νόμους καὶ ἐπέφραδε τιμάς.**
> ταῦτ' ἄρα Μοῦσαι ἄειδον Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι. 75

After the description of the Muses' performance (68-71), it is not immediately clear that the expansion of detail about Zeus introduced by ὁ δ' (71) is in fact an account of their song on this occasion.[237] This transition is parallel to the relative clause at line 53 which heralded the end of the Muses' song and the return to primary narrator-text, although we noted that the lack of an explicitly closural statement at his point allows Hesiod to form one, unified hymn out of the narratorially discrete units of the Muses' song and his own mythical account. The technique here is similar, with the difference that Hesiod here slips *into* the Muses' song without an introductory phrase, rather than slipping out of embedded song and back to the narrative voice of the primary poet-narrator.

Functionally, this song also serves to emphasize the connection between Hesiod and the Muses; once more we are confronted with a composite song where the voices of narrator and reported narrator are, at least momentarily, inextricably blended. The theogonic theme of their song should be no surprise – all of the Muses' songs in the *Theogony* proem are connected to the subject-matter of the frame narrative, though each emphasizes different aspects of the poem as a whole.[238] While the songs of the Muses underscore, and indeed

236 *Th.* 70-1. On this occasion, they are "travelling towards their father" which implies an ascent up Olympus or a location in its environs (71).
237 As also noted by Clay (2003): 68 n.72.
238 This last song particularly emphasizes Zeus' role in the distribution of *timai*, or honours, among the gods – a major concern of the *Theogony* proper: cf. *Th.* 112, 393, 885.

guarantee, the themes and concerns of the frame narrative, they are also digressive rather than effective: their words do not advance the plot or achieve any change in the action (which indeed has not yet begun at this stage). Instead, the assertion of poetic authority and veracity is the main function of these songs: Hesiod displays a virtuosic level of knowledge about the Muses' activities and the topics of their performance. His knowledge extends, we see through the proem, beyond the confines of the *Dichterweihe* (at least as narrated to the audience) to songs about divine subjects performed in the exclusive company of other divinities. By repeating the motif of the Muses' songs throughout the proem, Hesiod makes it difficult even for a reader, not to speak of a *listener*, to tell at times whether it is he, or the Muses who are speaking. Such a tactic can only raise the status of the poet, who has carefully engineered his proem so that his words may be mistaken for the utterances of the Muses.

1.5 Embedded Song in Early Greek Hexameter Poetry:

Allusion, tradition or coincidence?

Several models for explaining the occurrence of embedded songs in all of these sub-genres of early Greek hexameter poetry were discussed above (pp. 47-9, 105-115). Possibilities included firstly that there is a relationship of dependence between some of the poems, with one poet alluding to another by using the motif of embedded song. Secondly, it was suggested that embedded song may be traditional to the oral-derived poetry of early Greece, in the same manner as arming-scenes, battle-scenes or perhaps in a similar way to the looser 'themes' also traditional in these poems (which are themselves often similar to type-scenes but generally with fewer fixed components).[239] A third possibility was raised: that embedded song is 'natural' for an oral poet and that its presence could be explained as a phenomenon characteristic of oral poetry in general.[240] However, to prove in any meaningful way that embedded song is a motif of oral poetry outside the Greek corpus would be a task far outside the scope of this thesis; moreover, even if embedded song *is* a recurring feature in the literature of other oral cultures, this would not preclude either of the other possibilities – that the motif is traditional in Greek oral-derived poetry, or that these poems are alluding to one another. Rather than aiming to explain simply *why* the Greek poets use embedded songs (a question which could very well be answered with a comparative oralist study), I am interested in *how* they use it, a question which would not at

239 I follow the terminology as used by Sowa (1984): 15-16.

240 The *Kalevala* (the Finnish national epic largely agreed to be composed of traditional elements, although itself a written composition) contains an embedded theogonic song at 17.535-52, cf. Bosley (2008): 213-214. The Enuma Elish contains chanted imprecations which come close to song, although (as with magic spells in Greek literature) it is not entirely clear whether these imprecations are thought of as song proper (Dalley (2000): 237. The Near Eastern epic *Gilgamesh* (tablet XI) contains an embedded narrative analogous to the *apologoi* of Odysseus, where Gilgamesh asks Ut-napishtim "...how you came to stand in the gods' assembly and sought eternal life?" Ut-napishtim answers with a tale which lasts for many lines. However, the epic contains no examples of the more sophisticated and self-conscious embedded narrative found in the Greek texts where the embedded song is marked specifically as song. On the possible oral traditions behind these Near Eastern poems see Dalley (2000): 39-4, 228-232.

all be answered with comparative material. Thus this avenue of enquiry will have to remain unexplored in the present discussion.

With regard to the remaining question of allusion and traditionality in these embedded songs, it will be useful to consider both possibilities with reference to the texts in question, rather than to assume that the likelihood of one explanation automatically excludes the other. Turning first to allusion, then, the possibility of two particular examples of allusion between some of the examples of embedded song discussed above will be explored, before considering the potential traditionality of this motif and how (if at all) we should then characterize and define it as a traditional feature of early Greek hexameter poetry.

ALLUSION

A 'THEOGONY' OR THE *THEOGONY*? *HHERM.* 425-33

The fact that Hermes is depicted singing theogonic poetry at this point in the *HHerm.* immediately raises the question, for many a modern reader at least, of whether the *HHerm.* is invoking theogonic poetry in general, or alluding directly to Hesiod's poem.[241] Given the difficulty inherent in identifying allusion in the orally-derived texts of early Greek hexameter poetry (in that it has been argued both that audiences could not pick up on such allusion in an orally performed context, and that it was impossible for poets to allude directly to each other in a fluid, oral and formulaic tradition), this question must be

241 Clay (1989): 138-9 notes the similarities between the *Theogony* and Hermes' theogony but does not postulate allusion between the two poems, cf. also *AHS* 334 *ad loc.* for a similar view. Richardson (2010): 206 *ad loc.*, on the other hand, argues for allusion between *HHerm.* and Hesiod: "the poet seems to have the song of the Muses at the opening of Hesiod's *Theogony* particularly in mind throughout this episode." So too Stoddard (2001): 91 states that the theogony of Hermes "is clearly modeled on Hesiod's poem." Radermacher (1931): 149 takes a different tack again, suggesting that the poet is engaging in allusion here, but to a theogony attributed to Hermes such as those preserved in the *Corpus Hermeticum.*

approached with caution.[242] Scholars who argue for allusion between these two poems centre their assertions on three main areas of similarity. Two of these are easily dealt with: firstly, the theogonic theme(s) in lines 427-8 and 431-2 of *HHerm.* as compared with the themes adduced at *Th.* 43-6 and 105-13:[243]

> …αἱ δ' ἄμβροτον ὄσσαν ἰεῖσαι
> θεῶν γένος αἰδοῖον πρῶτον κλείουσιν ἀοιδῇ
> ἐξ ἀρχῆς, οὓς Γαῖα καὶ Οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ἔτικτεν,
> οἵ τ' ἐκ τῶν ἐγένοντο, θεοὶ δωτῆρες ἐάων· (*Th.* 43-6)
>
> κλείετε δ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων, 105
> οἳ Γῆς ἐξεγένοντο καὶ Οὐρανοῦ ἀστερόεντος,
> Νυκτός τε δνοφερῆς, οὓς θ' ἁλμυρὸς ἔτρεφε Πόντος.
> εἴπατε δ' ὡς τὰ πρῶτα θεοὶ καὶ γαῖα γένοντο
> καὶ ποταμοὶ καὶ πόντος ἀπείριτος οἴδματι θυίων
> ἄστρά τε λαμπετόωντα καὶ οὐρανὸς εὐρὺς ὕπερθεν· 110
> [οἵ τ' ἐκ τῶν ἐγένοντο, θεοὶ δωτῆρες ἐάων·]
> ὥς τ' ἄφενος δάσσαντο καὶ ὡς τιμὰς διέλοντο,
> ἠδὲ καὶ ὡς τὰ πρῶτα πολύπτυχον ἔσχον Ὄλυμπον. (*Th.* 105-13)
>
> κραίνων ἀθανάτους τε θεοὺς καὶ γαῖαν ἐρεμνὴν
> ὡς τὰ πρῶτα γένοντο καὶ ὡς λάχε μοῖραν ἕκαστος. (*HHerm.* 427-8)
>
> τοὺς δὲ κατὰ πρέσβιν τε καὶ ὡς γεγάασιν ἕκαστος
> ἀθανάτους ἐγέραιρε θεοὺς Διὸς ἀγλαὸς υἱὸς
> πάντ' ἐνέπων κατὰ κόσμον, ἐπωλένιον κιθαρίζων. (*HHerm.* 431-3)

The similarities between these passages do not seem to be close enough to justify a direct 'intertextual' relationship, for they do not share any significant vocabulary or even mention the same gods; rather they are similar simply because they are of the same genre (or at least, in the case of the *HHerm.*, *evoking* the same genre) and thus they contain the elements and themes appropriate to that genre. The fact that Hermes is concerned to proceed in chronological order could to be attributed to the genre, rather than a specific allusion to the *Theogony*.[244]

---

242 For a summary of these issues see Currie (2006): 1-45 and Kelly (2007): 1-17; each gives a useful summary of relevant further bibliography.
243 This is a main criterion for Richardson (2010): 206 and Stoddard (2004): 91 n.62.
244 A genealogical narration seems most likely to proceed chronologically, or at least to be concerned with defining the temporal relationship of one generation of gods to another, even if the poem as a whole is not structured in a linear, chronological fashion. West (1966): 1-11 gives a list of 'theogonies' from Greek and other traditions, most of which are constructed on a chronological basis, he then comments (37) "In the arrangement and presentation of the genealogies, the following principles may be discerned...the order is basically chronological."

Richardson finds the repetition of ἐρατός used to describe song and music in both poems significant in adducing the *HHerm.*'s dependency on the *Theogony*.[245] However, this seems to be a traditional way of describing song or music, since Apollo's lyre-playing is described using exactly the same phrase (ἐρατὸν κιθαρίζων) at *HAp.* 515 as is used of Hermes at *HHerm.* 423. Thus the idea of music or song having an erotic effect seems to be of wider currency, and in fact the examples from the *HHerm.* and *HAp.* are much closer to one another than the *HHerm.* is to the *Theogony*. Thus it seems prudent not to try to establish any firm relationship of dependency using this motif.

The final shared element between the two poems which might indicate an allusive relationship is the figure of Mnemosyne who appears in a prominent position at the start of both theogonies.[246] Mnemosyne is not usually present at the very beginning of creation – in Hesiod's *Theogony* she is the child of Earth and Heaven, in the third generation of gods.[247] Her position before all the other gods here disrupts a purely chronological, genealogical organization. The only explanation of her inclusion given is ἡ γὰρ λάχε Μαιάδος υἱόν (429). This phrase is difficult to interpret: it might make more sense if phrased the other way around, with Hermes (who is in the process of receiving his *timai* in the poem) receiving Mnemosyne (symbolizing poetic skill, perhaps) as *his* lot, thus explaining his privileging of her. The reference to her as μητέρα Μουσάων further suggests that there may be a *poetic* explanation for her rather than a genealogical one. At *Th.* 53-67 Hesiod tells of the birth of the Muses from the union of Zeus and Mnemosyne and, as such, the birth of music and poetry into the world. Thus, although she is not technically entitled to be present at the beginning of the chronologically organized *Theogony*, she *is* given a proleptically prominent position at its opening, before the poem itself begins. It is arguable that the poet of the *HHerm.* is doing something akin to the proem of the *Theogony* here, by

245 Richardson (2010): 206 *ad loc.* He mentions *HHerm.* 423 and 426 in relation to *Th.* 65 and 70.
246 Mnemosyne is sung "first" by Hermes (*HHerm.* 429-30) and appears in the account of the Muses' birth at the beginning of Hesiod's *Th.* 53. Stoddard (2004): 91 n.62 uses this as one of her criteria to posit allusion between these two texts.
247 *Th.* 127f.

placing Mnemosyne in a similarly prominent position. Her function in myth as the mother of the Muses, and thus the conduit for the birth of poetry, makes her doubly relevant to the *Hymn*, as Hermes has just invented not only the lyre but also hymnic and theogonic poetry (52-62, 425-33). This is made explicit by Apollo's enraptured response in which he several times explicitly states the *newness* of what Hermes has just performed.[248]

The poet draws attention to the poetic self-consciousness of the embedded song by explicitly stating Hermes' special debt to, and relationship with, the mother of the Muses. The phrase ἡ γὰρ λάχε Μαιάδος υἱόν can thus be interpreted in a theogonic context, in which the gods receive their allotted honours and portions: Mnemosyne notionally receives Hermes as *her* allotted portion because his skill in poetry and the connection of poetry with memory in the commemoration of glorious deeds is her remit.

Both Hermes and Hesiod thus qualify their knowledge of divine matters and their poetic skill by reference to Mnemosyne and her daughters.[249] Although the similarity in approach may seem superficially striking, it is not grounds on which to claim direct allusion to Hesiod, given both the ubiquitous association of the Muses and Mnemosyne with poetry and singers, and the traditionality of an appeal to the Muses in the proems of the Homeric poems and the *Homeric Hymns*.[250] As with Hesiod and the *HHerm.*, in the above discussion of the *HPan*, the possible areas where this hymn could be seen as alluding to the earlier *HHerm.* were set out, and it was concluded that the formulaic verbal similarities and similar story pattern were not enough to posit allusion, since in each case the coincidences of

248 *HAp.* 442-5. Apollo calls the theogony of Hermes a νεήφατον ὅσσαν, says that nothing like it has ever yet (οὔ πώ ποτέ) existed, emphasising that no-one except for Hermes (νόσφι σέθεν) has ever had such a song.
249 It may seem paradoxical that Hermes (himself a god) needs to justify his knowledge of divine matters, or his right to sing a theogony, with reference to his association with Mnemosyne (who is, after all, a more minor god than he himself will be). But it is this nascent status, as a god wishing to be recognized, but not yet fully accepted by the other gods which determines his approach.
250 Cf. Harden and Kelly (forthcoming) for proemic conventions in early Greek hexameter poetry; for the Muses in particular see *inter alia* Furley (2011): 211 and Tsagalis (2005): 81, Ford (1992): 31-40, Lanata (1963): 8-10.

content and form can be attributed to the poets' use of traditional language and story motifs.

The third potential index of allusion between the two poems adduced above was the occurrence of an embedded song in both, and any final judgement on whether or not the presence of an embedded song should be an appropriate criterion for allusion was suspended until a fuller picture of the nature and form of embedded songs across the whole range of early Greek hexameter poetry could be perceived. Such a delay was motivated by the need to answer the question of how traditional this motif is in early Greek hexameter poetry, a question which could not be answered without considering a wider range of examples than those from the *Homeric Hymns* alone. Although the evidence set out above is not strong enough to posit allusion between these two sets of examples, that assertion is not meant to preclude any possible allusion between the poems (or between other oral-derived) poems, but rather merely to state that there is not enough evidence to support such an assertion in these cases.

TRADITION

The very frequency of this motif of embedding a performance of poetry within an oral (or at least, an oral-derived) poem seems to suggest the possibility of a traditional interest in depicting song, and in exploring the function of song in a self-conscious manner.

As was briefly mentioned above these instances of embedded song should probably not be identified as type-scenes of the same sort as arming or departure scenes, or other such structures which tend to consist of a series of repeated elements and formulaic

vocabulary.[251] As the extensive passages of embedded song quoted above show, this motif may be expressed using a variety of song and music vocabulary, and there appears to be no consistent repetitive element which stands out across the board.[252] An attempt to re-create a 'pattern' or key for a type-scene of this nature (as has successfully been done for other varieties of type-scene) is thus difficult, given the degree of flexibility employed in the depiction of the performance of poetry. However, embedded song as a 'traditional' concern of early Greek hexameter poetry need not be precluded by a conclusion that these embedded songs do not constitute a type-scene of the same sort as arming or feasting scenes. The existence of recurring, traditional 'themes' in Homeric epic has long been recognized, although the terminology used to describe these elements and to differentiate them from 'type-scenes' as defined above has not always been consistent.[253] The definition of 'theme' adopted in this discussion follows that of Fry, who defines a theme in oral poetry as a regularly occurring cluster or pattern of ideas "which forms an underlying structure for an action or description" – that is, a recurring motif which is composed of a series of actions without any requirement for verbal or formulaic correspondence.[254]

To characterize embedded song as a theme or recurring motif in early Greek hexameter poetry is not entirely straightforward, since the examples vary widely in length,

---

251 The bibliography on this formal element of Homeric poetry is vast. I follow the definition of this term offered by Sowa (1984): 15 "A type-scene has a fixed set of elements, expressed in a set of key words that always occur at the same points in the scene, often in identical metrical position." Cf. Foley (1988) with bibliography for a summary of the scholarship on this topic up to that date; Kelly (2007): 1-17 offers a useful discussion of more recent positions.

252 Although there are some elements which are shared between some of the embedded songs, for instance that all Demodocus' songs end with the same formulaic phrase, or the shared use of ἐρατός to describe song, music and dance in the *HAp.*, *HHerm.* and *Theogony* (on this see Richardson (2010): 206), the similarities do not seem to be close enough to posit that these songs are "type-scenes".

253 Cf.Gunn (1970): 192-203. Foley (1988): 69 notes the development of the use of these terms and the eventual departure from what he terms the "Parry-Lord" definition of a theme to the definition I have adopted, viz. that a theme is constituted by a measure of correspondences between occurrences, or a pattern of ideas which does *not* include verbal or formulaic repetition. Cf. Crowne (1960): 362-72.

254 Fry (1968): 53. Sowa (1984): 16 offers a useful definition complementary to the present one: "Themes are characterized by their size, embracing large portions of narrative, and by the fact that they are made up of a number of separate episodes. They depend for their identification less on exact verbal identity from one example to another than on the fact that they contain a cluster of elements that regularly occur in the same sequence, albeit sometimes in vestigial or mutated form."

scope, genre, performer and function. Some elements which may be adduced as essential include:

a) The performance of a song is described using vocabulary specific to musical performance.[255]

b) There may be an indication of the song's content: this can be very brief or extended to cover the main themes of a whole song.

c) The song's effect or particular beauty is usually described.[256]

d) The location of the song is described.

e) The reaction of an internal audience to the song is recorded.

Not all of these elements are required to make a scene traditional, and it is a commonplace of the study of formulaic and traditional elements in the Homeric epics that such traditional components as type-scenes or themes may appear in a highly compressed or extensively elaborated form.[257] A useful criterion for whether something can be considered traditional is given by Kelly: "the objects of the enquiry need not be formulaic, in the narrow sense(s) determined by previous scholarship, but rather of sufficient similarity and integrity to strike the impression of an audience during a performance."[258] This sequence of embedded songs, I would argue, are of sufficient similarity to strike an audience during an oral performance. Indeed the sheer number of these songs and their inevitable occurrence in contexts of song-associated deities, would be another typical element, for it seems that an embedded song is an essential component of hymns to one of these song-associated deities.[259] At the same time, the discussion of the embedded songs from Homer, Hesiod and the *Hymns* above has, I hope, shown the wide range of meanings and functions to which poets put this theme: and

255 This may be a specific word for singing e.g. ὑμνέω, or an unmarked verb of speaking such as ἐνέπω combined with other descriptors such as the presence of a musical instrument (usually lyre or cithara) or a noun indicating that the utterance is song rather than speech such as ἀοιδή or μολπή.
256 This is true even of very abbreviated examples, cf. *Cypria* fr.6 (West): Νύμφαι καὶ Χάριτες, ἅμα δὲ χρυσῆ Ἀφροδίτη | **καλὸν ἀείδουσαι** κατ' ὄρος πολυπιδάκου Ἴδης.
257 Cf. Sowa (1984): 16.
258 Kelly (2007): 14.
259 Cf. Calame (1995): 15 "les *Hymnes* les plus disserts sur les manifestions musicales sont évidemment ceux consacrés aux dieux dont le champ d'action inclut la musique", although he does not connect this to the idea of traditionality within early Greek hexameter poetry.

it is with the question of the potential development in the use of this theme that this discussion will end.[260]

INCREASED SOPHISTICATION?

The flexibility of this motif and the sheer range with which the poets depict the performance of song raises the question of whether we can argue for a development in the sophistication of this device from the earliest extant poetry to some of the later examples. Some potential areas of development in the motif have already been noted. It was mentioned above that the songs of Hermes are more clearly self-contained than the song of the nymphs in the *HPan*, whereas the *HPan* 'blurs' the embedded song with the frame narrative, allowing the voices of the choir of nymphs and the narrator to merge. It might seem superficially that the poet of the *HPan* has developed the technique found in the (very likely earlier) *HHerm.*, but the *HHerm.* too, in its own way, plays self-consciously with the traditional components of epic verse. The miniature hymn (*HHerm.* 52-62) allows Hermes to re-introduce himself with a proem-in-the-middle which immediately precedes the mythical account of his theft of Apollo's cattle. Despite the clear end to Hermes' embedded song at *HHerm.* 62, the structural arrangement of his new self-sung proem does blur the boundary between the primary and reported narrator, since the myth which follows functions as the narrative section both of the *HHerm.* and of Hermes' own 'hymn' to himself. It is not necessarily the case that the *HPan* does something with the motif that the *HHerm.* is not yet capable of – for the blurring seen in the shorter poem is arguably an adaptation rather than a real development of the technique.

260 Foley (1991): 6-7 argues strongly for the potential for meaning generated by creative use of the traditional elements of Greek hexameter poetry. See too Kelly (2007) for the application of this theory to an extended portion of the *Iliad*; for other scholars who do not explicitly follow a "traditional referentiality" standpoint, but who do admit the possibility of meaning in traditional elements of Homer, cf. Nagy (1979), Slatkin (1986) and (1991), Graziosi and Haubold (2005): 48-56 (whose notion of 'resonance' is in fact very close to the idea of traditional referentiality).

The *Hymns* can be seen to combine two distinct forms of embedded narrative found in the *Odyssey*. The *HHerm.* complicates the relationship between the embedded song and the frame poem, for in both cases the song which Hermes sings is fitted carefully to the theme of the poem, and the singing of the song in some senses affects the outcome of the larger narrative. As noted above, it is through singing his hymn that Hermes realizes he must achieve more before he becomes a god, and thus he is inspired to play his series of pranks on Apollo, jostling with his brother for honour. The theogony which he sings later in the poem is a celebration of the new completeness of the pantheon, but also achieves Hermes' place in that pantheon by persuading Apollo to accept his baby brother in return for the lyre and the songs which accompany it.

This could be seen as an extension of the function of the second song of Demodocus in the *Odyssey*, which, although not entirely thematically irrelevant to the main narrative of the Odyssey, is largely digressive since it delays the narrative of the main story rather than progressing it. The first and last songs of the Odyssean bard, however, are only superficially digressive: although they narrate material from outside the scope of the *Odyssey* itself, they place Odysseus in a position to reveal himself to Alcinous and thus facilitiate, albeit indirectly, his passage home. After all, it is Odysseus' weeping at the final song of Demodocus which prompts Alcinous to finally ask for his story. Thus the seeming development of the *HHerm.* in making the inset songs an essential part of his narrative as both cause and effect of Hermes' actions is already present in the examples in the *Odyssey*.

Rather than posit a linear development from earliest examples to the latest (a position fraught with difficulty in any case, given the fact that we only have a handful of texts from this period and that the dating of many of the poems is hotly disputed), I would

argue that it is the particular context of each passage of embedded song which dictates the changes made to the basic motif.[261]

261 Perhaps judging certain elements as "more sophisticated" is a flawed approach in any case, vulnerable as it is to the application of subjective rather than objective criteria.

CHAPTER TWO

LYRIC POETRY

In archaic and classical lyric poetry, the frequency of embedded song in its most extended form (i.e. songs such as those sung by Hermes in *HHerm.* 51-62) is diminished. The generic differences between the epic and hymnic poetry of the earlier examples and the examples from lyric may go some way to explaining this discrepancy, and it will be a major task of this chapter to discuss how genre affects the use of this self-conscious narrative feature, not least taking account of the generic differences which exist even within the lyric corpus itself. The fragmentary state of much of the extant lyric poetry (and even some of the extant poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides) may also offer a partial explanation – for instance the first part of Corinna fr.654 is lost, which would almost certainly have contained a song sung by Helicon in opposition to the song sung by Cithareon in the remaining fragments. Furthermore, in a fragmentary poem it is often impossible to establish a context for lines which look very much as though they may have come from an embedded song, leaving interpretation uncertain at best. There are also a handful of lyric examples where the introduction of an embedded song is indicated in the extant text, but any following embedded song has been lost to us. Pindar's *Hymn to Zeus*, for instance, certainly contained a song performed by the Muses, but the nature and extent of this performance is almost impossible to establish due to the fragmentary nature of the text.[262]

Two of the best preserved examples of embedded song in lyric poetry are found in the epinicians of Pindar and Bacchylides; thus it will be from epinician that this discussion

262 Intriguing fragments which suggest possible inset song include, for instance, Pindar *Paian* 7.17 κελ]άδησαν αὐδάν; *Paian* 7b.10 κελαδήσαθ' ὕμνους, which suggest that a song may have been introduced; *Dithyramb* 3 16-19, where choruses and songs are mentioned; B.8.10-15 where several song-words are preserved; Sappho fr.58, which mentions the Muses and a "clear melodious lyre".

of lyric embedded songs begins. The genre's close thematic links with hymnic poetry - in that epinician is also poetry of praise (although for a human rather than a god) with close associations to Greek ritual and religion - make it in many ways an ideal link between the hymnic embedded songs of the previous chapter and the lyric poetry which will be the subject of our attention here.[263]

2.1 Epinician: The Poetics of Praise

Pindar *Nemean* 5 and Bacchylides 13 (hereafter B.13) both contain extended embedded songs: in *N.* 5 the Muses are depicted singing on Pelion, while Bacchylides depicts the song of an Aeginetan maiden-chorus. This is in itself remarkable, for *extended* inset song is not common in extant epinician, although references to internal choruses do occur elsewhere, such as *P.* 1.1-4, where the Muses dance to the lyre.[264] Power, in his discussion of B.13, gives six examples of references to choruses within epinician poetry, of which *N.* 5 is one.[265] However, there must be a difference between an internal chorus that is mentioned only briefly in one or two lines (which form the majority of Power's examples) and one which is given not only detailed contextual description, but also its own voice to speak within the poem. That these poems were written at the same time, and for the same victor, makes the coincidence even more intriguing.[266]

263 Particularly interesting is the fact that, despite the similarities in the function of these poems, their use of embedded song is quite different, even in the lack of frequency of examples we already observe a departure from the techniques of early Greek hexameter.
264 Although extended inset song is fairly unusual in epinician, there are many undeveloped references to song itself, and descriptions of the power of song on its listeners: (song) Pindar *Ol.* 8.54, 10.76-7, *P.* 1.97, 3.17-9, 77-9 (effect of song on an audience). Bacchylides 1.1. (although fragmentary) seems to refer to the Muses singing or creating the current ode, B.2.11-14 again depicts the Muse performing the victory ode at hand.
265 Power (2000): 68-9, the other examples are *P.* 10.38-9, *Ol.* 4-2-4, *Ol.* 14.9 and B.11.112.
266 For Pytheas of Aegina, in the pankration. For the date of the poems (probably 485BC), see Pfeijffer (1999), Fearn (2007): 342-350. In analogy with the *Homeric Hymns*, where we noted that embedded songs occur particularly in hymns to gods already associated closely with song and music, we may wonder if Pytheas was himself a talented musician or singer. However such biographical motivations can only ever remain speculative and should not be over-stated.

Scholarship on these poems has tended to focus on a strongly socio-functional interpretation of the embedded songs. For instance, the chorus of *parthenoi* (B.13) has been explained as a 'naturalizing' force within the poem, which brings epinician as a genre, as well as the victor, within the socially-acceptable and ritual context of religious choral festival.[267] Other critics have analysed the inset songs with too little focus on their surrounding poetic context: Burnett reads the Muses' song in *N.* 5 as "a vulgar folk-tale set to music", but fails to take account of the many subtle links between the inset chorus and the first-person narrator text.[268]

Out of the several functions for embedded song set out in the Introduction (see above, pp. 7-47), several suggest themselves as particularly relevant to the epinician genre, and indeed one or two have already been adduced to explain embedded song in Pindar or Bacchylides. Firstly, a model is suggested by Pfeijffer who seeks to limit the function of embedded song in choral lyric in contrast with earlier examples of the technique in Greek poetry: "Whereas the epic poets may use secondary narratives as a vehicle for introducing narrative material that is alien to the main storyline, the poets of victory odes tend to use secondary narrators to manipulate narrative time".[269] Thus, for Pfeijffer, the function of the inset song in these two odes would be explicable largely through a desire for narrative economy.

Given the primary function of epinician to commemorate and praise, we should certainly consider that embedded song could, as in the *Homeric Hymns*, function as a strategy of praise. and to further explore the effect(s) of an internal narrator on the poet's rhetoric of praise.

267 Power (2000): 67-81, Fearn (2007): 87-160.
268 Burnett (2005): 57-76.
269 Pfeijffer (2004): 226. Agócs (2009): 35, 77 also ascribes this role to what he terms "mise en abyme" in Pindar.

The function of such passages could be seen as a poetically competitive device. This is perhaps especially clear where the miniature poem embedded is of a different genre or subject-matter from the larger poem, as in the songs of Demodocus, two of which deal with Trojan War material outside the remit of the *Odyssey*. These songs could be read as examples of the poet 'advertising other wares', showing his virtuoso mastery over various genres while committing himself largely to one. As well as showing poetic excellence in general, inset song could also be a forum for more direct allusion or competition between poets (this could take the form of 'narratological' allusion, i.e. one poet alluding to another poet's use of embedded song, or the more familiar form of allusion, with one poet embedding another poet's 'song' within his own poem).

Allusion is a less problematic concept for Pindar and Bacchylides than for Homeric poetry. It has been argued that direct allusion between the two epinician poets occurred, for instance detailed verbal borrowing is suggested for Pindar and Bacchylides in the priamel of Bacchylides 3.85-8, which has been considered to allude to the opening seven lines of Pindar *Ol.* 1.[270] The pair of chattering crows depicted at *Ol.* 2.83-90, who are compared unfavourably with the eagle of Zeus, have been thought since Alexandrian times to refer to Pindar's poetic rivals.[271] A competitively allusive relationship between the two poets is an attractive possibility, perhaps particularly in this case because the poems were written at the same time and for the same client. In these circumstances competition between the two poets rivaling each other for poetic supremacy seems plausible. To establish a relationship between these poems with any certainty would require a striking point of similarity, and the very presence of mise en abyme proper (i.e. not an internal narration *spoken* by a character within the myth, but a song *sung* by an internal chorus) may supply this. The extended embedded song is unusual in epinician, appearing only here in the extant corpus; it may be

270 Cf. Carson (1984): 116 for a summary of scholarship on this topic.
271 Cf. scholia ad *Ol.*2 154b, 157a, 158c in Drachmann (1904), Most (1986): 304-316, Gildersleeve (1885): 152 *ad loc.* Pindar *P.* 2.72-5 has also been postulated as a area of poetic competition between the two poets – cf. Burton (1962): 126-8, Kirkwood (1982): 154-6.

that the occurrence of this unusual feature in two competing poems written at the same time is not a coincidence.

Before making any analysis of the embedded songs in these two epinician poems, it is worth considering more generally *why* embedded song may be less common in epinician than in epic and the related sub-genres of early Greek hexameter poetry. It may seem that the length of the poems would offer a reasonable explanation, since the odes of Pindar are much shorter than a book of the *Odyssey* or any of the longer *Homeric Hymns*, and as such may seem less likely to use a narrative technique which would easily overpower the frame narrative.[272] Indeed the frequency of brief mentions of choral performance in the epinicians of Pindar may seem to confirm such an impression, since they show an interest in depicting the performance of song, but specifically in evoking such a performance without detailing it.[273] However, the *HPan* offers precedent for a short poem of praise to successfully harness embedded song, and the very presence of the songs portrayed within *Nemean* 5 and B.13 suggests that such practicalities have little to do with the reduced frequency of embedded song in epinician lyric.

One of the main functions of embedded song in the hexameter poems discussed in chapter 1 was, across the board, to increase the poet's authority, usually by association with divine performers or the divine invention of song, genre, or music. Even the songs of Demodocus, which serve more to manipulate narrative time, implicitly increase the authority and prestige of the poet of the Odyssey, for Demodocus, a singer like the narrator, is presented as an honoured figure within the ideal city of the Phaeacians, a singer with a special relationship with the Muses, and a man whose knowledge of the epic past and also of divine matters is unrivalled. Embedded songs, along with more overt invocations to the Muses, are the main strategies by which the Homeric narrator obtains authority, for he

272 So Pfeijffer (2004): 226 "The scope of the victory ode calls for narrative economy".
273 Cf. for instance the depictions of song at *P.* 10.38-9, *Ol.* 4-2-4, *Ol.* 14.9 and B.11.112, none of which contain an account of the song sung by the performers equivalent to that of *N.* 5 or B.13.

famously does not intrude on the narrative with self-characterization or claims about his own excellence.[274] Hesiod, of course, does characterize his narrator more fully, but in the *Theogony* this is confined to the proem, where his self-referential *Dichterweihe* is combined with extensive use of embedded song to prove his connection with the Muses and his authority as a poet.[275] The *Homeric Hymns*' formulaic beginnings and endings contain first-person addresses to the gods and invocations of the Muse which are comparable to the invocations of the Muse found at the beginning of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but they do not offer extensive characterization of the narrator(s) of these poems.

Pindar's epinician narrator, on the other hand, (and to a lesser extent those of Bacchylides) is far from self-effacing.[276] It is doubtful that anyone would deny that we very often find in Pindar's epinicians an authoritative poet-narrator who directly adduces his connection with the Muses, his poetic skill, his remit to praise and his fitness for poetic purpose.[277] Bacchylides, although he refers to himself as poet less often and less emphatically than Pindar, is not reticent about his own poetic excellence on occasion.[278] Although both poets emphasize their poet-narrators' close connection with the Muses, the speakers of Pindar's poems in particular also adduce an independent poetic authority, achieved through moralizing statements and claims to excellence.[279] This increased directness about the poetic procedure seen in the constant references to the performance of the current song which occur in every Pindaric ode may then limit the need for embedded

274 The Homeric narrator has attracted much scholarly attention. Cf. de Jong (2004): 13-24 (a useful summary with further bibliography), de Jong (1987), Richardson (1990).
275 Cf. *inter alia* Nünlist (2004): 25-34, Scodel (2001): 109-137.
276 For a discussion of the authority of the Pindaric narrator, see Morrison (2007b): 84-90.
277 Cf. Pindar *Ol* .3.3-6, where the poet claims the Muse stands beside him and that song is the greatest reward for athletic success; *Ol.*4.2-4 Pindar portrays himself as the messenger of the *Horai* in delivering his song. The frequent first person references in Pindar (e.g. *Ol.* 7.14 κατέβαν, 16 αἰνέσω , 20 ἐθελήσω; *Ol.* 1.115b-end) also set his narratorial style apart from that of Homer. Cf. Lefkowitz (1991): 25-43 for the "bardic I" in Pindar's odes.
278 Cf. B.4.7-9, where B. refers to himself as the "sweet-voiced cock of Urania", in 5.14 he self-styles as the "famous servant of Urania of the golden hair-band", B.9.2-3 "the god-inspired spokesman of the violet-eyed Muses". See too Carey (1999): 18 "The poet's greatness, and with it his authority, is a given for Bacchylides as it is for Pindar".
279 For the Muses in Pindar see Gianotti (1975): 41-68 and Lanata (1963): 74-97. For narratorial authority created by gnomic statements and not by evocation of the Muse cf. Scodel (2001): 123 "Pindar constantly invokes and evokes the Muses. Yet in his epinicia he never cites them as an authority for his versions of a story or for any other point of truth". Cf. too Carey (1995): 97-8.

song as a mirror for the poet's work, since the poet-narrator often mentions the quality of his song directly.

2.2 PINDAR, *NEMEAN* 5: DIVINE PRAISE

Before the chorus of Muses even begin their song, Pindar has indicated that song is a major theme of this poem, and it is vital to understand the context of this embedded song within *Nemean* 5 in order to fully understand and interpret its significance and function.[280] From the very opening lines of *N.* 5 it is clear that a self-conscious awareness of the nature of poetry is here a subject for song. The speaker begins with a strongly adversative statement of identity, οὐκ ἀνδριαντοποιός εἰμ' (1); the poet contrasts his art form with that of the sculptor.[281] Sculpture is static and fixed, and the creation of the craftsman stands idle, ἐλινύσοντα...ἀγάλματ', in one location ἐπ' αὐτᾶς βαθμίδος | ἑσταότ' (1), unlike the song of the speaker, which is commanded to go out on every ship from the island

> ...ἀλλ' ἐπὶ πάσας
> ὁλκάδος ἔν τ' ἀκάτῳ, γλυκεῖ'ἀοιδά,
> στεῖχ' ἀπ' Αἰγίνας διαγγέλλοισ'... (*N.* 5.2-4)[282]

The songs are dynamic and active in comparison to the ἀγάλματα; not only do they travel, but they are depicted as messengers, bringing news of Pytheas' victory abroad (3).[283]

280 Previous treatments of this ode, such as that of Pfeijffer (2004): 230-231 have interpreted the song of the Muses without due consideration of the frame narrative; in his otherwise thorough and valuable narratological analysis of the embedded song in *N.* 5 there is little said on the links between the Muses' song and the lines which precede it.
281 For the re-performance of Pindar's odes, see Morrison (2007a): 11-19 and 81ff, Currie (2004): 49-69 offers different models of re-performance scenario.
282 The Greek text of Pindar throughout is that of Maehler (post B. Snell [hereafter *SMPi*]), Vol. 1 (1987) and Vol. 2 (1989).
283 Robbins (1987): 32 notes that "the ode will not be confined to the island".

Sculpture is represented as *silent* in contrast to the speaking poems, which inform their audience of news from other lands. The statue is also interpretatively static, a momentary pose captured forever in stone or metal and harnessed to one spot by a pedestal. The speaker's awareness of future performances for his poem implies the opposite for them: they are to be re-sung across the world, and it is possible for their meaning to have universal as well as local significance.[284] These lines herald the self-consciousness of the poet, who already as the poem is just beginning envisages a re-performance context for it. Unlike sculpture, which remains in one location and is essentially passive by its very nature (or at least so Pindar would have us believe), a poem is ultimately exportable. The claim is not only for poetic excellence but also reflects well on the *laudandus* who is presented as a worthy subject for song across Greece.[285]

At line 13b, after detailing the achievement of Pytheas and praising Aegina, the poet again turns to the subject of song, or rather what is and is not a desirable subject for poetry. A mythical narrative about the Aeacids is rejected on grounds of propriety. The speaker mentions the event elliptically, signaling his unease at the subject-matter, αἰδέομαι (13b), before alluding to the murder of Phocus in very vague terms. The deed itself is presented as morally ambiguous, ἐν δίκᾳ τε μὴ κεκινδυνευμένον (14), and the poet avoids mentioning any proper names, so Aegina is the εὐκλέα νᾶσον (15), Peleus and Telamon are ἄνδρας ἀλκίμους (15).[286] The strong first person statement of 13 is paralleled in στάσομαι at the beginning of line 16. This bold claim, "I will stand still", could be read as referring both to the words of the poem and the physical motion of the dance which would have

284 Contra Burnett (1985): 77 "The point about an epic...was that it would be repeated. A victory ode...was sounded out only in its one costly performance and was never produced again".
285 Elsewhere in the odes, Pindar compares his song with plastic art and architecture in a positive way: *Ol.*6.1-3 the song is described as a building adorned with golden columns; *N.* 3.4 the chorus is described as the τέκτονες of song; *N.* 4.79-81 the poem is metaphorically compared to a stele.
286 For Burnett (2005): 67-8, the silence of the poet does not necessarily indicate moral disapprobation, for she argues that this refusal of the poet to treat the Phocus episode does not indicate disapproval: "The sung words contain no syllable that condemns Peleus and Telamon". However, the use of the word αἰδέομαι at line 13 and the fact that the poet does not in fact treat the myth in detail suggests that Pindar is here aware that some subjects (such as fratricide) are not suitable for his genre: if Peleus is the mythical comparandum for the *laudandus*, then the poet must tell a story which brings glory on both men.

accompanied it. The speaker here calls an abrupt halt to proceedings, and furthermore adds a gnomic statement extolling the virtues of silence, καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώ- |τατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι (18).[287] So, the narrator tells us directly that he shrinks from telling an unflattering tale of fratricide from Aeginetan myth (hinted at in the preceding lines of the ode, 10-13) and, after a gnomic statement extolling discretion (albeit only in certain circumstances), the narrator gives an account of his preferred subjects for poetry: praising happiness (ὄλβον), physical strength (χειρῶν βίαν) and war (πόλεμον). These lines (19-21) are the reverse image of the previous section (which dealt with unsuitable topics of song), and in contrast to the stunted silence of 16-18, the imagery here invokes the power of the poet. He is first compared to a successful athlete, able to overcome a strenuous physical challenge, ἔχω γονάτων ὁρμὰν ἐλαφράν, then imagined as an eagle soaring over the sea, καὶ πέραν πόντοιο πάλλοντ' αἰετοί, which recalls the sea-faring *aoidoi* of the opening lines, and claims international appeal for poetry once again.

So what should we make of this in connection with the subsequent song of the Muses? These last lines (19-21) give us a reason for the speaker's earlier reticence: by setting out the ideal or preferred subjects for his song the narrator implies that it is the epinician poem's *genre*, its remit to praise, which makes the Aeacid fratricide an uncomfortable topic. This is made clear by the strong contrast between the fratricide and the three 'preferred' topics of 19-21 – the fratricide leaves the narrator ashamed and static (αἰδέομαι 14 and στάσομαι 16), while the war, happiness and athletic prowess of 19-20 inspire him to great heights of poetry represented in a double metaphor which transforms the static faltering of line 16 into the dynamic movement of an athlete's jump and an eagle's swoop across the sea.

When read in the hindsight of subject-matter of the Muses' song, these first person

287 For the poet as a 'moraliser' in this respect see Morrison (2007b): 68-9, Maehler (1982): 92, Fogelmark (1979): 72, Bundy (1962): 64; Hunter (2008): 119-20 discusses this type of reticence in the Hellenistic poets.

statements at 14 and 16, referring respectively to the speaker's shame and his verbal (and even physical) paralysis regarding the story of Phocus (αἰδέομαι 14 and στάσομαι 16), could also suggest that it is not concerns of genre alone which affect what can and cannot be told in a poem. In his cautious treatment of the Phocus myth, the poet sets up the idea that some stories have a pernicious quality in the mouth of the wrong speaker, as well when told in the wrong context. Having rejected the Phocus story as inappropriate, he is supplanted by internal narrators who sing a myth which seems in some ways just as inappropriate: the story of a young Peleus' encounter with a sexual predator. The Muses' authority as the divine source of poetry guarantees the acceptability of the story in an epinician (or indeed in any poem). We might compare the famous passage from *Ol.* 1.47-51, where the traditional but gorier tale of Thyestes' cannibal feast is relegated to the mouth of a jealous neighbour, while the speaker holds himself aloof from such subject-matter: again we find a strong first person statement, ἀφίσταμαι (*Ol.* 1.52), and the same issues of genre-appropriate material are clearly in play. Before the Muses even enter, then, the speaker has made clear his interest in the construction of, and even the ethics of, poetry. This disingenuous refusal to treat inappropriate subject-matter, which has been interpreted as arising from the spontaneity (i.e. lack of artistic planning) of the poem, is actually used in a sophisticated, self-conscious manner as the poet plays with his audience and their knowledge of the traditional myths of Aegina.[288] He displays his own knowledge of the mythic history of the island by referring obliquely to a famous story, but titillates his listeners by refusing to go into details. The same technique is used much later by Callimachus in fr.75 of the *Aetia*, where the narrator disingenuously pretends to be on the verge of telling a lewd story about Hera:

"Ἥρην γάρ κοτέ φασι...κύον, κύον, ἴσχεο, λαιδρέ
θυμέ, σύ γ' ἀείσῃ καὶ τά περ οὐχ ὁσίη (4-5)[289]

The self-reproach of the narrator in Callimachus' poem is humorously hyperbolic as he

288 Finley (1955): 47, whose views are updated by Morrison (2007b): 67-73, by what he terms (artful) 'pseudo-spontaneity'.
289 The text of Callimachus throughout is that of Pfeiffer (1949).

berates himself with repeated insults (κύον, κύον), and enlarges on the possibilities for a careless poet to be indecorous (9-10). Although the tone of Callimachus' narrator is lighter and more humorous, the technique is essentially the same. Both poets play self-consciously with appropriate and inappropriate subject-matter for poetry. Most interesting here, perhaps, is the fact that Pindar's narrator, having rejected the Phocus story as inappropriate, is then supplanted by internal narrators who sing of a myth with illicit sexual content. It is crucial that these self-conscious themes of the poem are recognized as the background for the inset song that follows (the whole embedded song is printed in full below).

πρόφρων δὲ καὶ κείνοις ἄειδ' ἐν Παλίῳ
Μοισᾶν ὁ κάλλιστος χορός, ἐν δὲ μέσαις
φόρμιγγ' Ἀπόλλων ἑπτάγλωσσον
χρυσέῳ πλάκτρῳ διώκων
ἀγεῖτο παντοίων νόμων· αἱ δὲ πρώτιστον μὲν ὕμνη-
-σαν Διὸς ἀρχόμεναι σεμνὰν Θέτιν
Πηλέα θ', ὥς τέ νιν ἁβρὰ
Κρηθεῖς Ἱππολύτα δόλῳ πεδᾶσαι
ἤθελε ξυνᾶνα Μαγνήτων σκοπόν
πείσαισ' ἀκοίταν ποικίλοις βουλεύμασιν,
ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον,
ὡς ἦρα νυμφείας ἐπείρα
κεῖνος ἐν λέκτροις Ἀκάστου
εὐνᾶς· τὸ δ' ἐναντίον ἔσκεν· πολλὰ γάρ νιν παντὶ θυμῷ
παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν.
τοῖο δ' ὀργὰν κνίζον αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι·
εὐθὺς δ' ἀπανάνατο νύμφαν,
ξεινίου πατρὸς χόλον
δείσαις· ὁ δ' εὖ φράσθη κατένευ-
σέν τέ οἱ ὀρσινεφὴς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ
Ζεὺς ἀθανάτων βασιλεύς, ὥστ' ἐν τάχει
ποντίαν χρυσαλακάτων τινὰ Νη-
ρεΐδων πράξειν ἄκοιτιν,
γαμβρὸν Ποσειδάωνα πείσαις, ὃς Αἰγᾶθεν ποτὶ κλει-
τὰν θαμὰ νίσεται Ἰσθμὸν Δωρίαν·
ἔνθα νιν εὔφρονες ἵλαι
σὺν καλάμοιο βοᾷ θεὸν δέκονται,
καὶ σθένει γυίων ἐρίζοντι θρασεῖ.
Πότμος δὲ κρίνει συγγενὴς ἔργων πέρι
πάντων. τὺ δ' Αἰγίναθε δίς, Εὐθύμενες,
Νίκας ἐν ἀγκώνεσσι πίτνων
ποικίλων ἔψαυσας ὕμνων.
ἤτοι μεταΐξαις σὲ καὶ νῦν τεὸς μάτρως ἀγάλλει
κείνου ὁμόσπορον ἔθνος, Πυθέα. (*N.* 5.22-43)

The embedded song in *Nemean* 5 is performed by a chorus of Muses singing on Mount

Pelion and forms the mythic narrative section of the poem.[290] The scene on Pelion is described as a choral performance of the Muses, a κάλλιστος χορός, with Apollo as accompanist and *choregos*.[291] It is usually interpreted by modern critics as the performance of the Muses at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, which Pindar mentions elsewhere at *Pythian* 3.88-92.[292] The Muses sing more than one kind of song: their *prooimion* to Zeus and its continuation into a narrative about Thetis (25-6) suggests a hymnic performance, while the part of their song given in most detail is a heroic narrative concerning mortals, namely the story of the wife of Acastus and her attempted seduction of Peleus. The implication is that successful mortals are as popular a subject-matter as gods for the Muses' songs.

The very presence of the Muses' performance in this poem has positive implications for the authority of the poet-narrator. Like Hesiod in the proem of the *Theogony*, Pindar knows what the Muses sing and is able to report it in his own poem, implying a close relationship with the patrons of poetry. This relationship is deepened even further by the layering of their song into his own: unlike, for instance the songs of Demodocus in the *Odyssey* (which are essentially digressive in structure), the song of the Muses is structurally integral to the epinican ode since their performance on Pelion functions as the mythical narrative section in the current praise poem for Pytheas. The effect of this is a blending of poetic voice which reflects positively on victor and poet alike.

The poet hands over the narratorial role in his ode to the Muses, having just heralded his own inability to sing of inappropriate topics; the question is, how much more appropriate is the song of the Muses? Their song has been accused of being unfit for

290 For the status of myth in the epinician genre cf. Hutchinson (2001): 367-8. The scholia *ad N.* 5.46a (=Drachmann (1927): 94) note the song of the Muses and discuss the fact that they take their proem from Zeus, but do not go any further in discussing the embedding of this song.
291 For a discussion of the choral representation of the Muses in *Nemean* 5 see Nagy (1990): 355.
292 Thus Burnett (2005): 70, Fogelmark (1979): 73, Fennell (1899): 62, Farnell (1932) : 276, Bury (1890): 85. Cf. Robbins (1987): 29 for an acknowledgement that this location for the Muses' is in fact not mentioned in *Nemean* 5 itself "no doubt at Peleus' wedding (though we are not specifically told this)"

epinician, dealing as it does with the "immoral" sexual exploits of Hippolyta.[293] In particular, Anne Pippin Burnett has argued that the song is highly inappropriate, and that its un-martial context undermines Peleus' status as a hero. For her the contest is "an indecent one, that pits a lusty and scheming female against an immature youth who has no chance to show heroic courage".[294] If this view of the Muses' song as unheroic and vulgar is accepted, the embedded myth of Peleus, who functions here as a mythical exemplum for the *laudandus,* is ineffective: it fails to cast a positive light on the victor and in fact narrates a shameful episode from his country's mythical past, the very thing that the narrator shrank from doing in lines 14-21. However, it may be possible to rehabilitate this song of the Muses from such accusations of generic failure and immorality.

I would argue that the juxtaposition of the Muses' song to the poet's discussion of what he may and may not sing implies an awareness of the difference between mortal and immortal speakers. The reluctance of the poet to speak of things unlawful (14-18) is not made applicable to the internal choir of the Muses. While silence may be wiser for *mortals*, καὶ τὸ σιγᾶν πολλάκις ἐστὶ σοφώτατον ἀνθρώπῳ νοῆσαι (18) it is not necessary for divinities, who sing all kinds of *nomoi* (παντοίων νόμων 25).[295] Moreover, while the repressed story of Phocus' murder contains the crime of a hero, the story of Hippolyta and Peleus does not – it is not the hero who is at fault here; in fact his respect for the laws of *xenia* is praiseworthy and gains him reward from Zeus (34-5). It is also unsatisfactory to argue, as Burnett does, that the song is unheroic because it does not display "strength of arm or yet soldierly skill".[296] This display of Peleus' restraint in the face of unlawful temptation fits into the story-pattern of 'hero tempted by a woman he may not have', which recurs

293 Burnett (2005): 70-6, Fennell (1899):56.
294 Burnett (2005): 71.
295 Nagy (1990): 355-6 argues persuasively that the *nomoi* of *Nemean* 5.25 refer to the Muses' songs and not to Apollo's music.
296 Burnett (2005): 71.

throughout Greek and Near Eastern literature.[297] Hippolytus is no less a hero because his story is one of the rejection of incest: what would make him less of a hero is succumbing to unlawful passions. So it is for Peleus. The story of Peleus and Hippolyta functions here as a kind of cautionary tale, warning the young victor that his success will bring advances from unsuitable women, but lawful, divinely sanctioned marriage is the only acceptable path.[298] As glorious marriage is Peleus' reward, so it may be the reward of athletic victory.[299] Indeed Pindar elsewhere links marriage and athletic victory, as in *Ol.* 1, where the two are physically merged in the tale of Pelops snatching Hippodameia and escaping in a chariot race.[300]

The Muses lend their authority as the source of poetry to another aspect of the mythical tale.[301] This particular story of Peleus and Hippolyta (in which Peleus' marriage to Thetis is directly motivated by his repudiation of Hippolyta) is almost certainly a Pindaric innovation.[302] At *Nemean 4*.48-65 the Hippolyta episode is mentioned but is it not directly linked with the marriage of Peleus and Thetis as it is in *Nemean* 5; it rather forms part of a sequence of events culminating in the wrestling match with Thetis which results in her rape and subsequent marriage.[303] The more usual motivation for the marriage between

297 For instance, the Bible story of Joseph and Potiphar's wife, and, in the Greek tradition, Bellerophon (*Il.* 6.160-205) and the Hippolytus myth. See Stern (1971): 69 and Lesky (1937): 26-30.
298Gärtner (1978): 39-40 argues for a biographical motivation for the story of Peleus and Thetis – that Pindar has included it because it reflects the marital circumstances of the victor's father, whom he postulates is married to a woman of higher status than himself. Such a historical interpretation can only ever remain speculation, and moreover, seems hardly likely to please the victor (which is surely the strongest objection against such a reading).
299 Cf. (for a slightly different slant on the marriage-theme in epinician) Burnett (2005): 75 "This sequence is meant to remind Pytheas and his chorus that the purpose of marriage is...the transfer of an inherited, divinely determined and success-bearing fate from one generation to the next".
300 On the play between tradition and innovation in this poem see Scodel (2001): 128-9. Cf. also *Pythian* 9, where success in the race leads Alexidamas to marriage inside the myth, while outside it the emphasis is on the women of Cyrene waiting for Telesicrates to come home (95-100). Carne-Ross (1985): 26-30 discusses this link between sexual language and the language of victory in epinician.
301 If my argument here is accepted, this instance would provide an exception to the comment of Scodel (2001): 123 "Yet in his epinicia [Pindar] never cites the [Muses] as an authority for his versions of a story or for any other point of truth".
302 Stoneman (1981): 61 "it seems to me typical of the kind of change Pindar makes in his myths: it elevates the moral character of the hero if he receives his bride, not through the arbitrary goodwill of Hera, but directly as a reward for his actions".
303 Henry (2005): 23 "There is little evidence for the date". Pfeijffer (1999): 59 and earlier (1995): 318-332 has argued for a date in 487 BC, based on hints in the content of the poem at a war between Athens and Aegina but this direct equation between poetic fiction and historical fact is fraught with problems and cannot

Thetis and Peleus in myth is the impossibility of a marriage between Zeus and Thetis (either because of Thetis' respect for Hera, or because Zeus fears a prophecy that Thetis' son will be greater than his father).[304] Pindar's representation of the winning of a glorious marriage through piety and restraint changes the motivation of the action from one of divine prerogative to human excellence, the key theme in any victory ode.[305] Pindar's innovation here is validated by the choice of narrator for the embedded song: by presenting it in the mouths of the Muses the poet gives credibility to his new myth and to his choice to play down the divine element of the traditional story. Moreover the location of the performance, at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, gives his version of the myth temporal priority, since the song of the Muses is thus presented as the *first* poetic account of the winning of Thetis, giving it the additional authority of being the earliest version of the story.

Pindar reflects further on this authorizing strategy within the poem through the language he uses to describe speech and song, showing again that interest in words and the power of words to praise or harm is something of a leitmotif of the poem. Epinician poetry and Hippolyta's verbal tricks within the song of the Muses are very similarly described in *Nemean* 5: at 42, the songs which rewarded the victory of Euthymenes are described as ποικίλων ὕμνων: the same adjective is used to describe the plans of Hippolyta in the embedded song, ποικίλοις βουλεύμασιν (28), while the songs of the gods themselves are also qualified by a similar adjective at line 25, ἀγεῖτο παντοίων νόμων. Moreover, both Hippolyta and the narrator of *Nemean* 5 tell lies through selectivity with the truth – Hippolyta in her attempted persuasions of Peleus and successful persuasion of Akastos (note

be relied upon to supply the date of the poem. Maehler (1982): 251 offers 483 BC but also suggests the possibility of 485 BC.

304 Pfeijffer (1999): 74 "According to the traditional story...Thetis was given to Peleus because of certain inconvenient, sensitive issues in Olympian politics". Although Pfeijffer bases his evidence that the Themis-version of the story was more traditional on later sources (Apollodorus 3.13.5 and Apollonius Rhodius 4.790-80), there are hints of this version in earlier texts, cf. *Cypria* fr. 2 = Hesiod fr.210 (West) where the motivation for the marriage in *Cypria* and Hesiod is said to be that Zeus was angry at Thetis' refusal of him.

305 Burnett (2005): 71 sees Peleus' actions in the myth as "a disappointment" and comments "The ultimate blessedness of the wedding on Pelion has thus been won by mere discretion".

especially παρφαμένα 31) and *Nemean* 5 in its refusal to tell the full truth about Phocus.[306] This can be pushed even further, for not only are Hipployta's words a lie, but the whole Peleus-Hippolyta episode, if it is a Pindaric innovation, is thus in one sense open to the accusation of being a lie in comparison with the traditional 'true' but unsavoury story of Phocus' murder. So the poem plays with fiction and reality, tradition and innovation.

It is useful to think again of *Olympian* 1, for in this poem too there is a very similar play with innovation, authority, truth and lies in the denial of the gorier version of the Pelops story in favour of a sanitized story. However, Pindar still includes the 'original' version of the Pelops myth within his odes, although he condemns it as a lie placed in the mouth of a jealous neighbour who tells the falsehood out of spite. The innovation in *Olympian* 1 is spoken by the primary narrator and *denied* by an internal speaker while here the innovation is given to a divine chorus as a validation strategy. In his reflection on truth and lies in *Ol.* 1, after Pindar has stated that lies can be made believable through charming narration ('Χάρις δ'...ἐπιφέροισα τιμὰν καὶ ἄπιστον ἐμήσατο πιστόν |ἔμμεναι τὸ πολλάκις'), he also states that *mortals* are the cause of lies, implying as he does in *N.* 5 that the identity of the narrator may be as important as the story they tell:

> ...καί πού τι καὶ **βροτῶν**
> φάτις ὑπὲρ τὸν ἀλαθῆ λόγον
> δεδαιδαλμένοι ψεύδεσι ποικίλοις
> ἐξαπατῶντι μῦθοι. (28-9)

STRUCTURE

The song of the Muses is introduced with the verb ἄειδ' in line 22, and their chorus and location on Pelion are described, along with Apollo's lyre-playing (23-5) before the subject of their song is given in detail. In 25-6, another verb of singing introduces their

306 Hubbard (1985): 106-7.

performance (ὕμνησαν) and finally the story of Hippolyta begins with the introductory ὥς in line 26. At the beginning of the Muses' performance, then, we are left in little doubt as to the speaker(s) of the *prooimion* to Zeus, the unelaborated story of Thetis and the Peleus-Hippolyta story. In contrast to its carefully delineated opening, the Muses' song has no explicitly marked ending. After this ὥς there are no further markers of indirect discourse, allowing the Muses' song to blend seamlessly with the rest of the ode so that it is very difficult to draw a line between the end of the Muses song and the return to first person, authorial, narration.[307] The passage below makes clear how the end of the Muses song is difficult to pin-point, for the actions of Zeus at the end of the second triad (up until line 36) are firmly part of the mythical narrative, telling of Peleus' reward for his piety, but with the beginning of the third triad, the transition between mythical narrative and a return to the present (and praise of the victor's family) is effected by means of a relative clause linking Poseidon as a character in the Peleus-Thetis story to the cult figure of Poseidon at the Isthmian games; a gnomic statement about inherited victory follows, then a direct reference to the victory of Euthymenes in the games.[308] This associative structure blurs the voices of primary and reported narrator: we might feel certain that by lines 45-6, where we have a return to the first-person singular in χαίρω, the primary narrator is speaking again. But before that, it is difficult to say precisely where the Muses stop speaking and Pindar begins: is it at the relative clause? The gnomic statement? The account of Euthymenes' victories? After that, even? This blurring between narratorial voices reflects the authority of the Muses onto the primary narrator. He not only claims to know and to be able to report *what* the Muses sang in the mythical past (a technique familiar from the early Greek hexameter

307 Gärtner (1978): 36 suggests that the Muses' song ends at line 39, while Robbins (1987): 29 argues for line 37 as the end of their song, on the grounds that it would be "oddly anachronistic to have the Muses singing of the Isthmian games at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis" – I would argue that such a slippage of time is exactly what Pindar is trying to achieve with the inset song. Burnett (2005): 72 argues that the Muses' song ends at line 38. Cf. too Stern (1971): 173, Pfeijffer (2004): 230, Fera (2000): 144. Bury (1890): 85-6 notes the blending at both beginning and end of the Muses' song: "thus the connexion of thought is really close between lines 21 and 22; there is not, as at first might appear, a break and a fresh start" ... "the peals of Apollo's lyre pass suddenly into the sounds of the flutes which greet the coming of the sea-king to his Isthmian games".

308 Bury (1890): 86 notes the suddenness of the transition from mythical narrative to praise of the victor's family but does not comment further upon it. Cf. also Burnett (2005): 72.

poets and one which would increase his poetic authority in any case), but appropriates their voice for his praise poetry.[309] This blurring between narratorial voices has the effect of conferring divine interest and involvement in the victory of Pytheas, who has a chorus not only of humans, but of goddesses hymning his victory. This divine involvement in human affairs is echoed in the Muses' mythical narrative itself, in Zeus' acknowledgement and reward of Peleus' virtue, and also in the transitional section in the presence of Poseidon at the Isthmus for athletic games at lines 36-9. In the last line of the poem, the Graces attend Pytheas' victory procession, which is σὺν ξανθαῖς Χάρισσιν.

The poet sets up a challenge to himself in the opening lines of the poem: he is not an ἀνδριαντοποιός, who creates static, mimetic images, but a creator of sweet songs. What follows is Pindar's answer to the art of the sculptor, a complex poem which has two narrators and the possibility of at least one more, which reflects as much on the mechanics of creating epinician as on the victory of Pytheas.[310] What, then, is the effect of the embedded song in this victory ode as a whole? One of the possible functions of embedded song discussed above is as a poetic strategy to include themes or motifs not otherwise found in the genre of the main narrative. Here, the song of the Muses *does* in one way narrate generically aberrant material, since it contains a Pindaric innovation, which is validated and arrogated to the tradition through its vocalization by the goddesses who are the very source of poetry itself.

Embedded song also allows the narration of events outside the time of the frame-

309 Pfeijffer (1999): 72 rather sees the chorus of Muses merging with the "Aeginetan" chorus who performed the ode: "By creating the illusion that the Muses are still singing when the victories are mentioned, the Aeginetan chorus performing the present ode merges with the chorus of the Muses: it as [sic] singing for Pytheas and his family just as the chorus of Muses sang for Peleus". In the absence of any evidence for such a chorus, and the presence of a strongly characterized primary narrator, I prefer to see the exchange of authority in the terms I have set out above.

310 Hippolyta's skill with words in the myth implies several impressive speeches which are here suppressed: her prowess in language is described several times in the short song. Cf. ψεύσταν δὲ ποιητὸν συνέπαξε λόγον (29), παρφαμένα λιτάνευεν (31), αἰπεινοὶ λόγοι (32) and the ποικίλιοις βουλεύμασιν: trickery described in the language of speech.

narrative.[311] While the mythical narrative of the Muses in *N.* 5 may seem to slot easily into the analeptic function, the effect of 'merging' voices (caused by the fact that the Muses' song is not closed off, but continues into the praise of Pytheas and his family) gives the inset song the feeling of being an immediate performance rather than an analeptic one. The narration of the Muses is not a flashback in the same way as, for instance, the *apologoi* of Odysseus. The most important difference is the motivation of the inset narrative: whereas a simple analeptic narrative fills in gaps in the pre-story, the Muses here narrate a story which is essentially linked to the victor. The fame and immortal glory of Peleus merge with that of the victor as the song of the Muses merges with the voice of the primary narrator. Thus the Muses' song is and is not a manipulation of narrative time in the way that Pfeijffer means: the scope of time is complex, and made more so by the blurring between internal and external narrators. The effect of the victory ode being taken over by the Muses is that it, and the praise it confers on the victor, become immortal and timeless, and in this way the inset song evades time as well as manipulating it. The present epinician is at the same time set against a divine hymnic, mythical performance (the Muses' proem to Zeus and Thetis, the tale of Peleus) and *merged* with it, appropriating for the victor the status of epic hero and for the poem, canonical status.

Placing the victory ode, or at least part of it, into the mouths of the divine Muses has obvious implications for the encomiastic aim of the poem. The Homeric hero Odysseus boasts that his fame has reached the heavens (*Od.* 9.20). Pindar makes this claim literally true for Pytheas: the appearance of the Muses in *N.* 5 elevates the fame of victor to the heavens and makes him an object of interest for the gods, while it also presents the poet as an equivalent to the divine source of poetry.

Pindar's use of a divine chorus, then, may be seen as a strategy of praise for his

311 Noted as a function of embedded song in lyric by Pfeijffer (2004): 226.

victor, and as a poetically competitive device which sets him at the pinnacle of his profession, since he (like Hesiod before him) claims to know what the Muses have sung and even dares to blend his own voice with theirs. Bacchylides, in his poem for the same victor, also augments his voice with that of an internal narrator, but he chooses a quite different choir from that of the Muses on Pelion.

2.3 Bacchylides 13: Human Praise

In B.13, Bacchylides presents a chorus of Aeginetan maidens who sing, like the Muses in *N.* 5, a mythical narrative. As Pindar's chorus of Muses was foreshadowed in *N.* 5 with several self-conscious reflections on song, so too Bacchylides introduces song as a vital theme of his poem long before the maidens are depicted. The beginning of the poem is lost, but it is possible to reconstruct a prophecy or similar pronouncement that serves to link the *pankration*, the event in which Pytheas (the *laudandus*) is victor, with a Herculean labour, the defeat of the Nemean lion.[312] At line 67, the poet turns to the present day and the benefits of Pytheas' victory in his home city; he is garlanded with flowers and, more significantly, with song, as his city is rich in soft-voiced revels, ἁβ[ροθρ]όων κώμ[ων] (40-1), specifically in honour of his distinction in the *pankration,* ὑπέρβι[ον] ἰσχὺν παμμαχίαν ἄνα φαίνων (42-3). These songs in honour of a victory in the games, which are described as pleasant to hear, τε]ρψιμ[β]ρότων (39), immediately recall the victory ode in progress and signal song and the role of song in celebrating the victor as a theme in the poem. Already in this depiction of the victor, crowned with flowers and celebrated by his fellow-citizens, there is a focus on human praise and civic song as a means of honour, rather than the divine song which was used to honour Pytheas in *N.* 5.

312 Cf. Cairns (2010): 300 n.13-43, also Maehler (1982) *ad loc* and Jebb (1905) *ad loc.* for their reconstructions and suggestions.

This theme is signalled again a few lines later where a proud maiden, ὑψαυχὴς κό[ρα (84), is depicted singing of Aegina, the victor's hometown. The physical details of the girl's performance are dwelt on: her feet are mentioned, πόδεσσι ταρφέως (52), and she is compared to a fawn, ἠΰτε νεβρὸς ἀπεν[θὴς (54). The song is a choral one, for she is joined by local girls, ἀγχιδόμ[οις]...ἑταίρα]ις (56-7). They are all garlanded as if for a festival στεφανωσάμε[ναι φοιν]ικέων ἀνθέων (58-9), with the particular detail that the flowers (as well as the maidens) are local ἐ[πιχω]ρίαν ἄθυρσιν (59-60), which gives emphasis to the Aeginetan tone of the poem.[313] The imagery of the fawn gives a sexual tint to the presentation of the maiden dancing as it recalls erotic lyric poetry such as Anacreon fr.408 *PMG*, where a timid maiden is compared to a fawn, or fr.417, where the movements of the girl are compared to a frisky filly playing in surroundings similar to those of the girls here, observed by an aroused male onlooker.[314]

The song of the maidens does not have a secure endpoint within the text, although this is more due to the fragmentary nature of the poem than any deliberate blurring on the part of the poet. The certain portion of their song, plus the (possible) transition from their embedded song back to the voice of the primary narrator, are printed in full below.

τό γε σὸν [κλέος αἰ]νεῖ
καί τις ὑψαυχὴς κό[ρα –]
[–⏑⏑–⏑⏑]ραν πό-
δεσσι ταρφέως
ἠΰτε νεβρὸς ἀπεν[θὴς]
ἀνθεμόεντας ἐπ[ʻ ὄχθους]
κοῦφα σὺν ἀγχιδόμ[οις] θρῴσ-
κουσ᾽ ἀγακλειτα[ῖς ἑταίρα]ις·
ταὶ δὲ στεφανωσάμε[ναι φοιν]ικέων
ἀνθέων δόνακός τ᾽ ἐ[πιχω]ρί-
αν ἄθυρσιν
παρθένοι μέλπουσι τ[⏑–⏑⏑]ς, ὦ δέσ-
-ποινα παγξε[ίνου χθονός,]
[Ἐν]δαΐδα τε ῥοδό[παχυν,]
ἃ τὸ[ν ἰσ]ό[θε]ον ἔτι[κτεν Πηλέα]
καὶ Τελαμ[ῶ]να [κο]ρυ[στὰν]

313 Cairns (2010): 303n.77-99 takes the girls' song as evidence of a 'traditional' performance in Aegina, cf. also 304n.87-9, where he says it "no doubt reflects Aeginetan tradition", however there is no real evidence for this in the poem – the girls' performance may very well be an invention of the poet.
314 The imagery has also been compared to that in the new Sappho – cf. Fearn (2007): 122n.96.

Αἰακῷ μιχθεῖσ᾽ ἐν εὐ[νᾷ·]
τῶν υἷας ἀερσιμάχ[ους,] 100
ταχύν τ᾽ Ἀχιλλέα
εὐειδέος τ᾽ Ἐριβοίας
παῖδ᾽ ὑπέρθυμον βοά[σω... (B.13.83-100)[315]

The maiden whose description introduces the song should probably be understood as a universal, rather than specific, figure. Such an interpretation increases the value of her praise, for it implies that "many a maiden" sings the praises of Aegina, rather than one specific girl.[316] The topic of the girl's song is introduced before she herself is described: τό γε σὸν [κλέος αἰ]νεῖ | καί τις ὑψαυχὴς κό[ρα –](83-4), thus the emphasis is placed firmly on Aegina rather than on the performer. The details of her song are delayed by a description of the proud maiden, the chorus which accompanies her, and the location of their performance which seems to be in a flowery, bucolic landscape (87-90). She and her chorus of local girls sing of Aeacus, son of Aegina and his union with Endais, which resulted in the heroic sons Peleus and Telamon. Their song forms part of the mythical narrative of the ode, setting the victor's achievement in the context of the glorious mythical past of the island where he was born; generically it seems likely to be a song of heroic genealogy, or (depending on where their song ends) an epic-style narrative which is prefigured with a genealogical history of the heroes involved.

The significance of the female chorus' presentation here is ambiguous. Power suggests that this sexualization of the *parthenos* chorus presents the female *choregos* as an idealized partner for the victor, and "not as a mirror of the epinician *choregos*".[317] According to Power, the song of the women places them outside the civilized bounds of the city and the victor must marry the maiden "to reintegrate into the world of the polis the *choregos*, who dances with her chorus outside this space in nature". However, Power also bases his argument on Kurke's theory that the victory ode stands to reintegrate the victor

315 The text of Bacchylides throughout is that of Snell and Maehler (1992) (hereafter *SMBa*); any changes to their edition are indicated in the notes.
316 For this use of τις in Bacchylides see Maehler (2004):143 n.31-3.
317 Power (2000): 78-80.

into society, and it is difficult to see how a song sung by maidens themselves outside the bounds of society could achieve this.[318] In fact, their song is not at all outside the polis, but concerns the mythical roots of the city. It is genealogical in tone, beginning with Aegina as mistress and motherland and detailing the succession of glorious children that sprang from Aegina's union with Zeus, going down through the generations. Snell and Maehler's reconstruction of the lacuna in line 61 as referring to the *kleos* of Aegina makes the polis-centred tone of the girls' song even clearer.[319] This subject-matter and the emphasis on the girls as local, crowned with local flowers, suggests that the maidens are not wild, exotic creatures who need to be tamed to be socially acceptable, but rather the voice (or at least one of the voices) of the triumphant polis itself.

At line 103 there is a textual crux, the interpretation of which is key to understanding the nature of the maidens' song. The papyrus is broken at the end of line 103, and the line end has been supplemented by Housman (followed by Snell and Maehler, Cairns, Power and Fearn) as βοα[σω, which changes the speaker from the internal chorus to a first-person narrator.[320] However Jebb (followed by Blass, Jurenka, Calame) believed the song of the maidens continued until 190 and offered βοα[θόον as a supplement to line 103 (Blass suggests βοα[τάν).[321] The reading of Jebb also requires a minor supplementation to line 100 whereby τῶν νΐας ἀερσιμάχ[ους,] becomes τῶν ⟨θ'⟩ νίας ἀερσιμάχ[ους,].[322] Cairns points out that the reading of the papyrus as it stands demands a finite verb at 103, which βοά[σω supplies.[323] To solve this textual problem definitively is impossible given the state of the papyrus, but although it would be of great significance to know how much of the mythical narrative Bacchylides definitively put into the mouth of his

318 Power (2000): 77, after Kurke (1991).
319 Fearn (2007): 107 suggests *kratos* to fill this lacuna (after Blass, cf. Jebb (1905: 342)) which would have a similar semantic implications– the girls sing of the power of Aegina, not of any peculiarly "female" concerns.
320 Cf. Cairns (2010): 305, Fearn (2007): 107, Power (2000): 73-5, *SMBa* 44.
321 Jebb (1905): 343 "it is still the maidens that sing". Cf. *SMBa* 44.
322 τῶν ⟨θ'⟩ νίας cf. Jebb (1905): *ad loc.*, *SMBa* 44. For strong criticism of Jebb's amendment to this line see Fearn (2007): 117 n.84.
323 Cairns (2010): 305 n.100.

maiden chorus, it is not a crushing blow to further interpretation to leave the matter unsolved. For, as we shall see, the thematic and structural links between the song of the maidens and the section of the poem immediately following are striking, so much so that the 'Iliadic' myth blurs into the song of the maidens regardless of whether there is a change of speaker or not.

The genealogy of Aegina, begun in the girls' song, is continued at lines 100f.: the sons of Endais sung by the maidens are the fathers of Achilles and Ajax, whose history is more fully developed. The genealogy of Aegina leads to an extended praise of her two most famous descendants, and thus there seems to be a unified plot and structure to this mythical narrative despite the question mark over its narrator(s). The girls are described by the poet as praising the *kleos* of Aegina (83), which fits perfectly with a song about Achilles and Ajax, for these two Aeacid heroes are more worthy of such a description than any other descendants, and their prominence in Homer's *Iliad*, a poem which centres on heroic *kleos*, actively associates them with the term. The Iliadic subject-matter of the myth would strongly evoke these associations in the minds of the audience. Indeed, even the technique of the maidens is thematically linked to the frame narrative, for their song associates the victor with the mythological past in much the same way as the (now largely fragmentary) opening focuses on Heracles' defeat of the Nemean lion.

Power, although he accepts the supplement of Housman (βοά[σω]), nonetheless interprets the maiden-chorus as the singers of the entire mythical narrative.[324] His interpretation is based on the idea that the rest of the myth after 103 proceeds in direct speech, which has been condemned by scholars such as Cairns, who sees the change as unmotivated in the text and difficult for an audience to pick up on in performance.[325] However, a comparison with other embedded songs may prove illuminating here. In the

324 Power (2000): 73.
325 Cairns (2010): 305 n.100-4.

discussion of Demodocus' second song, the so-called 'lay of Ares and Aphrodite', and (for instance) in the discussion of the *HPan*, it was shown how embedded songs which begin in indirect discourse very often 'slip' into direct discourse, losing the markers of indirect speech and proceeding as if the embedded narrative were in fact part of the narrator-text.[326] It is not surprising, given the battered nature of the text, that certain features may seem unmotivated by what precedes them, for we cannot be sure that the original version of the text did not introduce them better. The maiden song in B.13 may well be another example of this slippage between indirect and direct forms or it may be that the speaker does shift back to the external narrator at 103. Even in the latter case, the close structural and thematic links between the maidens' song and the following Iliadic episode (they form, as one unit, the narrative myth of the poem) have the effect of blurring the narrative voice anyway, creating the polyphonic "city of soft-voiced revels" described by Bacchylides at 72-4 before the entrance of the maidens into the ode.

The mythic section of this poem has been dubbed "the most overtly Homeric of all extant epinician odes".[327] It recounts in c.60 lines the basic plot of the *Iliad,* and has a complex time-structure, for although it focuses on an episode arising from the consequences of Achilles' wrath, it tells briefly of the course of the war before the withdrawal of Achilles and prophesies the future destruction of the Trojans when Achilles should return.[328] There is not space or scope here to discuss all the allusions to the Homeric epics in these rich lines (for a detailed discussion of these see Fearn (2007): 120-43).[329] It will be sufficient for our purposes to note the main epic features of the passage, before turning to the use to which Bacchylides puts epic in this poem. This passage is characterized by frequent use of epic-style epithets (almost 20 in 60 lines): Αἴαντα σακεσφόρον (71), ὀξεῖαν μάχα[ν,](84),

326 See above, pp. 67-80 for discussion.
327 Fearn (2007): 120.
328 Cairns (2010): 306 n.105-9 sees the episode as "a single static moment", although this is true of the main action of the myth, the several analepses and the prophetic prolepsis give it a much more dynamic air than Cairns allows.
329 Cf. also Buss (1913): 48-9.

Ἕκτορα χαλ[κεομίτρα]ν (75). An extended epic simile comparing Trojan morale to sailors in a storm takes up 9 lines, and the battle is vividly described with violent imagery, [δ' ἔ[ρ]ευθε φώτω [αἵμα]τι γαῖα μέλα[ινα] (120), urged on by Apollo and Ares, the gods who support the Trojan side in the *Iliad*.

Bacchylides here emphasizes certain factors from the Iliadic source material to his own purposes. The focus is on Ajax and Achilles, two Aeacid heroes, and the only two Iliadic heroes named here which gives an Aeginetan slant to the song. Ajax is painted very much as the key force in the Trojan army during the absence of Achilles, the withdrawal of Achilles is represented as devastating to the Greeks, while the return of Achilles means the ultimate doom of Troy – thus at every stage Aeginetan heroes are key to the progress of the war. The fact that no other Greek hero is mentioned creates the impression that the Trojan War was an Aeacid victory.

As well as this Aeacid focus (obviously motivated by encomiastic aim), several other features of this episode show connections to lyric poetic themes rather than epic style. So the portrayal of Briseis is eroticized, dwelling on her physical beauty: ξανθᾶς γυναικός, [Β]ρ[ι]σηΐδος ἱμερογυίου. The sexual connotation of ἱμερογυίου extends the vision of Briseis in the *Iliad*, where her beauty is mentioned using conventional language but not sexualized.[330]

More significantly, war is linked to athletic victory, for the Trojans plan to celebrate their victory in war with a feasting in the streets and a chorus:[331]

> [στάσειν χ[ο]ρ[ὸ]ν̣ [εἰλα]πίνας τ'ἐν
> [λαοφό]ροις ἔξειν θ[εόδ]ματον πόλιν. (B.13.162-3)

Such civic festivity is what Pytheas was met with in Aegina earlier in the poem:

330 Cf. Maehler (1982) on 133-5, Segal (1998): 272-3, Buss (1913): 15.
331 Accepting the supplement of Fearn (2007): 109, 355. His reconstruction of the papyrus (p.352) is certainly convincing. Cf. Cairns (2010): 318 n.162 "Fearn's suggestions are not unattractive". The paucity of the evidence means that certainty on this point is impossible.

πανθαλέων στεφάνοισιν
ἀνθ]ἑ[ων] χαίταν [ἐρ]εφθείς
αὔξων] πο̣λιν ὑψιάγυιαν
ἤλυθες, τε]ρψιμ̣[β]ρότων
ὥ̣[στε βρύεν] ἀβ›[ροθρ]όων
κώμ̣ω̣[ν] πατρ[ώια]ν
νᾶσο[ν]... (B.13.69-75)

By compressing the story of the *Iliad* into this inset song, Bacchylides offers his victor a miniature epic in his honour, and presents Pytheas as one son of Aegina in a succession who have brought glory to the city. He links the achievement of Pytheas with that of Achilles and Ajax, and implicitly promises the victor the fame of the two legendary heroes. That the girls who sing the epic are emphasized as Aeginetan adds further depth to the locality of the ode: it is vitally, essentially Aeginetan, but, like the Homeric epics, will have pan-Hellenic resonance. Fearn suggests that the comparison drawn here is between the Iliadic heroes and the Aeginetan aristocracy, seeking a political motive for the allusion, but this is to miss the point of the victory ode: Bacchylides is praising an Aeginetan victor, and therefore he praises his home city also. No overtly political partisanship need be attributed to Bacchylides here.[332] Like Pindar in *N.* 5, Bacchylides uses his embedded song(s) as a strategy of praise, although he harnesses the parthenaic authority of the maiden chorus and the pan-Hellenic resonance of epic heroism rather than the superlative quality of divine song in order to do so.

This inset song can, of course, also be read as a poetic claim to excellence. Bacchylides takes on Homeric epic and shows his poetic virtuosity: he can 'do epic', and through interaction with and re-interpretation of his poetic heritage can create something new and uniquely Aeginetan for his victor, a miniature *Iliad* within the praise poem for Pytheas. Thus once more we see embedded song functioning as a means to include poetic material from outside the genre of the frame narrative.

332 Fearn (2007): 143-152.

Power and Fearn both interpret the presence of embedded song in this poem in a highly communitarian manner, although Fearn does claim to challenge Power on this point.[333] For both of them the maiden chorus is a 'strategy of inclusion' in a social sense, allowing the victor to be re-integrated into society: "performance by *parthenoi* appears to naturalize and ritualize the epinician praise which needs ideological and ritual frameworks to legitimate its potentially destabilizing power".[334] Furthermore, both scholars see the chorus' gender as key to interpretation of the inset song: the women stand for marriage, and the production of heirs as a socially reintegrating 'next step' for the victor. However, this privileging of the social and cultural status of epinician, a conceptualization of 'genre in terms of performance and poetics in terms of social function' is perhaps over-emphasized, especially when it leads to interpretation of poetic features such as embedded song with reference only to a socio-political function and too little consideration of possible poetic motivations.[335] Most importantly, a strongly communitarian reading of these odes does not take into account the pan-Hellenic appeal and world-wide re-performance scenarios anticipated within the odes themselves, which imply that any social function the odes may have had is seen as secondary to both poet and victor (whose concerns, at least as expressed within the odes, seem to be for commemoration on a much wider scale).[336] As such, a communitarian reading of the embedded songs in epinician can only provide part of the answer.[337]

Firstly, it is worth considering that, as mentioned above, extended inset song is fairly rare in extant epinician. Of Power's six further examples of references to internal choruses in epinician, none are given voice in the way that the *parthenoi* and the Muses are in the

333 Power (2000): 67-8.
334 Fearn (2007): 118.
335 Kurke (1991): 257.
336 On commemoration in Pindar see *inter alia* Carey (1981): 69-86, Agócs (2009): 33-92, Faraone (2002): 259-270, Segal (1985): 199-212, Thomas (2007): 141-166.
337 This argument applies mainly to 'informal' reperformance scenarios, where the song would not become a cult act on the part of the polis in which it was performed – see Currie (2004): 49-69.

two examples discussed above.[338] If epinician needed to "arrogate to itself the traditional epichoric prestige and standing of the female chorus" in order to be socially acceptable, then we might expect many more examples of such embedded songs within the corpus.[339]

Secondly, Power's reluctance to allow the female voice in the poem to represent the poet fails to take account of the inherently self-referential quality of inset song, seen here clearly in the many links between the song of the maidens and the frame narrative. The girls sing as a voice from and on behalf of Aegina, and their song cannot be de-privileged to a mere mating cry. Their marriageability is certainly an aspect of their presence in the poem, but this need not rob their song of other significance – in fact, if their presentation reflects (as Power argues) their place in a traditional ritual cult, it may even be their marriageable age which qualifies them to sing in the chorus.[340]

In B.13 Bacchylides presents us with a city filled with songs celebrating Pytheas and the glory of Aegina. The girls are not the only singing characters in the ode: as well as the revels mentioned at 73-4, the poet-narrator also exhorts a group of young men to sing at 190. This transference of song from the bardic 'I' βοάσω at 103 to the group emphasizes the choral performance context of the ode and creates an amoebaean effect, with the embedded chorus of girls singing the historic narrative and the boys the victor's present. At the end of the poem when the first-person narrator re-asserts his voice and presents the ode as a newly-woven gift of *songs* in the plural, ὕμνων τινὰ τάνδε ν[εόπλοκον δόσιν, he signals his creation of a plurality of verse within one poem.

The function(s) of embedded song in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* may shed further light on the techniques of Pindar and Bacchylides, for this archaic poem contains (as we saw above) two embedded choruses, one of human maidens, one of Muses. The first

338 Power (2000): 68-9.
339 Power (2000): 71-2.
340 Swift (2010): 173-185.

inset song in the *HAp.* is part of a long and detailed description of the festival on Delos (144-54). It was noted above that the poet of the *HAp.* embeds this festival, and the performance of the Delian girls, within his poem with a view to its re-performance and re-creatability elsewhere. His poet-narrator, the notoriously self-referential "blind man of Chios", promises such future fame to the girls, in what amounts to a promise that he will repeat their song as he travels abroad:

> ἡμεῖς δ' ὑμέτερον κλέος οἴσομεν ὅσσον ἐπ' αἶαν
> ἀνθρώπων στρεφόμεσθα πόλεις εὖ ναιεταώσας·. (*HAp.* 174-5)

There are striking similarities between this embedded song and that of B.13. As the poet of the *HAp.* is careful to embed elements of the festival into the poem, which will be re-performed elsewhere and re-invoke the original performance context across the world, so Bacchylides' *parthenoi* are given a ritual aspect. Despite the difficulty modern scholars have found in identifying a precise (historical) ritual reference for the chorus of Aeginetan maidens in B.13, the presence of a chorus of girls, garlanded and dancing, singing of the local genealogy of Aegina is highly suggestive of some kind of local Aeacid festival. Everything about the Bacchylidean description emphasizes the Aeginetan identity of the poem. As the *HAp.* creates a festival within a poem, which can be exported throughout the world, so Bacchylides creates an exportable Aeginetan festival, not necessarily evoking an actual, historical, ritual occasion but giving the ode essential Aeginetan colour which would be appreciated abroad – this is hinted at line 90 where the maidens are described as ἀγακλειτα[ῖς, *far*-famed, in juxtaposition and contrast with their status as ἀγχιδόμ[οις] *local*-dwelling. Perhaps this reading could explain the difficulty in assigning a specific festival to the occasion described in B.13, for it is not meant as such, but rather to convey a particularly Aeginetan flavour of praise poetry. Thus in both the *HAp.* and B.13 the presence in the poem of a supposedly historical ritual context is actually the creation of a timeless ritual song which can be enacted anywhere the poems are re-performed, and which encodes within itself the (notional) original performance.

As in Pindar *N.* 5, Apollo in the *HAp.* is the accompanist and *choregos* for a performance of the Muses. Their song in the archaic hymn is of the contrast between gods and mortals, the gods have immortal blessings while men are doomed to death. This negative picture of mankind, suffering toil sent from the gods is contrasted with the beautiful scene of musical revelry on Olympus where no disjointed element is permitted. In contrast, Pindar's choir of Muses sings both of gods and the excellence of men: excellence, which is the human route to immortality. Generic differences may partly account for this contrast since hymnic poetry seeks to praise divinity and epinician to praise man: the fact that the *HAp.* focuses on the supreme gulf between human and god, while Pindar takes a more optimistic view, is unsurprising.

The Muses' claim in the *HAp.* that humankind cannot find a cure or remedy for death was shown above (pp. 81-89) to be ironic, or at least to be undercut by the very fact that humans become the subject-matter for immortal song, thus cheating the tragic death that makes them so intriguing for the gods in the first place. Pindar makes the implicit irony of the *HAp.* explicit: his human subjects are openly promised the immortalizing power of song, which can only be inspired by their own excellence to cheat ignominious death. The embedded song of *N. 5*, then, offers a potential θανάτοιό τ' ἄκος καὶ γήραος ἄλκαρ for the victor, which is (at least on the surface) denied to men in the *HAp.* This immortality is assured, not only through the human re-performance contexts envisaged by the speaker in the opening lines of *N. 5*, but also by the presentation of the divine Muses singing about mortal men: their song within the poem is a physical representation of the immortal quality of the victory ode itself.

The epinician poets' use of embedded song directly reflects their poetics, which have been shown to be both self-conscious and sophisticated in their awareness of the place of their poetry both in society and in the poetic tradition. The comparison between the inset

songs in the lyric poems and their epic ancestors places the lyric examples in a wider poetic context and raises important objections to previous interpretations. Power's narrowly communitarian interpretation of B.13 (which argues that a need to give the new genre established cultic status is the motivation for the maidens' song) is at best only part of the answer.

An alternative model for the poem's view of its own status is suggested by the inset song's extended allusion to Homer. As Pindar hitches his ode to immortality by giving it voice through the Muses, so Bacchylides has his inset chorus sing of the Trojan War, claiming *poetic* immortality for himself by vying with Homer, and *heroic* immortality for his victor who is assimilated to the greatest of all Aeacids. Thus a more poetic version of Power's self-justification theory offers itself: rather than the genre adopting solely social or ritual functions to explain itself, it also self-positions within the poetic tradition, appropriating epic motifs and re-presenting the Trojan War for an epinician context.

This is not entirely to deny a social or communitarian role to the maiden-chorus. On the contrary, their identity as a specifically *Aeginetan* maiden chorus is crucial, for it is this which will have pan-Hellenic appeal: Bacchylides is exporting an Aeginetan song for an Aeginetan victor, and the success of his strategy depends on encoding an image of the Aeginetan performance within the ode itself, a performance which could be re-created across the Greek world, but remain Aeginetan in flavour and bring fame upon the city and the victor.

A further communitarian aspect to both poems is suggested by Currie's theory of the anticipation of hero cult in epinician.[341] Currie shows the links often made in victory odes between the *laudandus* and heroes with established cult, arguing that these implicitly

341 Currie (2005).

foreshadow a cult for the victor.[342] It is possible to apply this to the inset song here. Pindar and Bacchylides are using the poetic tradition to liken their victors to heroes about whom hymns/epic are sung and thus justify their lyric. More specifically, in B.13 Ajax and Achilles are a mythological analogue for the hero who appropriates the ritual treatment of an Ajax or Achilles by having the chorus of young women sing to him as they would for an established cult hero. This awareness of the power of song to confer fame and even immortality is already explicitly present in the *Hymn to Apollo* when the speaker, nominally engaged in the task of praising *Apollo*, promises to herald the maidens' fame abroad. Here it is seen in a similar application, as the fame is not that of a mythical hero or god, but of a human who approaches the gods and heroes in excellence.

Pindar interacts with the poetic tradition in a slightly different way. Rather than re-write the *Iliad* from an Aeginetan perspective, his ode is highly self-conscious of the varying credibility of different speakers and displays mythic innovation validated both as truth and as an appropriate subject for victory song by its origin in the mouths of the Muses. This consciousness evident in the poem of the difference between immortal and mortal speakers is bound up with a strategy of praise also seen in B.13. The use of internal narrators has an immediate and obvious effect on the value of the praise given, in that it distances the poet (known to be commissioned and therefore biased) from the praise spoken in the poem and widens the scope of the victor's excellence. So, the appearance of the Muses in *N.* 5 elevates the fame of victor to the heavens and makes him an object of interest for the gods, while it also presents the poet as an equivalent to the divine source of poetry. In B.13, the Aeginetan chorus and indeed the *neoi* mentioned at the end of the poem create the illusion that Pytheas is hymned by his whole city: the technique places the victor in the context of his hometown and reflects his reception there.

342 Currie (2005): 410.

A further possible reason for the occurrence of inset song in both these poems is competition or allusion between the poets. From a close reading of the passages, there seems no reason to suspect that one of these poems interacts with the other on the level of close line by line allusion. It is extremely difficult to characterize such a relationship or to establish priority of one version over another, despite the tempting coincidence in date and victor which could easily lead one to suggest a competitive working relationship between the two poets.

These inset songs thus widen the scope of the poems in several ways. The poets are able to show their poetic virtuosity and define their place as poets in the tradition, as well as placing the subject of their song, the athletes, in a heroic context. There seems to be a reciprocal relationship between poet and athlete created through this association with heroes from poetry of the past: if Pytheas is an Achilles, Bacchylides is a Homer. In these odes, Pindar and Bacchylides show their sophisticated interest in the potential of their own art-form, and the possibility of future re-performance of their songs across the Greek world. The use of embedded song shows their awareness of the various 'values' of different genres of poetry, the ability to adapt the motifs and techniques of another genre to their own and the power of song to immortalize both the victor and the poet.

2.4 PINDAR *OLYMPIAN 5*: SELF-PRAISE

A very different sort of embedded song occurs in Pindar's *Olympian* 5, where the victor himself is depicted as returning from the scene of his success and hymning the virtues of his own home town.

> ...τὶν δὲ κῦδος ἁβρόν
> νικάσας ἀνέθηκε, καὶ ὃν πατέρ' Ἄ-
> κρων' ἐκάρυξε καὶ τὰν νέοικον ἔδραν.
> ἵκων δ' Οἰνομάου καὶ Πέλοπος παρ' εὐηράτων
> σταθμῶν, ὦ πολιάοχε Παλλάς, ἀείδει μὲν ἄλσος ἀγνόν 10
> τὸ τεὸν ποταμόν τε Ὤανον ἐγχωρίαν τε λίμναν
> καὶ σεμνοὺς ὀχετούς, Ἵππαρις οἷσιν ἄρδει στρατόν,
> κολλᾷ τε σταδίων θαλάμων ταχέως ὑψίγυιον ἄλσος,
> ὑπ' ἀμαχανίας ἄγων ἐς φάος τόνδε δᾶμον ἀστῶν· (*Ol.* 5.7-14)

This passage from *Olympian* 5 has caused much debate among scholars, most of whom deny or ignore the possibility the victor is singing at all; this controversy merits special scrutiny and for this reason *Ol.* 5 will be treated separately from the other epinician examples above. *Ol.* 5 was written for the same victor as *Ol.* 4: Psaumis of Camarina. The event in which Psaumis triumphed is not certain, nor is it universally agreed that these two odes were written to celebrate the same event. There have long been doubts as to the ode's authenticity (the scholia to *Ol.* 5 report that it was not included in the original text of Pindar), and most modern scholars seek to remove it from the Pindaric corpus on various grounds including metrical oddity, suspicious local knowledge of Camarina and over-use of language used elsewhere in Pindar's poetry (apparently the action of an over-compensating imitator).[343] However, despite the uncertainty surrounding the ode, it is still of interest (not only) for its use of embedded song.

343 Cf. Barrett (2007): 47-53 who attributes the ode to "some backwoods poet"; also Gildersleeve (1885): 168 "To me the poem is exceedingly suspicious"; Wilamowitz (1922): 420 for the locality argument; see too Bowra (1964): 414-420, von Leutsch (1846): 116-27. On the other side of this authenticity debate see Thummer (1968): 69 n.42 "...dass der nach aussen so schlüssig erscheinende Beweis, den Wilamowitz S. 420f. gegen die Echtheit des Gedichtes führt, nicht überzeugt" and Hamilton (1972): 324 "There appear to be no obvious grounds for calling into question the authenticity of the ode"; see too Galiano (1942): 112-48. For the report of the scholia see Drachmann (1904): 138.

If accepted, this would be a unique instance in Pindaric epinician of the victor depicted as singing an elaborated song within the poem itself.[344] Barrett dismisses this potential out of hand: "But is the victor himself conceived of as singing it? When it hymns his own praises, and when he is himself addressed a little later? This is evidently impossible".[345]

Barrett here rejects the possibility for the victor as singer on two grounds: firstly, as the poem praises the victor, and secondly, because the victor is addressed a few lines later. The latter objection is too readily dismissive in the light of recent work on voice in the Pindaric poems which has shown that the first person narrator in the odes can fluctuate throughout the poem from the poet-narrator to the chorus and perhaps even to the victor.[346] The fact that the victor is addressed in the second person by the narrator later in the poem does not, therefore, preclude his performing part of it. The first objection, that the victor should not praise himself, is made on the grounds of taste and is not supported by evidence from the rest of the odes to suggest that self-praise is in itself unacceptable. Moreover, even if self-praise *were* objectionable, the song of the victor as described in lines 10-14 contains no actual self-praise, but is rather a description of the victor's hometown. Given that the speaker of an ode may change at several stages throughout the poem, praise of the victor spoken by the primary narrator or the chorus elsewhere in the poem need not affect our judgement of the victor's song here in any case.

---

344 Although N.B. *P.* 8.56-60, cf. the comments of Huxley (1975): 11 "The personal pronouns...may denote the victor in the boys' wrestling", see also the examples listed by Currie (2005): 20 and on the idea of the *laudandus* speaking in the ode more generally cf. Carey (1981b): 159-61, Bremer (1990): 48-9, d'Alessio (1994): 130-4. Bruno Currie has suggested to me that Psaumis' performance here should not be classed as an embedded song because we do not get the '*ipsissima verba*' of a song of Psaumis and that the focalization is not his, but that of the primary narrator-focalizer. However, this is also true of e.g. the songs of the Muses in the *Theogony* proem, where their songs are reported in indirect discourse, and focalized through the primary narrator-focalizer.

345 Barrett (2007): 51. The scholia *ad Ol.* 5.20e note that the victor sings and give the subject of his song as the grove of Athena and the Oanus/Hipparis, but they do not expand on this further, concentrating rather on the implications of the verb κολλᾳ and its potential meanings. (Drachmann (1903): 145).

346 Cf. Anzai (1994): 141-50, D'Alessio (1994): 117-40, Lefkowitz (1991) and (1995): 139-50, Carey (2000): 165-177.

What, then, does it mean for the poet of a victory ode to depict the victor, rather than himself, as responsible for the celebration of the victor's hometown?[347] Before the introduction of his song, the victor is already depicted as proclaiming his father and hometown in celebration of his victory. The verb ἐκάρυξε is not necessarily grammatically causative, and has only been interpreted as such by critics who do not wish to admit the possibility of Psaumis having his own voice within this poem.[348] Even if the causative meaning is retained, it is clear that Pindar has here elided the presence of the notional third party, who 'really' announced the victory, in order to draw more attention to the role of the victor in having his father's name and hometown proclaimed. In either case the poet directly connects Psaumis' victory with verbal praise of his family and city, even before we see the victor singing about the same topic – his hometown. Psaumis is depicted as singing, ἀείδει, as he returns from Olympia crowned a victor in the games: through this *nostos*-style structure the focus is clearly put on the hometown of the victor and the reflected glory it will receive from his triumph. The subject-matter of his song bears this out – he does not sing of Olympia or his own victory but of the city where he is from. The details he mentions in lines 10-12 are all items of local geography – the holy sanctuary of Pallas; the river Oanos; the lake which is given the emphatic epithet ἐγχωρίαν; holy canals; a named river, Hipparis. This local emphasis is achieved through a combination of proper names and specific descriptions – the audience is given a picture of the area.

The next two lines, 13-14, have caused much controversy among commentators and scholars as to who the subject of κολλᾷ should be: the options are either the river Hipparis, which has been surprisingly popular given the problems this causes for the

347 Such a portrayal is especially telling in a Pindaric context since Pindar often comments on his role as fame-giver to both victors and their cities, e.g. *N.* 6.28-30.
348 Contrast Gildersleeve (1885): 168 *ad loc.* ("the verb is causative") with Fennell (1893): 55-6 ("the action of the herald is attributed to the victor who is the cause of that action, but the verb is not causative grammatically".)

meaning of the sentence, or Psaumis himself.[349] If Hipparis is taken as the subject, then these sentences refer to the role of the river in somehow aiding building of houses. Gildersleeve suggests that this refers to the flotation of building materials on the river, but this use of κολλᾷ seems strained. Barrett rightly points out the unlikelihood of the river Hipparis being depicted as the keystone of building works in Camarina, and offers a clear and persuasive analysis of the syntax which offers strong support for Psaumis as the subject of this verb.[350]

Most scholars who accept that Psaumis is the subject of this verb take it to mean that in 'real life', he actually built houses for his people, a rich citizen benefitting the poorer ones.[351] This may well be the case, but I would argue that κολλᾷ stands here in a sophisticated double meaning – possibly Psaumis *had* built houses for his people, and the word certainly has practical connotations, but it can also be used metaphorically of the creation of poetry, as it is indeed elsewhere in Pindar. At *Nemean* 7.78, the Muse is depicted as creating poetry, using the very same verb: κολλᾷ χρυσὸν ἔν τε λευκὸν ἐλέφανθ' ἁμᾶ | καὶ λείριον ἄνθεμον πον-|-τίας ὑφελοῖσ' ἐέρσας. Here, in *Olympian* 5, we see a similar metaphor of poetry as a crafted plastic object: the victor is depicted as singing a song about his hometown, and as such, re-creating it, 'welding' the houses anew.[352]

Barrett's criticism again misses the point: "[the poet writes] as though the building were being done on the triumphal procession. This again is not Pindar: not Pindar, but an incompetent". Yet in one sense the building *is* 'being done on the procession', for Psaumis'

349 Bowra (1964): 417, Fennell (1893): 56, Farnell (1932): 38-9 and Wilamovitz (1922): 422-23 also take Hipparis as the subject, although they interpret the practical meaning of the verb differently. Hamilton (1972): 325 n.6 argues for Psaumis as the subject, quoting Fraccaroli (1914): 264 n.3 and Jurenka (1895): 16-18 in support. Gildersleeve (1885): 169 *ad loc.* notes the controversy and offers a compromise – Psaumis as the *actual* agent of the verb (in the sense that he did some sort of work to the river to benefit his people), but the river as the grammatical agent, thus "instead of the benefactor, the benefaction".
350 Barrett (2007): 45.
351 So Barrett (2007): 45, Gildersleeve (1885): 169.
352 Hamilton (1972): 325 n.6 recognises the metaphorical meaning of κολλᾳ here and mentions two parallels – one the *Nemean* 7.78 passage quoted above, the other Aes. *Ag.* 1566.

song (perhaps even about the re-founding of Camarina only a few years before) 're-builds' the town in a poetic form, and moreover the embedded song will re-create this founding every time the song is re-performed.[353] In the last line describing the victor's song he is said to bring the town from helplessness to light: ὑπ' ἀμαχανίας ἄγων ἐς φάος τόνδε δᾶμον ἀστῶν. This image makes most sense if a metapoetic reading of κολλᾷ is accepted, i.e. that he brings his town into the light through singing about it. Pindar very often uses this same imagery of his own poetry – for instance at *Ol.* 4.9-10 δέξαι Χαρίτων θ' ἕκατι τόνδε κῶμον, |**χρονιώτατον φάος** εὐρυσθενέων ἀρετᾶν, the current song, described as κῶμος, is said to be a 'longest lasting light' for achievments of great strength. Similarly at *P.* 3.75, the poet describes himself as a τηλαυγέστερον φάος for the victor.[354]

A final objection to my interpretation must be countered. The tense of the verb which introduces the victor's song (present) may give rise to the impression that this song is performative – i.e. that it does not refer to a song of the victor but to the current ode. The song of Psaumis here would then be aligned with those statements in which the poet implies that the Muses are the performers of his poem, or where he exhorts the Muses (or indeed a human chorus) to sing.[355] Such instances are clearly references to the performance of the ode itself, rather than independent embedded songs within the poem. The difference between depicting the victor singing of his hometown in the manner discussed above and the exhortations to the chorus or Muses is that the Muses and chorus are inextricably linked to poetry and the performance of poetry already, so that reference to them serves as an automatic self-reference to the current ode. The victor (although some have suggested victors may have performed their own odes) is not associated with poetry in the same way, and so it is much more striking to find him depicted singing within the poem. Of course, since the victor's song forms part of the ode, it is in this sense performative, but the fact

353 For the notion of re-performance within Pindar's poetry see Currie (2004).
354 At *N.* 3.84, *Ol.* 10.23, φάος is used of athletic victory; at *I.* 2.17 the victor himself as a light to his people, and in *P.* 4.270, *I.* 6.63-5 victors bring praise into the light with their achievements.
355 E.g. *N.* 3.9-12 where Pindar implies his ode is "shared" with the Muse, cf. too *Ol.* 13.96-7, *Ol.* 3-4-5. The classic example of choral exhortation in Pindar is *Ol.* 6.87f., but cf. also *Ol.* 1.6-18.

remains that Pindar has depicted an internal narrator singing, and has given us an indication of what he sang – thus his voice is blended with that of the victor for this part of the poem. Rather than praising Camarina directly, Pindar chooses to portray the victor praising it in song, as he returns from the games. The present tense used of his song creates a sense of immediacy and perhaps of habit – like the Nymphs of the *HPan*, whose embedded hymn is enshrined in an eternal present, so Psaumis will forever be returning from the games, forever singing his city's praises.[356]

Thus it seems that what Barrett has taken as a flaw in this poem, the poet's depiction of the victor as directly and uniquely responsible for the celebration of his people, is in fact a highly sophisticated poetic technique.[357] The poet puts part of the ode directly into the mouth of the returning victor, closing the gap between the athletic achievements (which inspire the poem and bring fame on victor and town) and the poem (which, by commemorating these deeds, also brings fame on victor and town). Putting the song into the mouth of the victor, rather than describing the city and its locale in the voice of the primary narrator, not only lends vividness and authenticity to the description but also conflates the act of victory with the song which celebrates the act. The 're-founding' of the song in verse re-enacts the deeds of Psaumis as a leading citizen and blends his activities in the city with his victory; they are two sides of the same coin, both praiseworthy in their own right. In its emphasis on the locality of the victor, not to speak of the presence of a local, Camarinian voice in the poem, *Olympian* 5 might be compared with Bacchylides 13, where an Aeginetan maiden chorus is depicted as singing as the city welcomes the returning victor. Both these poems focus on their victor's native city, but while Bacchylides shows a city filled with song for its victor, having the praise of the ode multiplied and magnified until the poem resounds with the voices of a whole city, *Olympian* 5 reverses the situation – the *laudandus* becomes the *laudator*, not of himself, but of his home.

356 Cp. too the song of the maidens in B.13 which is also introduced with present-tense verbs.
357 Barrett (2007): 51-2 "What the poet must mean...is 'he is responsible for the celebration in this ode of your ἄλσος and so on. He must *mean* this; but he has *said* it most ineptly".

Thus far, the embedded songs discussed have been argued to function mainly to aid the poet in his aim of praising the victor, and in certain cases, to appropriate for the poet some of the authority of the internal narrator, although this latter tactic was acknowledged to be only a minor (or at least a rarely deployed) means of claiming poetic authority on the part of these lyric poets. In the following section, I will turn to Pindar and Bacchylides' use of historical embedded songs in the construction of time within their poems.

2.5 Proto- and Aetiological song: ancestral echoes?

In several poems of Bacchylides and Pindar, embedded songs are depicted as historic or mythic performances of epinician, dithyramb or *paean* in the past. These songs often function as an aetiological predecessor or proto-ancestor for the current song; in some cases it may even be argued that the embedded song is being presented as the first performance of such a song, providing a 'founding-myth' for the frame poem itself. A straightforward example of this occurs at *Ol.* 10.76-80:

> ἀείδετο δὲ πὰν τέμενος τερπναῖσι θαλίαις
> τὸν ἐγκώμιον ἀμφὶ τρόπον.
> ἀρχαῖς δὲ προτέραις ἑπόμενοι
> καί νυν ἐπωνυμίαν χάριν
> νίκας ἀγερώχου κελαδησόμεθα βροντάν
> καὶ πυρπάλαμον βέλος (80)
> ὀρσικτύπου Διός…

Here the current epinician is linked directly to the founding of the first Olympian games by Heracles and the song-celebrations which followed the first contests. In other cases, such as Pindar, *Olympian* 9 and Bacchylides 6 (B.6), a song from the recent history of the victor or from the history of his hometown is contrasted with the present victory-song of the poet. The song of the Muses in *N.* 5 is a more complex case, since their song begins in mythic time, but ends up blending with the current epinician praise of the victor. Thus Pindar in

N. 5 collapses, rather than exploits, the distance between the mythical and contemporary performances, whereas it is the very temporal remoteness of the embedded songs in the following passages of lyric which seems to be important. The depiction of historical embedded song is not common in the archaic hexameter poets discussed in the previous chapter: in the *HHerm.* Hermes' songs are performed contemporaneously with the main narrative, as are the songs of the Delian maidens in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo.* I distinguish here between songs *about* the past (for of course Hermes' song and the songs of Demodocus narrate past events!) and songs which are depicted as having been *performed* in the past.

The nearest analogue for this type of proto-song or ancestral song in hexameter poetry is found in the poetic investiture of Hesiod (depicted in the *Theogony* proem) where he recounts several songs of the Muses which may be felt to function as 'founding-myths' for his own theogonic verse.[358] The demands of genre will have a major part to play in explaining the differences between the hexameter examples and those from lyric poetry: in particular the immediate and definite social context of epinician and its remit to praise the victor necessarily sets it apart from epic and hymnic poetry. In the other lyric genres too, it will be argued, the function of the time-manipulation created by the inset songs is inextricably linked with their genre.

B.6

Λάχων Διὸς μεγιστου
λάχε φέρτατον πόδεσσι
κῦδος ἐπ' Ἀλφεοῦ προχοαῖσ[
δι' ὅσσα πάροιθεν
ἀμπελοτρόφον Κέον
ἄεισαν ποτ' Ὀλυμπίαι
πύξ τε καὶ στάδιον κρατεῦ[σαν
στεφάνοις ἐθείραις

νεανίαι βρύοντες.

358 See above, pp. 90-104, for discussion of the inset songs in the *Theogony* proem.

σὲ δὲ νῦν ἀναξιμόλπου
Οὐρανίας ὕμνος ἕκατι Νίκ[ας,
Ἀριστομένειον
ὦ ποδάνεμον τέκος,
γεραίρει προδόμοις ἀοι-
δαῖς, ὅτι στάδιον κρατήσας
Κέον εὐκλέϊξας.

In B.6, the framing epinician song for Lachon at 11-16 (attributed to Ourania as inspirational Muse of the poet) is linked with the songs sung πάροιθεν, in earlier times, by young men at Olympia. Bacchylides is aligning the current victory with those previously achieved by all Keans who have won at Olympia. The continuity is one of inspiration or *cause* for song, which in the past was the victorious deeds of Keans at Olympia, and is now the victorious achievement of Lachon in the same location: δι' ὅσσα (4), ὅτι (15). B.6 is structured in such a way as to suggest comparison be made between the two songs, for the inset song is introduced by linking Lachon's achievement associatively with that of previous Kean victors. The 'previous' song(s) are directly followed by reference to the framing song (which itself is characterized as a song of the Muse), and both references to song (current and past) are contained within lines which name Lachon, in the announcement at 1-3, and in the repeated mention of his victory in 15-16. Verbal repetition in lines 7 and 15, στάδιον κρατεῦ[σαν, στάδιον κρατήσας, and the repetition of Κέον in lines 5 and 16 emphasize the link between past and present still further. The shift from past to present is marked by the emphatic σὲ δὲ νῦν at line 10 which stands in contrast with πάροιθεν (4) and transfers attention from the unnamed victors of the past to the current *laudandus*, Lachon, who is explicitly named (after the first emphasis on his name in the pun at lines 1-2) as the son of Aristomenes (12).[359] A contrast between the two songs is the location of their performance, since the song of the νεανίαι is located at Olympia (6-7) and the song of Ourania is in Keos, as is indicated in 14 by the adjective προδόμοις.

359 Cf. Maehler (1982): 130 "πάροιθεν steht in Gegensatz zu νῦν in Vers. 10".

As a strategy of praise, then, the inset song of the νεανίαι serves to link Lachon's victory with Keos' glorious past.[360] The current song, however, is referred to coyly as the ἀναξιμόλπου Οὐρανίας ὕμνος, with no reference to a local chorus or to the poet except for the hint at locality in the adjective προδόμοις which describes Ourania's song and implies that it was performed at the victor's home or at least in his hometown (14-15). The choice to depict the current song as the exclusive property of a Muse aggrandizes the victor further; his victory is implied to be of concern to the gods themselves.[361] While the previous Kean victors received the laudatory choirs of young *men*, he gets divine songs from the mistress of music herself (ἀναξιμόλπου Οὐρανίας, 10-11). Indeed if we identify Νίκη in 11 as the personified goddess, rather than as an abstraction representing Lachon's act of victory, this would deepen the divine endorsement of Bacchylides' praise even further.[362] The entire effacement of the poet is not common in (particularly Pindaric) epinician where the poet often intrudes on the narrative *in propria persona*, commenting freely on the nature and function of his own art.[363] Although the ode is represented as the creation of Ourania, the poet-narrator is still obliquely present throughout, since the performance of Ourania is mentioned in the third person, creating a complex layering of voices within the ode. We might compare this technique with that used in *Ol.* 9.1-4 where the victor Epharmostus and his friends are depicted as having sung a song of Archilochus at Olympia in celebration of Epharmostus'victory:

> Τὸ μὲν Ἀρχιλόχου μέλος
> φωνᾶεν Ὀλυμπίᾳ,
> καλλίνικος ὁ τριπλόος κεχλαδὼς
> ἄρκεσε Κρόνιον παρ' ὄχθον ἀγεμονεῦσαι
> κωμάζοντι φίλοις Ἐφαρμόστῳ σὺν ἑταίροις.

360 Cf. Maehler (1982): 127-8; Burnett (1985): 50.
361 Cp. B.2.11-14 where the Muse is similarly depicted as directly honouring the victor.
362 Maehler (1982): 131 "durch Nikas Willen ehrt es heute den Sieger". Burnett (1985): 40 in her translation of the ode takes the phrase to refer to the victory itself.
363 Maehler (1982): 131 comments "der Dichter selbst tritt in diesem kurzen Lied gar nicht in Erscheinung"; cf. too Campbell (1983): 273 "Scarcely one of Pindar's victory odes does not contain some statement about his craft".

The fact that another poet (and indeed a specific poem) is explicitly named within the poem as the source for Epharmostus' spontaneous victory celebration is striking.[364] The performance context for the embedded song is the immediate aftermath of the victory at Olympia, and it is performed by the victor with his friends in a casual and carousing procession around the hill of Kronos. The impression given is one of a private celebration conducted only by the victor and those of his friends who were at the games, in contrast with the ode of Pindar which is meant to reach a wider audience, as is made clear by the poet's intention to praise the city and its victor, sending its fame 'everywhere', as voiced later in the poem:

> ἐγὼ δέ τοι φίλαν πόλιν
> μαλεραῖς ἐπιφλέγων ἀοιδαῖς,
> καὶ ἀγάνορος ἵππου
> θᾶσσον καὶ ναὸς ὑποπτέρου παντᾷ
> ἀγγελίαν πέμψω ταύταν... (*Ol.* 9.21-5).

The contrast is emphasized by the change of temporal focus in line 5 with the adversative ἀλλὰ νῦν drawing us back from the previous performance to Pindar's current song.[365] Furthermore, Pindar's poem is, like B.6, claimed to originate from several divine figures, including the Muses (who are exhorted by the poet to inspire him with songs for Epharmostus in lines 4-11) and the Graces (26), elevating the victor's importance by implying that he is a subject for the songs of gods, whereas in the Archilochus song, a hymn *to* a god (Herakles) is adapted for the victory. Pindar reverses the earlier situation in which the mortal victor sings the praise of the god, showing the Muses as (notionally) sending him songs they have composed about a mortal victory.

364 Pindar mentions other poets by name only rarely in his extant work. Cf. the reference to Xenocritus in fr.140b, to the "Homeridae" at *Nemean* 2.1-2, Archilochus at *P.* 2.52-56. That some have doubted this fragment's ascription to Archilochus is to some extent irrelevant – Pindar names another poet and quotes a few lines of poetry which he wishes to ascribe to this poet. Cf. West (1974): 138-9 for a discussion of this fragment. Compare the reference to Hesiod and quotation of his poetry at B.5.191-4.
365 Cp. the transitional σε δὲ νῦν of B.6.10.

Thus the opening lines set up a contrast between Pindar's personalized ode for the victor and an obviously well-known but more basic 'all-purpose' victory song.[366] The verb ἄρκεσε in line 4 seems to confirm this privileging of the current Pindaric song over the prior song, which merely 'sufficed' for the victor and his friends. There may also be a claim to poetic originality implied in his comparison between his ode and the Archilochean one: at lines 49-50 the poet-narrator comments that wine is praised for its age, while poetry is praised for its novelty:

> αἴνει δὲ παλαιὸν μὲν οἶνον, ἄνθεα δ' ὕμνων
> νεωτέρων...

This passage has often been read only in conjunction with the myth that follows it, with scholars debating what aspects of the myth are in fact Pindaric innovations (if any).[367] However, it should also be read in the light of the poetically competitive opening of the ode which clearly sets out a contrast between the older, more established poem of Archilochus and Pindar's fresh poem composed particularly for this occasion. The comparative adjective is obviously itself suggestive: Pindar's song is more novel than the one which opened his poem, an old stalwart victory song, used again and again. From the first lines of this ode Pindar sets out poetry and criticism of poetry as a theme, self-consciously offering the audience a contrast between Archilochus' poem and his own while at the same time appropriating the spontaneity and immediacy of the impromptu performance at Olympia for his own Kean song: through the inset song Pindar's poem both differentiates itself from and re-performs the earlier victory song. Having appropriated this moment to open his poem, enshrining the informal song of the victor inside the ode, he turns to the more universal concerns of the epinician poet, setting Epharmostus' achievement in a divine and mythic context.

366 Archilochus, 324 *IEG* τήνελλα καλλίνικε κτλ. Gildersleeve (1885): 203 notes that this hymn was sung in honour of victors at Olympia if no "special poem was ordered." cf. also Fennell (1893): 96 n.1, Rutherford (2001): 386, Gerber (2002): 21 n.1-4 notes the difficulty of reconstructing a stable text of this song.
367 Gerber (2002): 46 n.48-9 sums the problem up: "it is impossible to determine precisely what aspects of the myth are 'newer'." Cf. also Bernadini (1983): 139-140.

Although these two poems (B.6 and *Ol.* 9) both use inset song in a similar way, blending the past with the present in their praise of an athletic victor, there is a striking difference in the poetic voice in the two poems. As was noted above, in B.6 the main poem is referred to as if it is the direct product of the Muse, with no emphasis on the human poet. In *Ol.* 9, on the contrary, the poet-narrator makes his role in the creation and function of poetry very clear throughout: so, at line 21f. the first person pronoun emphatically introduces a statement of poetic purpose which contains two first person verbs:

> **ἐγὼ** δέ τοι φίλαν πόλιν
> μαλεραῖς ἐπιφλέγων ἀοιδαῖς...
> καὶ ἀγάνορος ἵππου
> θᾶσσον καὶ ναὸς ὑποπτέρου παντᾷ
> ἀγγελίαν **πέμψω** ταύταν,
> εἰ σύν τινι μοιριδίῳ παλάμᾳ
> ἐξαίρετον Χαρίτων **νέμομαι** κᾶπον. (21-6)

Although Pindar may claim divine inspiration from the Muses and Graces, he is very much the creator of his own poetry, present in these first-person assertions which are notable by their absence from B.6, where the poet-narrator shrouds himself in oblique references to the songs of others (Ourania, the *νεανίαι*) and is present only as a non-characterized 'voice' throughout the ode. In narratorial style, B.6 is much closer to epic than epinician, and this too may be part of a praise-strategy, elevating the victor to the status of an epic hero, for whom the Muses sing as they did for Achilles.[368]

In the epinician poems discussed so far, the historic embedded songs can be seen to underline the theme of the frame narrative(s), in the case of B.6 offering historical precedent for the current song and aligning the victor with the success of his ancestors, and in the case of *Ol.* 9 capturing the victor's joy at the moment of his success while contrasting the benefits of a personalized Pindaric victory ode with the all-purpose celebration hymn of Archilochus. However, the embedded songs in the dithyrambs and paeans do not always

368 Although under different circumstances, after his death, the comparison is still valid as it shows divine concern for mortals expressed through song, whether in a celebratory or a funerary context.

correspond so obviously with the genre of their frame narratives. B.20, a dithyramb, opens with a reference to a mythical, historic song – a choir of Spartan girls, we are told, sang a song "such as this", τοιόνδε (line 3), in the mythical past: ποτ' (line 1) picked up by ὅτ' (line 4) where the mythical narrative proper of Idas and Marpessa begins. The fragment is printed in full below.

B.20 = *dithyramb* 6

Σπάρτᾶι ποτ' ἐν ε̣[ὐρυχόρωι
ξανθαὶ Λακεδα[μονίων
τοιόνδε μέλος κ[ελάδησαν παρθένοι
ὅτ' ἄγετο καλλιπά[ρᾶιον
κόραν θρασυκάρδ[ιος Ἴδας 5
Μάρπησσαν ἰότ̣[ριχα νύμφαν
φυγὼν θανάτου τ[....
ἀναξίαλος Ποσ ⟨ε⟩ι[δὰν....
ἵππους τέ οἱ ἰσαν[έμους
Πλευρῶν ἐς ἐυκτ[ιμέναν 10
χρυσάσπιδος υἱὸ[ν Ἄρηος...

To what, then, is the Spartan girls' song being compared? The only answer seems to be the dithyrambic poem itself; and the location of the Spartan song at the beginning of the poem suggests the adjective τοιόνδε has the flavour of "such a song as follows". What then are we to imagine the Spartan girls as having sung? A marriage song is the most attractive possibility, given the mythical content of the union of Idas and Marpessa.[369] As several scholars have noted, there are strong parallels between this poem which represents an inset *hymenaios* from the mythical past and (among others) Ar. *Birds* 1731-42, Theocritus 18 and Sappho fr. 44.[370] In all three of these examples, a mythical wedding is the setting for a celebratory song sung by mythical characters: in *Birds* it is the *Moirai* who sing at the wedding of Zeus and Hera, in Theocritus a chorus of girls sing at the wedding of Helen and Menelaus, and in Sappho fr. 44 choruses of Trojan men and women sing two songs at the wedding of Andromache and Hector. This parallel with Aristophanes' *Birds* 1731-42 and

369 For *hymenaios* as a genre see Swift (2010): 241-249. On the Spartan girls in B.20: Maehler (2004): 221 n.2-3 "This would have been a wedding-song".
370 I take this terminology from Swift (2010): 241-2, following her broad distinction between *hymenaios* and *epithalamion,* although I agree with her that the boundaries between these two types of wedding song were probably often blurred. Jebb (1905): 406 notes the similarity between this and the epithalamion at Aristophanes, *Birds* 1731 and in Theocritus 18. Fraenkel (1959): 30 also notes the parallel and suggests either a common source for the three poets, or that all three are alluding to a fixed genre of marriage songs.

several other marriage songs from Greek literature suggests that perhaps the reference to an earlier marriage *song* in a *hymenaios* is a traditional feature of the genre.[371] Dunbar argues that a traditional feature of the *hymenaios* may have been reference to a mythical marriage – it is, however, striking that in each of these four examples, not only is the mythical marriage mentioned, but also the *hymenaios*-song which accompanied it.[372]

If reference to a mythical marriage in the *hymenaios* offers a positive paradigm for the couple, what does the poet achieve by prefacing the mythical narrative of the poem with a reference to an earlier performance of a marriage-song?[373] This retrojection into myth of the current ritual song validates it by providing it with mythical ancestry and precedent. Through the association of the current bride and groom with the mythic couple and the poet with the mythic performer(s) the current song is seen as a continuum with the past, in a similar technique to that used to praise victors in epinician by comparing them with mythical heroes. Since these literary *hymenaioi* (at least purportedly) function as celebratory wedding-songs, their depiction of celebratory wedding-songs from the mythic past can only be seen as self-referential; it is not only that the praise of the past figures reflects on the (perhaps notional) contemporary couple, but that the poet's own voice is echoed by and blended with those internal singers, his song takes on the quality of a polyphonic ritual song.

The identification of the inset song of the Spartan maidens in B.20 as *hymenaios*, together with the several parallels drawn (admittedly from literature across a wide period of time, which fact should make interpretation cautious) from other *hymenaioi* suggests that the generic classification of B.20 as dithyrambic may be problematic. Maehler dismisses the possibility that B.20 could itself be a wedding-song, adducing a comparison with B.16,

371 Dunbar (1995): 757 gives several parallels, including B.20. The others are Sappho fr.44, Theocritus 18 and Eur. *IA* 1036-79.
372 Dunbar (1995): 757.
373 Mythical marriage used as paradigm for newly-wedded couple: Swift (2010): 247; Dunbar (1995): 757.

which begins with references to paeans, although it is itself a dithyramb.[374] However, there are important differences between the two cases, namely, that while B.16 may allude to paeans being sung to Apollo, its lack of Apolline subject-matter in the mythic section marks it as something different from a *paean* in its main narrative.[375] B.20, on the other hand, contains nothing to contradict its belonging to the *hymenaios* genre. Although the poem is fragmentary, and as such we can not be sure what else it may have contained, the strong parallels with other literary *hymenaioi* beg the question of whether this is also in fact a wedding song.[376] The genre of the frame narrative itself is thus called into question by the inset song, and it is particularly interesting in this case that embedded song (at least in the examples discussed above) seems to be a recurrent generic feature of *hymenaios*.

If it is accepted that B.20 may be a wedding-song, then it begins to look very similar to *Threnos* 3, which contains inset *threnoi* from mythical times. Even if the dithyrambic genre is still preferred for B.20, the two poems are still closely aligned in their use of *mise en abyme*, since *Th.* 3 also compares itself to dithyramb and *paean* (as B.20, if a dithyramb, would be comparing itself to *hymenaios*).

Threnos 3 [P.Oxy.2447, fr. 4b + Scholion on Euripides, *Rhesus* 895][377]

Ἔντι μὲν χρυσαλακάτου τεκέων Λατοῦς ἀοιδαί
ὥριαι παιανιδες· ἐντὶ [δε] καί
θάλλοντος ἐκ κισσοῦ στέφανον Διο[νύσ]ου
ο[βρομι ⟨ ⟩? παιόμεναι. τὸ δε κοιμίσαν
τρεῖς υἷας ἐκ Καλλιόπας, ὥς οἱ σταθῇ μνάμα ⟨τ'⟩ 5
ἀποφθιμένων·

ἁ μὲν εὐχαίταν Λίνον αἴλινον ὕμνει,
ἁ δ' Ὑμέναιον, ⟨ὅν⟩ ἐν γάμοισι χροϊζόμενον
νυκτὶ σύμπρωτον λάβεν ἔσχατος ὕμνων·

374 Maehler (2004): 221.
375 Maehler (2004): 221.
376 To argue the nature of an earlier, fragmentary or lost poem from a later parallel may seem dangerously speculative, but the strong reminisence between the opening of B.20 (Σπάρτᾳ ποτ' ἐν ε[ὐρυχόρῳ | ξανθαὶ Λακεδαιμονίων | τοιόνδε μέλος κ[ελάδησαν πάρθενοι...) and Theocritus 18 (Ἔν ποκ' Σπάρτᾳ ξανθότριχι πὰρ Μενελάῳ | παρθενικαὶ θάλλοντα κόμαις ὑάκινθον ἔχοισαι..) is suggestive of an allusive relationship between the two poems – perhaps in genre as well as in opening words.
377 The text of *Threnos* 3 is that of Race (1997).

ἀ δὲ ‹ › Ἰάλεμον ὠμοβολῳ
νούσῳ πεδαθέντα σθένος· 10
υἱὸν Οἰάγρου ‹δὲ›

Ὀρφέα χρυσάορα...

Threnos 3 opens with a priamel listing two different genres of song acting as a foil for the dirge which will be the main focus of the extant lines of the poem. The dirge is set against *paean* (2) and against dithyramb, which latter genre seems to be implied by the reference to Dionysos, ivy, and the cult term *Bromi[os* in lines 3-4.[378] The poem turns in line 4 from these songs to *threnoi*, linking the creation of a composite genre of lamentation-songs with three sons of the muse Kalliope. Pindar gives us an aetion for the genre: the songs were created "so that memorials of the dead might be established for her" (5). Thus *threnoi* are characterized as a composite genre since the *ailinon* and *ialmenos* are two different types of lament, here grouped with a third lament for Hymenaios.[379] The impulse for the creation of the genre is memorialization of the three sons of the muse Kalliope. It is not clear whether she herself is the producer of the songs or whether they are created by someone else as a gift for her. The subject of lines 6-10 seems most likely to be ἀοιδή, leaving the question of the actual singer of the songs ambiguous.[380] It might be argued that Kalliope is most likely to have led the lament for her sons, following precedent from both human and divine behaviour after a loved one's death in Greek literature: Thetis mourns for her son, as does Hecuba for Hector, but this must remain speculation in the case of *Threnos* 3.[381]

The presence of Orpheus within the fragment raises the intriguing possibility that it is he who performed these songs. Although he appears in the accusative case, it seems

378 For dithyramb as a genre and a discussion of Pindaric dithyramb in particular see Kirkwood (1982): 321-322; Van Der Weiden (1991): 1-28. Fera (1990): 137 also argues that this song should be interpreted as dithyramb. N.B. that the term *Bromios* occurs at Pindar, fr.70b line 6 and fr.75 line 10, both dithyrambs.
379 cf. Fera (1990): 139 for discussion on the genre of *ialemos* and *linos*.
380 As it is used with ὕμνος at Soph. *Ant.*815-6: "...πώ μέ τις ὕμνος ὕμνησεν". Otherwise we must postulate three muses/female singers who remain unspecified. Fera (1990): 150 also takes a plural noun from something like ἀοιδή as the subject of the inset song, but she makes ὕμνει into an infinitive and takes it with Linos, "Linus who boasted of his singing". This reading is attractive from the point of view that it gives Linos, like the other two sons of Kalliope, a context of death, but is grammatically shaky, depending on the odd (and badly attested) εὐχέταν earlier in the line, which is amended to εὐχαίταν by Maehler.
381 Thetis mourns for Achilles: *Od.* 24.43–6. Hecuba mourns for Hector at *Il.* 22.431-6, 24.747-759.

unlikely that he too is supposed to be the subject of a dirge: the reference to τρεις in line 5 followed by the tightly structured embedded songs introduced by ἁ μὲν...ἁ δὲ...ἁ δὲ suggests that only three sons of the Muse are hymned here.[382] Moreover, as Fera points out, unlike the other three sons, Orpheus' name does not correspond with the name of a type of song; thus he is separated from them conceptually as well as grammatically.[383] His name *is,* however, synonymous with the (archetypal) act of singing, if not with a type of song, which suggests that he may here have been presented as the singer or inventor of these songs. Such an interpretation is particularly attractive given his association with the underworld and his traditional ability to bring back the dead as seen in the myth of Eurydice.[384] Again, however, the fragmentary nature of the poem does not allow more than speculation on this point.

This fragment of Pindar shows an interest in tracing the origins of song, and in particular defining the genre of one song (or set of songs) as opposed to other existing genres. The present tense assertions about the existence of *paean* and *dithyramb* in lines 1-4 are set against the embedded songs, which are set in the mythical past act as a composite founding-myth for songs of lament or grief; the genealogical relationship of the mythical characters reflects the generic relationship of the poems – as *Ialmenos* and *Linos* are brothers, so their respective songs are both types of dirge and thus 'brother-songs' in generic terms. It may be that Pindar here claimed to be reviving a genre which (before his threnos) only existed in mythical times – thus the contrast in sense between "there *are* paeans, there *are* dithryrambs" and "once, they *sang* laments". The inclusion of Hymenaios in this list may seem unusual, as he is associated perhaps more readily with marriage song than with

382 cf. Fera (1990): 143.
383 Fera (1990): 143.
384 Although Eurydice is only named in later sources (Virg. *Georgics*.4.453-527, Ovid *Met.*10.1-147), cf. Eur. *Alcestis* 357-360, where the situation does imply that a myth of Orpheus descending to the underworld to rescue his wife is being referenced: Admetus is speaking to Alkestis, and mentions charming Persephone and Hades with song, going to the underworld and fetching Alkestis back: εἰ δ' Ὀρφέως μοι γλῶσσα καὶ μέλος παρῆν, | ὥστ' ἢ κόρην Δήμητρος ἢ κείνης πόσιν | ὕμνοισιν κηλήσαντα σ' ἐξ Ἅιδου λαβεῖν, | κατῆλθον ἄν,...]. In any case, his power to bring back the dead through the power of his song is clearly attested in the 5th century.

funeral elegy. However, there is a later version of this myth which tells that he died at the wedding of Dionysos and Althaea, after performing a song for the marriage.[385] It seems that Pindar's version also involves Hymenaios' death at a wedding, but here it is his own, as is implied by the description of his skin being touched ἐν γάμοισι: the term χροίζω has a sexual connotation in the middle voice.[386] Pindar thus chooses to depict and emphasize the funerary aspect of Hymenaios as a character, obviously because it fits his threnodic context better: he may even be the earliest source for this version of the myth.[387]

Fera suggests that the function of the myth (by which she means the mythical inset songs) in this poem is consolatory: even the sons of a Muse die and are lamented by their mother.[388] Although this is probably correct, it still leaves an important question unanswered, namely, why does Pindar here depict not merely a scene of divine mourning, bridging the gap between human and divine and acting as a consolaton to the bereaved, but rather a founding-myth of dirge itself. Why does Pindar choose to depict the invention of *threnos* in this way? As a poetically competitive device it is comparable to the scenes in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* where Hermes is depicted as singing the first ever hymn and the first *theogony*. Pindar and the poet of the *HHerm.* are both claiming superior knowledge of the source of poetry (even if only of one particuar type or genre) and, uncoincidentally, both poets choose to depict the creation of the very type of poetry they themselves are currently engaged in.[389] In his account of the creation of *threnos*, Pindar is setting himself up as authoritative not only in his special access to divine matters (we might think again of the *Theogony* proem here) but also in his own composition of *threnos* which re-performs and contains within itself the archetypal performance.

---

385 Serv. *Aen.* 4.127: *alii nuptiarum inventorem tradunt...Cornelius Balbus Hymenaeum ait,...dum nuptias Liberi patris et Althaeae religiosis cantibus celebrat, exspirasse; propter quod ei talis honor in nuptiis adtributus est, ut celebratio nominis eius nuptiarum iugendarum perpetuum omen esset.*
386 Cf. Fera (1990): 153-4: "Il verbo...ha spesso connotazione erotica". She gives several parallels for the erotic use of the verb including Eur. *Heracles* 915.
387 I have been unable to find an earlier source for the myth of Hymenaios dying at his own or anyone else's wedding.
388 Fera (1990): 142-3.
389 Although obviously this does not go for the second song in the *HHerm.*, but there are important links between hymnic and theogonic poetry which are discussed above in the section on the *Homeric Hymns*.

Another poem which arguably shows an interest in depicting the origins of a certain genre of song is B.17, where at the climax of the poem, the return of Theseus miraculously un-drowned from his dive into the sea provokes a song from (respectively) the Athenian maidens and young men on board the ship.[390]

B.17.125-132

ἀγλαόθρονοί τε κοῦραι σὺν εὐ-
θυμίᾳ νεοκτίτῳ
ὠλόλυξαν, ἔκλαγεν
δὲ πόντος· ἠίθεοι δ' ἐγγύθεν
νέοι παιάνιξαν ἐρατᾷ ὀπί.
Δάλιε, χοροῖσι Κηΐων
φρένα ἰανθεὶς
ὄπαζε θεόπομπον ἐσθλῶν τύχαν.

Burnett assumes that the female singers here are the divine Nereids: "The fulfilment of the dive is greeted by non-human creatures who invent a song never before heard and they are joined not only by the Athenians but also by the sea itself".[391] Burnett's argument is based on her translation of these lines which adds the word "Nereids" into a line where it does not appear in Greek and gives the noun "melody" in the English where no analogue word exists in Greek; she similarly attributes personifed singing to the 'Sea' based on the verb ἔκλαγεν without any argument in defence of this unusual meaning for a verb which more usually refers to non-verbal sound.[392] As Maehler points out, it is unlikely the Nereids are depicted as singing here, since the joy felt by the singers is described as "new-founded", thus the arrival of Theseus is focalized through the maidens who have only just now realized that he is alive, not the goddesses with whom he has just been.[393] Furthermore, their song is structurally paired with that of the Athenian boys and it seems more likely that the effect

390 *Contra* Burnett (1985): 21, 25 and 36.
391 Burnett (1985): 36.
392 Although this verb is occastionally used of articulate sound, this is very rare and only with a human subject (cf. Aes. *Ag.*201) whereas with the sea (or indeed even with a human or an animal subject) the verb more usually and naturally refers to non-articulate sound and does not carry an automatic personifying force (animal noises: *Il.* 10.276, 17.756, *Od.* 14.30; inanimate objects creaking: *Il.* 1.46; non articulate human shouting: *Il.* 2.222, 17.88; musical instruments: *HPan* 14, B. 17.3).
393 Maehler (2004): 188, also Gerber (1982): 3-5.

here is of the two reactions of the humans on board, expressed in their distinctive gender-defined ritual song (*ololuge* vs. *paean*)[394] rather than a pairing of 'non-human creatures' with Athenian humans.[395] Although the sea is said to resound, ἔκλαγεν, with the women's song, the verb does not have sufficient personifying force here to attribute a separate song to the sea, as some scholars have done.[396] However, it is not going too far to say that this imagery suggests the sea echoing with the sound of the singing, or perhaps providing a sonorous backdrop to it. This adds to the richness of the embedded songs of the Athenian choruses, and does confer a sense of nature rejoicing along with the human choirs – particularly relevant here, perhaps, given Theseus' marine parentage of which the audience has just heard striking evidence.

The presence of the double choir at the end of Bacchylides' poem creates similar narrative blurring as was identified above in the discussion of the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*.[397] The mythical song of the Athenian boys and the current dithyrambic song effectively merge in the last three lines of the poem. The inset song is not closed off with any markers of narrative ending, and in the vocative address to Delian Apollo there is an echo of the Athenian boys' *paean* to Apollo, although the prayer is now in fact (unexpectedly?) elaborated in the voice of the Kean choir.[398] Unlike the *HPan*, which blends a divine voice with the voice of the poet-narrator, here the narrator's voice is blended with the voices of a mythical, but still human, choir. As in B.6, this blurring of the voices of the young Athenian choir from mythical times with the current choir creates a link between present and past. In B.6, however, this functioned as a strategy of praise aligning the victor's achievement with those in Keos' athletic past, while here, in a dithyramb, the function will

394 For these genres of song as expressing gender distinctions, cf. Maehler (2004): 188.
395 We might fruitfully compare the similar male and female pairing in the Trojan choirs which sing at the end of Sappho fr. 44, discussed above.
396 Burnett (1985): 36.
397 See above, pp. 67-80.
398 cf. Maehler (1997): 210 "...dass hier der Paian, den die athenischen ἠίθεοι anstimmen..., in den Paian des Chores aus Keos übergeht, der bis hierher den "Chor" der ἠίθεοι gleichsam dargestellt hatte: die Mythenerzählung mündet in die Gegenwart der Aufführung ein."

not be laudatory but rather have the effect of claiming for the poet's composition the quality and tone of the 'original' performance.

Although Theseus is rescued by his father Poseidon and not by Apollo, the young men on board sing a *paean* in gratitude, which is immediately followed by an address to Delian Apollo in the last three lines of the poem. Again, as in B.20, the inset song begs the question of the traditionally assumed genre of the frame-poem, which begins to look very much like a *paean* rather than a dithyramb.[399] The embedded *paean* of the Athenian boys functions as an ancestor, rooted in mythical times, of the current song of the Keans, giving it mythological precedent and (through the blurring of voices in the last lines) authority. It also conveys a similar sense of spontaneity and immediacy to the inset song in *Ol.* 9, as the intense relief, joy and gratitude of the Athenian boys on Theseus' return is reflected onto the Kean chorus.

A very similar technique is adopted in B.16, traditionally thought to be a dithyramb, where the narrator looks back to past performances of paeans at Delphi.[400]

.....]δ' ἵκῃ παιηόνων
ἄνθεα πεδοιχνεῖν,
Πύθι' Ἄπολλον,
τόσ[σ]α χοροὶ Δελφῶν
σὸν κελάδησαν παρ' ἀγακλέα ναόν. (B.16.8-12)

Apollo has already been shown in the fragmentary opening lines of this poem to be associated with song, specifically he "rejoices in the [honey sweet voice of?] swan": the bird was associated in Greek literature with beautiful singing.[401] However, it seems reasonable to examine whether or not B.16 may in fact be a paean, given the address to Pythian Apollo and the reference to choirs of Delphians singing at Apollo's temple. Maehler dismisses the possibility out of hand: "this ode is certainly not a paean since its main part has nothing to

399 That B.20 may in fact be a *paean* has already been suggested by Jebb (1905): 223 and Maehler (2004): 173, although Maehler later in the same work (p.164) denies that B.16 *can* be a *paean* since "its main part has nothing to do with Apollo" – neither does B.20, which he is happy to accept as a *paean*.
400 Contra Burnett (1985): 124 who translates the poetic aorist κελάδησαν as a future tense.
401 Maehler (2004): 168.

do with Apollo."[402] Yet in his discussion of B.17 (also usually defined as a dithyramb) he accepts that it is likely to be a paean although its main narrative also has nothing to do with Apollo: "it seems to have been a paean, not only because it is addressed to Apollo at the end but also in view of the preceding lines ... they describe how the Athenian boys greet Theseus ... the boys with a paean".[403] If the criteria for changing the classification of B.17 are a) an address to Apollo and b) an internal choir singing paeans, then it seems unobjectionable to at least consider re-evaluating the genre of B.16, which also has an address to Apollo and an internal choir singing paeans.

The interpretation of the Delphians' song depends partly on how πρίν is read in the following line.[404] The interpretation of these lines has vexed modern commentators, who struggle to resolve the temporal structure of the poem.[405] It seems likely that πρίν should here be read as an adverb rather than as a conjunction.[406] If πρίν is read as an adverb, then the aorist κελάδησαν must be read as a gnomic aorist since a past tense would no longer make any sense.[407] This would give the sense: "You arrive, seeking the blooms of paeans which the Delphians usually sing at your temple, meanwhile, we sing...". The inset, gnomic, *paean-song* is part of a *recusatio*-style justification for the genre of the current song: until it is time for the next paean, the chorus will sing a dithyramb. The poem would then be performed during the winter months, when dithyramb took the place of paean at Delphi.[408] If this reading is accepted, then the traditional genre of the poem is validated, since the effect is of contrast between the gnomic, habitual song of the Delphians and the frame narrative: the contrast itself is not only one of genre but one of time – the frame narrative is used to delay the performance of a paean (which will happen later in the year).

402 Maehler (2004): 163.
403 Maehler (2004): 173.
404 I am greatly indebted to Evert van Emde Boas for his suggestions on this matter.
405 Cf. Maehler (2004): 169, Jebb (1905): 371.
406 Cf. Rijksbaron (2006): 78-9, 81.
407 For it would mean: "you seek [the songs] which the Delphians sang...before that, we **are singing**" which obviously makes no sense.
408 Cf. Jebb (1905): 368.

For Pindar and Bacchylides, embedded song is put to a variety of uses, from augmenting their praise in their epinician poetry to validating their own poetic authority outside the epinician genre. Their use of embedded song, although not ubiquitous in their extant works, offers an important corrective to the assumption often made by modern scholars that Pindar (and to a lesser extent Bacchylides) does not rely on the Muses or other external sources for his poetic authority. The focus of the discussion so far has centred exclusively on the lyric poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides largely because more of their work is preserved in better condition than that of many other lyric poets; the problems that fragmentary poems cause for securely identifying embedded songs were mentioned above. It will be profitable to consider one further example of the technique from outside the work of these two poets, in order to contextualize their approach to embedded song.

2.6 CORINNA: A DEFENCE AGAINST PAROCHIALISM

One of the most interesting non Pindaric/Bacchylidean examples of embedded song in lyric poetry is found in the poetry of Corinna. The date of Corinna has vexed scholars for many years, and argument has focused on attempts to date her from linguistic and dialectical features, which have been argued by scholars such as Page and West to suggest a Hellenistic date, and anecdotal evidence from other authors such as Pausanias which, if followed, would make her a contemporary of Pindar.[409] While the anecdotal accounts of Corinna's strife with Pindar are rightly treated with suspicion, the linguistic arguments remain unconvincing at best, since both archaic linguistic features as well as more Hellenistic ones can be found in her poetry.[410] A recent re-examination of the

409 West (1970): 277-87 and (1990): 553-57; Page (1953): 65-84; Paus. 9.22.3, Ael. *VH.* 13.25.1-2; Plutarch *De Glor. Ath.* 4.347f-348a.
410 West (1970): 284-5 gives a list in which the problem of dating from linguistic features is obvious: any archaic language is dismissed as Corinna having "got it from a predecessor" (284) while later language is

iconographical evidence dismissed by Page and West suggests that a date in the fifth century is not as impossible as has been believed.[411] Stewart concludes that literary scholars have been too quick to dismiss Tatian's list of statues which included Corinna, and adds the evidence of a small statue labelled "Corinna" which would suggest a much earlier date for the poet than previously accepted: "there seems no reason to doubt that the Compiègne Corinna copies a Greek original of around or shortly after 320 B.C., presumably Silanion's statue. This rules out a third-century date for the poetess; indicates that the anecdotes linking her to Pindar cannot be lightly dismissed; and counsels that her contribution to the development of Greek lyric poetry be urgently reevaluated."[412] Collins posits a fifth-century Corinna, famous only inside Boeotia and later discovered and taken up by Alexandrian poets and scholars, which is the position which will be adopted in this discussion.[413] No attempt will be made here to prove her date, since the evidence is still uncertain and the question will continue to be debated among scholars. The above summary is intended to show that the inclusion of Corinna among the classical lyric poets of this chapter is supported by at least some of the available evidence.

Corinna fr. 654, P. Berol. 284.

The contest of Helicon and Cithaeron

[ ]ε̣ὐ̣.[.....]Κώρει-
τες ἔκρου]ψαν δαθίο̣[ι θι]ᾶς
βρέφο]ς ἄντροι, λαθρά[δα]ν ἀγ-
κο]υλομείταο Κρόνω, τα-
νίκά νιν κλέψε μάκηρα Ῥεία
μεγ]άλαν τ' [ἀ]θανάτων ἔσ-
ς] ἔλε τιμάν· τάδ' ἔμελψεμ·
μάκαρας δ' αὐτίκα Μώση
φ]ερέμεν ψᾶφον ἔ[τ]αττον
κρ]ουφίαν κάλπιδας ἐν χρου-
σοφαῖς· τὺ δ' ἅμα πάντε[ς] ὤρθεν·
πλίονας δ' εἶλε Κιθηρών·

seized upon as evidence for her Hellenistic date. Conversely, one could easily argue that the later linguistic usages could well be a feature of the Hellenistic date of the papyrus, or that Corinna, if an archaic date is preferred, is the earliest attestation of them.

411 Larson (2002): 47-8; Stewart (1998): 271-282.

412 Stewart (1998): 280.

413 Collins (2006): 19-20.

τάχα δ' Ἑρμᾶς ἀνέφαν[έν
νι]ν ἀούσας ἐρατὰν ὡς
ἕ]λε νίκαν στεφ[ά]νυσιν
...].(.)ατώ . ανεκόσμιον
μάκα]ρες· τῶ δὲ νόος γεγάθι·
ὁ δὲ λο]ύπησι κά[θ]εκτος
χαλεπ]ῆσιν Fελι[κ]ὼν ἐ-
.....] λιττάδα [π]έτραν[414]

This fragment narrates a song contest between Helicon and Cithaeron, which is presided over by the Muses and Hermes, and voted on by the gods. Only the last few lines of one inset song are preserved, and even the identity of the singer here is not securely known, although it is generally assumed to be Cithaeron.[415] This myth, of a song contest between the two mountains, is not attested elsewhere although their antagonism towards each other appears in other sources.[416] Despite the very fragmentary nature of the text, it is clear that the song of the contestant is included in the poem in embedded narrative since the end of his song is marked with the words τάδ' ἔμελψεμ· at line 18, and it is likely that the song of his opponent was also included.[417] This singing contest complete with an embedded audience as judges is reminiscent of the contests between bucolic characters in Theocritus' *Idylls*: in 8.88-91, for example, we are shown a vivid picture of the contrasting emotions of victor and vanquished, similar to that here at 29-31. The embedded song tells of another myth, that of how the infant Zeus was rescued from a murderous Cronus by his mother Rhea, and raised in a cave on a mountainside by the Curetes. This myth is treated elsewhere, for instance at *Theogony* 453f.[418]

414 The text is that of Page (1953), with emendations from West (1996): 22-3: 13 δάθιοι Page: δάθιον.
415 Why this should be is not entirely clear: Page (1953): 20 "Wilamowitz chose Cithaeron, and posterity repeats it; I do not know why"; Bolling (1956): 283 n.1 notes that the winning contestant usually sings second in a musical *agon*. Weiler (1974): 82 n.189 "dass der Sieger bei musischen Agonen in der Regel als zweiter auftrifft" (cf. also Collins (2006): 26 following Weiler) but this only establishes a general rule, from which Corinna may have departed: the outraged reaction of Helicon may even indicate that he sang second and thus 'expected' to win.
416 Campbell (1982): 411; Weiler (1974): 80-9 has a survey of this contest and earlier traditions; Henderson (1995): 33 wrongly states that this myth of the song-contest appears in the *Theogony* 453ff. – it is rather the *myth* narrated by the inset song, i.e. the birth of Zeus, which Hesiod relates in these lines.
417 Clayman (1993): 635 "Although the first part of the contest poem is lost, it appears that each mountain sings in turn either set pieces or shorter exchanges".
418 Collins (2006): 28 wrongly interprets the inset song as a story about Rhea stealing Zeus from the Curetes, but this is not suggested either by the extant text or by mythological tradition. His own difficulty in explaining why Rhea should steal Zeus from those who traditionally protected him speaks for itself.

The significance of this fragment has been largely missed by modern scholars who too readily dismiss it without careful reading: Page comments on fr. 654 "In thought, in structure, in language, and in metre the impression given by this quaint and comfortable yarn is one of extreme simplicity", and says elsewhere in his work on Corinna "Here [in the myth of Asopus' daughters] as in *Helicon and Cithaeron,* we have a glimpse...into provincial, almost parochial records".[419] Finally, he comments on the title "Orestes" preserved in the fragments of Corinna: "The title is surprising. There is no other evidence that Corinna wrote of anything but local Boeotian lore".[420] Similarly, Campbell claims that Corinna's "subjects are exclusively the legends of her native Boeotia".[421] This position does not take full account of the subject of the inset song in fr. 654, which is a *Cretan* myth, and which, even estimating conservatively from the fragments preserved, must have been at least ten lines long. Indeed, even the myth of strife between Helicon and Cithaeron is preserved in other sources, although Corinna seems to have elaborated on this enmity in presenting a musical contest between the two.[422] The evidence for Corinna's interest in non-Boeotian myth is thus clearly and indisputably preserved in one of her major fragments, and the failure of scholars to admit this must be partially accorded to a pre-conceived notion, not to say prejudice, of the poet as an exclusively local one.[423] Furthermore, the use of inset song in this poem, whether it was in amoebaean structure or in the form of two longer pieces, complicates the structure of the frame narrative sufficiently to offer an immediate rebuttal of Page's condemnation of the structure, at least, as of "extreme simplicity".

419 Page (1953): 21, 25.
420 Page (1953): 28.
421 Campbell (1982): 409-10.
422 Campbell (1982): 411; Page (1953): 21-2.
423 West (1970): 282 makes the same mistake: "Corinna's songs were narrative, dealing with local Boeotian legends" (NB the self-contradictory comment only a few paragraphs later: "when she does refer to a non-Boeotian story, the birth of Zeus..." !); Skinner (1983): 10 "... we can still regard her as an extraordinarily conservative author whose use of old-fashioned techniques was suited to her listeners, unsophisticated village maidens". Some scholars have attempted to see beyond this view: see Larmour (2005): 43, who notes in passing that some myths and themes in Corinna are "certainly not confined to her region", Henderson (1995): 32 "Corinna was aware of and showed some interest in the broader traditions of lyric poetry".

The inset song here, then, takes place on a mountain where the newborn Zeus has been brought by Rhea. The mountainside location is suggested by the fragments ἐπ' ἄκρυ in 3 and ὀρίων in 5. Among the very fragmentary words preserved before the first readable line (line 12) there is a suggestion that the Curetes may have been depicted as playing the lyre, since the word χορδάς, "lyre-strings" is preserved in line 4; whereas this myth elsewhere has the guardians of the baby making loud noises on percussion instruments to hide his crying from Cronus.[424] The presence of the Curetes named in line 12 locates the action in Crete, or less probably on Mount Ida, since these mythical figures are strongly associated with Crete in most sources, and with Ida in the others.[425] Moreover, the mythic subject-matter concerns the Olympian gods and is as such pan-Hellenic, especially as no Boeotian twist is given to the story of Zeus' birth in the extant fragments. Rhea is said to have won great honour, μεγ]άλαν...ἔλε τιμάν, from the immortals for her actions – this can be paralleled by the victory of Cithaeron which is described in similar terms: ἐρατὰν...ἔλε νίκαν, and of course his victory is granted also by the immortals. A single word preserved from the opening line of the poem suggests another possible point of contact between the embedded song and the frame: 1 ε]ὐστέφανον is usually used of a goddess[426] and could perhaps here refer to Rhea, bringing her once again into contact with the victor of the contest, Cithaeron, who is also crowned in 25-6 στεφ[ά]νυσιν δ[' ἐλατάων νιν] ἀνεκόσμιον μάκαρες.[427] These connections between the heroine of the inset song and the victor of the singing contest begin to suggest that Corinna, far from being a parochial amateur, is playing quite sophisticated poetic games here.

424 West (1970): 283 notes that the earliest attestation for the Curetes in this story is Eur. *Ba.*120ff; Schachter (2005): 276 gives a reconstruction of these lines in which the singer talks about himself playing the lyre: "I (deserve) the crown (στέφανον, ἔγωγε)...(I struck the) chords (of my lyre) (χορδὰς) (and sang of)..." but this seems an unlikely scenario, since the narrator who closes the inset song is the 3rd person primary narrator at line 18 – it would seem unecessarily complicated to have the singer introduce his song in the past tense and the primary narrator close it off.
425 Cf. Hes. *Th.* 484 (Aegaeum in Crete); Call. *Hymn to Zeus* 7-8 (Ida).

426 Hes. *Th.* 196 of Aphrodite, so also Ps.-Hes. *Scut.*80 of Thebes.
427 Cf. also Larmour (2005): 29.

Page points out several close verbal parallels between Hesiod's *Theogony* and this inset song, remarking that "its influence is clearly visible in her words".[428] However, he draws no conclusions from these parallels beyond the fact of their existence. Other scholars too miss the possible significance of this: for instance Skinner characterizes the allusions as "straightforward" which presumably implies 'not clever' – why allusion (usually a sign of poetic sophistication) should be interpreted as naive in this poem she does not make clear.[429] Some correspondences are set out below:

...**κρύψεν** δέ ἑ χερσὶ λαβοῦσα
ἄντρῳ ἐν ἠλιβάτῳ, **ζαθέης** ὑπὸ κεύθεσι γαίης,
Αἰγαίῳ ἐν ὄρει πεπυκασμένῳ ὑλήεντι. (*Th.* 482-4)

...Κώρει-
τες **ἔκρυ]ψαν δαθίῳ[ι** θι]ᾶς
βρέφο]ς **ἄντροι, λαθρά[δα]ν** ἀγ-
κο]υλομείταο Κρόνω... (fr. 654.12-15)

... ἵνα μή τις ἀγαυῶν Οὐρανιώνων
ἄλλος ἐν ἀθανάτοισιν **ἔχοι** βασιληίδα **τιμήν**. (*Th.* 461-2)

μεγ]άλαν τ' **[ἀ]θανάτων** ἔσ-
ς] **ἔλε τιμάν**·... (fr. 654.17-18)

...οὓς κατέπινε μέγας **Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης** (*Th.* 473)

ἀγ- κο]υλομείταο Κρόνω (fr. 654.14-5)

The verbal correspondences show that inset song is here used by Corinna to show her mastery of poetry – she alludes to Hesiod and is using the poetic tradition in a new way, transforming a section of Hesiod's narrative into a competitive song which wins honour from the gods.[430] She adds the Curetes into the story, a specifically Cretan element which is absent from Hesiod, and ends the myth with a focus on Rhea's honour for saving her son from Cronus rather than continuing to narrate Zeus' childhood. Several modern scholars have sought to interpret this as an interest in female achievement; Larmour assumes that much of Corinna's poetry has a female focus, despite the obvious fact that the main

428 Page (1953): 20.
429 Skinner (1983): 14.
430 Page (1953): 20 "Corinna remembers, though she goes beyond, the narrative in the *Theogony*".

characters in this poem, Helicon and Cithaeron, are male, not to speak of the general dubiousness of making such assumptions when we have so little of Corinna's poetry preserved to us.[431] Rayor goes as far as to say that the focus on Rhea here marks Corinna's poetry "women-identified", and that this story shows in a new way the clever woman outwitting her husband and taking control of her progeny.[432] However, Rhea is shown already in Hesiod's *Theogony* to be the prime instigator of Zeus' survival and Cronus' downfall – at lines 469-473 she plots with Gaia and Ouranos, her parents, to save her child and punish her husband:

> ...ὅπως λελάθοιτο τεκοῦσα
> παῖδα φίλον, τείσαιτο δ' ἐρινῦς πατρὸς ἑοῖο
> παίδων <θ>' οὓς κατέπινε μέγας Κρόνος ἀγκυλομήτης (*Th.* 471-3)

Where Corinna *does* significantly change the focus of the Hesiodic version is in lines 17-18, where Rhea is said to win great honour, τιμή, from the immortals for her deed. In the earlier version, τιμή is also at stake, but it is Cronus' concern for his own τιμή, and fear that another god will steal it from him at line 461-2. Thus it is clear that Corinna, in the story of Rhea's theft of Zeus, only slightly expands on the already prominent role of the female Rhea in this traditional myth, and it seems more plausible to read it as a portrayal of one god outwitting another, and receiving honour from the rest of the gods for it – a parallel situation for the singers in the frame narrative, rather than as a specifically gendered re-working of a traditional myth.[433] By transferring the τιμή from Cronus/Zeus to Rhea, she changes the point of the story from the eventual ascension of Zeus to the trickery of Rhea; thus the structure and plot of inset narrative may be seen to correspond to the frame narrative, in which Cithaeron, the lesser-known mountain (in poetic terms) "steals glorious τιμή" from Helicon, the better known poet. The narratives both contain weaker gods outwitting stronger gods and gaining τιμή, and possibly even some trickery is involved in both situations, although the fragmentary nature of the texts forces us to remain uncertain.

---

431 Larmour (2005): 41 "Corinna's poems are far removed from the realm of epinikian...many were concerned with marriage and women's experience and ***probably paid more attention to female figures*** like Rhea and various sets of daughters"(My italics).
432 Rayor (1993): 226.
433 Larmour (2005), Rayor (1993): 226.

Some critics have seen humour in this passage – notably Collins, who terms it "the absurd and obviously humorous singing contest between Helicon and Cithaeron".[434] However, there is nothing obviously comic about these lines, the verbal parallels with Hesiod seem to suggest a serious tone and the outcome of the contest suggests further that humour is not at all intended. The bitter reaction of Helicon, the loser, is expressed in a series of actions which are not altogether clear in the extant fragments. Following the text of Page, he tears off a huge lump of rock and throws it from the mountain.[435] The emendations of Ebert suggest that Helicon rather climbs the mountain and hurls himself off, committing suicide in anguish at losing the contest.[436] In either case, the point of the frame narrative, then, would seem to be an aetiological explanation of the mountain Helicon's association with the Muses. This too has links with the inset song, which tells of Zeus' association with a mountain – in other versions of the story a particular mountain is named and claimed to be the one where Zeus was raised.[437]

The full function of the inset song in this passage is difficult to gauge without the opposing song, with which it must have been meant to be compared and contrasted. Bowra and, more recently, Clayman have sought to read an allegorical, metapoetic element into the contest.[438] Bowra suggests that the victor, Cithaeron, stands for the superiority of the poetry from the region of Helicon, while Clayman, after giving an allegorical reading of Callimachus' 4th *Iambus*, tries to fit the song of Helicon and Cithaeron into this mould "in which Helicon takes the part of Pindar and victorious Cithaeron is Corinna".[439] However there is no support in what remains of the text for this position, and it must remain

434 Collins (2006): 20, Skinner (1983): 14 "The playful tone of the narrative warns us not to take its implications too seriously".
435 Page (1953): 10-14.
436 Ebert (1978): 5-12.
437 Hes. *Th.*484 (Aegaeum in Crete); Call. *Hymn to Zeus* 7-8 (Ida).
438 Bowra (1979): 290.
439 Clayman (1993): 636.

speculation.[440] What the embedded song does show is that Corinna, far from being parochial, is interested in pan-Hellenic myth and in interacting with the poetic tradition in the composition of her own poetry.

440 Clayman (1993): 636 gives as support a somewhat strained connection between the mountain setting of this poem and a supposed nickname of Pindar's father as 'Scopelinus', '*man-of-the-rocks*', but this is not enough to suggest a metapoetic and polemical reading of the contest.

CHAPTER THREE

HELLENISTIC POETRY: WRITTEN SONGS

"Greek art exhibits a long inward hostility to writing and did not want to be read."

(Nietzsche)[441]

The poetry of Apollonius and Theocritus, perhaps surprisingly, contains frequent depictions of the performance of poetry in an oral context. The tension between such depictions of oral song and the frame narratives which contain them centres on the increased literacy of the Hellenistic world and the fact that Apollonius and Theocritus are both very much *writing* their poetry for reading audiences, even if they did also give oral recitations of their work. While genre will continue to be an important factor in determining how and why these poets use embedded song, their relationship with their poetic heritage will be of key importance in exploring why these literate and literary poets are so interested in depicting oral poetry and to what extent their depictions of oral poetry can be said to be self-reflexive.

Beginning with the epic of Apollonius, the role of the songs of Orpheus and the magical songs of Medea and the Sirens in the *Argonautica* will be discussed; as well as setting out the function of these embedded songs *within* the *Argonautica*, I will consider the poem's strong links with (but also divergences from) the models of embedded song in the *Odyssey*, arguing that these two poems, although both epics, use embedded songs in very different ways.[442]

441 Translated from the unpublished *Wir Philologen* by Arrowsmith (1963): 15.
442 For it is this Homeric poem which provides the epic antecedent for the *Argonautica*'s interest in depicting the performance of poetry. Cf. Hunter (1993): 148-50 for an account of some Odyssean models for Argonautic song.

Song is adduced as an important theme of the *Argonautica* from the very opening of the poem, in Orpheus' prominent role in the catalogue of heroes (immediately following the proem), where his power in song is emphasized with an account of his control over nature (*Arg.* 1.23-34.)[443] The prominence given to Orpheus by his enrolment first in the catalogue of heroes is not belied by his first appearance in the narrative proper, where his song is of vital importance in ensuring that the expedition even sets out at all.[444]

3.1 *ARGONAUTICA:* RITUAL AND MAGIC SONGS

Χώετ' ἐνιπτάζων· προτέρω δέ κε νεῖκος ἐτύχθη,
εἰ μὴ δηριόωντας ὁμοκλήσαντες ἑταῖροι
αὐτός τ' Αἰσονίδης κατερήτυεν· †ἂν δὲ καὶ † Ὀρφεύς,
λαιῇ ἀνασχόμενος κίθαριν, πείραζεν ἀοιδῆς.
Ἤειδεν δ' ὡς γαῖα καὶ οὐρανὸς ἠδὲ θάλασσα,
τὸ πρὶν ἔτ' ἀλλήλοισι μιῇ συναρηρότα μορφῇ,
νείκεος ἐξ ὁλοοῖο διέκριθεν ἀμφὶς ἕκαστα·
ἠδ' ὡς ἔμπεδον αἰὲν ἐν αἰθέρι τέκμαρ ἔχουσιν
ἄστρα, σεληναίης τε καὶ ἠελίοιο κέλευθοι·
οὔρεά θ' ὡς ἀνέτειλε, καὶ ὡς ποταμοὶ κελάδοντες
αὐτῇσιν νύμφῃσι καὶ ἑρπετὰ πάντ' ἐγένοντο.
ἤειδεν δ' ὡς πρῶτον Ὀφίων Εὐρυνόμη τε
Ὠκεανὶς νιφόεντος ἔχον κράτος Οὐλύμποιο·
ὥς τε βίῃ καὶ χερσὶν ὁ μὲν Κρόνῳ εἴκαθε τιμῆς,
ἡ δὲ Ῥέῃ, ἔπεσον δ' ἐνὶ κύμασιν Ὠκεανοῖο·
οἱ δὲ τέως μακάρεσσι θεοῖς Τιτῆσιν ἄνασσον,
ὄφρα Ζεὺς ἔτι κοῦρος, ἔτι φρεσὶ νήπια εἰδώς,
Δικταῖον ναίεσκεν ὑπὸ σπέος, οἱ δέ μιν οὔπω
γηγενέες Κύκλωπες ἐκαρτύναντο κεραυνῷ,
βροντῇ τε στεροπῇ τε· τὰ γὰρ Διὶ κῦδος ὀπάζει.
Ἦ, καὶ ὁ μὲν φόρμιγγα σὺν ἀμβροσίῃ σχέθεν αὐδῇ·
τοὶ δ' ἄμοτον λήξαντος ἔτι προύχοντο κάρηνα,
πάντες ὁμῶς ὀρθοῖσιν ἐπ' οὔασιν ἠρεμέοντε
κηληθμῷ· τοῖόν σφιν ἐνέλλιπε θέλκτρον ἀοιδῆς. (*Arg.* 1.492-515)

443 The role of Orpheus in the *Argonautica* has attracted a predictably large number of studies: Scherer (2002): 115n. 386 gives a summary of the bibliography and offers his own discussion pp.115-123, but cf. especially Cuypers (2004): 58 (also with a summary of bibliography on this issue), Carsprecken (1952): 33-143, Clare (2002): 9-33, Clauss (1993): 30-32, Hunter (1993): 126-7, Fränkel (1968): 45-6, Goldhill (1991): 286-93.

444 The Greek text of Apollonius throughout is that of Fränkel (1970 [1961]).

Orpheus' song has the power to calm dissent and to turn his companions' attention away from their argument. The legendary singer chooses a cosmological theme for his first song in the epic: he sings of the creation of the world and the succession of the gods who later ruled over it, from the primeval rulers Ophion and Eurynome down to Zeus, whose rule is anticipated (although not yet realized) by the end of the inset song.[445]

The theme of the embedded song reflects that of the surrounding frame narrative.[446] Orpheus sings in a successful attempt to calm a quarrel among his companions and the song begins with the creation of the world out of strife: the word νεῖκος is used both in line 498 as an *aition* for the separation of the three elemental sections of the world (earth, sky and sea), and in the frame narrative at line 492 it is used of the heroes' argument, linking the embedded song with the frame narrative even on a verbal level.[447] However, in Orpheus' song the elemental, deadly strife which sets creation in motion gives way to an orderly system in which the heavenly bodies of sun, moon and stars are depicted as proceeding along their fixed paths in perpetual motion. This image implies the heroes could do well to follow the example of the co-ordinated and organized cosmological phenomena, which share the sky successfully because each has its fixed place.[448]

In the series of divine successions which make up the latter half of Orpheus' song the theme of strife, or at least of violent contention, is again present since each set of rulers must

445 For cosmogony in Greek literature and thought see Gregory (2008). Most scholars have interpreted this song as a theogony/cosmogony, cf. Pietsch (1999): 521-39 (which offers a useful summary of recent bibliography), Hunter (1993): 149-50, Kyriakou (1994), Busch (1993): 306 who divides the song into two halves, one a theogony and one a cosmogony, Margolies DeForest (1994) sees in the song an allusion to the creation of writing. Many scholars have written on the intertextual connections between Orpheus' song and Empedocles: cf. scholia to *Arg.* 1.496-8b in Wendel (1958): 43-4, Vian (1974): 252-3, Kyriakou (1994): 309-13. For intertextuality with the *Theogony* see Clare (2002): 55-6, Hunter (1993): 148-9, Brown (1990): 316-7. For intertextuality with the Iliadic shield of Achilles, see Feeney (1991): 67, Vian (1974): 252-3, Clare (2002): 55.

446 Noted already by the scholia on 1.496-498a: οἰκεία δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὑποκειμένοις πράγμασιν ἡ ᾠδή, ὅτι πρέπον ἐστὶ τῆς μάχης παύσασθαι καὶ εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν διάθεσιν ἐπανιέναι. Cf. also Karanika (2010): 407; Levin (1971): 217-221, Fränkel (1968): 77 argues that the links are only partial, that strife is a link but that the world order which arises from the strife is not foreshadowed in the main narrative.

447 Hunter (1993): 149, Nelis (1992): 159, Hurst (1967): 56, and Busch (1993): 18 also note this repetition of *neikos*.

448 Cf. Green (2007): 208 n.495 "Orpheus's song is similarly designed to bring harmony back out of *neikos*".

overthrow their predecessor by force, as we are specifically told Kronos and Rhea defeated Ophion and Eurynome by might (βίηι 505). The temporal limitation set to their own rule in lines 508-509 makes clear that Zeus will soon overthrow them in turn, while the reference to his weapons created by the Cyclopes implies a violent *coup d'état*. Zeus' innate power is perhaps undermined by the implication that it is only when the Cyclopes give him the weapons they have created for him that he is able to defeat his parents. This seems particularly to be indicated by the end of line 511, where Zeus' glory is said to be provided by his Cyclopean weapons.[449]

The negativity of the νεῖκος in this section of Orpheus' song is again neutralized by its eventual outcome – the order which will be established by Zeus on Olympus after his succession. Kyriakou sees the succession myth as a negative paradigm, "a reminder of the detrimental effects of νεῖκος on human life", but this interpretation does not take account of the fact that the myth does not show any negative impact on human life (taking place as it does entirely in the divine sphere) and that Zeus' eventual accession to power would not have been seen in a negative light.[450] Her insistence on the negativity of the succession myth mars her interpretation of the effect of Orpheus's song:

> "The succession myth exemplified the grave consequences that a disruption of social order can have. The song calms the Argonauts because it restores the momentarily disturbed order by invoking the archetypal principles of order and disorder, by putting things in a larger cosmic perspective."[451]

The song certainly puts their quarrel in a "larger cosmic perspective", but it does not do so by presenting the succession myth negatively. The song rather shows a context in which strife is useful, since it eventually results in Zeus as supreme ruler establishing the order of the cosmos. The cosmic perspective is one of the correct contexts for strife: with its emphasis on strife which ultimately results in better order, Orpheus' song aims to show the heroes that their own strife (unlike that of the divine succession or that which created the

449 Indeed it has been suggested that the order imposed by Zeus' reign is deliberately indicated as contingent or impermanent here, cf. Clare (2002): 58.
450 Kyriakou (1994): 312.
451 Kyriakou (1994): 313.

world) is not going to result in a positive outcome, but rather risks derailing the whole Argonautic expedition. This vision of different kinds of strife with contrasting negative and positive outcomes is very similar to the double Strife(s) portrayed by Hesiod in the opening section of the *Works and Days.* In the *Works and Days,* Hesiod 'corrects' the account of strife offered at *Theogony* 225-226, remarking on the two different kinds of Strife inherent in human life:

> οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην Ἐρίδων γένος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν
> εἰσὶ δύω· τὴν μέν κεν ἐπαινήσειε νοήσας,
> ἡ δ' ἐπιμωμητή· διὰ δ' ἄνδιχα θυμὸν ἔχουσιν.
> ἣ μὲν γὰρ πόλεμόν τε κακὸν καὶ δῆριν ὀφέλλει,
> σχετλίη· οὔ τις τήν γε φιλεῖ βροτός, ἀλλ' ὑπ' ἀνάγκης 15
> ἀθανάτων βουλῇσιν Ἔριν τιμῶσι βαρεῖαν.
> τὴν δ' ἑτέρην προτέρην μὲν ἐγείνατο Νὺξ ἐρεβεννή,
> θῆκε δέ μιν Κρονίδης ὑψίζυγος, αἰθέρι ναίων,
> γαίης [τ'] ἐν ῥίζῃσι καὶ ἀνδράσι πολλὸν ἀμείνω·
> ἥ τε καὶ ἀπάλαμόν περ ὁμῶς ἐπὶ ἔργον ἐγείρει· 20
> εἰς ἕτερον γάρ τίς τε ἴδεν ἔργοιο χατίζων
> πλούσιον, ὃς σπεύδει μὲν ἀρόμεναι ἠδὲ φυτεύειν
> οἶκόν τ' εὖ θέσθαι· ζηλοῖ δέ τε γείτονα γείτων
> εἰς ἄφενος σπεύδοντ'· ἀγαθὴ δ' Ἔρις ἥδε βροτοῖσιν.
>
> (Hesiod, *WD* 11-24).[452]

These two different 'Strifes' can respectively be aligned with the strife between the Argonauts, which is destructive and will result in disaster for the expedition, and the strife between primeval deities and their descendants, which results ultimately in the better ordering of the universe. The powerful, quasi-magical effect of the song on its audience resolves the negative strife between Idas and Idmon: in contrast to their earlier uproarious fighting (implied to be verging on a physical brawl at 493-4, where Jason and his companions are described as restraining, κατερήτυεν, the arguing men), they are quiescent under the spell of his music (514-5).

SELF-REFERENTIALITY

452 The Greek text of Hesiod throughout is that of Solmsen (1983).

Orpheus is often seen as a metapoetic figure for the poet of the *Argonautica*, an internal reflection of how Apollonius saw himself or wished himself to be seen by his readers.[453] The relationship between the fictional poet and the poet-narrator of the frame narrative is complex and will be discussed throughout this chapter, but it is important to consider the possibilities for authorial self-reflexivity in this first song of Orpheus.

Orpheus' theogony is clearly demarcated as indirect narrative, beginning with the introductory verb ἤειδεν at 496 (after the more general description of Orpheus playing his lyre at 494-5). The same verb is repeated at 503, and the end of the song is marked both with a past-tense verb ἦ and with the emphatic image of the bard stopping his lyre and voice simultaneously. The introductory interrogative pronoun ὡς, characteristic of indirect discourse, is also repeated at 496, 499, 501 (x2), 503 and 505. This technique draws to the reader's attention that the song is sung by an internal narrator throughout, and does not allow the same level of blurring between the internal and external narrators as is found elsewhere in Greek poetry, for instance in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*, where the markers of indirect discourse are not repeated throughout. The emphasis on *reported* speech does not preclude a mirroring of the poet-narrator in the character of Orpheus, but it does distance the fictional bard and his song from that of the narrator.

It could be argued that by reporting Orpheus' song in this way, Apollonius is emphasizing his authorial control over the song, since Orpheus is not directly quoted but 'summarized' by Apollonius, whose insistence on repeating the markers of indirect discourse throughout the song reminds the reader constantly of the song's status as secondary narrative. Paradoxically perhaps, the repetition of the indirect speech markers distances Apollonius from Orpheus' song (by indicating constantly that *Orpheus* sang this song and

453 Cf. Hunter (1993): 127 n.102 "the narrator of the *Argonautica* hugs Orpheus to himself", also pp. 148-51 in the same volume; Asper (2008): 177 "Orpheus as *the* archetypal singer does function quite clearly as an alter-ego of the narrator." Cf. also Busch (1993): 323-4, Goldhill (1991): 296-300, de Jong (2009): 105-6, Cuypers (2004): 58, Fusillo (1985): 59, 361-2.

not Apollonius) and yet this very repetition simultaneously emphasizes Apollonius' own narratorial presence, by reinforcing the status of the song of Orpheus as a secondary narrative, a song re-told by someone other than its primary originator.

Some scholars have argued that there is, to a limited extent, narrative blurring in this embedded song, since there is a gap of 5 lines between the last marker of indirect discourse and the conclusion of the embedded song.[454] However, the effect of such blurring seems to be at odds with this otherwise very carefully demarcated song of Orpheus, which is introduced and concluded very explicitly as an embedded song and which contains so many reminders of its reported nature, and would be rather limited in scope.

454 Cf. de Jong (2009): 105 "from 507 onwards we are dealing with an independent construction, while in 512 the song is capped by an unmistakable reference to its singer Orpheus", also Hunter (1993): 149-51.

'FUNCTIONAL' ARCHAIC MODELS

It has become a scholarly commonplace to see an Alexandrian allusion to Empedoclean philosophy in these lines.[455] While this is certainly plausible (the following arguments are not meant to exclude a philosophical reading of this passage), there is more to be said about possible poetic antecedents for such an inset song.[456] The song's intertextuality with the *Theogony* and possible links with the songs of Demodocus in the *Odyssey* have been pointed out by other scholars; rather than focusing on possible close verbal allusion(s) to an archaic model, or similarities in theme or ideas (as I have argued for above with the *Works and Days*), I wish to focus on the function of this first embedded song in the Argonautica and its possible archaic models.

As with the 'lay of Aphrodite and Ares' sung by Demodocus in the *Odyssey*, this inset song is of a different genre from the main narrative. Its cosmological and theogonic theme shows the poet's capability in another poetic genre closely related to epic, the function described in the Introduction above as the poet's "genre-appropriation".[457] Unlike the songs of Demodocus, however, this song has a direct aim and effect: Orpheus sings with the *intention* of calming the brawl which has broken out among the Argonauts, and the poet-narrator tells us of his ultimate success. Although Demodocus' song(s) certainly have an effect on his audience, they are not intentionally manipulative, and this is true of most bardic narratives in Homer.[458] Phemius, for instance, does not *intend* to upset Penelope at

455 See note 445 above for bibliography on the Empedoclean allusions in these lines. West (1983): 127 does not find a link between this theogony and the *Orphic Theogonies*, but N.B. West (1971): 22, where he does discuss this possibility

456 See note 445 above for bibliography on the Hesiodic and Homeric intertexts found by other scholars in this section of the *Argonautica.*

457 Introduction pp. 42-3.

458 Asper (2008): 178-9 discusses the cosmological song of Orpheus and notes that Apollonius makes more explicit the implicit effects of Demodocus' songs upon his audience.

Od. 1.325-7, but this is a side-effect of his song, chosen rather because it is the newest and most entertaining narrative in his repetoire.[459]

Such intentionality in performing a song is anticipated by Hermes, whose miniature 'theogony' in the *HHerm.* is delivered with a similar aim of establishing order from a chaotic situation, and indeed resolving the strife between himself and Apollo.[460] His song too has a divine theme, specifically emphasizing the creation of order in the divine world and the succession of the gods, and his audience (Apollo) is delighted by the performance, as are the Argonauts at *Arg.* 1.513-5. Both these inset songs emphasize the power of song to order the world – in Orpheus' case the song calms a serious quarrel which threatens to put the whole Argonautic expedition in jeopardy, while Hermes' 'theogony' delights his older brother Apollo so much that the baby god is forgiven for his appropriation of Apollo's rights and is granted a position in the divine order about which he has been singing. The central theme of each of these songs thus directly impacts on the frame narrative: the songs are not digressions, but actively move the plot along, in both cases solving a problem that threatens to destroy the progress of the narrative.

Orpheus' song shares yet another feature with the *HHerm.* It was argued above (pp. 56-62) that Hermes' first song in that hymn, a miniature hymn to himself, functions as a kind of proem to the remaining portion of the frame narrative, a new 'proem in the middle' which displaces the poet-narrator's own opening statements and allows Hermes to usurp narratorial control of his own hymn. The genre of Orpheus' cosmogonical song by its very nature suggests beginnings, the origins of things, and creates a wide conceptual landscape in which the adventures of the Argonauts may be set. Unlike the cheeky god of the *HHerm.*, who offers a very similar proemic hymn to that of the frame narrative (i.e. a

459 Cf. Scodel (1998): 172 "Bardic narrative, by contrast, ordinarily does not seek to manipulate its audience. Although the bard's song may have special significance for the audience, or some members of the audience, it is essentially disinterested."
460 *HHerm.* 424-435, see above pp. 49-67.

souped-up version emphasizing his own better qualities), Orpheus does not directly compete with the proem of the *Argonautica* in singing this cosmogonical song. Rather he offers, on the very moment of departure, a reflective account of the beginning of the world and the origins of the human condition, focusing specifically on strife and how difficulties may be overcome – themes which will be of immense importance for the rest of the poem.[461]

RELIGIOUS SONG

Orpheus' song at 1.496-515 also establishes his position as the Argonauts' main adviser in religious matters and one of their most important means of communicating with the divine within the poem.[462] It is Orpheus who advises and enacts many of the Argonauts' interactions with the divine throughout the *Argonautica*.[463] At *Arg.* 2.684-713, Orpheus is the first of the heroes to speak after the epiphany of Apollo: he instigates a series of ritual acts including sacrifice, the building of an altar and the singing of a hymn. In book 1, his theogonic song foreshadows his connection with the divine and his authority in divine matters, acting as proof of both his power over mortals and of his knowledge of things outside normal human limits. The reaction of the Argonauts to his song signals its religious dimension: after the immediate spell of the music has worn off, they at once sacrifice to Zeus. The quarrel that threatened to jeopardize the whole expedition is thus transformed into a unifying ritual act through the power of Orpheus' song.[464]

461 After they do set out, his lyre is used to set the time for the rowing, another image of order (1.540-541). Cf. Nelis (1992): 166 where he comments that, as a result of the song of Orpheus "the feats of the Argonauts are thus placed in a cosmic setting and given their place in the whole panorama of history", now also Klooster (2011): 75-86.
462 Cf. Clare (2002): 233-240, Hunter (1986): 53, Busch (1993): 301 for the religious aspect of Orpheus' character. Karanika (2010): 391-410 also points out some of the religious implications of Orpheus' songs, particularly in respect to colonization and the religious role of the oikist.
463 Cf. Williams (1991): 204; Hunter (1986): 53; Karanika (2010): 395-6.
464 Cf. Busch (1993): 304 – he argues that Orpheus usurps Jason's role as leader by successfully calming the quarrel.

The religious aspect of Orpheus' character is further exemplified in his next song of the epic, at 1.569-579 (printed in full below).

τοῖσι δὲ φορμίζων εὐθήμονι μέλπεν ἀοιδῇ
Οἰάγροιο πάις Νησσόον εὐπατέρειαν
Ἄρτεμιν, ἣ κείνας σκοπιὰς ἁλὸς ἀμφιέπεσκεν
ῥυομένη καὶ γαῖαν Ἰωλκίδα. τοὶ δὲ βαθείης
ἰχθύες ἀίσσοντες ὕπερθ' ἁλός, ἄμμιγα παύροις
ἄπλετοι, ὑγρὰ κέλευθα διασκαίροντες ἔποντο·
ὡς δ' ὁπότ' ἀγραύλοιο μετ' ἴχνια σημαντῆρος
μυρία μῆλ' ἐφέπονται ἄδην κεκορημένα ποίης
εἰς αὖλιν, ὁ δέ τ' εἶσι πάρος, σύριγγι λιγείῃ
καλὰ μελιζόμενος νόμιον μέλος—ὣς ἄρα τοίγε
ὠμάρτευν· τὴν δ' αἰὲν ἐπασσύτερος φέρεν οὖρος.

Orpheus is here depicted as singing a hymn to Artemis in her capacity as a sea-farer's goddess. The hymn takes place as the Argonauts leave on their journey, and its function is partially one of temporal transition in that it takes up a portion of their journey-time, filling a gap between two destinations, although it does not completely obscure a narration of the details of their journey. The response of the fish to Orpheus' song again shows his power not just over human audiences but over nature, recalling his power over the trees which was mentioned in the catalogue at book 1.27-31.[465] The necessity for song in obtaining the goodwill of the gods is a constant theme in book 1 of the *Argonautica* as the heroes undertake their voyage, and this song is the first in a series of short hymns sung by Orpheus which have the effect of presenting song as part of the ritual fabric of society.[466]

So at 1.857-860, the Lemnian women are shown propitiating Hephaestus and Aphrodite with song in celebration of the arrival of the Argonauts:

αὐτίκα δ' ἄστυ χοροῖσι καὶ εἰλαπίνῃσι γεγήθει
καπνῷ κνισήεντι περίπλεον· ἔξοχα δ' ἄλλων
ἀθανάτων Ἥρης υἷα κλυτὸν ἠδὲ καὶ αὐτήν
Κύπριν ἀοιδῇσιν θυέεσσί τε μειλίσσοντο.

465 Cf. Simonides fr. 567 *PMG* for a similar image of Orpheus charming the fish from the sea.
466 As well as the songs discussed in detail below, we also find Orpheus leading the wedding songs for Medea and Jason at *Arg.* 4.1158-60 and 4.1193-97 (N.B. that this Orphic performance is combined with the spontaneous song & dance of the Nymphs). The prayer of Orpheus at 4.1408-1422 is, although similar to hymn, marked as a speech-act and will not be treated in detail here, although it does further cement his characterization as the intermediary between the Argonauts and the divine. Klooster (2011): 83 notes the similarity of this prayer to hymn and also the frequent difficulty of separating prayer and hymn in ancient texts, on this cf. Furley & Bremer (2001): 3.

Although Apollonius here gives us only the information that the Lemnian women sang in celebration and the briefest indication of what they sang about (Hephaestus and Aphrodite), this abbreviated depiction of the performance of song still shows its importance in the ritual activity depicted in the *Argonautica* – it is put on an equal footing with sacrifice through the balanced and equal pairing in line 860 (the gods are appeased ἀοιδῇσιν θυέεσσί) and by the mention of choruses and banquets together in 859, again putting song on a par with (the aftermath of) sacrifice in the celebration. Similarly at 1.1124-1138, again in a religious context, song is portrayed as a vital component in the ritual act, and Orpheus is at the heart of the performance, directing the dance of the young men.[467]

The song the Argonauts sing at 2.161-3 is similarly grounded in ritual activity. Before the song, the Argonauts sacrifice to the immortals, feast and offer burnt sacrifices.[468] Their heads garlanded with laurel (159), they begin their song, again with Orpheus as accompanist:

> ξανθὰ δ' ἐρεψάμενοι δάφνης καθύπερθε μέτωπα
> ἀγχιάλου φύλλοις, τῇ περ πρυμνήσι' ἀνῆπτο,
> Ὀρφείῃ φόρμιγγι συνοίμιον ὕμνον ἄειδον
> ἐμμελέως, περὶ δέ σφιν ἰαίνετο νήνεμος ἀκτή
> μελπομένοις· κλεῖον δὲ Θεραπναῖον Διὸς υἷα. (*Arg.* 2.159-63)

This song caused some consternation among the ancient critics. The scholia seem to have assumed from the use of the term ὕμνος that the song may not refer to a human subject (i.e. Polydeuces), for the song is there suggested to be in honour of Apollo.[469] Fränkel suggests that this performance is in fact an aetiology, depicting the performance of the first ever epinician ode.[470] Although Pindar does certainly refer to his own epinicians as *hymnoi*, the genre of this embedded song in Apollonius seems harder to establish, since we are given very

467 ...ἄμυδις δὲ νέοι Ὀρφῆος ἀνωγῇ |σκαίροντες βηταρμὸν ἐνόπλιον εἰλίσσοντο,| καὶ σάκεα ξιφέεσσιν ἐπέκτυπον... *Arg.* 1.1134-6. It seems likely that this performance did not involve the performance of poetry but a ritual cry accompanied by dancing – cf. Klooster (2011): 83 n.26.
468 *Arg.* 2.156-8.
469 Scholia *ad* 2.162-3 in Lachenaud (2010): 223.
470 Fränkel (1968): 164 n.161-3; followed by Klooster (2011): 86. Cf. Hurst (1967): 69 for an emphasis on the collective nature of this song.

little detail of what was sung.[471] Although Polydeuces is depicted as winning in a boxing match before the performance of the song, his athletic achievements and the performance are separated by almost 70 lines (Polydeuces' opponent dies at *Arg.* 2.97) and no direct mention is made of them in the performance.

The elaborately described ritual context of sacrifice and libation, and the term ὕμνος points to hymn as the genre of this embedded song, and indeed the way in which the subject of the song, Polydeuces, is referred to seems to bear this out – he is not named, but called the "Therapnaean son of Zeus" (163). Such a title must have evoked the cult of Polydeuces at his birthplace in Therapnae in the minds of Apollonius' readers.[472] The manner of the address is in itself reminiscent of hymnic style: compare the opening line of the *HHerm.* (Ἑρμῆν ὕμνει Μοῦσα Διὸς καὶ Μαιάδος υἱόν). I would argue that Apollonius has the Argonauts sing a proleptic hymn to Polydeuces (who is still as yet a mortal hero within the world of the *Argonautica*), playfully anticipating his future godhead, an association obvious to his readers but not yet to the Argonauts. The proximity to epinician poetry adds a further layer to this embedded song, and my interpretation does not exclude that of Fränkel – indeed the difference in genre could be argued to be a matter of perspective. Perhaps the Argonauts think they are singing an epinician, while we (and the Hellenistic readers) see it more as a hymn.

The religious power of song is nowhere clearer in the *Argonautica* than in the hymn sung after the epiphany of Apollo in book 2.701-719:

> ἀμφὶ δὲ δαιομένοις εὐρὺν χορὸν ἐστήσαντο,
> καλὸν Ἰηπαιήον' Ἰηπαιήονα Φοῖβον
> μελπόμενοι, σὺν δέ σφιν ἐὺς πάις Οἰάγροιο
> Βιστονίῃ φόρμιγγι λιγείης ἦρχεν ἀοιδῆς·
> ὥς ποτε πετραίῃ ὑπὸ δειράδι Παρνησσοῖο
> Δελφύνην τόξοισι πελώριον ἐξενάριξεν,
> κοῦρος ἐὼν ἔτι γυμνός, ἔτι πλοκάμοισι γεγηθώς

471 For examples of this see Fränkel (1968): 164 n.29.
472 Cf. Vian (1974): 268.

ἱλήκοις· αἰεί τοι, ἄναξ, ἄτμητοι ἔθειραι,
αἰὲν ἀδήλητοι, τὼς γὰρ θέμις, οἰόθι δ' αὐτή
Λητὼ Κοιογένεια φίλαις ἐνὶ χερσὶν ἀφάσσει 710
πολλὰ δὲ Κωρύκιαι νύμφαι, Πλειστοῖο θύγατρες,
θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσιν, "ἴη ἴε" κεκληγυῖαι
ἔνθεν δὴ τόδε καλὸν ἐφύμνιον ἔπλετο Φοίβῳ.
αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ τόνγε χορείῃ μέλψαν ἀοιδῇ...

The epiphany of Apollo inspires an outpouring of music in the Argonauts' camp. A chorus is established and their ritual song is given in brief at 702. Such a ritual chant may also be compared to the 'all-purpose' victory song sung by the victor and his *hetairoi* at Pindar *Ol.* 9.1-5, since it represents a ritual song which would have been repeated on various occasions and which is not individual in character.[473] This song is linked to the theogony/cosmogony of *Arg.* 1.496-515 and the hymn to Artemis at 1.569-579 by its religious context and function. The chorus of Argonauts sing the traditional refrain to Apollo while Orpheus adds his own more individualized song to the ritual chant. The distinction between the voice of the chorus and that of Orpheus is made clear both at the beginning and the end of the song: the scene opens with the Argonauts establishing a chorus to Apollo (701), and their song is marked as separate from Orpheus' (although, as I argue below, the songs are complementary): they sing the *Ie Paian*, while he sings a mythological narrative which tells of how this chant came to be associated with Apollo. At the end of the song the poet emphasizes the distinction between the choral and solo elements of the ritual: αὐτὰρ ἐπειδὴ τόνγε χορείῃ μέλψαν ἀοιδῇ (714).

Orpheus' song is introduced with clear markers of indirect discourse: ἦρχεν ἀοιδῆς followed by ὡς in lines 704-5. A mythical narrative of three lines follows the introductory ὡς, indicating that Orpheus' song is a hymn, containing the narration of a mythological exploit of the god to whom the hymn is dedicated.[474] Orpheus' story of Apollo's defeat of the monster at Delphi is also hymnic in its emphasis on the youth of the divine protagonist – like Hermes in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*, Apollo was a prodigious child. The

473 For the *paean* as a genre and the ritual cry see Swift (2010): 61-103 and Rutherford (2001): 3-136 (with bibliography).
474 Janko (1981): 9-24.

exclamatory address made directly to Apollo in lines 708-710 is also in keeping with the hymnic style of the song: *Du-Stil* requests for the good favour of the god addressed are a traditional component of hymn.[475] This address to the god is spoken in an ambiguous narrative voice which has excited much scholarly debate over who is speaking these lines.[476]

Firstly, Orpheus could still be singing, but in a more direct style than in the previous lines. After the introductory ὡς in 705, there are no further markers of indirect speech, and since second-person addresses to the god are a traditional feature of hymn it is plausible that these lines could be attributed to Orpheus. The direct address adds vividness and immediacy to the song, and the trope of disingenuous 'correction' of something said which is possibly offensive to the god is used in hymns to imply spontaneity on the part of the speaker.[477] If Orpheus speaks these lines, the present tense ἀφάσσει would refer to the internal 'now' of the epic, the time of the Argonauts. Alternatively, these lines could be spoken by the poet-narrator of the *Argonautica* and in this case, they have the effect of 'correcting' the statement of Orpheus that Apollo "*still* rejoiced" in his long hair while a youth, a statement which implies that his hair was later cut in adulthood.[478] Apollonius would then be contradicting this mistake with the mythological 'truth' that Apollo's hair remained traditionally uncut, a truth still in operation in the 'now' of the poem's creation, Apollonius' own time.

However, it is not necessary to choose a single narrator for these lines. Apollonius has deliberately created a blurring of the narratorial voice in this hymn, unlike the theogony discussed above which is clearly spoken by Orpheus throughout.[479] In fact, the narrative voice is also blurred in the next three lines, 711-713. If we choose to interpret Orpheus as the narrator here, he would plausibly be continuing his mythological narration of the

475 Norden (1996): 149-160, Bremer & Furley (2001): 1-64 deal with the *Du-Stil* in cult hymns.
476 Cf. Klooster (2011): 89, Hunter (1993): 150-1, Cuypers (2004); 59, Goldhill (1991): 297-8.
477 Cf. for instance the self-conscious opening of Call. *Hymn to Zeus*, 1-12.
478 So Hutchinson (1988): 90. Cf. on these lines Hunter (1986): 56-60.
479 Cf. Albis (1996): 30-1, although he interprets the effect of the burring rather differently.

slaying of Delphi's monster, since aetiological explanations for cult practice are a traditional feature of hymns, and the subject-matter links up with the mythical narrative which was interrupted at line 708.[480] But we may also argue that the poet-narrator is at work here, explaining the *aition* for the refrain to Apollo in true Alexandrian style.[481] The primary narrator gives just such an aetiological explanation after an account of a particular religious ritual at 1.1138-39: ...ἔνθεν ἐσαιεί | ῥόμβῳ καὶ τυπάνῳ Ῥείην Φρύγες ἱλάσκονται. As in lines 708-11, it is impossible to choose a narrator here because Apollonius has deliberately blurred the boundaries between frame narrative and embedded narrative.

Indeed, these lines taken as a whole may be seen as a single, polyphonic hymn, structured in a deliberately and playfully composite manner. Orpheus' song begins with a mythological narrative at 705 and as such his song would be truncated as a hymn proper, since it contains no address to the god or listing of his titles. The god is not named at all in the part of the song which Orpheus narrates, instead he uses the third person singular verb ἐξενάριξεν with no named subject. We hear that the snake-slayer is a boy with long hair, and it is not until line 710 and the mention of Leto that a specifically Apolline feature is mentioned. This would be highly uncharacteristic of a hymn, were it not for the chorus of Argonauts mentioned in lines 701-3. It is the chorus who perform the task of beginning this composite hymn by introducing the god with his name and title:

> καλὸν Ἰηπαιήον' Ἰηπαιήονα Φοῖβον
> μελπόμενοι... (*Arg.* 2.702-3)

Such a combination of the god's proper name with attributes is seen at the beginning of almost every *Homeric Hymn*, but an example taken from the opening of the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* will be enough to illustrate the similarity:

> Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον σεμνὴν θεὰν ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν... (*HDem.* 1)

480 Cf. Fränkel (1968): 228 n.712 "Aitiologische Deutungen von Kultbräuchen und Kultwörtern waren von jeher in Götterhymnen üblich".
481 Cf. Call. *Hymn to Apollo* 96 ἰὴ ἰὴ Παιῆον; ἀκούομεν, οὕνεκα τοῦτο Δελφός τοι πρώτιστον εὕρετο λαός. Goldhill (1991): 297 argues that these lines are spoken by the narrator of the frame narrative, that they are in fact "a scholarly afterword on the history of a religious (and aesthetic) term".

The first person ἄρχομ' has been changed in Apollonius' embedded hymn to a plural participle, a function of the process of narrative embedding, but otherwise these lines are highly suggestive of the opening of a hymn.

Orpheus then takes over the 'mythical narrative' section of this composite hymn – it is described as at once a separate song (Orpheus *begins* a song λιγείης ἦρχεν ἀοιδῆς, 704) and yet as somehow connected to the song sung by the chorus of Argonauts: he sings this new song *with them* (σὺν δέ σφιν 703). Structurally, the order of these two simultaneously discrete and unified songs suggests that they should be read together as forming the opening sections of a hymn, since the pattern 'god's name and epithets' with a mythical narrative immediately following is typical of hymnic style.[482] The interjection and direct address to Apollo, if spoken by the primary narrator, would then add a third voice to this already composite hymn; indeed the very ambiguity of voice in these last lines of the passage gives a polyphonic effect regardless of which narrator is speaking. Finally, the aetiological explanation for the ritual cry to Phoibos Apollo adds yet another voice to the hymn, as we hear the 'original' cry of the Korukian maidens in the last line of the song; their cry suggests a further possible embedded song (although this remains unelaborated) within the poem *Arg.* 2.711-2:

> πολλὰ δὲ Κωρύκιαι νύμφαι, Πλειστοῖο θύγατρες,
> θαρσύνεσκον ἔπεσσιν, "ἴη ἴε" κεκληγυῖαι.

The effect of this sophisticated blending of voices is to create a deliberate narratological puzzle.[483] It is impossible to say for certain who is speaking at lines 708-713 and it seems likely that Apollonius has intentionally blurred the boundaries between character-text and narrator-text. His own authority as a poet is thus blended with the authority of Orpheus, the mythical pinnacle of poetic power and success, and the hymn to Apollo is made both a speech-act of mythic heroes in a long-ago time and a current speech-act within a Hellenistic

482 Janko (1981): 9-24, Furley & Bremer (2001): 1-40.
483 Of course Apollonius would not have described it using this vocabulary, but such a complex layering of voices cannot but be felt to be a deliberate construction on the part of the poet.

epic spoken by a Hellenistic poet. This pushes at the boundaries of fiction and reality, breaking the illusion of narrative in much the same way as playwrights use actor-interaction with the audience to break the fourth wall in theatre. The difficulties raised by this complicated hymn to Apollo, the questions it raises, force Apollonius' reader into an abrupt awareness that they are *reading* a text, a text which demands close attention and interpretation.

Such a blending of narrative voices is discussed by de Jong in her article on metalepsis in ancient Greek literature (mainly with reference to archaic and classical poetry), where she argues that metalepsis does not have an anti-illusionistic effect in Greek literature but rather increases the authority of the song through intensifying its connection with the past it purports to narrate.[484] I would argue that the two effects are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Although this may seem like a paradoxical claim to make, the above example from the *Argonautica* makes clear that Apollonius is capable of having his cake and eating it: the very impossibility of pinning down the narrative voice gives the poem an interpretative flexibility which encompasses both an anti-illusionistic effect (i.e. the deliberate drawing of the reader's attention to the literariness of the text) *and* the effect of bringing Apollonius' voice closer to that of the mythical bard (with all of the poetically competitive claims to excellence that such an association brings). Anti-illusionism, or perhaps better, a self-conscious awareness of the poem as an artefact created by an author, does not necessarily deprive a poem of authority or 'truth'.[485]

EPIC INTERACTIONS

484 de Jong (2009): *passim,* esp. 115.
485 The frequent metalepsis found in hymn, such as that of Callimachus' *Hymn to Zeus* lines 4-12 also contains this seemingly paradoxical effect: the author makes clear the status of the song as a text which competes with other texts in its account of Zeus' childhood. This fractures the illusion of the poem, but also claims greater authority for Callimachus, whose version is the 'true' one. On metalepsis see de Jong (2009).

As indicated by my brief discussion above of the models for the cosmogonical song of Orpheus in book 1.496-515 of the *Argonautica*, the fact that this Hellenistic poem is an epic does not automatically indicate the *Odyssey* (or even the *Iliad*) as its primary source as regards embedded songs. The function of the embedded songs in the *Argonautica* is fundamentally different from the use of the same form in the Homeric epics, especially in the *Odyssey*, which (unlike the *Iliad*) is linked to the *Argonautica* in one basic sense, since it too has several extended embedded songs sung by a fictional bard.[486]

Structurally, the most striking difference between the two epics is the context of the embedded songs in each: in the *Odyssey*, song is the preserve of royal or aristocratic courts, or failing that, is bound closely to a domestic setting. Phemius and Demodocus are bards at Ithaca and Phaeacia respectively, each singing for those present at the court of Alcinous and (the absent) Odysseus.[487] They are presented as retainers of the household rather than wandering bards. The bard who is left behind to guard Clytemnestra's honour is similarly attached to Agamemnon's household: his position as a guardian shows that he is a figure whose presence is supposed to be constant and reliable throughout the absence of the king.[488] Calypso and Circe both sing while they work at the loom – again, in this female context, song is firmly located within the household.[489] Outside these domestic or royal contexts there is little or no song within the *Odyssey*, with very few exceptions (we might immediately think of the Sirens, but their identity as supernatural figures make them a separate case).[490]

---

486 The *Iliad*'s embedded songs are not sung by a professional bard but by characters such as Achilles and are thus quite different from the songs of Demodocus and Phemius in the *Odyssey* – cf. above, Introduction pp. 18-32 for discussion of this.
487 Phemius: *Od.* 1.151-5, 1.325-7 etc. Demodocus: *Od.* 8.73-82, 8.87-93, 8.266-366, 8.499 – 520, 13.27.
488 *Od.* 3.267.
489 *Od.* 5.61, 10.221.
490 For the Sirens, whose song I did not have space to discuss in detail, see Pucci (1979): 121-132, for the Homeric Sirens in relation to those of the *Argonautica* see Hunter (2008): 125-6 and Hunter (1996): 146-7, Kyriakou (1995): 190-205, Asper (2008): 177-8. Hunter (1993): 149-150 argues for the songs of Demodocus as the main model for Orpheus' first song.

The songs of Demodocus are also presented as non-religious in their function (and indeed two of them are non-religious in content too): although his poetic skills are certainly connected with the divine, the emphasis is laid on audience pleasure and the context is always one of festivity. It seems clear that the majority of embedded songs in the *Odyssey* are presented as entertainment within the household.[491] Elsewhere in the *Odyssey,* song plays little part in ritual: Odysseus and his men (unlike the Argonauts) do not sing or establish choruses as part of the rituals or sacrifices they perform on their journey, although they do frequently engage in ritual action.[492]

The rituals performed on the island of Helios in *Odyssey* may be contrasted with those of the Argonauts at *Arg.* 2.156-163 (discussed above, p. 193).

> τὰς δὲ περίστησάντο καὶ εὐχετόωντο θεοῖσιν,
> φύλλα δρεψάμενοι τέρενα δρυὸς ὑψικόμοιο:
> οὐ γὰρ ἔχον κρῖ λευκὸν ἐυσσέλμου ἐπὶ νηός.
> αὐτὰρ ἐπεί ῥ᾽ εὔξαντο καὶ ἔσφαξαν καὶ ἔδειραν,
> μηρούς τ᾽ ἐξέταμον κατά τε κνίσῃ ἐκάλυψαν 360
> δίπτυχα ποιήσαντες, ἐπ᾽ αὐτῶν δ᾽ ὠμοθέτησαν.
> οὐδ᾽ εἶχον μέθυ λεῖψαι ἐπ᾽ αἰθομένοις ἱεροῖσιν,
> ἀλλ᾽ ὕδατι σπένδοντες ἐπώπτων ἔγκατα πάντα. (*Od.* 12.356-63)

Apollonius' use of embedded song is entirely different. Whereas in the *Odyssey*, song is portrayed as a leisure activity conducted and enjoyed in a domestic or palace setting, Apollonius' embedded songs are always conducted during the active journey of the Argonauts (whether going or returning to Greece).[493] The inclusion of Orpheus in the Argonauts' expedition and his placement as first in the catalogue signals the importance of song in the Argonautic expedition, an importance which is played out as Apollonius gives his internal poet a voice several times throughout the journey, usually (as has been noted above) in a ritual or religious context. The journey is peppered with song and music:

491 Calypso's and Circe's songs would also fall into this category as they sing to pass the time while weaving. For bards and the divine cf. for instance *Od.* 8.62-64 (the Muse's love for Demodocus), 8.73 (Muse as inspiration for Demodocus' song). See Hainsworth (1988): 349 n.62-103 "the occasion of ἀοιδή is a banquet and its purpose is frankly entertainment".
492 For sacrifice and libation in the *Odyssey* cf. for instance 3.418-563, 13.24-7, 22-334-6.
493 The same is not true of the *Iliad*, where human characters sing the *paean* and the *linos* song (see above, pp. 25-32 for discussion).

Orpheus calms the quarrel which threatens to de-rail the expedition, he sets the time for the rowing, sings hymns to appropriate deities to secure safe passage across the sea and favourable treatment from Apollo on land.[494] Whereas Demodocus' songs are primarily for the enjoyment of those listening, every one of Orpheus' songs is purposeful: each one achieves something of benefit to the Argonauts.[495]

When the Argonauts reach the court of Aeetes (N.B. arrival in the house of a host would in the *Odyssey* be the natural context for a bard's songs), there is a notable absence of song from Orpheus or anyone else, until the journey begins once again in book 4 when the Argonauts flee with the golden fleece. Perhaps the lack of bard and music in the house of Aeetes is even a sign of his lack of culture, also evidenced by his perverted hospitality towards the Argonauts. The context for song in the two epics thus appears to be directly opposite: in the *Odyssey*, it is domestic and largely for entertainment, while in the *Argonautica* song is much more heavily associated with religious ritual and successful journeying.[496]

JUST FOR FUN: PURPOSEFUL PLEASURE

This contrast between the two poems is played out in the reaction of the internal audience(s) to the embedded songs in each. Phemius' songs are portrayed primarily as entertainment for the suitors at banquet, and Penelope's criticism of him makes clear the expected function of a bard's song:

Φήμιε, πολλὰ γὰρ ἄλλα βροτῶν θελκτήρια οἶδας

494 1.494-515 (calms the quarrel), 1.540 (sets time for rowing), 1.569-572 (hymn to Artemis), 1.1143-37 (leads ritual in honour of Hera) 2.685-693 (hymn to Apollo), 4.902-909 (defeats the Sirens), 4.1148-1160 (leads wedding songs for Jason and Medea), 4.1409-1422 (leads prayer to Hesperides).
495 *Contra* Busch (1993): 320 who argues that all of the later episodes of Orpheus' song (after 1.496-515) are of little or no consequence to the plot (although he does go on to give three very important exceptions to this on p.322).
496 For song (and myth) in Greek ritual practice see Kowalzig (2007) esp. 1-55.

ἔργ᾽ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, τά τε κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί. (*Od.* 1.337-8)

Telemachus' rebuke to his mother also focuses on the entertaining properties of song.

μῆτερ ἐμή, τί τ᾽ ἄρα φθονέεις ἐρίηρον ἀοιδὸν
τέρπειν ὅππῃ οἱ νόος ὄρνυται; (*Od.* 1.346-7)

Penelope refers to the "charm", θελκτήρια, of song, implying its pleasant effect on the mortals who hear it, while Telemachus assigns to them the task of giving enjoyment, τέρπειν. So, according to Telemachus and Penelope, the function of a bard is to give pleasure to those hearing his song. The continual presence of Phemius at the banquets of the suitors places him in a convivial context. Demodocus too sings for the entertainment of Alcinous and his guests:

αὐτὰρ ὅτ᾽ ἂψ ἄρχοιτο καὶ ὀτρύνειαν ἀείδειν
Φαιήκων οἱ ἄριστοι, ἐπεὶ τέρποντ᾽ ἐπέεσσιν,
ἂψ Ὀδυσεὺς κατὰ κρᾶτα καλυψάμενος γοάασκεν. (*Od.* 8.90-92)[497]

Note that, as with the song of Phemius in book 1, a contrast is drawn between the reaction of the group, who enjoy the song, and the pain it may cause to an individual. The same effect is caused by Demodocus' third song, as Alcinous alone notices *Od.* 8.537-8:

Δημόδοκος δ᾽ ἤδη σχεθέτω φόρμιγγα λίγειαν·
οὐ γάρ πως πάντεσσι χαριζόμενος τάδ᾽ ἀείδει.

A wider point may be drawn from this about the impact of song on those who hear it: the Argonauts react as a unit to the song of Orpheus in book 1.495-515 of the *Argonautica*; the very point of the song is to re-unify the expeditionary force as it threatens to splinter due to competition between the heroes. His later songs in the same book contribute to the cohesion of the expedition as they help the heroes to row in time in with one another. In the *Odyssey*, ironic effects are created by the depiction of various reactions to a song which show the complexity of facing a composite audience with the remit of pleasing everyone (or at least the majority). It is not the case that song in the *Argonautica* is not enjoyable or charming: in fact the songs of both Orpheus and Medea are constantly associated with such

497 Cf. also *Od.* 8.367-9: …αὐτὰρ Ὀδυσσεὺς | τέρπετ᾽ ἐνὶ φρεσὶν ἦσιν ἀκούων ἠδὲ καὶ ἄλλοι | Φαίηκες δολιχήρετμοι, ναυσικλυτοὶ ἄνδρες.

an effect and the verb θέλγω and related words are often applied to their songs.[498] The difference in this case lies in the function of this charming quality. In the *Odyssey* it is mainly aesthetic, that is, the charm of the song is pleasurable to those who hear it in a festive setting; for Apollonius, the charm of a song is (like its ritual power) something which has a direct and potent effect on the action of the poem.

The charm of Orpheus' song is what calms the fighting Argonauts, while Medea's charming magical songs defeat the monster which guards the golden fleece. That their hearers enjoy the songs is not in question, but it is also not their only or main function in the poem: Apollonius transforms the aesthetic quality of poetry into a dynamic force with the power to achieve heroic feats. The closest that the *Odyssey* comes to this use of embedded song is the fake wedding song which Odysseus contrives in *Od.* 23.133-136, which succeeds in delaying the rumour of the suitors' murder.[499] In this instance, the performance of poetry is functional in its impact on the plot but its charm is not specifically stated as a persuasive or powerful force.

MEDEA'S MAGICAL 'SONGS'

Medea's power in book 4 of the *Argonautica* is similar to that of Orpheus: it relies largely on the power of her voice. I do not include discussion of Orpheus' defeat of the Sirens (*Arg.* 4.902-909) in this section, because it is not at all clear that there is a verbal element to his musical display here – the description is perfectly compatible with the representation of music without song, and in particular the sound of his strumming (ὄφρ' ἄμυδις κλονέοντος ἐπιβρομέωνται ἀκουαὶ | κρεγμῷ, *Arg.* 4.908-9), and the lyre itself (παρθενίην δ' ἐνοπὴν ἐβιήσατο φόρμιγξ, 4.909) is adduced, seeming to emphasize the

498 On *thelxis* in Greek literature see Parry (1992).
499 *Od.* 23.133-136 αὐτὰρ θεῖος ἀοιδὸς ἔχων φόρμιγγα λίγειαν |ἡμῖν ἡγείσθω φιλοπαίγμονος ὀρχηθμοῖο |ὥς κέν τις φαίη γάμον ἔμμεναι ἐκτὸς ἀκούων,| ἢ ἀν' ὁδὸν στείχων, ἢ οἳ περιναιετάουσι.

power of the music rather than to imply the singing of a particular song.[500] Medea's magical achievements are largely wrought through vocal means, and the vocabulary used of these 'spells' is that of song.[501] At 4.42 Medea uses ἀοιδαῖς to escape her home. The Moon mentions the maiden's crafty ἀοιδαῖς at 4.59, claiming that Medea has often driven her out of the sky with magic. This word is sometimes translated as 'spell' rather than song, but its use elsewhere in book 4 of the *Argonautica* in connection with Medea implies that it should be understood as indicating song (or sung spells). At 4.1665-1670 Medea defeats the bronze giant Talos again with ἀοιδαῖς (1665, 1668), but in this instance the term is combined with other musical vocabulary as she is described as singing to the Death-Spirits *Arg.*1665-1670:

> ἔνθα δ' ἀοιδῇσιν μειλίσσετο θέλγε τε Κῆρας
> θυμοβόρους, Ἀίδαο θοὰς κύνας, αἳ †περὶ πᾶσαν†
> †ἠέρα δινεύουσαι ἐπὶ ζωοῖσιν †ἄγονται.
> τὰς γουναζομένη τρὶς μὲν παρακέκλετ' ἀοιδαῖς,
> τρὶς δὲ λιταῖς· θεμένη δὲ κακὸν νόον, ἐχθοδοποῖσιν
> ὄμμασι χαλκείοιο Τάλῳ ἐμέγηρεν ὀπωπάς·

This performance is described much like a hymn, as Medea sings and prays to these deadly divinities for help against the bronze man. The details given about the Κῆρας in 1666, Ἀίδαο θοὰς κύνας, ἃι περὶ πᾶσαν | ἠέρα δινεύουσαι ἐπι ζωοῖσιν ἄγονται, add to the hymnic tone of these lines, as the relative clause detailing a god's attributes or sphere is a typical component of the opening of a hymn.[502]

Medea's defeat of the serpent that guarded the fleece is also achieved through song; in this instance at 4.146-8 her vocal skills are at first described in language which could indicate either song or speech:

> Ὕπνον ἀοσσητῆρα, θεῶν ὕπατον, καλέουσα
> ἡδείῃ ἐνοπῇ, θέλξαι τέρας: αὖε δ' ἄνασσαν
> νυκτιπόλον, χθονίην, εὐαντέα δοῦναι ἐφορμήν.

500 Cf. Klooster (2011): 82-4.
501 Cf. Albis (1996): 102-103 where he argues that we should associate Medea's spells with song.
502 Janko (1981): 10-11, Richardson (2010): 4.

Although Medea is not yet said explicitly to be singing, the hymnic tone of these lines (again expressed through the addresses to the gods with their epithets θεῶν ὕπατον, νυκτιπόλον, χθονίην and the request to be propitious addressed to Persephone in line 148) and their anticipated effect on the monster both already imply that Medea is in fact singing. She hopes to charm the monster (θέλξαι, 147), a reaction which the reader of the *Argonautica* has already witnessed the songs of Orpheus having on various entities, from the trees and rocks of the catalogue and the Argonauts themselves to the fish of the sea. The very same verb is used at 1.27 and 1.31 of Orpheus' song and its effect on the trees and boulders (θέλξαι, θελγομένας), while a word from the same root is used at 1.515 to describe the effect of Orpheus' song on his companions: τοῖόν σφιν ἐνέλλιπε θέλκτρον ἀοιδῆς.

The charming nature of Medea's spell thus links it to song through association of terminology. The reference to her voice and its sweetness also implies a musical activity: ἡδύς is an aesthetic term applied to song elsewhere in Greek literature, for instance at *Od.* 8.64, where the Muse is said to have given Demodocus the gift of ἡδεῖαν ἀοιδήν. The musical nature of Medea's spell becomes more explicit at 4.150, where it is described as an οἴμη, a word strongly associated with song and usually translated as such. The charming effect on her victim is realized with a repetition of the verb θέλγω, reinforcing our impression that Medea's power is expressed through song. The repetition of ἀοιδαῖς (157) at the critical moment when the monster is overcome emphasizes the importance of song in defeating it – potions and φάρμακα are not enough on their own.

> εἵπετο δ' Αἰσονίδης πεφοβημένος, αὐτὰρ ὅγ' ἤδη
> οἴμῃ θελγόμενος δολιχὴν ἀνελύετ' ἄκανθαν...
> ...
> ἡ δέ μιν ἀρκεύθοιο νέον τετμηότι θαλλῷ
> βάπτουσ' ἐκ κυκεῶνος ἀκήρατα φάρμακ' ἀοιδαῖς
> ῥαῖνε κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν:... (*Arg.* 4.149-151,156-80)

It will be clear from the above examples of Medea's songs that Apollonius often depicts Medea performing songs without re-narrating them. It is only in the incidents with the serpent and with the bronze man Talos at the end of book 4 that we get a hint of what

Medea sang about. In both these cases the effect of "narrative contagion" is observed. Narrative contagion is the term I use for a phenomenon that occurs when a character is depicted performing poetry but their song is not explicitly summarized in full (a full summary would be the song of Orpheus in book 1.495-515 of the *Argonautica*), but instead a description is given by the poet-narrator of the Argonautica which contains echoes of the 'original' song of the character.[503] Such echoes will belong in tone, style or content more to the song of the character than the frame narrative. The fictional song of the character has thus exerted a kind of "narrative contagion" on the frame narrative.[504]

This technique is closely related to the blurring of narrative voices which occurs elsewhere in the *Argonautica* (for instance at 2.701-14), but has a different effect on the poem: in narrative blurring, it is ambiguous who is speaking a certain line or lines, while in narrative contagion, the speaker may be clearly indicated but their speech has been affected in content, tone or style by the embedded song they are describing. Thus at 4.1661-1672 Medea performs a song to defeat Talos. She is said to use ἀοιδαῖς and the verb μέλπε is used of her action.[505] At 1665-7 the subject of her song is referred to in terms strongly reminiscent of hymn: the *Kerai* are invoked with epithets, θυμοβόρους, Ἀίδαο θοὰς κύνας, and a relative clause detailing their sphere and habitual action: αἳ περὶ πᾶσαν | ἠέρα δινεύουσαι ἐπὶ ζωοῖσιν ἄγονται. These lines could be read as the poet-narrator giving us more detail about the *Kerai*, but in the current context immediately following the mention of Medea's song the language implies hymn – Medea's song has 'contaminated' the frame

503 To some extent, the echoes between the frame narrative and an embedded song such as those found in the repetition of νεῖκος and related words in book 1 of the *Argonautica* also constitutes a kind of much diluted narrative contagion.

504 de Jong (2009) notes a similar effect in this article on metalepsis in Greek literature, but the wide range of meanings and forms she assigns to metalepsis makes it a slippery term which may refer to a number of narrative devices including apostrophe and narratorial intervention. I prefer my own term, "narrative contagion", for this reason. The term is based on the concept of "ecphrastic contagion" coined by Whitmarsh (2002): 111-125.

505 The *w* manuscript of the *Argonautica* preserves θέλγε rather than μέλπε which is attested in *m*. I, with Vian (1981): 140, 206 n.1667, prefer μέλπε, although θέλγε would still have associations of song given its strong association with Orpheus in the *Argonautica*.

narrative with hymnic language. These lines could even be a quotation from her song.[506]

A similar effect occurs in her earlier magical song at 4.145-150, where she sings a song to the serpent that guards the fleece. As noted above, lines 146-8 contain hymnic elements such as addresses to gods with their epithets and usual spheres of habitation and a request for goodwill from the god. These hymnic elements are spoken in the voice of the primary narrator using third person verbs and feminine nominative participles:

> Ὕπνον ἀοσσητῆρα, θεῶν ὕπατον, καλέουσα
> ἡδείῃ ἐνοπῇ, θέλξαι τέρας. αὖε δ' ἄνασσαν
> νυκτιπόλον, χθονίην, εὐαντέα δοῦναι ἐφορμήν.

but the hymnic elements are clearly influenced by the song of Medea, which has bled into the frame narrative, creating, rather than a blurring of narrative voices, a blurring of genre. Epic becomes, for these lines, hymn.

The impact of Medea's song on the surrounding narrative suggests that Medea should be seen as a figure with similar self-conscious resonance for the poet-narrator of the *Argonautica* as Orpheus. Her association with song and the impressive power she displays through song (defeating not only the monster which guards the fleece but also the massive bronze man) also aligns her with Orpheus, whose song defeats the Sirens in book 4, and makes her an attractive figure for self-conscious reflection on Apollonius' part. Like the bard, Medea's songs are functional and purposeful: they actively move the plot along – without Orpheus the Argonauts would not have reached Aeetes' land, and without Medea Jason would not be able to defeat the monster and retrieve the fleece, or escape back to Greece in safety. The magical power of Medea's song can be aligned with the religious power of Orpheus' song: while Orpheus invokes the Olympian deities to further the Argonauts' cause (Apollo, Artemis), Medea invokes chthonian deities – the *Kerai* at 4.1665-8 and the Moon at 4.59. Apollonius appropriates the female magical voice, bringing the

506 Cf. also Vian (1981): 206 "le poète résume au style indirect l'incantation de Médée".

subversive and sub-literary genre of magical spells into epic through Medea's weird and disturbingly powerful songs.[507]

THE SCROLL AND THE LYRE

The self-reflexivity of Medea and Orpheus for the poet-narrator of the *Argonautica* is to some extent affected by the poem's existence as a written text for a reading audience. How should we interpret the fact that Apollonius, a *writer* of poetry, chooses to depict poetry being sung in an oral and extemporizing fashion within his narrative?[508] Why include a singing poet at all? Firstly, it is necessary to be cautious in assigning greater or more 'natural' self-reflexivity or metapoetic implication to, for instance, Demodocus in the *Odyssey* than to Orpheus in the *Argonautica* simply based on an assumption that Demodocus is somehow a closer representation of the poet of the *Odyssey*. So little is known about the performance contexts of the Homeric epics or about exactly how they were performed that it seems foolhardy to build too much of an argument on how close a representation Demodocus may be to the poet of the *Odyssey*. Such identification of the attributes of a fictional character with those of a biographical, historical person is fraught with difficulty. However, given the Homeric epics' status as orally-derived poetry, and furthermore the fact that they were performed orally (whether sung or recited), the representation of the oral performance of poetry within these poems does at first seem more inherently self-referential than the representation of orally performed poetry in Apollonius' written epic.

However, this distance of narrative self-reflexivity, termed "the distance between primary

507 For the Greek magical papyri see esp. Faraone (1999) (with a particular focus on love-spells) but also Betz (1996), Faraone & Obbink (1991).
508 Bing (1988): 10-48 discusses Hellenistic poets' relationship with both their own writing and the oral poetics of archaic Greece.

and secondary epic" by Hardie, is complicated by the fact that Apollonius' narrative persona within the *Argonautica* is not a bookish writing poet.[509] On the contrary, in the opening lines of the poem he aligns himself with early Greek hexameter poets through a hymnic opening which echoes the opening formulas of the *Homeric Hymns,* ἀρχόμενος σέο, Φοῖβε, παλαιγενέων κλέα φωτῶν | μνήσομαι (*Arg.* 1.1-2).[510] A few lines later at 1.18-22 he strengthens this association in two ways:

> Νῆα μὲν οὖν οἱ πρόσθεν ἔτι κλείουσιν ἀοιδοί
> Ἄργον Ἀθηναίης καμέειν ὑποθημοσύνῃσι·
> νῦν δ' ἂν ἐγὼ γενεήν τε καὶ οὔνομα μυθησαίμην
> ἡρώων, δολιχῆς τε πόρους ἁλός, ὅσσα τ' ἔρεξαν
> πλαζόμενοι· Μοῦσαι δ' ὑποφήτορες εἶεν ἀοιδῆς.

The reference to the songs of earlier ἀοιδοί indicates that he sees himself as part of the tradition of epic poetry which begins with Homer. Both the term ἀοιδος and the verb κλείω have epic resonance.[511] Apollonius differentiates his subject-matter from theirs but indicates through the invocation to the Muses that he too is concerned with the production of ἀοιδή. Although the historical author Apollonius was a writer and a scholar, not an oral poet, the narrator of his poem is presented in the proem with the characteristics of an oral(ly-derived) epic poet, and as such the performances of oral poetry depicted in the poem take on a more self-referential significance.

The question that remains is why Apollonius chose to present his poem with these stylistic hallmarks of oral poetry and fill it with depictions of oral poetry being performed. At least a partial answer lies in the same lines of book 1 quoted above (1.18-22). The reference to πρόσθεν ἀοιδοί displays an acute awareness of the poetic tradition that has gone before, and the transition in line 20 from the past to the present (νῦν δ' ἂν ἐγὼ), combined with the contrast between the plurality of the former ἀοιδοί and the poet-

509 Hardie (1986): 56-7.
510 Cf. *Homeric Hymn to Demeter* line 1: Δήμητρ' ἠύκομον, σεμνὴν θεόν, ἄρχομ' ἀείδειν; *Homeric Hymn to Apollo* line 1: μνήσομαι οὐδὲ λάθωμαι Ἀπόλλωνος ἑκάτοιο; *Homeric Hymn to Dionysus (Hymn 7)* lines 1-2: ἀμφὶ Διώνυσον, Σεμέλης ἐρικυδέος υἱόν | μνήσομαι.
511 Cf. *Il.* 9.186-9 with note in Hainsworth (1993) *ad loc.* Demodocus and Phemius are referred to as *aoidoi*, cf. above 18-24 for discussion and bibliography.

narrator's singular ἐγώ, conveys a sense of poetic continuity as well as of differentiation.[512] A sense of what was traditional or expected in an epic poem can be traced in Apollonius' use of oral colouring in the opening of the *Argonautica*.[513]

As the genre demanded certain features of the proem such as mention of the Muses, summarized details of the subject-matter, it could be argued that the post-Homeric epic's use of embedded song is also partly related to poetic tradition. Although song is used in very different ways in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and is much more prolific in the latter epic, the inclusion of so many embedded songs in the *Odyssey* in particular may indicate that embedded song, or the depiction of a fictional and/or famous bard at work, was a 'traditional' component of Greek hexameter poetry. Certainly song or the performance of song has not been recognized as a 'traditional' or typical part of Homeric epic by commentators or scholars, as a glance at the index of the published commentaries on both the epics shows.[514] However, the frequency and importance of song in the *Argonautica*, perhaps in particular the recurring role of song in ritual throughout the poem, suggests that for Apollonius, song was a typical feature of epic poetry, something essential to the composition of his poem.

The fact that all of the embedded songs in the *Argonautica* are functional (that is to say, they contribute to the progression of the plot) also sets them apart from the songs of Demodocus and Phemius in the *Odyssey*, which are largely digressive and presented as purely entertainment. Apollonius transforms the digressive songs of the *Odyssey* into song which *is* action, rather than song which describes and/or delays action. It should be noted that Demodocus' songs do have an implicit impact on the frame, in that his epic-style songs of Odysseus lead ultimately to the revelation of his identity and the *apologoi*, and in this

512 For this tendency of Hellenistic poets to recreate a lost social context for their poetry by depicting performance *within* their works see Albis (1996): 1-15, Depew (1992): 313-330.
513 Cf. Busch (1993): 317 (on *Arg.* 1.496-515) for an argument that embedded song is a typical device of epic.
514 Cf. above, pp. 105-115 for argument and bibliography on this issue.

sense Apollonius greatly intensifies an element of embedded songs which is only implicit in Homer. The different techniques are motivated by the different modes of each epic. It has been noted that the songs of Demodocus could be performed separately from the main narrative of the Odyssey – this is also true of embedded speeches in the *Odyssey*, such as the story of Helen in book 4, or the *apologoi*. These episodes, like the songs of Demodocus, are discrete narrative units which would make sense on their own as well as functioning as part of a larger narrative structure. This hallmark of orally-derived epic poetry is motivated by a need for flexible and adaptable performance-pieces to fit different occasions. Apollonius does not need this type of structural versatility in his written epic, and his songs are more closely integrated into the story of the poem.[515]

The importance of song in moving the plot along and in achieving some of the key heroic feats in the epic also has metapoetic implications. Apollonius portrays a world filled with song: song makes the Argonauts' voyage possible, not just by resolving the quarrel in book 1 but by setting the time for the oars and by propitiating various gods along the way to ensure the success of the voyage. Song solemnizes the wedding between Jason and Medea and allows the snatching of the fleece; it defeats the Sirens and the bronze giant Talos. Although none of the embedded songs in the *Argonautica* are as extended as those of Demodocus, the performance of poetry is depicted much more often in the Hellenistic epic, and poetry is also performed in a wider range of contexts beyond the domestic sphere. The prominent presence of song in the *Argonautica* suggests that it is a poem about the power and possibilities of poetry. The dynamic potential of the songs in the *Argonautica* serves to make a wider point about the role of song in memorializing and re-performing great deeds: the Argonauts' expedition succeeds through song in a practical way, on the level of the plot (= Bal's *story*); for instance, in the incident of the fleece where Medea's song is instrumental

515 This is not to deny the many important links between the songs of Demodocus and the frame narrative of the *Odyssey* – all three of Demodocus' songs are linked in theme and content to the *Odyssey*, but unlike the songs in the *Argonautica*, they have no effect on the outcome of the story beyond this foreshadowing or intratextual resonance.

in the epic deed of bravery. But the expedition also succeeds through song on a poetic level (= Bal's *text*) as a fictional account of a journey which is achieved through the skill of the poet-narrator.[516] The frequent blurring between the voices of character and narrator fracture the narrative illusion of the poem, linking these two levels (which may be termed the character-level and the primary narrator-level), and drawing the reader's attention to the fictional quality of the text.[517]

3.2 THEOCRITUS: BUCOLIC SONGS

Theocritus' poetry is more replete with song than that of any other Greek poet: the *Idylls* constantly depict the performance of song, both in dialogue or dramatic form (usually two or more characters in competition with each other) or embedded within narrative. The first problem raised by the sheer variety of narrators and forms used by Theocritus is how we should categorize his mimetic or dialogic poems: are they narrative poetry? The narrative status of the mimetic *Idylls* is of central importance to this discussion, since we have elsewhere excluded drama from our analysis of embedded song on the grounds that its (narrator-less) form precludes the same kind of 'self-referentiality', or at least the same tension between primary and reported narrators which embedded songs have in narrative poetry. Indeed the most important definition or defining characteristic of narrative poetry is arguably that it contains a *narrator* who tells the sequence of events which make up the narrative. This narrator may take one of myriad forms (external, internal, overt, covert, etc), but the presence of the figure (in whatever incarnation) is paramount in the interpretation of a text as 'narrative'. Thus it is unsurprising that de Jong argues that drama

516 Bal (1997) distinguishes a three-level model of narratology, a distinction between three levels: text (the text which the narrator recounts), story (the focalized version of the events recounted) and fabula (the events from the story in their 'pure' form).
517 This effect is also created by apostrophe: see Mackay (2001): 18 "he turns aside to address one of his characters and instantly breaks down the otherwise clear divisions between his story and the context in which he is telling it, between the here-and-now of his performance and the there-and-then of his tale".

cannot and should not be discussed using narratological analysis because it does not have a narrator.[518]

The mimetic *Idylls* have not, on similar grounds, traditionally been treated as narrative poetry.[519] However, in a puzzling differentiation between drama and mimetic poetry or prose outside drama (i.e. Plato, Lucian, the mimetic hymns of Callimachus and the mimetic *Idylls* of Theocritus), de Jong argues that these texts, due in part to their "similarity" to mimetic texts *with* narrative frames, and in part to their obvious constructedness as literary artefacts, should be treated as narrative texts with "suppressed primary narrators". This concept is difficult, and more explanation is necessary before we move on. To deal specifically with Theocritus as the author at hand we must shift from de Jong's outlining of the concept in her introduction, to Hunter's more detailed discussion of the "suppressed primary narrator" in Theocritus later in the same volume. A key passage from Hunter's argument is quoted below for detailed analysis:

> "The genuine bucolic poems of Theocritus inscribe within themselves a sense of tradition, of an already known world of rustics engaged in hexameter song and disputation, and hence of a creator of that artificial 'natural' world whom we may in different contexts call 'narrator', 'poet', 'author'. The artifice of metre, dialect and poetic allusion never allows us to imagine that we have unmediated access to a rural reality, and that sense of distance is in part our consciousness of the poetic presence of a creative (though sometimes suppressed) narrator."[520]

The most obvious objection to the above statement is that the same 'artificiality', the same use of poetic dialect, metre, form and style which here justifies the interpretation of wholly dramatic poems as "narrative", is also present in Attic tragedy. We feel the same distance from the events of *Medea* as we do from the bucolic world of Daphnis and Damoetas. Furthermore, any conflation of the terms "narrator", "poet" and "author" is one which should cause considerable concern in a book which aims to define and discuss these

518 Cf. Morrison (2007b): 2 de Jong (2004) : 6-7 "It is therefore simply not necessary to turn to narratology when discussing dramatic texts." Of course drama may *contain* narratives (spoken by narrators) which can perfectly well be analysed narratologically (for this see de Jong (1991)). For the opposite view (that drama should be treated as narrative) see Gould (2001): 319-334, Goward (1999): 10-13 and Markantonatos (2002).
519 Cf. Hunter (2004): 83.
520 Hunter (2004): 83.

concepts as often very pointedly and deliberately separate entities. It seems that the so-called "suppressed primary narrator" of these mimetic texts is in fact a name for our awareness as readers or audience members that the text before us (whether written or performed) has been created by someone: i.e. it has been authored. We might wonder, then, if the whole issue might be solved not by super-imposing a mysterious and shadowy figure such as the "suppressed primary narrator" on these poems, but by using a more conventional and easily quantifiable term such as "author".

The problems of conflating this awareness of the poem as a fictional artefact with the creation of the text by the *historical* author are obvious, but the narratological term "implied author" (indicating the author-figure imagined or speculated about in the mind of the reader rather than the historical author Theocritus, Jane Austen, or whoever) seems to serve very well here.[521] While it seems natural and indisputable that anyone who encounters *Idyll* 4 would accept that it has been authored by someone whose literary choices inform the style, metre etc of the dramatic poem, the term "suppressed primary narrator" suggests a "narrator" who is patently not present anywhere in the text and whose presence is counter-intuitive in a dramatic, mimetic work.

This discussion will not treat the poems which are entirely in dramatic form, such as *Idyll* 1, since they (like Attic drama) are narratologically distinct in that they do not have a primary narrator: they may contain embedded narratives or depict the performance of song, but such instances are fundamentally different from embedded narratives in texts which contain an explicit primary narrator.[522] The absence of a primary narrator directly affects the self-referential capacity of an embedded song, since such self-referentiality often takes place in the conflict, blurring and sharing of the narrative voice between the primary and reported or embedded narrators. Embedded songs from *Idylls* which contain dialogues

521 Cf. Gould (2001): 320 on the "implied author" in Greek tragedy.
522 *Idylls* 1, 4, 5, 10.

introduced by a primary narrator, such as *Idylls* 6 and 7, are a different case from the entirely mimetic *Idylls* and an example of such a construction will be discussed below. The sheer ubiquity of embedded song within Theocritus' poetry means that, even with the restriction on dramatic dialogues argued for above, the range of passages discussed will necessarily be very selective.[523] Within the *Idylls* Theocritus uses a range of embedding techniques – the following chapter will outline the effects and functions of these different types of embedded song and the relationship between embedded song and the genre of pastoral poetry.

The first sub-category of embedded song which is found in Theocritus is best exemplified by the song of the Cyclops in *Idyll* 11 and the epithalamion sung by the Spartan maidens in *Idyll* 18. In both of these cases, the embedded song is introduced by a narrator who sets the scene for the song as taking place in the mythical past, introduces the performer of the song and then reports the song in *oratio recta* (i.e. without the continued markers of reported speech which are characteristic of (for instance) the songs of Orpheus in the *Argonautica* or Demodocus in the *Odyssey*). Although both poems are introduced by a primary narrator, their conclusions offer pleasing variety: in *Idyll* 11 the narrator returns at the end of the Cyclops' song to conclude the poem, while in *Idyll* 18 the narrator does not speak again after the introduction in lines 1-8 and the last word is left with the choir of Spartan maidens.

WEDDING SONGS: RITUAL AND MYTH

523 I will discuss *Idylls* 11, 18, and 6. For Theocritean poems which do contain embedded songs, but which I do not discuss here for reasons of space, see Appendix I. I do not discuss *Idyll* 2 as it is not clear whether a song proper is here depicted or rather a ritualized chant – no song-words or musical language is used. Dover (1992 [1971]): 94-98 treats the poem as though it is spoken; Gutzwiller (2007): 88 differentiates *Idyll* 2 from the songs of the other poems, calling it "incantation", (although cf. Hutchinson (1988): 153-7 who assumes it is song).

Idyll 18 consists almost entirely of embedded song.[524] The opening lines of narrative (1-8) are spoken by a Homeric-style narrator whose identity and relationship to the narrative are not made explicit, while the rest of the poem down to its conclusion at line 58 is spoken by the maiden chorus.

> Ἦν ποκ' ἄρα Σπάρτᾳ ξανθότριχι πὰρ Μενελάῳ
> παρθενικαὶ θάλλοντα κόμαις ὑάκινθον ἔχοισαι
> πρόσθε νεογράπτω θαλάμω χορὸν ἐστάσαντο,
> δώδεκα ταὶ πρᾶται πόλιος, μέγα χρῆμα Λακαινᾶν,
> ἄνίκα Τυνδαρίδα κατεκλάξατο τὰν ἀγαπατάν 5
> μναστεύσας Ἑλέναν ὁ νεώτερος Ἀτρέος υἱῶν.
> ἄειδον δ' ἅμα πᾶσαι ἐς ἓν μέλος ἐγκροτέοισαι
> ποσσὶ περιπλέκτοις, ὑπὸ δ' ἴαχε δῶμ' ὑμεναίῳ.

The particle ἄρα in line 1 gives the only hint of characterization to the narrator in its indication of a larger previous narrative from which the speaker is now drawing this particular tale; it also implies a conversational interest in the subject-matter on the part of speaker and perhaps even the audience of the poem.[525] The opening lines set the scene as taking place in the mythical past (ποκ'), featuring mythical figures such as Helen and Menelaus, which distance the 'present' of the narrator from the action. The lack of characterization of the narrator and the brief duration of his speech compared to the embedded song suggests that this narrative section is constructed simply for the purpose of embedding the Spartan chorus's song.

From line 9 until the end of the poem the chorus of Spartan girls takes over the narratorial voice; the primary narrator does not return to close off their song or to offer a conclusion to the narrative of lines 1-8.[526] How we interpret this embedded song will depend partly on our view of the poem as a whole. There is no firm evidence for the performance context of *Idyll* 18, although scholars have suggested that it was written

524 The Greek text of Theocritus throughout is that of Gow (1952).
525 For ἄρα as a marker of selective narrative see Hunter (1996): 149-50, Dover (1992 [1971]): 229-230.
526 Cf. Hunter (2004a): 84.

and/or performed to celebrate the wedding of Ptolemy Philadelphus with Arsinoe.[527] Such a context for *Idyll* 18 would make the wedding-song of the Spartan chorus all the more self-conscious, but our lack of evidence limits such discussion to cautious speculation. What should be noted is that this poem was written by a male poet writing for an elite reading audience: even if the poem was performed in recitation at court or in public, it would necessarily have had a very different performance context from the archaic choral performance which the text inscribes within itself. Their performance is evoked by narratorial contextualization as well as by direct "quotation" of their song, for the chorus of Spartan maidens and the location of their performance is described by the narrator before their song begins (lines 2-3, 7-8), a familiar feature of embedded songs from the *Odyssey* onwards, as we have already seen. The maidens are arrayed in costume, with flowers in their hair and they dance as they sing their wedding song. Their performance is evocative of that of the Aeginetan maiden chorus in B.13 or the maiden-chorus of Alcman's *partheneia*: the Bacchylidean embedded chorus dances in what is likely to be a local ritual, garlanded with flowers, while Alcman's maidens engage in self-description very much like that of the Spartan maidens at *Id.* 18.22-5:

> ἄμμες δ' αἱ πᾶσαι συνομάλικες, αἷς δρόμος ὠὐτός
> χρισαμέναις ἀνδριστὶ παρ' Εὐρώταο λοετροῖς,
> τετράκις ἑξήκοντα κόραι, θῆλυς νεολαία,
> τᾶν οὐδ' ἄτις ἄμωμος ἐπεί χ' Ἑλένᾳ παρισωθῇ.[528]

The praise of Helen's beauty in this *Idyll*, especially when coupled with her role in performint ritual poetry explicitly mentioned by the girls later in the poem (35-7), links her closely with the maidens described in Alcman's choral poetry, whose beauty and ability in song are much emphasized.[529]

> οὐ μὰν οὐδὲ λύραν τις ἐπίσταται ὧδε κροτῆσαι 35

527 Kuiper (1921): 226-7, Griffiths (1979): 86-91, Gutzwiller (1992): 366-7, Hunter (1996): 163-4. Kaibel (1892): 249-59 offers a discussion of the poem's intertexts with various fragments of Sappho, while Stern (1978) focuses on the irony inherent in a wedding song for such a couple as Helen and Menelaus.
528 For B.13 see above, pp. 135-49, for cf. for instance Alcman fr.1 *PMGF* – esp. lines 39-40, 58-9 and 64-73 where beauty and physical characteristics are specifically mentioned. It is interesting that they describe themselves to such an extent in this *hymenaios*, for it has been noted that such female self-description does not normally occur outside *partheneia* (cf. Swift (2010): 117, Calame (1994)).
529 Cf. Swift (2010): 173-196.

Ἄρτεμιν ἀείδοισα καὶ εὐρύστερνον Ἀθάναν
ὡς Ἑλένα, τᾶς πάντες ἐπ᾽ ὄμμασιν ἵμεροι ἐντί.

Given Helen's position as the former leader among the girls, it may even be that she is here depicted as their *choregos*, although not enough is said about her performance to confirm that it is choral rather than monodic, for the her sung praise of Artemis and Athena could indicate choral ritual or a solo hymnic song analogous to the *Homeric Hymns*. This performance of Helen is embedded within the maidens' embedded performance, creating layers of embedded oral song within Theocritus' written poem. The interest in oral poetics is thus over-determined by this double emphasis on music, dance and song: if we see Helen as the (former) *choregos* of these maidens, the poem is especially self-referential, for just as Theocritus embeds a lost choral poem of *his* cultural past within his poem, so the maidens, lamenting their lost playmate and leader, embed a former performance of *hers* within their song.

As with Apollonius' depictions of Orpheus, *Idyll* 18 raises the question of why a literate poet writing for a literate audience chose to represent a quasi-mythical, oral, poetic performance. It is also relevant to consider how self-referential such a representation might be, especially given the obvious differences between the poet and the fictional singers of his work.[530] After all, Theocritus is not a choregos, and he does not compose oral poetry in a ritualized community setting, yet he chooses here to form his written verse as close as possible to choral poetry, to an imaginary representation of a form of poetry very alien to writing and being read.

As noted above, this poem has a strong sense of the passage of time and of the contrast between the 'present' of the primary narrator and the past of the Spartan chorus. Unlike the *Partheneia* of Alcman, to which this poem has often been compared, the details

530 Helen and Menelaus, at whose wedding the song takes place, have both mythical and (in the case of Helen at Sparta) religio-historical aspects.

of the choral ritual given by the narrator in lines 1-8 emphasize distance from the actualities of the choral performance rather than conveying performative immediacy (in contrast to the details in Alcman's choral lyric). This distance is created by the very presence of the narrator in lines 1-8 which emphasizes that this choral performance is mediated and secondary: it happened a long time ago, in a far-off place, at the wedding of figures famous from the earliest Greek literature. Theocritus' depictions of unmediated poetic performances in (for instance) *Idylls* 1, 4, 5, and 10 show that he was both capable of depicting such mimetic performances and interested in the effects of doing so. His choice to present the Spartan chorus through embedded narrative shows a self-conscious awareness of the changing (or changed) nature of poetry in the Hellenistic era: although song may still have been vital to religious activity, the reverse was not necessarily true, since by the Hellenistic era high poetry was more divided from such oral, ritual performances than it had been in the archaic or classical period.[531]

Barchiesi has discussed "imaginary performances" of song in Roman lyric poetry, linking it to an awareness of poetry's textuality in the Roman period and to a sense of the cultural and temporal gap between Greece and Rome.[532] The imaginary performances in the poetry of Horace and Catullus, he argues, express "personalities and situations that simply could not be reproduced in Roman culture." The cultural and temporal gap between Hellenistic and archaic or classical Greek poetry may not be as large as that between Greek and Roman poetry, but even the development of a culture of literate poetry for a reading audience (as opposed to poetry largely composed for oral dissemination) creates a considerable gulf between the poetry of Theocritus and his poetic ancestors.

531 For possible festival contexts for the *Hymns* see esp. Garcia (2002): 5-39; Pindar and Bacchylides are also quasi-ritual through their links with the games and with hero-cult cf. especially Currie (2005), with bibliography; comedy and tragedy were grounded in civic ritual through the theatre of and the religious festivals in which the plays were performed (cf. *inter alia* Goldhill (2000): 34-56, Seaford (2000): 30-44, Csapo & Slater (1994): 165-85).
532 Barchiesi (2009): 332-334.

Theocritus draws attention to this gulf explicitly within *Idyll* 18 itself, for these maidens, despite their characterization as performers of oral ritual song in the mythical past, are also depicted as literate.[533] At lines 47-48 the girls state their intention to dedicate a tree to Helen by writing a message on it, which (as they are self-consciously aware) will be read by future visitors.

> γράμματα δ' ἐν φλοιῷ γεγράψεται, ὡς παριών τις
> ἀννείμῃ Δωριστί· 'σέβευ μ'· Ἑλένας φυτόν εἰμι.

The message will inform the passer-by that the tree is sacred to Helen, thus establishing Helen's status as a god as well as her particular association with the plane-tree. Is this a hint that writing (and written poetry) may have its uses? It seems that it is writing, and not oral song, which will be the means by which Helen's fame is disseminated in the future. The choral song of the maidens will not be available for the passer-by to remember Helen by, while the words on the tree function as a kind of primitivized inscription to her memory. That the girls are concerned with memory is made clear in lines 41-2 where they imagine themselves playing without Helen but full of memories of her:

> πολλὰ τεοῦς, Ἑλένα, μεμναμέναι ὡς γαλαθηναί
> ἄρνες γειναμένας ὅιος μαστὸν ποθέοισαι

Theocritus creates a tension between oral and written forms of communication: the imagined performance of the maidens at once invokes a lost social context for poetry and pointedly shows one advantage of a written composition over an oral one: survival. Unlike the written inscription which will be of interest to others as they pass by, the girls' song is occasional, tied to its immediate performance context at the wedding. Ironically, the maidens' song does in fact 'survive' to be accessed by others apart from its original audience, but only because it is embedded within Theocritus' written verse. The link between their writing and his written poetry is made closer by the qualification that their writing is to be read in the Dorian dialect (Δωριστί 48), given that Theocritus himself uses

533 For Theocritus' self-consciousness about the written nature of his work see Bing (1988), esp. 20-1.

mainly Dorian Greek in composing his poetry.[534] By aligning their written memory of Helen with his own written poetry he at once emphasizes the durability of writing in successful memorialization and implies a close connection between his verse and the mythical past. Such a connection implies that his version of events is based on knowledge of the 'original' words of the maidens who knew Helen themselves, and that his version is the most authoritative because it is so closely connected to the very mythical time when Helen herself lived. Thus it is a similar tactic for garnering poetic authority as that used by Hesiod and Pindar, when they adduce their close connection with the Muses and knowledge of specific songs the Muses "sang" in mythical times. This hint of the importance of writing disrupts any straightforward narrative of decline in *Idyll* 18 – Theocritus may be aware of a lost oral performance context for his own poetry, but he is also aware of what has been gained.

Throughout the embedded song from lines 9-48, Theocritus characterizes the female chorus of Helen's companions in great detail, emphasizing their usual and future activities as well as their strong emotional links with Helen However at line 49 there is a shift away from this mimetic style, for the last lines of the poem, 49-58, are much less personalized than the rest of the poem.[535]

Χαίροις, ὦ νύμφα· χαίροις, εὐπένθερε γαμβρέ.
Λατὼ μὲν δοίη, Λατὼ κουροτρόφος, ὔμμιν
εὐτεκνίαν, Κύπρις δέ, θεὰ Κύπρις, ἶσον ἔρασθαι
ἀλλάλων, Ζεὺς δέ, Κρονίδας Ζεύς, ἄφθιτον ὄλβον,
ὡς ἐξ εὐπατριδᾶν εἰς εὐπατρίδας πάλιν ἔνθῃ.
εὔδετ' ἐς ἀλλάλων στέρνον φιλότατα πνέοντες
καὶ πόθον· ἐγρέσθαι δὲ πρὸς ἀῶ μὴ 'πιλάθησθε.
νεύμεθα κἄμμες ἐς ὄρθρον, ἐπεί κα πρᾶτος ἀοιδός
ἐξ εὐνᾶς κελαδήσῃ ἀνασχὼν εὔτριχα δειράν.
Ὑμὴν ὦ Ὑμέναιε, γάμῳ ἐπὶ τῷδε χαρείης.

Neither Helen nor Menelaus is named in these lines, which is striking given the repetition of Helen's name throughout the poem, especially in lines 25-48 where her name is repeated 6

534 On dialect in Theocritus see Abbenes (1996): 1-19, Dover (1992 [1971]): xxvii-xlv, Gow (1952): lxxii-lxxx, Hunter (1999): 22-4.
535 For the Sapphic intertexts here see Kaibel (1892): 249-59.

times. Menelaus too is twice named directly earlier in the poem (lines 1 and 15). The titles νύμφα and γαμβρός are used in 49 instead of proper names, and the content of the following lines is generalized wishes for the happiness and fruitfulness of the marriage. Nothing in lines 49-58 is particular to Helen and Menelaus as a couple, rather these lines might be spoken in any *hymenaios*;[536] this impression is deepened by the closing line of the poem with its echo of the refrain *Hymen O Hymen,* characteristic of the *hymenaios*.[537] By de-personalizing the poem at this point Theocritus widens its frame of reference from the internal addressees (Helen and Menelaus) to any newly-weds at any time. In doing so he creates a sense of continuity with the past: the maiden chorus expresses the hope that the couple will share reciprocal love, have many children and enjoy rich wealth, all of which are culturally transferable motifs still applicable as wishes for a married couple in Theocritus' time, despite any cultural or poetic gap between choral lyric and written Hellenistic poetry. It may be going too far to see a blurring of voice in these lines, especially since the first person plural in 56 (νεύμεθα κἄμμες ἐς ὄρθρον) implies the continued presence of the maiden chorus, but the more general tone does give their song a relevance beyond the circumstances of its immediate performance.

Theocritus uses the embedded song of the Spartan maidens to comment on the different status and function of poetry in his society as opposed to the poetry of archaic and classical Greece. By creating cultural and temporal distance between their performance and the present of the narrator in lines 1-8, he implies that the communal and choral aspect of their poetry is no longer applicable, while at the same time the various general sentiments of the marriage song are still appropriate. Unlike the poets of the *Homeric Hymns* and the ritual lyric poetry of archaic and classical poets such as Alcman and Pindar, Theocritus is

536 Cf. Konstan (1979): 233-34 for an argument that the cockrel in these lines refers mockingly to Menelaus.
537 Cf. Swift (2010): 214-55, Calame (2001): 83-85 for the *hymenaios* as a genre and its components.

the author of largely secular verse, without an established socio-ritual context. His sensitivity to and exploration of this change is clear in *Idyll* 18.[538]

The poignant irony of our access to their song through the words of Theocritus (closer in some ways to the inscription on the plane-tree than to their performance) rings the changes which have occurred in the creation and dissemination of poetry in the Hellenistic period, rather than having a straight-forwardly self-referential significance.[539]

SONG AS PERSUASION AND CURE

Unlike the ritual chorus of Spartan maidens in *Idyll* 18, the song of Polyphemus in *Idyll* 11 is secular and solo; the primary narrator is more intrusive in the text, several times referring to himself directly (line 2, ἐμὶν δοκεῖ, line 5, οἶμαι, line 7, ὁ Κύκλωψ ὁ παρ' ἁμῖν) and addressing a man named Nicias in a playfully didactic tone (line 2, Νικία).[540] Whereas the epithalamion for Helen is introduced without an explicit reference to its function in relation to the main narrative (i.e. *why* is the uncharacterized narrator of *Id.* 18.1-8 telling us about these maidens?), in *Idyll* 11 the narrator sets up the song of the Cyclops for his friend to consider as an explicit example of the claimed power of poetry to cure love. Thus the song is part of a mythological paradigm, a feature of persuasive language and rhetoric from the

538 In *Idyll* 15, omitted from detailed discussion here for reasons of space, I have ascribed a very similar function to the embedded song performed at the festival of Aphrodite and Adonis. This embedded song encodes within a written poem the performance of an oral ritual which will thus be "re-performed" every time Theocritus' poem is read.

539 A similar irony underpins Brian Friel's 1981 play *Translations*, which deals with the forced Anglicization of Ireland's place names under British rule in 1833 and the enforcement of national education in English at the same time. The play, which had to be written in English for a modern English-speaking Irish audience, laments the death of the Gaelic language and culture: a dynamic which may be compared to Theocritus' written representation of a 'lost' oral performance.

540 Brooke (1971): 74 on the other hand sees the figure of the narrator in the opening lines as "detached and discursive".

Iliad onwards.[541] In lines 1-18 the narrator sets the scene for Polyphemus' performance by first establishing the premise that (in his opinion, ἐμιν δοκεῖ, line 2) song is able to cure love. One of the major questions which naturally arises from this structure (premise + mythological paradigm) is whether or not the Cyclops' story does in fact prove the claim made in the introductory section. We might also consider how ingenuous the claim is in the first instance, and how irony is created through tension between the frame narrative and the embedded song.

In *Idyll* 18, as I argued above, the embedded song fosters a sense of temporal and cultural disjunction between the poet's own time and the archaic, mythical time of the epithalamion, while at the same time some elements of the epithalamion seem timeless in their appeal. The embedded song of the Cyclops in *Idyll* 11 is similarly used to manipulate the concept of time and to create a similar complexity of distance and continuity, for the performance of the Cyclops takes place in the mythical past, before even the events of the *Odyssey* have occurred.[542] Although the reference to the Cyclops as a kinsman of the narrator (ὁ Κύκλωψ ὁ παρ' ἁμῖν 7) creates a possible sense of continuity between the primary and embedded narrators, the temporal distance between the frame narrative and the embedded song is strongly emphasized, partly through the depiction of the Cyclops as a pre-*Odyssean* character but also in the adjective ὠρχαῖος which is self-consciously applied to him in line 8. The self-consciousness of this positioning becomes even clearer in the naively ironic 'Odyssean' references made by Polyphemus to the future fate of his eye (καὶ τὸν ἕν' ὀφθαλμόν, τῶ μοι γλυκερώτερον οὐδέν 53) and to the advent of a mariner from across the sea (αἴ κα τις σὺν νάι πλέων ξένος ὧδ' ἀφίκηται 61). Theocritus deliberately places this song in a pre-epic world, where one of the most horrendous monsters of the *Odyssey* is transformed into a pitiful rejected lover in a peaceful bucolic landscape. This

541 Cf. Fantuzzi (1995): 16-35. The classic Homeric example is the Meleager-story in the speech of Phoenix (*Il.* 9.433-605). For persuasion and paradigm in Homeric speeches cf. Alden (2000): *passim*, but esp. 1-47 (with bibliography). For parainetic poetry and Hesiod cf. Ford (1992): 30, Martin (1984): 29-4-8.
542 Cf. Fantuzzi & Hunter (2004): 165-6 for the ironies created by the ambiguous presentation of song and for the foreshadowing of the *Odyssey* in this poem.

playful de-bunking of the epic monster can be read as a poetic challenge to re-present a character famous from myth in a new light, by offering an innovative view of their psychology or by placing them in a new context (we might compare the Phaedra of Euripides' extant *Hippolytus*, who is far from being the destructive sexual predator from other versions of the myth).[543]

It is not only the pathetic (and humorous) quality of the Cyclops' song which humanizes him, but the very fact that he sings at all. In the *Odyssey* the Cyclops' isolated existence is presented as a life of anti-culture: he does not cultivate the land or make wine and is ignorant of generally accepted social customs and religious convention.[544] In *Idyll* 11, Polyphemus sings directly to Galatea and also refers to his skill in singing and playing the *syrinx* among the other Cyclopes (38). This speaks not only of a more homogeneous community than is depicted in the *Odyssey* (where the Cyclops is a loner even among his own kind) but portrays the Cyclopes as engaging in similar communal bucolic activities to the characters in the other *Idylls*. Far from being an isolated, man-eating monster, the Cyclops plays the pipe, sings, rears animals and (in direct contrast to the *Odyssey*) cultivates the vine (46).

Whether or not the Cyclops' song does in fact prove the narrator's premise and constitute a cure for lovesickness has been a subject of much debate among scholars.[545] I will address the problem by looking specifically at the interaction between frame narrative and embedded song, hoping to add something new and helpful to the considerable scholarship on this issue. The contradiction in lines 13-18 has long been considered a hint that the Cyclops' song is not meant to be seen as a success in curing his love, since he first depicts singing of Galatea as a symptom of love-sickness and then claims that singing provided a cure:

543 Cf. Barrett (1964): 6-12 Halleran (1995): 24-27.
544 *Od.* 9.107-30, cf. Hunter (1999): 215-218.
545 Holtsmark (1966): 253-59; Hunter (1999): 220; Gow (1952): 211 n.13.

...ὃ δὲ τὰν Γαλάτειαν ἀείδων
αὐτὸς ἐπ' ἀιόνος κατετάκετο φυκιοέσσας
ἐξ ἀοῦς, ἔχθιστον ἔχων ὑποκάρδιον ἕλκος,
Κύπριδος ἐκ μεγάλας τό οἱ ἥπατι πᾶξε βέλεμνον.
ἀλλὰ τὸ φάρμακον εὗρε, καθεζόμενος δ' ἐπὶ πέτρας
ὑψηλᾶς ἐς πόντον ὁρῶν ἄειδε τοιαῦτα.

This does give the reader a first hint that the relationship between song and love in this poem is more complex than it may appear from the narrator's opening remarks.[546] It is worthwhile considering how far the content of his song and its apparent aims (as deduced from its own internal rhetoric) correspond to a cure for lovesickness. The majority of the song (lines 19-66) is addressed directly to Galatea and is entirely focused on persuading her to relent and become Polyphemus' lover. He employs various means of persuasion, including compliments (19-21), their past friendship (25-9), his agricultural wealth and the beauty of the countryside (34-49), and claims he would be willing to die and give up his most treasured possession for her (50-2). The persuasive rhetoric climaxes in two fantasies which express the Cyclops' feeling of powerlessness and his wish to follow Galatea into the sea, which is currently inaccessible to him (54-60). These aquatic 'what-if' scenarios aim to show his willingness to leave his own environment, were he able, in order to be with Galatea: he does not expect her to make all the compromises. After line 66, he turns to blame, irrationally focusing censure on his mother (who is obviously not at all responsible for Galatea's lack of interest in him): the anger and resentment of lines 67-71 show the failure of his persuasion in the preceding lines. This sense of failure is further emphasized by the self-address in lines 72-9, where the Cyclops remonstrates with himself in a manner which anticipates the highly psychologized Latin love poetry of Catullus.

His assertions in the self-apostrophe are crucial to our interpretation of the failure of the song's rhetoric. Not only does the motif of self-address indicate high emotion and possibly despair, but the particular claims made by the Cyclops that he is invited out by

546 Hunter (1999): 220-222 discusses this issue at length and argues that song as a symptom and cure of love are not necessarily mutually exclusive.

many other girls (πολλαὶ...κόραι 77) and that on land, at any rate, he is considered "someone" (δῆλον ὅτ' ἐν τᾷ γᾷ κἠγών τις φαίνομαι ἦμεν 79) do not correlate with his earlier frank assessment of his lack of beauty at lines 31-3 (where his features include one huge eyebrow across his face, a single eye, and a broad, flat nose) and at line 50 where he mentions his excessive hairiness. An indication that the girls are mocking him is given by the Cyclops himself (although he seems unaware of the possibility), when he says that they laugh when he answers their request (κιχλίζοντι δὲ πᾶσαι, ἐπεί κ' αὐταῖς ὑπακούσω 78). Given his lack of success with Galatea and his self-confessed ugliness, it seems likely that the girls are teasing him. Thus his song ends in self-delusion: the Cyclops who before was honest about his short-comings is now convinced of his attractiveness and ability to get another girl. Hunter sees lines 72-4 as the *end* of delusion for the Cyclops, arguing that the lines herald a new realization on his part that he must move on and get back to work.[547] I would argue on the contrary that the Cyclops rather moves from one delusion (that Galatea might love him) to another (that it's all his mother's fault and that he has plenty of girls after him anyway).

The final couplet of the poem is spoken again by the narrator and forms a ring around the embedded narrative with the opening lines 1-18. The narrator simply comments that the song enabled the Cyclops to "shepherd" (ἐποίμαινεν, 79) his love and feel better than if he had paid a large fee (i.e. to a doctor). This comment is ambiguous, since the verb ἐποίμαινεν has various and, in this context, contradictory connotations: it can mean to cherish, nurture or tend, but also "to shepherd" in the sense of herd, govern or control.[548] Thus we are left with a statement which could be read as a confirmation of the opening premise or a direct contradiction of it. It is likely that Theocritus meant there to be an ambiguity in these lines and that no one interpretation is to be preferred. The failure of the Cyclops' song to persuade Galatea and its disintegration into irrational recriminations

547 Hunter (1999): 220.
548 Cf. Hunter (1999): 220 for a discussion of these lines in which he points out their deliberate slipperiness and argues that they offer little support for those who argue for a complete cure.

and self-delusory assertions, however, does suggest that there is irony in the opening and closing statements about the power of song to cure love.

The opening of the poem may be read differently with the hindsight of the Cyclops' song and its self-delusory ending. As the ambiguous last lines of the poem show, the song has not straightforwardly 'cured' the Cyclops – the language rather implies that although the song may have eased his pain (note that it does not remove it altogether) it also causes his love to be nourished even as he attempts to control it. The narrator's blithe statement in lines 1-4 that the Muses are the only remedy for love begins to be called into question almost immediately, not only with the contradictory status of song as both symptom and cure for love in lines 13-18, but by the rest of the poem as a whole. The consistent ambiguity and lack of clear proof for the statements made in the opening lines call into question the seriousness of the premise itself and suggest that the point of the poem may be to assert playfully that (as Nicias himself is aware) poetry, like medicine, is unable truly to cure the pain of love. This suggests an element of continuity between the mythical Cyclops and the time of the narrator, since his condition and experience is based on a reality of human life, even if it is a parody of a real-life situation, and one which the narrator connects to the present time through the didactic address to Nicias at the beginning of the poem.

There is another element of continuity in the portrayal of Polyphemus: the Cyclops' song is not very different in its persuasive rhetoric from that of the bucolic narrator of *Idyll* 3. He too promises his girl pastoral presents of fruit and animals, wishes he could enter her realm from which he is forbidden, threatens that he will leave her for another lover and states his willingness to die for her. The similarity in content and style between Polyphemus' song and that of the narrator of *Idyll* 3 suggests a reason for the embedded song in *Idyll* 11, or at least for the choice of Polyphemus as its author. Already in the *Odyssey* the Cyclops' island is a kind of bucolic landscape, although at the same time their lack of community and

agriculture beyond animal husbandry emphasizes their wildness and status as anti-civilized figures. Theocritus' Cyclops has been 'pastoralized': that is to say, Theocritus picks up on his already bucolic environment and adds in characteristics which make the Cyclops look like a character from any *Idyll*: he sings with his fellow-Cyclopes, he guides Galatea to pick flowers and promises to pick flowers for her, he appreciates the trees which surround his home, weaves baskets etc. Even his *paraclausithryon* on the shore, with its close similarities to *Idyll* 3, positions him within the concerns and activities of the pastoral world. Theocritus thus uses the Cyclops and his song, not only to make a playful point about the effect of song on lovers, but to provide a kind of aetiology for pastoral itself. His Cyclops is pre-epic, and sings a pastoral love-song, placing pastoral in a competitive relationship with the Homeric *Odyssey* both in terms of temporal priority (since the narrator claims to be reporting a pastoral song from before the *Odyssey*) and in terms of the character of the Cyclops.

SONG AS COMPETITION

Many *Idylls* of Theocritus depict song competitions between two performers. These can take the form of short couplets exchanged between the two singers, with each trying to 'cap' the other (cf. *Id.* 5), or the performance of two or more longer songs in competition (cf. *Id.* 6, 7). Presenting these competitive performances, even in a fictional bucolic setting, immediately evokes the theme of poetic excellence and competition more widely. Theocritus' singing shepherds evaluate each other's songs and compete for prizes awarded for the best verses; we also see in certain poems the powerful or at least pleasant effects of song upon its audience – the reader is similarly invited to ask what makes a good song, and indeed to consider the power of song to soothe or arouse its listeners.[549]

549 The conversation which opens *Idyll* 1 shows the pleasure song gives, as the shepherds compare it favourably with several positive experiences, while the prizes on offer for performance show the value of being skilled in song. *Idyll* 7 shows the laughter of Lycidas at the cheeky song of Simichidas, the desperate love of *Idyll* 3 lists various powerful songs of myth which contrast sharply with his own failed attempt to serenade

The songs of *Idyll* 6 are rather different from, for instance, the performance of song in *Idylls* 1 or 8, where the performance results in the winning of a prize, and the song's merit seems to lie in the aesthetic pleasure it gives the judge and/or audience.[550] The frame narrative has a similarly didactic tone to *Idyll* 11, for it is addressed to an unknown Aratus, to whom (we must suppose) the remainder of the song has some relevance, although what that may be is a matter destined to remain speculative.[551] Bowie has pointed out that the frame narrative introduces the two singers by pointing out their appearance and facial hair, and has argued that the downy chin of one and bearded aspect of the other indicates an *erastes/eromenos* relationship.[552] The songs that the two shepherds sing in this poem both take love as their theme, and each impersonates a mythical character. Daphnis addresses the Cyclops (also the subject of *Idyll* 11) directly, remonstrating with him because he will not respond to the attentions of Galatea. From this we must assume that he is a mythical person, although his identity is not revealed. Damoetas impersonates Polyphemus, and sings in reply.

The themes of their songs are complementary – Daphnis sings of the pain of possibly unrequited love, and of the various tricks Galatea employs to get the Cyclops' attention, while the opposing song has the Cyclops admit that he has liked Galatea all along, and that his feigned indifference is a mere tactic to get *her* interest. It is the conclusion to the poem which holds the key to its interpretation, however. This poem emphasizes the erotic effects of song: ironically, the mythical lovers do not seem to sing to one another (unlike in *Idyll* 3 and 11) as a means of solving the *impasse* between them, although there

---

Amaryllis; if the magical spells of *Idyll* 2 are taken as song then the poem implies a potential mystic power for musical performance which would be echoed in the magical songs of Orpheus and Medea in the *Argonautica*.
550 Cf. Fantuzzi & Hunter (2004):149-151 for a discussion of this poem.
551 Cf. Bowie (1996): 95, Hunter (1999): 243-244.
552 Bowie (1996): 92-3 "One of them is at the age when young men are at the most attractive...the other is slightly older which...is enough to make him a potential ἐραστής and the younger herdsman his ἐρώμενος."

may be an implication that the Cyclops does play music to attract Galatea, since that is what he is doing while she attempts to engage his attention:

> βάλλει τοι, Πολύφαμε, τὸ ποίμνιον ἁ Γαλάτεια
> μάλοισιν, δυσέρωτα καὶ αἰπόλον ἄνδρα καλεῦσα
> καὶ τύ νιν οὐ ποθόρησθα, τάλαν τάλαν, ἀλλὰ κάθησαι
> ἁδέα συρίσδων. πάλιν ἄδ', ἴδε, τὰν κύνα βάλλει,
> ἅ τοι τᾶν ὀίων ἔπεται σκοπός... (*Id.* 6.6-10)

The piping of the Cyclops is immediately ringed with reference to Galatea's tricks, perhaps implying that his music has an erotic effect upon her. The outcome of the song-contest is that the competitors kiss (an undoubtedly erotic act)[553] and continue to perform music, although now in unison rather than in competition. Their singing, originally in contention (N.B. ἔρισδε, 5), results in a physical expression of erotic desire, emphasizing the difference between reading and listening to poetry. Performance necessarily involves interaction, it is a face-to-face medium, and the erotic effects of listening to song are mentioned well before the Hellenistic period.[554] Theocritus, by embedding this erotic encounter within his written poem, raises questions about the different axes of interaction possible for a reading, rather than a listening, audience.

THEOCRITEAN SONG – CONCLUSIONS

A common feature of all the embedded songs in Theocritus, despite their very different styles, functions and performers, is that all are mimetic representations: i.e. they are all directly quoted and not reported in indirect speech. This gives immediacy and vitality to the songs, allowing the performance to continue unhindered by constant reminders of the embedded status of the poetry. This technique is very much in contrast to that seen in earlier Greek literature: as we have seen in earlier chapters, the songs of Orpheus in the

553 Cf. Bowie (1996): 92, Hunter (1999): 260 *ad loc.*, Lawall (1967): 67-9, Cairns (1972): 194-5, for the opposite view see Hutchinson (1988): 184.
554 Cf. Aristophanes *Thes.*130-3, with Austen and Olson (2004): 87 and (more generally) Petropoulos (2003), Plato *Symp.* 196d6-36, with Hunter (2004): 72-77. Also cf. above, pp. 204-209, on the charming effect of the 'songs' of Medea and Orpheus in the *Argonautica*.

Argonautica and Demodocus in the *Odyssey* are given in indirect speech, as are the embedded songs of the Muses in Pindar *Nemean* 5 and the maidens in Bacchylides poem 13. We saw earlier that, although the embedded songs of archaic and classical poetry begin (and often end) in indirect discourse, that some examples (for instance the song of the nymphs in *HPan*) have a section of narrative where the markers of indirect discourse fall away. In such cases, it was argued, the embedded song may look (or sound) identical to the frame narrative, and thus there is a blurring of voice between the primary narrator and the performer of the embedded song. Theocritus' embedded songs do not even begin in indirect speech, however, creating a striking contrast between his bucolic poetry and the earlier examples.

One explanation may lie in the *Idylls*' connection with mime: many poems take the form of mimetic dialogues in direct speech between one or more actors, and thus it follows naturally that their songs will be mimetic in form also.[555] However, this does not necessarily offer a satisfactory account of the non-mimetic *Idylls* such as 18 and 11, which nonetheless quote their embedded songs directly without interference from the primary narrator, unless we are satisfied that the influence of mime is so pervasive in Theocritus that it has affected even the non-mimetic odes. Such an interpretation is perfectly reasonable, and in fact not mutually exclusive with the other possibilities I wish now to discuss.

The fact that even the *Argonautica* represents embedded song in indirect speech raises the question of why Theocritus alone represents song through direct quotation, for it undercuts any attempt to see Theocritus' direct style of representing embedded songs as a 'Hellenistic' phenomenon across the board. Apollonius thus rules out one possible explanation which suggested itself, i.e. that as performance contexts for poetry are lost, so too is any strong distinction or differentiation between speech and song. Such a

555 On the connections between Theocritus and mime see Hunter (1996): 149-69.

differentiation is fundamental in archaic poetry, which frequently represents very long character speeches (such as the *apologoi* of Odysseus) in the direct style but tends to keep songs in indirect discourse. One might have suggested, were it not for Apollonius, that the written format of Hellenistic poetry allowed for greater freedom in representing embedded songs without fear that the audience would lose track, or without fear that the narrator would lose control, for a reader is more able to re-read passages and to look back at things which are not clear.

In the absence, then, of an explanation due to the conditions of composition and reception in the Hellenistic period, perhaps the different genres of these two authors offer the best explanation for their different approaches to embedded song. Apollonius, as was argued extensively above, uses mainly archaic hexameter poetry as models for his work, and his embedded songs show echoes of the *Odyssey,* Hesiod and the *Homeric Hymns*. It may be that Apollonius uses indirect discourse for his embedded songs because that is how the archaic poets tended to do it, as well as for the specific reasons discussed in the individual readings above (for instance, to retain narratorial control over Orpheus in the embedded song at *Arg.* 1.496-515).

Theocritus, on the other hand, takes the *Argonautica*'s elison of its own written composition to a new level.[556] In the Hellenistic epic, Apollonius chooses to depict poetry as an exclusively oral, largely ritual affair, performed to the lyre by the mythical bard Orpheus. He does not admit the written nature of his own work, but even presents himself in the proem as one of a long line of *aoidoi*, thus implying his connection with the oral and oral-derived poetry of the archaic and classical period. It was argued above that *Idyll* 18 explores the distance between the choral, performative past of poetry and the written reality of Hellenistic poetic composition; it may be that the same sense of distance from a

556 The poetic relationship of Apollonius and Theocritus has been variously discussed, and it is not wildly controversial to suggest that Theocritus was influenced by Apollonius, even if the latter was a slightly younger contemporary. Cf. Hunter (1999): 2-4, Hunter (1996a): 59-63.

performative poetic past informs Theocritus's emphasis on poetic performance. The very lack of a communally enshrined performance context for high poetry in Theocritus' time seems to lead him to focus on poetry as a performed object, reflecting on different performance contexts, and on the dynamics of competitive performance and the functions that performed poetry can fulfil both for performer and audience. Theocritus, by presenting song directly (perhaps most clearly in those *Idylls* where song is unmediated by narratorial introduction), elides the written aspect of his work as far as possible – these poems look exactly like orally performed texts, with no markers of embedding to remind us that the songs are part of a larger poem with an author. It seems to be a deliberate poetic effect to collapse the difference and distance between written and sung in these poems, for although these poems are obviously words written on a page, they are also performances sung by shepherds in a bucolic landscape. In 'quoting' his shepherds directly Theocritus creates immense tension between written and performed, for the reader is constantly aware, of course, that these songs are fictional, since their physicality as written objects overrides their presentation in oral manner.[557] In this light, it may not be too fanciful to read significance into the lack of explicit internal audience(s) for Theocritean embedded songs such as the unsuccessful (and un-heard?) love-song in *Idyll* 3 and the lonely song of the Cyclops in 11 - perhaps this is a sign of the performances' fictionality and an oblique reference to Theocritus's own lack of a listening audience.

557 Cf. Klooster (2011): 96 "these poems pretend to be direct reports of the songs of the rustics."

CONCLUSION

Embedded song plays a part, then, in all genres of narrative poetry from the *Iliad* onwards. In archaic epic, we saw that song is supressed in the *Iliad*, for although several choruses (and even a couple of solo performances) are described, their songs are not given in any detail. The *Odyssey*, on the other hand, shows a great interest in song, and in elaborately describing the performances of the mythical bards it describes. It seems likely that the *Iliad* supresses song for reasons of genre, rather than because the technique or motif of embedded song is, at this stage of Greek literature, primitive or undeveloped. Since the poem knows of bards such as Thamyris, and mentions instances such as the divine chorus in book 1.604, or the performance of Achilles in book 9.186-9, it seems unlikely that the poet of the *Iliad* is *unable* to represent embedded song – he just chooses not to. Indeed the great contrast between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* seems to offer a counter-argument to the developmental view, since, even if the *Odyssey* is agreed to be later than the *Iliad*, it seems implausible that the technique of embedded song should have developed so greatly between the two epics as to allow for the gap between the extended embedded songs of Demodocus and the seemingly embryonic song of Achilles. I would characterize the difference between the Homeric poems rather as one of generic nuance – the *Iliad*'s martial subject-matter does not lend itself to long embedded songs. The fact that most of the instances of embedded song in the *Iliad* occur in peacetime, or at least in cessation of battle (as on the shield of Achilles, and when Achilles' own song is performed during his withdrawal from the fray), or in the divine realm (the chorus of Muses), seems to confirm the idea that song is felt somehow to be an inappropriate activity during war. An interesting irony, given the ultimate suitability of war as a *subject* of epic song.

One further contrast between the two Homeric epics is the suppression in the *Odyssey* of ritual song. Song in this epic is almost entirely presented as entertainment, rather than as religious, whereas from the handful of examples of embedded songs in the *Iliad*, two are paeans sung by the Greeks to the gods, and one is a *linos*-song with arguable ritual overtones. Apart from the fake wedding-song ordered by Odysseus to conceal his slaughter of the suitors (*Od.* 23.143-145), the only song in the *Odyssey* connected with ritual is the lament for Achilles sung by the Muses and reported by Agamemnon in the *nekuia* scene (*Od.* 24.60-1). It is striking that the only instances of ritual song in the poem are thus undermined – the wedding song is a false performance, covering brutal violence, while the lament is an embedded song *within* an embedded speech, at two removes from the frame narrative, and moreover it is told by a character in the underworld, a place where speeches may not always be entirely true or straightforward.[558]

Demodocus (and Phemius) were argued to be figures closely associated with the shadowy Homeric narrator, and it was suggested that their prestige, close connection with the Muses and their prowess in constructing and narrating epic song reflects positively on the primary narrator. Such a claim for poetic authority is achieved also by the embedded songs in the *Theogony* proem, where the narrator ('Hesiod') presents the Muses and their songs as the source and guarantors of his skill and knowledge. While the songs of the *Odyssey* and Hesiod's *Theogony* increase the authority of the primary narrator, and certainly foreshadow later events or themes within the frame narrative, they are nonetheless digressive in function – they do not move the plot along. Similarly, there is only limited blurring of voice in the epic and theogonic examples of embedded song, for in all three poems there is a concern to explicitly mark the embedded songs with introductory and concluding phrases, and in many cases to continue the markers of indirect discourse

558 Cf. the statement of Amphimedon at 24.167-9, where he claims that Penelope colluded in Odysseus' victory over the suitors (on this important passage in the *Odyssey* see Segal (1994): 123-4. Cf. too the discussion above, pp. 25-32, which shows that, in the *Iliad*, lament straddles the speech-song divide and is not represented as song proper.

throughout the song, to remind the audience that what they are hearing is different from the frame narrative.

The *Homeric Hymns*, on the other hand, contain embedded songs with a direct function in the plot (so in the *HHerm.* Hermes' theogony directly achieves reconciliation with Apollo and Hermes' accession to Olympus) and also songs which are constructed in such a way as to blur the voice of the embedded narrator with that of the primary narrator (as the song of the nymphs in the *HPan* 'blends' seamlessly with the frame-narrative), a technique which allows the poet to increase both his own authority and the value of the praise he offers to the god.

Nonetheless, despite the differences in the embedded songs across early Greek hexameter poetry, I would resist an attempt to see a linear development in the use of the motif, for the particular context and genre seem to be the most important factors in defining the extent or characteristics of the embedded song.

It was also argued that the presence of embedded song in all the sub-genres of early Greek hexameter poetry, and the similar basic components of each representation (which can of course be greatly adapted according to the aim of the poet and the individual context), indicate that this motif should be considered 'traditional' to Greek hexameter poetry in a similar way to motifs such as the return of the hero, or a god's birth and rise to power.

As we saw, lyric poetry, particularly archaic lyric, presents a considerable problem for any study of embedded speech or song, since the very fragmentary state of most of the corpus makes secure identification of embedded song very difficult. Rather than base arguments on fragments where depiction of song was uncertain, we focused on the Classical

lyric of Pindar and Bacchylides (and an example from Corinna, the date of which is uncertain) to explore the nature of embedded song in this set of genres.

Poetic authority is again a major theme in the embedded songs of Pindar and Bacchylides. Despite Pindar's very different tactics for adducing his own poetic authority, in *Nemean* 5 we see him using a very Hesiodic method to appropriate the authority of the Muses, as he uses their song to narrate an innovation of his own (giving it canonical status in their mouths) and moreover to tell the mythical story of his own poem. Bacchylides too appropriates the authority of the chorus of Aeginetan maidens in B.13 in constructing a polyphonic poem of praise for his victor. The non-epinician poetry of these two poets showed a particular interest in the history of poetry itself, and in depicting embedded songs which formed aetiologies or at least mythical ancestors for their own poetry.

The Hellenistic epic *Argonautica* has strong links with the *Odyssey* in its use of embedded song, as well as links with the *Theogony* and the *Homeric Hymns*. Despite its written format, the epic depicts poetry as an exclusively oral activity, and moreover an activity which is vitally connected to the success of a heroic endeavour. The focus on the religious aspect of Orpheus' song may reflect Apollonius' sense of the increasing secularism of poetry – he does not write hymns like those of the archaic period, to be performed in honour of the gods in a festival context, but poetry to be read and enjoyed by a literary elite. Unlike the songs of Demodocus, however, Orpheus' songs were shown to be essential to the furtherance of the plot – without his first song in the epic (*Arg.* 1.496-515) the adventure would not have occurred, and without his defeat of the Sirens (4.902-09) it would have ended in death and disaster.

Apollonius' wilful elision of his own literacy is also seen in Theocritus, whose poetry is characterized by the performance of song; indeed, the motif is seen as a defining feature

of the bucolic genre.[559] Theocritus' embedded songs create a tension between written and spoken poetry, exploring the potentialities of oral song which are closed to written verse. His focus on oral song links him closely with the poetry of the past, and yet in poems such as *Idyll* 18 he seems aware of the (ironical) benefits of poetry as a written artefact.

In general terms, all these passages from earliest to latest raise certain similar questions, for instance whether or not there is something essentially different about an oral poet depicting a (fictional) oral poet at work and a writing poet depicting an oral poet within his verse. Does the meaning change when the depicted poem is of a different medium? Can such a representation be self-referential? Connected to this is the problem of self-referentiality created by a representation of choral song within a poem narrated by a solo poet-narrator.[560] What the passages above have shown is that self-referentiality is rarely a straightforward correspondence between embedded narrator and primary narrator – and that in many cases, it is the *difference* between the two which creates meaning. So, for the male, solo poet-narrator 'Hesiod', the embedded chorus of Muses lend divine, epichoric authority to his verse. For Apollonius, the mythical Orpheus reflects onto the poet-narrator a continuity with the Greek literary past and the authority of a poet whose connection with the divine is immediate and vital.

Embedded songs are also used across the board to manipulate time – to narrate the mythical, historic or even the poetic past, thus analeptically expanding the time-frame of the frame narrative. Embedded songs themselves may be depicted as having been performed in the past: contrast the songs of Demodocus, which are performed during the action of the main narrative (although of course they are in the past from the point of view of the audience) with the song of Kean youths in B.6, or with the songs of the Muses in the *Theogony* proem, which are emphatically placed in the past in relation to the present song.

559 Cf. Klooster (2011): 92, with bibliography.
560 And indeed to the examples of a poet embedding a poem of another genre from that of the frame narrative, as with the theogony sung by Hermes in the *HHerm.*

Such examples not only *narrate* past events, but themselves form a kind of poetic past against which the current song positions itself. A kind of internal literary history is thus created by the presence of such embedded songs.[561]

For the most part, we find in embedded songs in Greek literature thematic continuity with the frame narrative rather than disruption of the main theme(s). The hymn and theogony sung by Hermes in the *HHerm.*, the hymn sung by the nymphs in the *HPan*, and the mythical narratives of both embedded choruses in *N.* 5 and B.13 are all examples of such thematic continuity; where the embedded songs do not exactly mirror the theme(s) of the main narrative, as in *N.* 5, they are nonetheless felt to be analogous (so here the myth is of heroic success and restraint, two ideals applicable to the epinician subject). While there may be meaningful differences between the content of the embedded song and the frame narrative, these are for the most part minor – we might think of the differences between the theogonic songs of the Muses in *Theogony* 1-110 and the following body of the poem, for Hesiod does not (as discussed above) slavishly follow a Muse-led program in narrating his own poem. However, the main point of their presence is to underline Hesiod's authority as a poet of divine matters, and the similarities between their song and Hesiod's are far more salient than the minor differences.

Linked closely to thematic continuity (or disruption) is the role of embedded songs in introducing genres which differ from that of the frame poem. This is so commonly the case that it may be easier first to mention those embedded songs which do not fall into this category. The miniature hymns found in the *HHerm.*, *HPan* and *HAp.* all re-inforce the genre of the frame narrative, similarly the mythical narratives of the Muses in *N.* 5 and the girls in B.13 form a recognized portion of epinician poetry, and thus cannot be said to be extra-generic. The non-epinician poetry of Pindar and Bacchylides, as discussed above,

561 Cf. Klooster (2011): 113 (she writes in relation to Hellenistic poets only) "These characteristics provided the perfect circumstances for the flourishing of "invented tradition", the anchoring of new poetic practice firmly to a time of venerable mythical origins".

contains both 'types' of embedded song – for instance B.6 and *Ol.* 9 each contain past performances of epinician, which allow the poets to reflect on the genre and its aims as well as its links with the past.

Pindar's *Threnos* 3, however, explicitly compares its own genre with others, showing a pre-Hellenistic interest in the nature and capabilities of various genres of lyric poetry. Generic disruption occurs, I would argue, also in the songs of Demodocus, for although they may be epic, his first and last songs are martial epic of a different sort from the *Odyssey* itself, and the song of Ares and Aphrodite may be either hymn or theogony. The poet here shows his capabilities in other kinds of hexameter verse, placing his own poem in the context of competing sub-genres, and in particular (if the *Odyssey*'s knowledge of the *Iliad* is accepted) placing Odysseus' *nostos* in relation to the concerns and action of the *Iliad*. Similarly the theogony/cosmogony of Orpheus is of a different genre from the framing epic poem, but this and his other religious songs set the epic in relation both to its archaic predecessors and to its (lost) religious context.

Embedded songs may fulfil either a digressive or effective role within the frame narrative – this function depends largely on context, rather than on the date or genre of the poems. Even in digressive embedded songs, such as those of Demodocus, the links between the subject-matter of the embedded songs and the frame narrative prevent the inset song from being entirely irrelevant. Indeed in the case of Demodocus, his songs on Odysseus do lead up to the revelation of the hero's identity and may thus subtly impact on the progression of the plot. The songs of Orpheus in the *Argonautica* offer an interesting paradox – their subject-matter may well be technically digressive (cf. for instance the cosmogony of *Arg.* 1.494-515), but they have a highly effective function within the plot, so

much so that Orpheus' vital role in the poem seems metapoetic.[562] If Orpheus does not sing, the poem halts – in this privileging of poetry we see a mirror of Apollonius' own role as author. Theocritus' embedded songs are the opposite of digressive, since they form the major part of his narratives, with the frame-narrative de-privileged in favour of these seemingly "oral" bucolic performances. Thus the embedded song in Theocritus strains to break out of the frame, and the bucolic shepherds, Cyclopes and Spartan maidens take over the poem from the narrator.

Embedded songs not only allow us to see embedded performer(s) (in whatever guise such performers may be, 'ideal', 'mythical', choral, divine, historical etc.), but often encode the reception of these songs as well. The audiences of the many embedded songs in Greek literature offer a refraction of the external audience to the poet's own creation: it is no surprise, then, that the audience response is overwhelmingly positive: think of the delight and high emotion caused by the songs of Demodocus, of the pleasure of Apollo at his baby brother's song in the *HHerm.* and the impressive charm of Orpheus' songs (which can calm any argument and even defeat the mythical songs of the Sirens). In poems where songs seem to have no audience, this may be pointed – so, I have argued that the lack of audience to the song of the Cyclops in *Idyll* 11 (and to the love-song of the desperate shepherd in *Idyll* 3) indicates an awareness of the fictionality of their performances, a signpost of the lack of aural reception for Theocritus' own work. Perhaps this is at its most pointed in *Idyll* 18, where the chorus of girls sing to an unresponsive Helen and Menelaus, shut inside their marital bower, and where the future memory of Helen seems to be tied up with writing rather than song. On the other hand, the lack of audience response to the song of the Muses in *N.* 5 or B.13 is a function of the blurring between these embedded songs and the frame narrative: such audience reaction is expected usually at the *end* of an embedded song, and

562 So too with Hermes' theogony in the *HHerm.*, although arguably this song is only superficially digressive, for as Hermes sings the theogony, it becomes true. He effects his own place in the divine world by singing it.

these examples have no explicit end, thus precluding any explicit comment on the embedded audience or their response.

All of the embedded songs discussed above highlight meaningful tensions and continuities with the narrative in which they are embedded; these reflections and refractions of the larger narrative tell us a great deal about how the poets saw their own art and how they wished it to be seen, as well as how they defined the value of poetry and its role in society.

APPENDIX I

EMBEDDED SONGS IN ANCIENT GREEK NARRATIVE POETRY[563]

A.1.1: *Iliad*

1.472-74 – Achaean youths try to appease Apollo with song.

1.604 – Muses sing at the banquet of the gods; accompanied by Apollo.

9.186-89 – Achilles sings to the lyre.

16.182 – Polymele is raped by Hermes after being seen singing in a chorus for Artemis.

18.493 – Marriage song (shield of Achilles).

18.570-2 – Linos-song (shield of Achilles).

[18.604-5] – An *aoidos* plays the lyre – N.B. most editors delete this line.

18.605-6 – acrobats lead off dance: song implied by *molpe*.

22.391 – Achilles orders a victory song over the death of Hector.

24. 720-1 – Professional singers lament for Hector in tandem with the (spoken?) laments of his family.

A.1.2: *Odyssey*

1.151-5 – Phemius performs for the suitors.

1.159 – dance and song after banquet.

1.325-7 – Phemius sings of the *nostos* of the Achaians.

1.421 – suitors enjoy song after banquet.

4.17 – a bard sings to the lyre at the palace of Menelaus.

[563] I have included some intriguing fragments of lyric poetry which may or may not have represented embedded songs, but outside this very fragmentary corpus have restricted myself to instances where I feel the embedded song is securely portrayed. Thus I do not include any pseudo-songs, prayers or other speeches which have the characteristic of song.

5.61 – Calypso sings as she works at the loom.

6.101– Nausicaa leads the maidens in a song as they play ball.

8.73-82 – Demodocus' first song: quarrel of Odysseus and Agamemon.

8.87-93 – Demodocus continues singing (unelaborated performance after the first song).

8.266-366 – Demodocus' second song: Ares and Aphrodite.

8.499 – 520 – Demodocus' third song: Trojan Horse.

10.221 – Circe sings at the loom.

10.226 – Circe sings at the loom (reported by Polites).

10.254 – Circe sings at loom (reported by Eurylochus).

12.44 – Sirens (reported by Circe).

12.183-192 – Sirens song' to Odysseus.

13.27 – Demodocus sings at the final celebration in Phaeacia.

17.262 – Phemius plays among the suitors.

17.358-361– Odysseus and suitors eat "as long as the minstrel sings".

17.605 – Suitors make merry with dance and song.

18.304 – Suitors make merry with dance and song.

19.518-523 – Penelope's analogy with the nightingale.

22.331 – Phemius sang "by force" among the suitors.

23.143-145 – Phemius sings at fake wedding.

23.326 – Odysseus tells Penelope of the Sirens.

24.60-1 – Muses sing the dirge of Achilles.

A.1.3 *The Homeric Hymns*

HAp. 157-164 – the song of the Delian maidens.

HAp. 189-193 – The Muses sing in a divine revel.

HAp. 514-7 – Cretans sing the first *paian*.

HPan 5-7 – Nymphs sing a hymn to Pan.

HPan 19-45 – The song of the nymphs

HHerm. 52-62 – Hermes' hymn to himself.

HHerm. 425-33 – Hermes' 'theogony'.

HHerm. 502 – Apollo sings once he has received the lyre.

HH. 21.1-4 – the swan and the bard alike sing of Apollo.

HH. 27.18-20 – Artemis, Muses and Graces sing a hymn to Leto.

A.1.4 Hesiod

A.1.4.1 *Theogony*

11-21 – Muses sing of the gods.

36-52 – Muses sing of what is and what will be; sing a theogony.

65-74 – Muses sing glorifying ordinances of the immortals.

1.4.2 *Shield*

201-205 – chorus of Muses, led by Apollo.

A.1.5 The Epic Cycle

A.1.5.1 – *Cypria*

Fr.6 (West) – Nymphs and Graces sing in company with Aphrodite on Mt. Ida.

A.1.6 Lyric Poetry (except Pindar and Bacchylides)

A.1.6.1 – Sappho

Fr. 44 (Voigt) – Performance of song at wedding of Hector and Andromache.

Fr.96 (Voigt) – performance of a wedding song (?)

A.1.6.2 – Ibycus

Fr.166 (*SLG*) – a group sing to the pipes, possible erotic theme.

A.1.6.3 – Simonides

Fr. 511 (*PMG*) – Apollo sings (?)

Fr.595 (*PMG*)– Sirens sing

Fr. 597 (*PMG*) – Orpheus plays a song, fish leap in response.

A.1.6.4 – Pratinas

Fr. 708 (*PMG*) – Bromios performs a song (?)

A.1.6.5 – Corinna

Fr. 654 (*PMG*) – Song contest of Helicon and Cithaeron

A.1.7 – Pindar

A.1.7.1 *Olympians*

Ol. 5.9-14 – Psaumis sings of his hometown.

Ol. 9.1-3 – Archilochus' "song".

Ol. 10.76 – mythical performance of epinician.

A.1.7.2 *Pythians*

P. 2.15 – Cyprians often sing of Kinyras.

P. 2.18-20 – A Lokrian maiden sings of Hieron.

P. 3.16-20 – Marriage-songs (iterative).

P. 3.77-9 – Maidens sing of Pan before narrator's door at night.

P. 3.90 – Muses sing at weddings of Cadmus and Harmonia, Peleus and Thetis.

P. 10.37-39 – Eternal songs of Hyperboreans (iterative).

P. 12.8 – (?) deathly *threnos* of Gorgons (possibly pre-song?).

A.1.7.3 *Nemeans*

N. 5.25ff. – Song of the Muses.

N. 10.34-5 – Athenians celebrated the victor in the past with sweet voices.

A.1.7.4 *Isthmians*

I. 2.1-8 – men of long ago used to sing hymns of love to handsome boys.

A.1.7.5 *Paeans*

Paean 2.96 – Maidens of Delphi sing.

Paean 6.16-18 – Maidens of Delphi sing.

Paean 7.17 – Unnamed subject "sang a song" (fragmentary).

A.1.7.6 – *Dithyrambs*

Dith. 2.1 – Song of dithyrambs in the past.

A.1.7.7 *Threnoi*

Threnos 3 – past performances of *threnoi* and other laments.

A.1.8 – Bacchylides (all numbers as in *SMBa*)

B.5.191-4 – Quotes a poem of Hesiod.

B.6.4-9 – Young men of earlier days sing of Ceos' victory.

B.13.83f. – Aeginetan maiden chorus sing of Aegina's past.

B.16.10-12 – Delphians sing *paians* at Apollo's temple.

B.17.125-130 – A paian is raised for Theseus' safe return from the sea.

B.20.1-3 – Spartan maiden song.

Paean fr.4 – Songs of boys rise like flames – aetiology for paean?

Fr. 20C.14-16 – Maidens and youths celebrated in song (former victory celebration as in *Ol.*9?)

Fr.60.34-37 – ritual performance of song (very fragmentary).

A.1.9 Apollonius

Arg. 1.496-515 – Orpheus sings a cosmogony.

Arg. 1.568-572 – Orpheus sings a hymn to Artemis.

Arg. 1.859-860 – Hypsipyle's city hymns Hera and Cypris.

Arg. 1.1125 (?) – Argonauts "call" on the Mountain Mother.

Arg. 1.1151 – Argonauts hymn Rhea.

Arg. 1.1222-5 – Nymph choruses hymn Artemis.

Arg. 2.161-2 – The Argonauts (led by Orpheus) sing a proto-hymn to Polydeuces.

Arg. 2.694-713 – The Argonauts (led by Orpheus) hymn Apollo.

Arg. 3.897 – Medea and her maidens "play" (μολπή).

Arg. 3.948-50 – Medea and her maidens "play" (μολπή).

Arg. 4.42 – Medea's magical songs.

Arg. 4.59 – Medea's magical songs.

Arg. 4.157 – Medea's magical songs.

Arg. 4.902-8 – The Sirens.

Arg. 4.1158-1160 – Wedding Songs for Jason and Medea.

Arg. 4.1193-1200 – Wedding Songs for Jason and Medea combined with hymn to Hera.

Arg. 4.1296-1302 – Maidens lament (song rather than wailing implies by swan simile).

Arg. 4.1399 – Hesperides sing a lovely song.

Arg. 4.1665-70 – Medea's song to the *Kerai*.

A.1.10 Theocritus

Idyll 6.6-19, 21-40 – Songs of Daphnis and Damoetas.

Idyll 7.52-89, 96-127 – Songs of Lycidas and Simichidas.

Idyll 8.3-80 – Amoebaean songs of Menalcas and Daphnis.

Idyll 9.7-21, 31-6 – Song of Daphnis, song narrator sang in the past.

Idyll 11.19-79 – Polyphemus' song.

Idyll 15.100-144 – Professional singer performs at the festival of Adonis.

Idyll 18.9-58 – Epithalamion for Helen.

Idyll 22.219-220 – Homer sang of Priam's town and other Iliadic themes.

A.1.11 Callimachus

A.1.11.1 *Hymns*

Hymn to Apollo 5 – Swan sings of Apollo

Hymn to Apollo 18-21 – Silence falls whenever singers celebrate lyre or bow.

Hymn to Delos 249 – Swans sing over Apollo's birth.

Hymn to Delos 256-7 – Delian nymphs sing birth-song.

Hymn to Delos – 304-5 – Men sing a song in Delos brought from Xanthos.

A.1.11.2 *Aetia*

Fr. 75.43 – Cydippe's age-mates "say" the marriage-song for her.

A.1.11.3 *Iambi*

Iambus 4.27 – The Pythian priestess "sings" of laurel.

A.1.12 Bion

A.1.12.1 *Lament for Adonis*

31-2 – Hills and glens lament for Adonis.

36-8 – Cyprus sings a lament for Cytherea's grief.

89-90 – Wedding god sings a transformed song.

94-5 – Fates sing a magic song for Adonis.

A.1.13 Moschus

A.1.13.1 *Lament for Bion*

21-2 Bion sings a forgetful song in Hades.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abbenes, J. G. J. (1996) 'The Doric of Theocritus, A Literary Language' in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1996): 1-19.

Abbott, H. P. (2008) *The Cambridge Introduction to Narrative* (Cambridge).

Agócs, P. (2009) 'Memory and Forgetting in Pindar's Seventh Isthmian' in L. Doležalová, (ed.) *Strategies of Remembrance from Pindar to Hölderlin* (Newcastle-upon-Tyne): 33-92.

Albis, R. (1996) *Poet and Audience in the Argonautica of Apollonius* (Lanham, Md.).

Alden, M. J. (1997) 'The Resonances of the Song of Ares and Aphrodite' *Mnemosyne* Fourth Series 50: 513-29.

Alden, M. J. (2000) *Homer Beside Himself: Para-Narratives in the Iliad* (Oxford).

Alexiou, M. (2002 [1974]) *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition* Second edition, revised by D. Yatromanolakis and P. Roilos (Lanham, Md.).

Allan, W. (2005) 'Arms and the Man: Euphorbus, Hector, and the Death of Patroclus' *CQ* 55: 1–16.

Allan, W. (2006) 'Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic' *JHS* 126: 1-35.

Allen, T. W. (1917-19) *Homeri Opera III-IV* (Oxford).

Allen, T. W. (1931) *Homeri Ilias* (Oxford).

Allen, T. W., Halliday, W. R., and Sikes, E. E. (1936) *The Homeric Hymns* (Oxford).

Aloni, A. (1993) 'The Proem of Simonides' Plataea Elegy' in Boedeker and Sider (1993): 86–105.

Aly, W. (1966) 'Hesiod von Askra' in E. Heitsch (ed.) *Hesiod* (Darmstadt): 50-99.

Anzai, M. (1994) 'First-Person Forms in Pindar: a Re-examination' *BICS* 39: 141-50.

Arend, W. (1933) *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer* (Berlin).

Arrowsmith, W. (1963) 'Nietzsche on Classics and Classicists' *Arion* First Series 2: 5-18.

Asper, M. (2008) 'Apollonius on Poetry' in Papanghelis and Rengakos (2008): 167-197.

Athanassaki, L. (2009) 'Narratology, Deixis, and the Performance of Choral Lyric. On Pindar's *First Pythian Ode*' in Grethlein and Rengakos (2009): 241-273.

Austin, C., and Olson, S. D. (2004) *Aristophanes: Thesmophoriazusae* (Oxford).

Austin, N. (1966) 'The Function of Digressions in the *Iliad*' *GRBS* 7: 295-312.

Bakker, E. J. (1997) *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca, NY, London).

Bakker, E. J. (1999) 'How Oral is Oral Composition?' in E. A. MacKay (ed.) *Signs of Orality: The Oral Tradition and its Influence in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden): 29-47.

Bakker, E. J. (2009) 'Homer, Odysseus and the Narratology of Performance' in Grethlein and Rengakos (2009): 117-136.

Bal, M. (1977) *Narratologie: essais sur la signification narrative dans quatre romans modernes* (Paris).

Bal, M. (1997) *Narratology: Introduction to the Theory of Narrative* English edition, translated by Christine van Boheemen, Second edition (Toronto, Buffalo, London).

Barbantini, S. (2009) 'Lyric in the Hellenistic period and beyond' in Budelmann (2009): 297-318.

Barchiesi, A. (2009) 'Lyric in Rome' in Budelmann (2009): 319-335.

Barker, A. (1994) 'The Daughters of Memory' *Musica e Storia* 2: 171-90.

Barker, A. (2004) 'Transforming the Nightingale: Aspects of Athenian Musical Discourse in the Late Fifth Century' in Murray and Wilson (2004): 185-204.

Barrett, W. S. (1964) *Euripides' Hippolytus* (Oxford).

Barrett, W. S. (2007) 'Pindar and Psaumis: *Olympians* 4 and 5' in M. L. West (ed.) *Greek Lyric, Tragedy and Textual Criticism* (Oxford): 38-53.

Bassett, S. (1923) 'The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*' *AJP* 44: 339–48.

Beck, D. (2008) 'Narratology and Linguistics: An Interdisciplinary Perspective on Homeric Speech Representation' *TAPA* 138: 351-378.

Beck, D. (2012) 'The presentation of song in Homer's *Odyssey*' in E. Minchin (ed.) *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World* (Leiden): 25-53.

Bell, R. H. (2007) 'Homer's Humor: Laughter in the *Iliad*' *Humanitas* 20.1-2: 96-116.

Bergren, A. L. T. (1982) 'Sacred apostrophe: re-presentation and imitation in the Homeric hymns' *Arethusa* 15: 83-108.

Bernadini, P. A. (1983) *Mito e attualita nelle odi di Pindaro. La Nemea 4, l'Olimpica 9, l'Olimpica 7* (Rome).

Betz, H.D. (1996) *The Greek Magical Papyri in Translation, Including the Demotic Spells* (Chicago).

Bianchi, L. (1915) 'Corinna' *SIFC* 21: 225–79.

Biles, Z. (2003) 'Perils of Song in Homer's *Odyssey*' *Phoenix* 57.3-4: 191-208.

Bing, P. (1988) *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic Poets* (Göttingen).

Bing, P. (1993) 'Impersonation of Voice in Callimachus' *Hymn to Apollo*' *TAPA* 123: 181-98.

Bliss, F. R. (1968) 'Homer and the Critics. The Structural Unity of *Odyssey* Eight.' *Bucknell Review* 16: 53-73.

Boedeker, D., and Sider, D. (eds.) (2001) *The New Simonides* (Oxford):

Bohme, E. (1937) *Prooimion: eine Form sakraler Dichtung der Griechen* (Baden).

Bolling, G. M. (1956) 'Notes on Corinna' *AJP* 77: 282–7.

Bona, G. (1966) *Studi sull'Odissea* (Torino).

Bonnafé, A. (1985) *Eros et Eris: Mariages divins et mythe de succession chez Hésiode* (Lyon).

Bosley, K. (2008) *The Kalevala: an epic poem after oral tradition* (Oxford).

Bowie, E. (1993) 'Lies, Fiction and Slander in Early Greek Poetry' in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman (eds.) *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter): 1-37.

Bowie, E. (1996) 'Frame and Framed in Theocritus Poems 6 and 7' in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1996): 91-100.

Bowra, C. M. (1938) 'The Daughters of Asopus' *Hermes* 73: 213-221.

Bowra, C.M. (1964) *Pindar* (Oxford).

Braswell, B. K. (1982) 'The song of Ares and Aphrodite: Theme and relevance to *Odyssey* 8' *Hermes* 110: 129-37.

Bremer, J. (1981) 'Greek Hymns' in H. S. Versnel (ed.) *Faith, Hope and Worship: Aspects of Religious Mentality in the Ancient World* (Leiden): 193-215.

Bremer, J. (1990) 'Pindar's Paradoxical ἐγώ and a Recent Controversy about the Performance of his Epinicia' in S. R. Slings (ed.) *The Poet's I in Archaic Greek Lyric, Proceedings of a Symposium Held at the Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam* (Amsterdam): 41-57.

Bremmer, J. (1996) *Götter, Mythen und Heiligtümer im antiken Griechenland* (Darmstadt).

Brillante, C. (1999) 'L'invenzione della lira nell'inno omerico a Hermes' *SCO* 47: 95-128.

Broeniman, C. (1996) 'Demodocus, Odysseus and the Trojan War in *Odyssey* 8' *CW* 90.1: 3-13.

Brooke, A. (1971) 'Theocritus' Idyll 11: A Study in Pastoral' *Arethusa* 4: 73-81.

Brown, C. G. (1989) 'Ares, Aphrodite and the Laughter of the Gods' *Phoenix* 43: 283-93.

Brown, R. D. (1990) 'The structural function of the song of Iopas' *HSCP* 93: 315-24.

Budelmann, F. (ed.) (2009) *The Cambridge Companion to Greek Lyric* (Cambridge).

Bulloch, A. W. (1985) *Callimachus: the fifth hymn* (Cambridge).

Bulloch, A. W. (1977) 'Callimachus' Erysichthon, Homer and Apollonius Rhodius' *AJP* 98: 97-123.

Bundy. E. (1962) *Studia Pindarica* (Berkeley, Calif.).

Bungard, C. (2010) 'Surplus potential in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*' *Arethusa* 44: 143-65.

Burgess, J. S. (1997) 'Beyond Neoanalysis: Problems with the Vengeance Theory' *AJP* 118: 1–19.

Burgess, J. S. (2001) *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle* (Baltimore).

Burgess, J. S. (2006) 'Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference' *Oral Tradition* 21.1: 148-89.

Burkert, W. (1960) 'Das Lied vom Ares und Aphrodite' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 103: 130-44.

Burkert, W. (1997) 'The song of Ares and Aphrodite: On the Relationship between the *Odyssey* and *Iliad*' in G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones (eds.) *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation* (Oxford): 249-62.

Burnett, A. P. (1985) *The Art of Bacchylides* (Cambridge, Mass., London).

Burnett, A. P. (2005) *Pindar's Songs for the Young Athletes of Aegina* (Oxford).

Burton, R. (1962) *Pindar's Pythian odes : essays in interpretation* (London).

Bury, J. B. (1890) *The Nemean odes of Pindar* (London).

Burzacchini, G. (1990) 'Corinna e i Plateesi. In margine al certame di Elicone e Citerone' *Eikasmos* 1: 31-35.

Busch, S. (1993) 'Orpheus bei Apollonios Rhodios' *Hermes* 121: 301–324.

Buss, H. (1913) *De Bacchylide Homeri imitatore* (Dissertation: Giessen).

Cairns, D. L. (2010) *Five Epinician Odes: 3, 5, 9, 11, 13* (Cambridge).

Cairns, D. L. (ed.) (2001) *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford).

Cairns, F. (1972) *Generic Composition in Greek and Latin Poetry* (Edinburgh).

Calame, C. (1994) 'From Choral Poetry to Tragic Stasimon: The Enactment of Women's Song' *Arion* Third Series 3.1: 136-154.

Calame, C. (1995) 'Variations énoncatives, relations avec les dieux et fonctions poétiques dans les *Hymnes homériques*' *MH* 52: 2-19.

Calame, C. (2001) *Choruses of young women in ancient Greece: their morphology, religious role, and social functions* English edition, translated by D. Collins and J. Orion (Lanham, Md.).

Calame, C. (2011) 'The *Homeric Hymns as Poetic Offerings: Musical and Ritual Relationships with the Gods*' in Faulkner (2011): 334-357.

Campbell, D. A. (1982) *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Bristol).

Campbell, D. A. (1983) *The Golden Lyre* (Bristol).

Carey, C. (1980) '*Homeric Hymn to Apollo* 171' *CQ* 30: 288-90.

Carey, C. (1981) 'Myth, Cult and Memory in Pindar's Third and Fourth *Isthmian* Odes' *Ramus* 10.1: 69-86.

Carey, C. (1981b) *A Commentary on Five Odes of Pindar* (New York).

Carey, C. (1995) 'Pindar and the Victory Ode' in L. Ayres (ed.) *The Passionate Intellect* (New Brunswick): 85-103.

Carey, C. (1999) 'Ethos and pathos in Bakchylides', in I. L. Pfeijffer and S. Slings (eds.) *One hundred years of Bacchylides* (Amsterdam): 17-29.

Carey, C. (2000) 'The Panegyrist's Persona' in Fera and Grandolini (2000): 165-77.

Carne-Ross, D. S. (1985) *Pindar* (New Haven, London).

Carson, A. (1984) 'The Burners: A Reading of Bacchylides' Third Epinician Ode' *Phoenix* 38: 111-119.

Carspecken, J. F. (1952) 'Apollonius Rhodius and the Homeric Epic' in *id.* (ed.) *Apollonius Rhodius and the Homeric epic. Yale Classical Studies* XIII (New Haven): 35–143.

Càssola, F. (1975) *Inni Omerici* (Milan).

Càssola, F. (2010) *Inni Omerici* Ninth edition (Rome).

Chatman, S. (1978) *Story and Discourse: Narrative Structure in Fiction and Film* (Cornell).

Clare, R. J. (2002) *The Path of the Argo* (Cambridge).

Clauss, J. J. (1993) *The Best of the Argonauts*: *The Redefinition of the Epic Hero in Book One of Apollonius'* Argonautica (Berkeley, Calif.).

Clay, J. S. (1983) *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey* (Princeton, NJ).

Clay, J. S. (1988) 'What the Muses Sang: *Theogony* 1-115' *GRBS* 29: 323-33.

Clay, J. S. (1989) *The Politics of Olympus: form and meaning in the major Homeric hymns*, (London).

Clay, J. S. (1997) 'The Homeric Hymns' in I. Morris and B. B. Powell (eds.) *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden): 489–507.

Clay, J. S. (2003) *Hesiod's Cosmos* (Cambridge).

Clay, J. S. (2011) 'The *Homeric Hymns* as Genre' in Faulkner (2011): 232-253.

Clayman, D. (1978) 'The meaning of Corinna's ϝεροῖα' *CQ* NS 28: 96-7.

Clayman, D. (1993) 'Corinna and Pindar' in R. M. Rosen and J. Farrell (eds.) *Nomodeiktes: Greek Studies in honor of Martin Ostwald* (Michigan): 633-642.

Collins, D. (2001) *Reanimated Voices: Speech Reporting in a Historical-Pragmatic Perspective* (Amsterdam).

Collins, D. (2006) 'Corinna and mythological innovation' *CQ* 56: 19-32.

Conte, G. B. (2007) *Poetry of Pathos: Studies in Virgilian Epic* (Oxford).

Crowne, D. K. (1960) 'The Hero on the Beach: An Example of Composition in Theme in Anglo-Saxon Poetry' *Neuphilologische Mitteilungen* 61: 362-72.

Csapo, E. & Slater, W. J. (1994) *The Contexts of Ancient Drama* (Ann Arbor, Mich.).

Currie, B. G. F. (2004) 'Reperformance Scenarios for Pindar's Odes' in C. J. Mackie (ed.) *Oral Performance and its Context* (Leiden and Boston): 49-69.

Currie, B. G. F. (2005) *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes* (Oxford).

Currie, B. G. F. (2006) 'Homer and the Early Epic Tradition' in Currie, Clarke, and Lyne (2006): 1-45.

Currie, B. G. F., Clarke, M. J., and Lyne, R.O.A.M. (eds.) (2006) *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition Presented to Jasper Griffin by Former Pupils* (Oxford).

Cuypers, M. P. (2004) *Apollonius of Rhodes* in de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie (2004): 43-62.

D'Alessio, G. B. (1994) 'First-Person Problems in Pindar' *BICS* 39: 117-40.

Dalby, A. (1995) 'The Iliad, The Odyssey and Their Audiences' *CQ* 45: 269-279.

Dällenbach, L. (1977) *Le récit spéculaire: essai sur la mise en abyme* (Paris).

Dällenbach, L. (1989) *The Mirror in the Text* English edition, translated J. Whitely and E. Hughes (Oxford).

Dalley, S. (2000 [1989]) *Myths from Mesopotamia: Creation, The Flood, Gilgamesh and others* (Oxford).

Damon, C. (1995) 'Narrative and Mimesis in the *Idylls* of Theocritus' *QUCC* 51: 101-123.

Danek, G. (1998) *Epos und Zitat: Studien zu den Quellen der* Odyssee (Vienna).

Danek, G. (2002) 'Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality' in F. Montanari and P. Ascheri (eds.) *Omero tremila anni dopo* (Rome): 3–19.

Daniel, R., Maltomini, F. (1990-92) *Supplementum Magicum. Papyrologica Coloniensia* 16 (Opladen).

Davies, M. (1988) 'Corinna's Date Revisited' *SIFC* Third Series 81: 186-194.

de Jong, I. J. F. (1985) '*Iliad* 1.366-392: A Mirror Story' *Arethusa* 18.1: 5-22.

de Jong, I. J. F. (1987) *Narrators and Focalizers: The Presentation of the Story in the* Iliad (Amsterdam).

de Jong, I. J. F. (1991) *Narrative in Drama: the Art of the Euripidean Messenger-Speech* (Leiden).

de Jong, I. J. F. (2001) *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey* (Cambridge).

de Jong, I. J. F. (2004a) 'Narratological Theory on Narrators, Narratees and Narrative' in de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie (2004): 1-10.

de Jong, I. J. F. (2004b) 'Homer' in de Jong, Nünlist and Bowie (2004): 13-24.

de Jong, I. J. F. (2006) 'The Homeric narrator and his own *kleos*' *Mnemosyne* Fourth Series 59: 188-207.

de Jong, I. J. F. (2009) 'Metalepsis in Ancient Greek Literature' in Grethlein and Rengakos (2009): 87-115.

de Jong, I. J. F., and Nünlist, R. (eds.) (2007) *Time in Ancient Greek Literature* (Leiden).

de Jong, I. J. F., Nünlist, R. and Bowie, A. (eds.) (2004) *Narrators, Narratees, and Narratives in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative. Volume One. Mnemosyne* Supplement 257 (Leiden).

Depew, M. (1992) 'ἰαμβεῖον καλεῖται νῦν· Genre, Occasion and Imitation in Callimachus, frr. 191 and 203 Pf.' *TAPA* 122: 313-30.

Derderian, K. (2001) *Leaving Words to Remember: Greek Mourning and the Advent of Literacy* (Leiden).

Di Gregorio, L. (1975) *Scholia Vetera in Hesiodi Theogoniam* (Milan).

Dickey, E. (2007) *Ancient Greek Scholarship* (Oxford).

Dindorf, W. (ed.) (1855) *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam* 2 volumes (Oxford).

Doherty, L. E. (1995a) *Siren Songs: Gender, Audiences and Narrators in the Odyssey* (Ann Arbor, Mich.).

Doherty, L. E. (1995b) 'Sirens, Muses and Female Narrators in the *Odyssey*' in B. Cohen (ed.) *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey* (Oxford): 81-92.

Dornseiff, F. (1933) *Die archaische Mythenerzählung: Folgerungen aus dem homerischen Apollonhymnos* (Berlin).

Dover, K. J. (1992 [1971]) *Theocritus: Select Poems* (Bristol).

Drachmann, A. B. (1903-1927) *Scholia Vetera in Pindari Carmina* 3 Volumes (Leipzig).

Dué, C. (2002) *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis* (Lanham, Md.).

Dué, C. (2006) *The Captive Woman's Lament in Greek Tragedy* (Austin, Texas).

Duke, T. T. (1950) 'Vergil: A bit player in the *Aeneid*?' *CJ* 45: 191-193.

Dunbar, N. (1995) *Aristophanes:* Birds (Oxford).

Easterling, P. E. (1991) 'Men's κλέος and women's γόος: Female voices in the *Iliad*' *JMGS* 9.2: 145-51.

Ebert, J. (1978) 'Zu Korinnas Gedicht vom Wettstreit zwischen Helikon und Kithairon' *ZPE* 30: 5-12.

Edinger, H. G. (1980) 'The Lay of Demodocus in Context' *The Humanities Association Review* 31: 45-52.

Edmunds, L., and Wallace, R. W. (eds.) (1997) *Poet, public and performance in ancient Greece* (Baltimore).

Edwards, M. W. (1975) 'Type-Scenes and Homeric Hospitality' *TAPA* 105: 51-72.

Edwards, M. W. (1987) *Homer, poet of the* Iliad (Baltimore).

Edwards, M. W. (1991) *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume V: Books 17-20.* (Cambridge).

Effe, B. (1978) 'Die Destruktion der Tradition: Theokrits mythologische Gedichte' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 121: 48-77.

Fantuzzi, M., and Hunter, R. (2004) *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).

Fantuzzi, M. (1995) 'Mythological Paradigms in Theocritus' *PCPS* 41: 16-35.

Faraone, C. (1999) *Ancient Greek Love Magic* (Cambridge, Mass., London).

Faraone, C. (2002) 'A drink from the Daughters of Mnemosyne: Poetry, Eschatology and Memory at the end of Pindar's Isthmian 6' in J. F. Miller, C. Damon, and K. S. Myers (eds.) *Vertis in Usum: Studies in honor of Edward Courteney* (Leipzig): 259-270.

Faraone, C. and Obbink, D. (1991) *Magika Hiera: Ancient Greek Magic and Religion* (Oxford).

Farnell, L. R. (1930) *The Works of Pindar translated, with Literary and Critical Commentaries. Volume 1: Translation in rhythmical prose with Literary comments* (London).

Farnell, L. R. (1932) *The Works of Pindar translated, with Literary and Critical Commentaries. Volume 2: critical commentary* (London).

Faulkner, A. (2008) *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite* (Oxford).

Faulkner, A. (2011) 'Introduction' in *id.* (ed.) *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford): 1–25.

Fearn, D. (2007) *Bacchylides* (Oxford).

Feeney, D. C. (1991) *The gods in epic. Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition* (Oxford).

Fenik, B. (1968) *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad* (Wiesbaden).

Fennell, C. A. M. (1893) *Pindar, The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (Cambridge).

Fennell, C. A. M. (1899) *Pindar, The Nemean and Isthmian Odes* (Cambridge).

Fera, M. C. (ed.) (1990) *Pindarus, Threnorum Fragmenta* (Rome).

Fera, M. C. (2000) 'Il canto delle Muse e il canto del poeta' in Fera and Grandolini (2000): 141-147.

Fera, M. C., and Grandolini, S. (eds.) (2000) *Poesia e Religione in Grecia: Studi in onore di G. Aurelio Privitera* (Puglia).

Finkelberg, M. (1987) 'The First Song of Demodokos' *Mnemosyne* Fourth Series 40: 128-32.

Finkelberg, M. (1990) 'A Creative Oral Poet and the Muse' *AJP* 111: 293-303.

Finkelberg, M. (1998) *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece* (Oxford).

Finley, J. (1955) *Pindar and Aeschylus* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Finnegan, R. (1977) *Oral Poetry* (Cambridge).

Fludernik, M. (1993) *The Fictions of Language and the Languages of Fiction* (London, New York).

Fogelmark, S. (1979) 'καὶ κείνοις: Pindar, *Nemean* 5.22' in G. W. Bowerstock, W. Burkert and M. C. Putnam (eds.) *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard W. M. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday* (Berlin, New York): 71-80.

Foley, J. M. (1988) *The Theory of Oral Composition* (Bloomington, Ind.).

Foley, J. M. (1991) *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic* (Bloomington, Ind.).

Foley, J. M. (1999) *Homer's Traditional Art* (Philadelphia, Penn.).

Foley, J. M. (2002) 'Editing and Translating Traditional Oral Epic' in I. Worthington and J. M. Foley (eds.) *Epea and Grammata: Oral and Written Communication in Ancient Greece* (Leiden): 3-28.

Ford, A. (1992) *Homer. The Poetry of the Past* (Ithaca, NY).

Forderer, M. (1971) *Anfang und Ende der abendländische Lyrik: Unterschungen zum homerischen Apollonhymnus und zu Anise Koltz. (*Amsterdam).

Fowler, R. (2004a) 'The Homeric question' in *id.* (ed.) *The Cambridge Companion to Homer* (Cambridge): 220-232.

Fraccaroli, G. (1914) *Pindaro* (Milan).

Fraenkel, E. (1959) 'Zum Text der Vögel des Aristophanes' in H. Dahlmann and R. Merkelbach (eds.) *Studien zur Textgeschichte und Textkritik* (Cologne): 9-30.

Fränkel, H. (1962) *Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums* (Munich).

Fränkel, H. (1968) *Noten zu den Argonautika des Apollonios* (Munich).

Fränkel, H. (1970 [1961]) *Apollonii Rhodii Argonautica.* (Oxford).

Friedländer, P. (1914) 'Das Proömium von Hesiods *Theogonie' Hermes* 49 1-16.

Friedländer, P. (1931) 'Vorklassich und Nachklassich' in W. Jaeger (ed.) *Das Problem des Klassischen und die Antike* (Leipzig, Berlin): 33-46.

Friel, B. (1981) *Translations* (London).

Fröhder, D. (1994) *Die dichterische Form der Homerischen Hymnen* (Hildesheim).

Frontisi-Ducroux, F. (1986) *La Cithare d'Achille: Essai sur la poetique de l'Iliade* (Rome).

Fry, D. K. (1968) 'Old English Formulaic Themes and Type-Scenes' *Neophilologus* 52: 48-54.

Furley, W. D. (2011) 'Homeric and Un-Homeric Hexameter Hymns' in A. Faulkner (ed.) *The Homeric Hymns: Interpretative Essays* (Oxford): 206–31.

Furley, W. D., and Bremer, J. M. (2001) *Greek Hymns Volume I: The Texts in Translation*, (Tübingen).

Fusillo, M. (1985) *Il tempo delle Argonautiche. Un' analisi del racconto in Apollonio Rodio* (Rome).

Gager, J. G. (1992) *Curse Tablets and Binding Spells from the Ancient World* (New York, Oxford).

Galiano, M. F. (1942) 'Psaumis en Las Olímpicas de Píndaro' *Emerita* 10: 112-48.

Garcia, J. F. (2002) 'Symbolic Action in the Homeric Hymns: The Theme of Recognition' *CA* 21: 5-39.

Gärtner, H. A. (1978) 'Die Siegeslieder Pindars für die Söhne des Lampon' *Würzburger Jharbucher für die Altertumswissenschaft* 4: 27-46.

Garvie, A. F. (1994) *Homer* Odyssey *VI-VIII* (Cambridge).

Garzya, A. (ed.) (1983) *Euripides:* Alcestis (Leipzig).

Gemoll, A. (1886) *Die homerischen Hymnen* (Stuttgart).

Genette, G. (1972) *Figures III* (Paris).

Genette, G. (1980) *Narrative Discourse* English edition, translated by J. E. Lewin (Ithaca, NY).

Genette, G. (1983) *Nouveau discours du récit* (Paris).

Genette, G. (1988) *Narrative Discourse Revisited* English edition, translated by J. E. Lewin (Ithaca, NY).

Gerber, D. E. (1994) 'Greek Lyric Poetry Since 1920' *Lustrum* 36: 152-62.

Gerber, D. E. (1982) '*Bacchylides* 17.124-29' *ZPE* 49: 3-5.

Gerber, D. E. (2002) 'A Commentary on Pindar *Olympian* Nine' *Hermes Einzelschriften* 87 (Stuttgart).

Germany, R. (2005) 'The figure of Echo in the *Homeric Hymn to Pan*' *AJP* 126: 187-208.

Gianotti, G. F. (1975) *Per una poetica Pindarica* (Turin).

Gildersleeve, B. L. (1885) *Pindar: The Olympian and Pythian Odes* (New York).

Goldhill, S. (1986) 'Framing and Polyphony: Readings in Hellenistic Poetry' *PCPS* 212: 25-52.

Goldhill, S. (1991) *The Poet's Voice: essays on Poetics and Greek literature* (Cambridge).

Goldhill, S. (2000) 'Civic Ideology and the Problem of Difference: The Politics of Aeschylean Tragedy, Once Again' *JHS* 120: 34-56.

Görgemanns, H. (1976) 'Rhetorik und Poetik im homerischen *Hermeshymnus*' in H. Görgemanns and E. A. Schmidt (eds.) *Studien zum antiken Epos* (Meisenheim am Glan): 113-128.

Gould, J. (2001) *Myth, Ritual, Memory and Exchange* (Oxford).

Gow, A. S. F. (1952) *Theocritus* Second Edition (Cambridge).

Goward, B. (1999) *Telling Tragedy. Narrative Technique in Aeschylus, Sophocles and Euripides* (London).

Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic* (Cambridge).

Graziosi, B., and Haubold, J. (2005) *Homer: The Resonance of Epic* (London).

Graziosi, B., and Haubold, J. (2010) *Homer Iliad VI* (Cambridge).

Green, P. (1997) *The Argonautika by Apollonios Rhodios* (Berkeley, Calif.).

Gregory, A. (2008) *Ancient Greek Cosmogony* (Bristol).

Grethlein, J., and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2009) *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature* (Berlin and New York).

Griffin, J. (1980) *Homer on life and death* (Oxford).

Griffin, J. (1987) *Homer: The Odyssey* (Cambridge)

Griffiths, F. (1979) *Theocritus at Court* (Leiden).

Gunn, D. M. (1970) 'Narrative inconsistency and the oral dictated text in the Homeric epic' *AJP* 91: 192-203.

Gutzwiller, K. (1991) *Theocritus' Pastoral Analogies, the formation of a genre* (Madison).

Gutzwiller, K. (1992) 'Callimachus' Lock of Berenice: Fantasy, Romance and Propaganda' *AJP* 113: 359-385.

Gutzwiller, K. (2007) *A guide to Hellenistic Literature* (Blackwell).

Haft, A. (1996) 'The Mercurial Significance of Raiding: Baby Hermes and Animal Theft in Contemporary Crete.' *Arion* Third Series 4.2: 27-48.

Hägg, T. (1989) 'Hermes and the invention of the lyre: an unorthodox version' *SO* 64: 36-73.

Hainsworth, J. B. (1969) *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford).

Hainsworth, J. B. (1988) in Heubeck, Hainsworth and West (1988).

Hainsworth, J. B. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume III: Books 9-12* (Cambridge).

Halleran, D. (1995) *Euripides* Hippolytus (Warminster).

Hamilton, R. (1972) 'Olympian Five: A Reconsideration' *AJP* 93: 324-329.

Hamilton, R. (1989) *The Architecture of Hesiodic Poetry* (Baltimore).

Hansen, O. (1989) 'The meaning of Corinna's ϝεροῖα reconsidered' *HSF* 102: 70-71.

Harden, S. J., and Kelly, A. (forthcoming) 'Proemic Convention and Character Construction in Early Greek Epic' in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*.

Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (eds.) (1996) *Theocritus. Hellenistica Groningana* 2 (Groningen).

Harder, M. A., Regtuit, R. F., and Wakker, G. C. (2000) (eds.) *Apollonius Rhodius* (Leuven).

Hardie, P. (1986) *Virgil's* Aeneid*: Cosmos and Imperium* (Oxford).

Hardie, P. (1993) *The Epic Successors of Virgil* (Cambridge).

Harrell, S. E. (1991) 'Apollo's fraternal threats: language of succession and domination in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*' *GRBS* 32: 307-329.

Henderson, W. J. (1995) 'Corinna of Tanagra on Poetry' *Acta Classica* 38: 29-41.

Henry, W. B. (2005) *Pindar's Nemeans: A Selection* (Leipzig).

Hentze, C. (1905) 'Die Chorreden in den Homerischen Epen' *Philologus* 64: 254-268.

Herington, J. (1985) *Poetry into Drama* (Berkeley, Calif.).

Heubeck, A., Hainsworth, J. B., and West, S. (eds.) (1988) *A Commentary on Homer's* Odyssey (Oxford).

Holtsmark, E. (1966) 'Poetry as Self-Enlightenment: Theocritus 11' *TAPA* 97: 253-59.

Hubbard, T. K. (1985) *The Pindaric Mind: A Study of Logical Structure in Early Greek Poetry* (Leiden).

Hunter, R. (1986) 'Apollo and the Argonauts: Two notes on Ap. Rhod. 2.669-719' *MH* 43: 50-60.

Hunter, R. (1993) *The* Argonautica *of Apollonius: Literary Studies* (Cambridge).

Hunter, R. (1996a) *Theocritus and the Archaeology of Greek Poetry* (Cambridge).

Hunter, R. (1996b) 'Mime and Mimesis: Theocritus *Idyll* 15' in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1996): 149-169.

Hunter, R. (1999) *Theocritus: A Selection* (Cambridge).

Hunter, R. (2001) 'The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*' in T. D. Papanghelis and A. Rengakos (eds.) *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden): 93-125.

Hunter, R. (2004a) 'Theocritus and Moschus' in de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie (2004): 83-97.

Hunter, R. (2004b) *Plato's Symposium* (Oxford).

Hunter, R. (2008) 'The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*' in Papanghelis and Rengakos (2008): 115-146.

Hurst, A. (1967) *Apollonios de Rhodes: Manière et Cohérence* (Rome).

Hutchinson, G. O. (1988) *Hellenistic Poetry* (Oxford).

Hutchinson, G. O. (2001) *Greek Lyric Poetry* (Oxford).

Huxley, G. (1975) *Pindar's Vision of the Past* (Belfast).

Jaillard, D. (2007) *Configurations d'Hermès. Une 'théogonie hermaïque*' (Liège).

Janko, R. (1979) 'βώσεσθε revisited' *CQ* 29: 215-6.

Janko, R. (1981) 'The structure of the Homeric Hymns: a study in genre' *Hermes* 109: 9–24.

Janko, R. (1982) *Homer, Hesiod and the Hymns* (Cambridge).

Jebb, R. C. (1905) *Bacchylides: The Poems and Fragments* (Cambridge).

Johnson, W. A. (2008) 'Hesiod's *Theogony*: Reading the Poem as a Priamel' *GRBS* 43: 231-5.

Jurenka, H. (1895) 'Psaumidea' *WS* 17: 16-18.

Kaibel. G. (1892) 'Theokrits ΕΛΕΝΗΣ ΕΠΙΘΑΛΑΜΙΟΝ' *Hermes* 27: 249-259.

Kaimio, M. (1974) 'Music in Homeric Hymn to Hermes' *Arctos* 8: 29-42.

Karanika, A. (2010) 'Inside Orpheus' Songs: Orpheus as an Argonaut in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*' *GRBS* 50: 391-410.

Kelly, A. (2007) *A Referential Commentary and Lexicon to Homer Iliad VIII* (Oxford).

Kelly, A. (2008) 'Performance and rivalry: Homer, Odysseus and Hesiod' in Revermann and Wilson (2008): 177–203.

Kelly, A. (2012) 'The Mourning of Thetis: 'Allusion' and Future in the *Iliad* in F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.) *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry* (Berlin): 211-256.

Kenyon, F. G. (1897) *The Poems of Bacchylides* (Oxford).

Kirk, G. S. (1960) 'The Structure and Aim of the *Theogony*' in K. von Fritz (ed.) *Hésiode et son Influence. Entretiens Hardt* 7 (Vandoeuvres): 61-107.

Kirk, G. S. (1981) 'Orality and Structure in the Homeric 'Hymn to Apollo'' in C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, and C. O. Pavese (eds.) *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale* (Padua): 163-82.

Kirk, G. S. (1985) *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume I: Books 1-4* (Cambridge).

Kirkwood, G. (1982) *Selections from Pindar* (Chico, Calif.).

Kirkwood, G. M. (1974) *Early Greek Monody*: *The History of a Poetic Type* (Ithaca, NY).

Klein, T. M. (1980) 'Myth, song and theft in the Homeric hymn to Hermes' in W. Aycock and T. M. Klein (eds.) (1980) *Classical Mythology in 20th century Thought and Literature* (Lubbock, Tex.): 125-144.

Klinck, A. L. (2008) *Woman's Songs in Ancient Greece* (Montreal).

Klooster, J. (2011*) Poetry as window and mirror: positioning the poet in Hellenistic poetry* (Leiden).

Köhnken, A. 'Theokrits Polyphemgedicte' in Harder, Regtuit, and Wakker (1996): 171-186.

Kolde, A., Lukinovich A, and Rey, A. L. (eds.) (2005) *Κορυφαίῳ ἀνδρί. Mélanges offerts à André Hurst* (Geneva).

Koller, H. (1956) 'Das kitharoidische Prooimion. Eine formgeschichtliche Untersuchung' *Philologus* 100: 159-206.

Konstan, D. (1979) 'A Note on Theocritus *Idyll* 18' *CP* 74: 233-234.

Kowalzig, B. (2007) *Singing for the Gods: performances of myth and ritual in archaic and classical Greece* (Oxford).

Kozloff, S. (1988) *Invisible Storytellers: Voice-Over Narration in the American Fiction Film* (Berkeley, Calif.).

Kuiper, K. (1921) 'De Theocriti Carmine XVIII' *Mnemosyne* First Series 49: 223-242.

Kullmann, W. (1956) *Das Wirken der Götter in der Ilias* (Berlin).

Kurke, Leslie (1991) *The Traffic in Praise: Pindar and the Poetics of Social Economy* (Ithaca, NY).

Kyriakou, P. (1994) 'Empedoclean Echoes in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica' Hermes* 122: 309-319.

Kyriakou, P. (1995) *Homeric* hapax legomena *in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius* (Stuttgart).

Lachenaud, G. (2010) *Scholies à Apollonios de Rhodes (*Paris).

Laird, A. (1999) *Powers of Expression, Expressions of Power: Speech Presentation and Latin Literature* (Oxford).

Lanata, G. (1963) *Poetica Pre-Platonica* (Florence).

Larmour, D. H. J. (2005) 'Corinna's Poetic *Metis* and the Epinikian Tradition' in E. Greene (ed.) *Women Poets in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Oklahoma): 25-58.

Larson, J. (1995) 'The Corycian nymphs and the bee maidens of the Homeric Hymn to Hermes' GRBS 36: 341-357.

Larson, J. (2001) *Greek Nymphs: Myth, Cult, Lore.* (Oxford).

Larson, J. (2002) 'Corinna and the daughters of Asopus' *SyllClass* 13: 47-62.

Lasso de la Vega, J. S. (1960) 'Notulae' *Emerita* 28: 125-45.

Latacz, J. et al. (2000) *Homers Ilias Gesamtkommentar: Band I: Erster Gesang* (Munich).

Lawall, G. (1967) *Theocritus' Coan Pastorals, a poetry book* (Washington).

Lefkowitz, M. R. (1991) *First Person Fictions: Pindar's Poetic 'I'* (Oxford).

Lefkowitz, M. R. (1995) 'The First Person in Pindar – Again' *BICS* 40: 139-50.

Lenz, A. (1979) *Das Proöm des frühen griechischen Epos* (Bonn).

Lesky, A. (1937) 'Motifkontamination' *WS* 55: 21-31.

Létoublon, F. (1983) 'Le *miroir* et la *boucle*,' *Poétique* 53: 19-36.

Levin, D. N. (1971) *Apollonius'* Argonautica *Re-Examined* (Leiden).

Lloyd-Jones, H. (ed.) (1996) *Sophocles, Volume 3: fragments* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Lobel, E. (1930) 'Corinna' *Hermes* 65: 356-65.

Lohmann, D. (1988) *Die Andromache-Szenen der Ilias* (Hildesheim).

Lonsdale, S. H. (1992) *Dance and Ritual Play in Greek Religion* (Baltimore).

Lord, A. B. (1953) 'Homer's Originality: Oral Dictated Texts' *TAPA* 84: 124-34.

Lord, A. B. (1960) *The Singer of Tales* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Lord, A. B. (1968) *Homer as Oral Poet* (Cambridge Mass.).

Mackay, E. A. (2001) 'The Frontal Face and "You": Narrative Disjunction in Early Greek Pottery and Painting' *AC* 44: 5-34.

Mackie, H. (1997) 'Song and Storytelling: An Odyssean Perspective' *TAPA* 127: 77-95.

MacLachlan, B. C. (1997) 'Personal Poetry' in D. E. Gerber (ed.) *A Companion to the Greek Lyric Poets* (Leiden): 133-221.

Macleod, C. (1983) 'Homer on Poetry and the Poetry of Homer' in *id. Collected Essays* (Oxford) 1-15.

Macleod, C. W. (1982) *Homer Iliad XXIV* (Cambridge).

Mader, W. (1990) *Die Psaumis-Oden Pindars (O.4 und O.5): ein Kommentar* (Innsbruck).

Maehler, H. (1963) *Die Auffasung des Dichterberufs im frühen Griechentum bis zur Zeit Pindars* (Göttingen).

Maehler, H. (1982) *Die Lieder des Bakchylides Vol.1 Die Siegeslieder. Mnemosyne* Supplement 62 (Leiden).

Maehler, H. (1997) *Die Lieder des Bakchylides Vol. 2 Die Dithyramben und Fragmente. Mnemosyne* Supplement 167 (Leiden).

Maehler, H. (2004) *Bacchylides: A selection* (Cambridge).

Marg, W. (1956) 'Das erste Lied des Demodokos' *Navicula Chiloniensis* (Leiden): 16-29.

Marg, W. (1957) *Homer über die Dichtung. Der Schild des Achilles* (Münster).

Margolies DeForest, M. (1994) *Apollonius' Argonautica: A Callimachean Epic* (Leiden).

Markantonatos, A. (2002) *Tragic Narrative: A Narratological Study of Sophocles' Oedipus at Colonus* (Berlin, New York).

Martin, R. (1992) 'Hesiod's Metanastic Poetics' in A. Athanakassis (ed.) *Essays on Hesiod I. Ramus* 21: 11-33.

Martin, R. P. (1984) 'Hesiod, Odysseus and the Instruction of Princes' *TAPA* 114: 29-48.

Martin, R. P. (1989) *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad* (Ithaca, NY).

Marx, F. (1907) 'Der blinde Sänger von Chios und die delischen Mädchen' *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 62: 619-20.

Mastronarde, D. (ed.) (2002) *Euripides: Medea* (Cambridge).

Mattes, W. (1958) *Odysseus bei den Phäaken. Kritisches zur Homeranalyse* (Würzburg).

McHale, B. (1978) 'Free Indirect Discourse: A Survey of Recent Accounts' *Poetics and Theory of Literature* 3: 249-287.

Michon, S. (2005) 'Une Lecture de l'Épithalme d'Hélène de Théocrite' in Kolde, Lukinovich and Rey (2005): 213-221.

Miller, A. M. (1979) 'The 'Address to the Delian Maidens' in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*: Epilogue or Transition?' *TAPA* 109: 173-186.

Miller, A. M. (1986) *From Delos to Delphi* (Leiden).

Minchin, E. (1995) 'The Poet Appeals to his Muse: Homeric Invocations in the Context of Epic Performance' *CJ* 91: 25-33.

Minton, W. (1960) 'Homer's Invocation of the Muses: Traditional Patterns' *TAPA* 91: 292-30.

Minton, W. (1970) 'The Proem-Hymn of Hesiod's *Theogony*' *TAPA* 101: 357-77.

Montanari, F., Rengakos, A., and Tsagalis, C. (2009) *Brill's Companion to Hesiod* (Leiden).

Morrison, A. D. (2007a) *Reperformances and Audiences in Pindar's Sicilian Victory Odes. BICS* Supplement 95 (London).

Morrison, A. D. (2007b) *The Narrator in Archaic Greek and Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).

Most, G. (1986) 'Pindar O.2.83-90' *CQ* 36: 304-316.

Most, G. (2006) *Hesiod: Theogony, Works and Days, Testimonia* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Murray, O. (2008) 'The Odyssey as Performance Poetry' in Revermann and Wilson (2008): 161-176.

Murray, P. (1981) 'Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece' *JHS* 101: 87-100.

Murray, P., and Wilson, P. (eds.) (2004) *Music and the Muses: The Culture of Mousike in the Classical Athenian City* (Oxford).

Nachmanson, E. (1910) 'Zu den neugefundenen Gedichten der Korinna' *Glotta* 2: 131–46.

Nagy, G. (1979) *The Best of the Achaeans* (Baltimore).

Nagy, G. (1990) *Greek Mythology and Poetics* (Ithaca, NY).

Nagy, G. (1996) *Poetry as Performance* (Cambridge).

Nelis, D. P. (1992) 'Demodocus and the Song of Orpheus' *MH* 49: 153-170.

Nelles, W. (1997) *Frameworks. Narrative levels and Embedded Narrative* (New York).

Nelson, S. (1997) 'The Justice of Zeus in Hesiod's Fable of the Hawk and the Nightingale' *CJ* 92: 235-247.

Neville, B. (1992) 'The Charm of Hermes: Hillman, Lyotard and the Postmodern Condition' *The Journal of Analytical Psychology* 37: 337-353.

Newton, R. M. (1987) 'Odysseus and Hephaestus in the *Odyssey*' *CJ* 83: 12-20.

Nilsson, M. P. (1906) *Griechishe Feste der religiöser Bedeutung* (Leipzig).

Nisetich, F. J. (1980) *Pindar's Victory Songs* (Baltimore and London).

Norden, E. (1923) *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede* (Leipzig).

Norwood, G. (1945) *Pindar* (California).

Notopoulos, J. A. (1962) 'The Homeric Hymns as Oral Poetry: a study of the post-Homeric oral tradition' *AJP* 83: 337-68.

Nünlist, R. (2004) 'The Homeric Hymns' in de Jong, Nünlist, and Bowie (2004): 35-42.

Nünlist, R. (2009) *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia* (Cambridge).

Obbink, D. (2001) 'The Genre of Plataea' in Boedeker and Sider (2001): 65-85.

Olson, S. D. (1989) '*Odyssey* 8: Guile, Force and the Subversive Poetics of Desire' *Arethusa* 22: 135-45.

Olson, S. D. (1995) *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey* (Leiden).

Page, D. (1953) *Corinna* (London).

Page, D. (1957) 'A Note on Corinna' *CQ*: 109–12.

Palumbo-Stracca, B. M. (1993) 'Corinna e il suo pubblico' in R. Pretagostini (ed.) *Tradizione e innovazione nella cultura greca da Omero all'età ellenistica. Scritti in onore di Bruno Gentili I* (Rome): 403-412.

Pantelia, M. (2002) 'Helen and the Last Song for Hector' *TAPA* 132: 21-27.

Papanghelis, T. D., and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2008) *Brill's Companion to Apollonius Rhodius* (Leiden).

Parker, R. (1996) *Athenian Religion: A History* (Oxford).

Parry, A. (1971) *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford).

Parry, H. (1992) *Thelxis: Magic and Imagination in Greek Myth and Poetry* (Lanham, New York, London).

Parry, M. (1936) 'Review of *Die typischen Szenen bei Homer*' *CP* 31: 357-60.

Pease, A. S. (1935) (ed.) *Publi Vergili Maronis:* Aeneidos *Liber Quartus* (Cambridge).

Pedrick, V. (1992) 'The Muse Corrects: the opening of the *Odyssey*' in F. M. Dunn and T. Cole (eds.) *Beginnings in Classical Literature. Yale Classical Studies* XXIX (Cambridge): 39–61.

Peponi, A. E. (2009) '*Choreia* and aesthetics in the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*: the performance of the Delian maidens' *CA* 28.1: 39-40.

Petropoulos, J. (2003) *Eroticism in Ancient Greek and Medieval Poetry* (Bristol).

Pfeiffer, R. (1949-1953) *Callimachus: Fragmenta, Hymni et Epigrammata* 2 Volumes (Oxford).

Pfeijffer, I. L. (1995) 'The Date of Pindar's fifth Nemean and Bacchylides' thirteenth ode' *CQ* 45: 318-332.

Pfeijffer, I. L. (1999) *Three Aigenetan Odes of Pindar. A commentary on* Nemean *V,* Nemean *III, and* Pythian *VIII* (Leiden, Boston and Cologne).

Pfeijffer, I. L. (2004) 'Pindar and Bacchylides' in de Jong, Nünlist and Bowie (2004): 213-232.

Pfeijffer, I. L. and Slings, S. R. (1999) *One hundred years of Bacchylides* (Amsterdam).

Pietsch, C. (1999) 'Weltdeutung im Orpheusgesang: zur Bedeutung von Apollonios Rhodios, *Arg.* 1.496-511' *Gymnasium* 106: 521-539.

Powell, J. U. (1914) 'A Fragment of Corinna' *JPh* 33: 296–7.

Power, T. (2000) 'The Parthenoi of Bacchylides 13' *HSCP* 100: 67-81.

Preisendanz, K., and Henrichs, A. (1974) *Papyri Graecae Magicae* 2 volumes (Stuttgart).

Prince, G. (1982) *Narratology: The Form and Functioning of Narrative* (Berlin, New York, Amsterdam).

Pucci, P. (1977) *Hesiod and the Language of Poetry* (Baltimore).

Pucci, P. (1979) 'The Song of the Sirens' *Arethusa* 12: 121-132.

Pucci, P. (1987) *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad* (Ithaca, NY).

Pucci, P. (1998) *The Song of the Sirens* (Lanham, Md.).

Pucci, P. (2009) 'The Poetry of the *Theogony*' in Montanari, Rengakos and Tsagalis (2009): 37–70.

Pulleyn, S. (1997) *Prayer in Greek Religion* (Oxford).

Pulleyn, S. (2000) *Homer Iliad 1* (Oxford).

Race, W. H. (1982) 'Aspects of Rhetoric and Form in Greek Hymns' *GRBS* 23: 5-14.

Race, W. H. (1992) 'How Greek Poems Begin' in F. M. Dunn and T. Cole (eds.) *Beginnings in Classical Literature. Yale Classical Studies* XXIX (Cambridge): 13–38.

Race, W. H. (1997) *Pindar: Nemean Odes, Isthmian Odes, Fragments* (Cambridge, Mass.).

Radermacher, L. (1931) *Der homerische Hermeshymnus* (Vienna , Leipzig).

Rayor, D. J. (1993) 'Korinna: Gender and the Narrative Tradition' *Arethusa* 26: 219-31.

Redfield, J. M. (1975) *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector* (Chicago, London).

Rengakos, A. (2009) 'Hesiod's Narrative' in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (eds.) (2009): 203-218.

Revermann, M. (1998) 'The Text of *Iliad* 18.603-6 and the Presence of an ἀοιδός on the shield of Achilles' *CQ* 48: 29-38.

Revermann, M. and Wilson, P. (eds.) (2008) *Performance, Iconography, Reception. Studies in Honour of Oliver Taplin* (Oxford).

Richardson, N. J. (1974) *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford).

Richardson, N. J. (1993) *The Iliad: A commentary. Volume VI: books 21-24* (Cambridge).

Richardson, N. J. (2007) 'The Homeric Hymn to Hermes' in P. J. Finglass, C. Collard, and N. J. Richardson (eds.) *Hesperos: Studies in ancient Greek poetry presented to M. L. West on his seventieth birthday* (Oxford): 83-91.

Richardson, N. J. (2010) *Three Homeric Hymns: To Apollo, Hermes and Aphrodite* (Cambridge).

Richardson, S. (1990) *The Homeric Narrator* (Nashville).

Rijksbaron, A. (2006) *The Syntax and Semantics of the Verb in Classical Greek* Third edition (Chicago).

Rinon, Y. (2008) *Homer and the Dual Model of the Tragic* (Michigan).

Ritook, Z. (1989) 'The views of early Greek epic on poetry and art' *Mnemosyne* Fourth Series 42: 331-348.

Robbins, E. I. (1987) 'Nereids with Golden Distaffs: Pindar, *Nem.* 5' *QUCC*, NS 25: 25-33.

Rudhardt. J. (1996) 'Le Préambule de la *Théogonie*' in F. Blaise and P. Judet (eds.) *Le Métier du Mythe* (Lille): 25-39.

Ruffy, M. V. (2004) *La Fabrique Divin: Les Hymnes de. Callimaque à la lumière des Hymnes homériques et des Hymnes épigraphiques. Kernos* Supplement 14 (Liège).

Rüter, K. (1969) *Odysseeinterpretationen: Untersuchungen zum ersten Buch und zur Phaiakis* (Göttingen).

Rutherford, I. A. (2001) *Pindar's Paeans: A Reading of the Fragments with a Survey of the Genre* (Oxford).

Rutherford, R. B. (1986) 'The Philosophy of the *Odyssey*' *JHS* 106: 145-62.

Rutherford, R. B. (1992) *Homer, Odyssey XIX-XX* (Cambridge).

Rutherford, R. B. (2007) ''Why should I mention Io?' Aspects of Choral Narration in Greek Tragedy' *PCPS* 53: 1-39.

Sale, W. (1961) 'The Hyperborean Maidens on Delos' *HThR* 54: 75-89.

Satterfield, B. (2011) 'The Beginning of the *Iliad*: the 'Contradictions' of the Proem and the Burial of Hector' *Mnemosyne* Fourth Series 64: 1–20.

Schachter, A. (2005) 'The singing-contest of Kithairon and Helikon: Kor. fr. 654 PMG Col.i and ii, 1-11: Content and Context' in Kolde, Lukinovich and Rey (2005): 275-283.

Schadewaldt, W. (1959) *Von Homers Welt und Werk* (Stuttgart).

Scheinberg S. (1979) 'The bee maidens of the Homeric hymn to Hermes' *HSPh* 83: 1-28.

Scherer, B. (2002) *Mythos, Katalog und Prophezeiung. Studien zu den Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios* (Stuttgart).

Schlesier, R. (1982) 'Les Muses dans le prologue de la 'Théogonie' de Hésiode' *RHR* 199: 131-67.

Schuol, M. (2006) 'Sänger und Gesang im der *Odyssee*' in A. Luther (ed.) *Geschichte und Fiktion in der Odyssee* (Munich): 139-62.

Scodel, R. (1998) 'Bardic Performance and Oral Tradition in Homer' *AJP* 119: 171-94.

Scodel, R. (2001) 'Poetic Authority and Oral Tradition in Hesiod and Pindar' in J. Watson (ed.) *Speaking Volumes: Orality and Literacy in the Greek and Roman World* (Leiden): 109-137.

Seaford, R. (2000) 'The Social Function of Attic Tragedy: A Response to Jasper Griffin' *CQ* 50: 30-44.

Segal, C. (1975) 'Pebbles in golden urns. The date and style of Corinna' *Eranos* 73: 1-8.

Segal, C. (1981) *Poetry and Myth in Ancient Pastoral* (Princeton, NJ).

Segal, C. (1985) 'Messages to the Underworld: An aspect of poetic immortalization in Pindar' *AJP* 106: 199-212.

Segal, C. (1992) 'Bard and Audience in Homer' in R. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney (eds.) *Homer's Ancient Readers* (Princeton, NJ): 3-29.

Segal, C. (1994) *Singers, Heroes and Gods in the Odyssey* (Ithaca, NY).

Segal, C. (1998) *Aglaia: the poetry of Alcman, Sappho, Pindar, Bacchylides, and Corinna* (Lanham, Md.).

Segal, C. (1998a) 'Poetry, Performance, and Society in Early Greek Literature' in Segal (1998): 9-24.

Seidensticker, B. (1982) *Palintonos harmonia: Studien zu den komischen Elementen in der griechischen Tragödie* (Göttingen).

Shelmerdine, S. C. (1984) 'Hermes and the tortoise: a prelude to cult' *GRBS* 25: 201-7.

Shelmerdine, S. C. (1986) 'Odyssean allusions in the Fourth Homeric Hymn' *TAPhA* 116: 49-63.

Skinner, M. B. (1983) 'Corinna of Tanagra and her Audience' *Tulsa Studies in Women's Literature* 2.1: 9-20.

Slatkin, L. M. (1986) 'The Wrath of Thetis' *TAPA* 116: 1-24.

Slatkin, L. M. (1991) *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad* (Berkeley, Calif.).

Slings, S. R. (1999) 'Information Unit and Metrical Unit' in Pfeijffer and Slings (1999): 61-75.

Slings, S. R. (2002) 'Oral Strategies in the Language of Herodotus' in E. J. Bakker, I. J. F. de Jong, and H. van Wees (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Herodotus* (Leiden): 53-77

Snell, B. (1953) *The discovery of the mind: the Greek origins of European thought* English edition translated by Thomas G. Rosenmeyer (Oxford).

Snell, B. and Maehler, H. (1970) *Bacchylides carmina cum fragmentis* (Leipzig).

Snell, B. and Maehler, H. (1987) *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis Pindar* Volume 1 (Leipzig).

Snell, B. and Maehler, H. (1989) *Pindari Carmina cum fragmentis Pindar* Volume 2 (Leipzig).

Snyder, J. M. (1984) 'Korinna's 'Glorious Songs of Heroes' *Eranos* 82: 125-34.

Solmsen, F., Merkelbach, R. and West, M. L. (1983) *Hesiodi Theogonia; Opera et Dies; Scutum; Fragmenta Selecta* Second edition (Oxford).

Sowa, C. A. (1984) *Traditional Themes and the Homeric Hymns* (Chicago).

Spatafora, G. (1997) 'Esigenza fisiologica e funzione terapeutica del lament nei poemi omerici. Studio sul significato di κλαίω, γοάω, στένω, οἰμώζω-κωκύω, ὀδύρομαι' *AC* 66: 1-23.

Stehle, E. (1997) *Performance and Gender in Ancient Greece* (Princeton, NJ).

Stern, J. (1971) 'The Structure of Pindar's *Nemean* 5' *CP* 66: 169-173.

Stern, J. (1978) 'Theocritus' *Epithalamion to Helen*' *Revue Belge de Philologie et Histoire* 56: 29-37.

Stewart, A. (1998) 'Nuggets: mining the texts again' *AJA* 102: 271-282.

Stoddard, K. (2004) *The Narrative Voice in the Theogony of Hesiod* (Leiden).

Stoneman, R. (1981) 'Pindar and the Mythological Tradition' *Philologus* 125: 44-63.

Sturgess, P. J. M. (1992) *Narrativity: Theory and Practice* (Oxford).

Suerbaum, W. (1968) 'Die Ich-Erzählungen des Odysseus' *Poetica* 2: 150-77.

Swift, L. A. (2010) *The Hidden Chorus: Echoes of Genre in Tragic Lyric* (Oxford).

Taplin, O. P. (1990) 'The Earliest Quotation of the *Iliad*?' in E. M. Craik (ed.) '*Owls to Athens' Essays on Classical Subjects Presented to Sir Kenneth Dover* (Oxford): 109-112.

Taplin, O. P. (1992) *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad* (Oxford).

Thalmann, W. G. (1984) *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry* (Baltimore).

Thiel, K. (1993) *Erzählung und Beschriebung in den Argonautika des Apollonios Rhodios* (Stuttgart).

Thomas, O. (2011) 'The Homeric Hymn to Pan' in Faulkner (2011): 151-174.

Thomas, O. R. H. (2009) *A Commentary on the Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 184–396 (DPhil dissertation, Oxford).

Thomas, R. (1992) *Literacy and orality in ancient Greece* (Cambridge).

Thomas, R. (1995) 'The place of the poet in archaic society' in A. Powell (ed.) *The Greek World* (London): 104-129.

Thomas, R. (2007) 'Fame, Memorial and Choral Poetry: The Origins of Epinician - an Historical Study' in S. Hornblower and C. Morgan (eds.) *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons and Festivals* (Oxford): 141-166.

Thomas. R. (1992) *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece* (Cambridge).

Thornton, A. (1970) *People and Themes in Homer's Odyssey* (Dunedin).

Thummer, E. (1968) *Pindar: Die Isthmischen Gedichte* Band I. (Heidelberg).

Triviños, G. (1980) 'Los relatos de relatos' *Estudios Filológicos* 15: 145-78.

Tsagalis, C. (2004) *Epic Grief: Personal Laments in Homer's* Iliad (Berlin).

Tsagalis, C. (2005) 'Poet and Audience: from Homer to Hesiod' in F. Montanari and A. Rengakos (eds.) *La Poésie épique grecque: métamorphoses d' un genre littéraire* (Geneva): 79–130.

Tsagalis, C. (2009) 'Poetry and Poetics in the Hesiodic Corpus' in Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (2009): 131-178.

van der Weiden, M. J. H. (1991) *The Dithyrambs of Pindar: Introduction, Text and Commentary* (Amsterdam).

van Groningen, B. A. (1946) 'The Proems of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*' *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandsche Akademie van Wetenschappen*, Amsterdam: 279–94.

van Groningen, B. A. (1958) 'La Composition Littéraire Archaïque Grecque' *Med. Ned. Ak. Afd. Letterk.* NS 65.2 (Amsterdam).

van Nortwick, T. (1975) *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes. A Study in Early Greek Hexameter Style.* (PhD Dissertation, Stanford).

van Nortwick, T. (1980) 'ΑΠΟΛΛΟΝΟΣ ΑΠΑΤΗ. Associative imagery in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*' *CW* 74 : 1-5.

van Thiel, H. (1991) *Homeri Odyssea* (Hildesheim).

Vergados, A. (2007a) *The Homeric Hymn to Hermes* (PhD Dissertation, Virginia).

Vergados, A. (2007b) 'The *Homeric Hymn to Hermes* 51 and Antigonus of Carystus' *CQ* 57: 739-742.

Vergados, A. (2011) 'Shifting Focalization in the *Homeric Hymn to Hermes*: the Case of Hermes' Cave' *GRBS* 51: 1–25.

Vernant, J. P. (1965) *Mythe et Penseé chez les Grecs* Vols 1 & 2 (Paris).

Vian, F. and Delage, É. (1974) *Apollonios De Rhodes:* Argonautiques *Tome I: Chant I-II* (Paris).

Vian, F. and Delage, É. (1980) *Apollonios De Rhodes:* Argonautiques *Tome II: Chant III* (Paris).

Vian, F. and Delage, É. (1981) *Apollonios De Rhodes:* Argonautiques *Tome III: Chant IV* (Paris).

Vivante, P. (1971) *Korinna's Singing Mountains. Teiresias* Supplement 2, *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Boiotian Antiquites* (Montreal): 83-6.

Voigt, E. M. (1991) *Sappho et Alcaeus* (Amsterdam).

von der Muehll, P. (1962) *Homeri Odyssea* (Leipzig).

von Leutsch, E. (1846) 'Ist die fünfte olympische ode von Pindar?' *Philologus* 1: 116-127.

Walsh, G. (1984) *The Varieties of Enchantment* (Chapel Hill).

Walsh, T. (1995) '*Odyssey* 1.6–9: a little more than kine' *Mnemosyne* Fourth Series 48: 385-410.

Weiler, I. (1974) *Der Agon im Mythos* (Darmstadt).

Wendel, C. (1935) *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium Vetera* (Berlin).

West, D. (1995) *Horace Odes I* (Oxford).

West, M. L. (1966) *Hesiod: Theogony* (Oxford).

West, M. L. (1970) 'Corinna' *CQ* NS 20: 277-87.

West, M. L. (1971) *Early Greek Philosophy and the Orient* (Oxford).

West, M. L. (1974) *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus* (Berlin).

West, M. L. (1978) *Hesiod: Works and Days* (Oxford).

West, M. L. (1981) 'The Singing of Homer and the Modes of Early Greek Music' *JHS* 101: 113-29.

West, M. L. (1983) *The Orphic Poems* (Oxford).

West, M. L. (1990) 'Dating Corinna' *CQ* NS 40: 553-557.

West, M. L. (1996) 'The Berlin Corinna' *ZPE* 113: 22-3.

West, M. L. (1997) *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).

West, M. L. (1999–2001) *Homerus: Ilias* 2 vols. (Stuttgart).

West, M. L. (2003) *Homeric Hymns, Homeric Apocrypha, Lives of Homer.* (Cambridge, Mass.).

West, M. L. (2005) '*Odyssey* and *Argonautica*' *CQ* 55: 39–64.

West, M. L. (2007) *Indo-European Poetry and Myth* (Oxford).

West, M. L. (2011) *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary* (Oxford).

West, S. (1988) in Heubeck, Hainsworth and West (1988).

Whitmarsh, T. (2002) 'Written on the Body: Ekphrasis, Perception and Deception in Heliodorus' *Aethiopica*' *Ramus* 31.1-2: 111-125.

Wilamowitz, U. (1920) *Die* Ilias *von Homer* Second edition (Berlin).

Wilamowitz, U. (1922) *Pindaros* (Berlin).

Willcock, M. M. (1977) 'Ad Hoc Invention in the *Iliad*' *HSCP* 87: 41-53.

Willcock, M. M. (1978) *The Iliad of Homer: Books I–XII*, (London).

Willcock, M. M. (1997) 'Neoanalysis' in Morris and Powell (eds.): 174–89.

Williams, M. F. (1991) *Landscape in the* Argonautica *of Apollonius Rhodius* (Dissertation: Austin, Tex; Frankfurt).

Yossi, M. J. (1997) 'Corinna Fr. 654 PMG: Archaic or a Case for Metamorphosis' in J.-T. Papademetriou (ed.) *Acta: First Panhellenic and International Conference on Ancient Greek Literature* (Athens): 167-186.

Zanetto, G. (1996) *Inni Omerici* (Milan).