Classical Quarterly 57.2 341–350 (2007) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838807000432

MORE ON *ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ**

In an article published in this journal in 1986, I argued that the inner criteria of Homer's formulaic diction preclude identifying the Homeric κλέος ἄφθιτον, 'imperishable fame' (*Il.* 9.413), as a traditional formula and *a fortiori* as an inherited Indo-European expression on a par with the Vedic *śrávas . . . ákṣitam*.[1] In the subsequent years, this conclusion has been hotly disputed by adherents of the hypothesis of Indo-European provenance of the expression.[2] However, the main objective of my 1986 article was not so much to address the history of the expression but, rather, to draw attention to the fact that the looseness with which the term 'formula' is being used often has the result that certain things are taken for granted without having undergone a proper examination. This is why I called the article 'Is *ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ* a Homeric formula?' rather than, say, 'Is *ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ* an Indo-European formula?' This is also why I referred only in passing to the expression's post-Homeric occurrences. Meanwhile, the polemics that followed the publication have considerably broadened the scope of the discussion. Especially valuable has been the contribution of Calvert Watkins, who demanded that the Homeric κλέος ἄφθιτον should be taken not only synchronically but also diachronically.[3] By all standards this is a justified demand, which can only be met if we examine the expression in the context of the Greek epic tradition as a whole.

I. *ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ* IN HOMER

In my 1986 article I drew attention to the fact that the adjective ἄφθιτον of the phrase ὤλετο μέν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται, 'lost is my return, but my *kleos* will be imperishable', emerging in Achilles' great speech in *Iliad* 9, is used predicatively rather than attributively. This specific point, which since then has been widely accepted,[4] was recently disputed in a polemical note of Katharina Volk. Volk bases her argument on the premise that if one construes the verb ἔσται at *Il.* 9.413 as a *verbum existentiae* with a dative of possession rather than as the copula with a dative of interest, this will automatically provide the adjective ἄφθιτον with an attributive meaning equivalent to that rendered by the English phrase 'I will have imperishable

* I am deeply indebted to M. W. Edwards for his expert advice. I am also grateful to the anonymous reader of this journal for his penetrating remarks.

[1] M. Finkelberg, 'Is *ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ* a Homeric Formula?', *CQ* 36 (1986), 1–5.

[2] See esp. E. Risch, 'Die ältesten Zeugnisse für κλέος ἄφθιτον', *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 100 (1987), 3–11; A. Edwards, '*ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ* and oral theory', *CQ* 38 (1988), 25–30; R. P. Martin, *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the 'Iliad'* (Ithaca, 1989), 182–3; G. Nagy, *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past* (Baltimore, 1990), 244–5, n. 126; E. Campanile, *La ricostruzione della cultura indoeuropea* (Pisa, 1990), 87–9; C. Watkins, *How to Kill a Dragon: Aspects of Indo-European Poetics* (New York, 1995), 173–8; K. Volk, '*ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ* revisited', *CPh* 97 (2002), 61–8 (with bibliography).

[3] Watkins (n. 2), 173. Cf. A. Edwards (n. 2), 25, n. 2: 'Finkelberg's discussion of that phrase in isolation is perhaps somewhat narrow in scope'.

[4] Also by those who do not necessarily agree with my conclusions, see A. Edwards (n. 2), 25; Martin (n. 2), 182–3; B. Hainsworth, *The 'Iliad': A Commentary* (Cambridge, 1993), 3.117; Watkins (n. 2), 173.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

kleos.'[5] The question whether the adjective ἄφθιτον at *Il*. 9.413 is used predicatively or attributively is of course important but not for its own sake. If the adjective is used predicatively, this will make it unlikely that the Homeric κλέος ἄφθιτον is a self-contained semantic unit. Accordingly, it would make it difficult to see it as an inherited Indo-European formula on a par with the Vedic *śrávas . . . ákṣitam*.

While I agree with Volk that it is not critical whether we take the μοι at *Il*. 9.413 as the dative of interest or the dative of possession,[6] this is not yet to say that the latter option would preclude a predicative use of the adjective in question. What is true of the English syntax is not necessarily so in the case of Greek. When used as a *verbum existentiae* with the possessive dative, the verb εἶναι takes predicative constructions as naturally as the copula does, compare for example such expressions as μισθὸς δέ οἱ/τοι ἄρκιος ἔσται, 'his/your reward will be adequate' (*Il*. 10.304, *Od*. 18.358) or νῶιν ἀνήκεστος χόλος ἔσται 'our anger will be incurable' (*Il*. 15.217). This will become even more evident if we take into consideration such widely attested occurrences of the same construction that are completed with a noun rather than an adjective, see for example ὄνομά τινὶ ἔστι τι, 'one's name is so-and-so' (*Od*. 9.366, 19.183, 19.409, 24.306), or μήτηρ δέ μοί ἐστ' Ἀφροδίτη, 'my mother is Aphrodite' (*Il*. 20.209).[7] It goes without saying that taking these propositions as predicative is the only available option.

It would therefore be mistaken to claim that the interpretation of μοι . . . ἔσται as a possessive construction, equivalent to the English 'I have', would provide sufficient support for the conclusion that the accompanying adjective is attributive rather than predicative. The rhetoric of the phrase reinforces the connection of ἄφθιτον with ἔσται and its separation from κλέος. The chiastic order of ὤλετο μέν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται, with balancing phrases on either side of ἀτὰρ, singles out κλέος as a counterpart of νόστος, while ἄφθιτον ἔσται acts as a counterpart of ὤλετο.[8]

At the same time, the status of the adjective was by no means the main point of my argument. I also argued that the expression κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται (a) is unique; (b) is duplicated by the formula κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται, '*kleos* will never be lost', and (c) is derivative, in that it can be shown to be created out of formulaic associations involving two established formulae, κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται and ἄφθιτον αἰεί. By the criteria of formulaic analysis, this would mean that, rather than a formula proper, we are dealing with a formulaic modification created by analogy with formulae and formulaic patterns available to the poet. Yet, since not everyone seems to acknowledge that formulaic analysis can be a useful or indeed a valid tool in approaching Homeric diction, and since I am still of the opinion that the coincidence with the Vedic *śrávas . . . ákṣitam* is in itself not sufficient for seeing in κλέος ἄφθιτον a traditional

[5] Volk (n. 2), 63–5.

[6] This point was first brought to my attention by Seth Schein, who wrote to me in 1986: 'I've always felt that in Homeric Greek, datives, in particular, are not amenable to strict classification, and I wonder whether "possession" is separable from "interest" as an aspect of Achilles' (sense of his own) identity. Even if all Homeric noun–adjective formulae involve attributive adjectives (do they? must they? are any used attributively and predicatively at different times?), would it not still be possible for rhetorical emphasis in a given instance to make a particular attributive adjective be felt predicatively? This might be especially true in 9.413, if one were to accept, as I do, Adam Parry's argument for Achilles' κατάχρησις of traditional language elsewhere in his speech to Odysseus.' Cf. Watkins (n. 2), 176.

[7] Cf. P. Chantraine, *Grammaire homérique* (Paris, 1953), 2.71.

[8] This specific point was suggested to me by Mark Edwards.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

expression,[9] it seems desirable to examine the status of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* in Homer according to other criteria as well.

As is well known, 'fame' is neither the sole, nor indeed the main, meaning of *kleos* in Homer. The word's proper rendering in most Homeric contexts would be 'report', 'rumour', 'repute': compare for example, 'What *kleos* is there in the city now?' (*Od.* 16.461), where *kleos* actually means 'news', or 'we only hear *kleos* and know nothing' (*Il.* 2.486), where its meaning is simply a 'rumour', or 'whose [Agamemnon's] heaven-reaching *kleos* is the greatest, at least now' (*Od.* 9.264), where the word's meaning is 'repute'. This is why the constant epithets by which *kleos* is accompanied make no provision for the idea of longevity: *kleos* is 'good', 'noble' (*κ. ἐσθλόν,* thirteen times), 'great' (*μέγα κ.* eleven times), 'wide' (*κ. εὐρύ* seven times, *Od.* only), and 'heaven-reaching' (*ὑπουράνιον κ.* twice). Beside noun–epithet combinations, we also have the formula *κ. οὐρανὸν ἵκει* / *κ. οὐρανὸν εὐρὺν ἱκάνει*, '*kleos* reaches unto (wide) heaven', also expressing the idea of the persistence of one's *kleos* in the present rather than in the future.[10] Extensiveness and goodness, not longevity, are thus the essential characteristics of *kleos* in Homer.

Note now that *κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται*, '*kleos* will never be lost', the only Homeric formula making provision for the perpetuation of *kleos*, is actually formulated so as to exclude the idea of its imperishability: if anything, it implies that one's *kleos* is normally expected to perish. The same conclusion follows if we analyse the supplementary expression '*kleos* may be inextinguishable' (*ἄσβεστον κλέος εἴη*), which occurs twice in the *Odyssey* (4.584, 7.333). In both cases, rather than being taken for granted, the imperishability of one's *kleos* is predicated on something else: Agamemnon's *kleos* will be inextinguishable *if* Menelaus builds a tomb for him; Alcinous's fame will be inextinguishable *if* he helps Odysseus to return home—the alternative is the extinction of *kleos*, which is obviously envisaged as the norm. This is neatly paralleled in Achilles' choice in *Iliad* 9: it is only *if* Achilles stays at Troy that his *kleos* will become imperishable; otherwise, his 'noble *kleos*' will not survive. If, as a result of treating the expression as a noun–epithet combination, we take 'imperishable' as the essential characteristic of *kleos* in Homer, this and other choices of Homeric heroes will carry little weight.[11] It is thus the perishability rather than the imperishability of *kleos* that comes to the fore in the Homeric poems: only by

[9] Cf. Watkins (n. 2), 173: 'It is circular to claim that *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is a Homeric formula simply because of its agreement with Vedic *śrávas . . . akṣitam*.'

[10] *Il.* 8.192; *Od.* 8.74, 9.20, 19.108. For further examples, see S. D. Olson, *Blood and Iron: Stories and Storytelling in Homer's Odyssey* (Leiden, 1995), 1–23.

[11] This is recognized in Volk (n. 2), 66: 'Of course, understanding Achilles' words the way I suggest, with *ἄφθιτον* as attributive, means that the adjective carries somewhat less weight than when taken as predicative: if the point is not so much the imperishability of the hero's fame, but the fame itself, then the epithet *ἄφθιτον* is exactly that, just an epithet, albeit a particularly significant one.' This is why she argues further in the same paragraph that in *Il.* 9.415 Achilles effectively glosses *κλέος ἄφθιτον*, 'imperishable fame', with *κλέος ἐσθλόν*, 'noble fame': 'the "noble fame" that the hero loses when returning is essentially the same as the "imperishable fame" he gains when staying'. Note however that, if followed consistently, this line of argument will inevitably bring us to the paradoxical conclusion that the formula 'one's *kleos* will never be lost' has essentially the same meaning as 'one's imperishable *kleos* will never be lost'. The fact is, however, that while the *kleos* referring to a person is readily commutable with such noun–epithet combinations as 'noble *kleos*', 'wide *kleos*', or 'great *kleos*', it does not lend itself to substitution by 'imperishable *kleos*'.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

fulfilling certain conditions can the Homeric hero ensure that his good repute of the present be imperishable in the future.[12]

To recapitulate, if we take κλέος ἄφθιτον as a Homeric formula, we will have an expression which is not only unique and derivative, but also one whose meaning would disagree with the standard usage of the word *kleos* in Homer. All this being taken into account, it will be difficult to avoid the conclusion that the contention that κλέος ἄφθιτον at *Il*. 9.413 is a self-contained expression, and a singularly ancient one at that, cannot be substantiated on the inner grounds of Homeric diction.

II. *ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ* IN EPIC TRADITION

There are two other early occurrences of κλέος ἄφθιτον, both emerging in the same metrical position as κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται at *Il*. 9.413: ἵνα οἱ κλέος ἄφθιτ[ον εἴῃ (‘in order that his/her fame may be imperishable’) in the pseudo-Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (fr. 70.5 MW) and hος και κενος εχοι κλεFος απθιτ[ον αιFει (‘in order that he too may have fame imperishable forever’) in the sixth-century B.C.E. dedicatory inscription from Crisa (*CEG* 344). The two variants they represent, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται /εἴῃ and κλέος ἄφθιτον αἰεί continue to reappear in Greek poetry up to the Roman period.[13] We can see that while the pseudo-Hesiodic expression is practically identical to what we find in Homer, the inscription from Crisa shows a significant deviation from the Homeric usage, in that it treats κλέος ἄφθιτον as the direct object of the verb ἔχω.[14] How should their relationship to Homer be interpreted?

The impact of Milman Parry’s work on Homeric scholarship was felt, among other things, in the recognition of the fact that parallels between traditional texts can well indicate that these are independent variants of a common tradition. As far as the specific case under discussion is concerned, this would mean that we cannot rule out the possibility that, rather than simply imitating *Il*. 9.413, κλέος ἄφθιτον εἴῃ at Hes. fr. 70.5 is an independent manifestation of the same traditional expression. Since the alternative Homeric expression κλέος οὔποτ’ ὀλεῖται is attested both in the same fragment of pseudo-Hesiod (fr. 70.7) and in other traditional poetry cast in hexameters (*Hymn. Hom. Ap*. 156), there is good reason to suggest that κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται/εἴῃ and κλέος οὔποτ’ ὀλεῖται are two equivalent formulae for the expression of the same basic idea. The existence of equivalent formulae as, for example, βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη and θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη, is rather uncommon in Homer. It is usually taken as indicative of the fact that traditional poetry does not keep the same formula forever: owing to social changes and changes in literary taste, to the fact that a given expression may become obsolete or alter its original meaning, new formulae were constantly entering into circulation, some of them eventually replacing the old ones.[15]

[12] As far as our evidence goes, these conditions consisted in either or both of the following—building a magnificent tomb and accomplishing deeds significant enough to become the subject of song. See M. Finkelberg, *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece* (Oxford, 1998), 73–88.

[13] See further E. D. Floyd, ‘*Kleos aphthiton*: an Indo-European perspective on early Greek poetry’, *Glotta* 58 (1980), 154–7; Volk (n. 2), 63–4.

[14] That *kleos* as the direct object of the verb ‘to have’ presents a non-Homeric usage has been emphasized in Volk (n. 2), 65.

[15] Cf. J. B. Hainsworth, ‘Good and bad formulae’, in B. C. Fenik (ed.), *Homer: Tradition and Invention* (Leiden, 1978), 145, on ‘the vogue for θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη’. On equivalent formulae see also R. Janko, ‘Equivalent formulae in the Greek epos’, *Mnemosyne* 34 (1981), 251–61; id., *The ‘Iliad’: A Commentary* (Cambridge, 1992), 4.124, 260.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Now if both *κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται* and *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται/εἴη* are formulae, there is little room for doubt which of the two is the more recent. As we have seen, as distinct from *κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται*, *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται/εἴη* is reducible to established formulae and is therefore derivative (see Section I). In view of this we may suggest that, like *θεὰ λευκώλενος Ἥρη*, *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται/εἴη* is a younger formula, which began to circulate when the expression *κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται* was already in existence. The examination of *κλέος ἄφθιτον αἰεί*, another post-Homeric expression of the same metrical shape, allows us to understand why.

In *κλέος ἄφθιτον αἰεί* on the inscription from Crisa we encounter, for the first time in hexametric poetry, the adjective *ἄφθιτον*, 'imperishable', used as an attribute of *kleos* or, to be more precise, as part of the epithet 'imperishable forever'; the expression is the direct object of the verb *ἔχω*. As already mentioned, this is our first example in hexametric poetry of *kleos* being construed in this way (on non-hexametric poetry see below, Section III). The inscription from Crisa thus signals a significant shift in the meaning of the word *kleos*: as distinct from the predicative use of *ἄφθιτον* with *κλέος*, which results in the contextual meaning of the latter as 'fame', 'glory', the attributive use would presuppose 'fame', 'glory' as the established meaning of *kleos* (see above, Section I).

Both *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται* and *κλέος ἄφθιτον αἰεί* are derivative expressions, modelled on the same formulaic patterns (see above, Section I). Unlike *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται*, however, *κλέος ἄφθιτον αἰεί* does not duplicate the formula *κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται* or indeed any other expression in Homer. This makes a good case for seeing *κλέος ἄφθιτον αἰεί* as an underrepresented formula. This also seems to give it chronological priority over the Homeric *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται*. Namely, as far as *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται/εἴη* is a derivative expression duplicating a well-attested formula, it might well have evolved as a reaction to the new meaning of the word *kleos* as 'fame', 'glory' and the newly coined expression *κλέος ἄφθιτον αἰεί* which reflected this meaning.[16]

It seems more than a mere coincidence that all the attestations of the phrase *κλέος ἄφθιτον αἰεί* which, as we have seen, must have been the first hexametric expression treating *κλέος ἄφθιτον* as a noun–epithet combination, belong to inscriptions on stone. Thus, apart from the inscription from Crisa discussed above, it is plausibly conjectured for a fifth-century B.C.E. Athenian epigram commemorating the dead of the battle of Marathon, and for a Hellenistic inscription from Rhodes.[17] Since, as I argued in my 1986 article, the primary associations of the adjective *ἄφθιτος* are with material objects of divine origin (see also below, Section IV), the application of this adjective to an incorporeal entity, and especially such an ephemeral one as 'rumour', must have been felt as semantically incongruous.[18] But it is quite a different matter if 'rumour' is incised on stone, the very embodiment of indestructibility. The use of the

[16] Cf. Hainsworth (n. 4), 117: 'The words stand here [in *Il.* 9.413] as subject and predicate, but that may be a grammatical modification of a formula in which the epithet, though not decorative, is attributive, cf. the Delphic inscription *GDI* 1537, Ibycus fr. 1.47 Page, and Sappho fr. 44.4 Page.' Cf. also M. Edwards, personal communication: 'No MS variant, but I would not mind betting that there have been ancient singers (maybe many of them) who sang 9.413 ending *aphthiton aiei*.' Note, however, that even on this interpretation we will have to postulate a predicative proposition with the copula omitted, viz. 'Lost is my return, but [my] *kleos* [is] imperishable forever', rather than a noun–epithet combination.

[17] See Floyd (n. 13), 154–5 and Volk (n. 2), 63.

[18] See Finkelberg (n. 1), 4 and n. 16; cf. Floyd (n. 13), 136–40, 148–51; for the discussion see Nagy (n. 2), 244–5, n. 126.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

still relatively new medium of writing, with its emphasis on the permanence of the words committed to it, should also be taken into account in this connection. It can be tentatively suggested, therefore, that it was such commemorative inscriptions on stone that supplied the stimulus to the semantic evolution of the expression.[19]

However that may be, the diachrony that suggests itself can be tentatively reconstructed as follows. The expression *κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται*, '*kleos* will never be lost', a well-attested formula occurring not only in Homer but also in the Hesiodic corpus and the Hymns and preserving the meaning of *kleos* as 'rumour', 'report', 'repute', was undoubtedly the traditional one. Next to appear was the expression *κλέος ἄφθιτον αἰεί*, '*kleos* imperishable forever': it was created out of formulaic patterns readily available in hexametric poetry and purported to express the new idea of the imperishability of *kleos* in its developing meaning 'fame', 'glory'. Finally, there emerged the expression *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται/ἐῖῃ* κτλ., '*kleos* will be imperishable', which was modelled on the new expression but, as distinct from it, duplicated the already existing formula *κλέος οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται*. As far as our evidence goes, this development took place not earlier than the second half of the seventh century B.C.E.: if this was indeed the case, Achilles' words 'my *kleos* will be imperishable' must have sounded boldly innovative at the time of their first appearance.

We can conclude, therefore, that even if *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is approached in the perspective of Greek epic tradition as a whole, there is still no way to regard it as a traditional formula. Considerations relating to the inner structure of the hexameter help us to explain why.

III. *ΚΛΕΟΣ ΑΦΘΙΤΟΝ* AND THE HEXAMETER

There are two occurrences of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* in early poetry not cast in hexameters: Sappho 44.4 Page, *κλέος ἄφθιτον* at the end of a corrupted line (glyconic with dactylic expansion) whose general context is the wedding of Hector and Andromache, and Ibycus 282.47 Page, *καὶ σύ, Πολύκρατες, κλέος ἄφθιτον ἕξεῖς*, 'and you, Polycrates, will have imperishable fame' (pherecratean with dactylic expansion). In both *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is unmistakably a noun–epithet combination; in addition, like the inscription from Crisa, the poem of Ibycus supplies the non-Homeric construction of *kleos* with the verb 'to have'. It can be concluded, therefore, that, like the inscription from Crisa again, the meaning of *kleos* that both Sappho and Ibycus had in mind was 'fame', 'glory' rather than 'rumour', 'repute'.

As Gregory Nagy and Calvert Watkins pointed out, the fact that the metrical shape and position of *κλέος ἄφθιτον*, especially as attested in Sappho, suit very well the

[19] According to the suggestion made by the anonymous referee, it is more likely that *ἄφθιτος* is 'a metaphor of an unfailing spring'; he adduces both Vedic parallels and Hes. *Theog.* 805 *Στυγὸς ἄφθιτον ὕδωρ*. In Homer, however, the formula *ἄφθιτον αἰεί* is applied to such objects as the sceptre of Agamemnon made by Hephaestus (*Il.* 2.46, 186), the palace of Poseidon (13.22), and the throne promised by Hera to Hypnos (14.238); when used alone and not in its standard position after the bucolic diaeresis, the adjective *ἄφθιτος* is applied to the golden wheel-rim of Hera's chariot (*Il.* 5.724), to the palace of Hephaestus (18. 370), to the plans (*μήδεα*) of Zeus (24.88), and to the marvellous grapevines on the Island of Cyclops (*Od.* 9.133). Only one out of the nine cases in which *ἄφθιτος* is found in Homer, *κλέος ἄφθιτον* at *Il.* 9.413, does not belong to the sphere of divine and marvellous, and only two, *κλέος ἄφθιτον* again and *ἄφθιτα μήδεα* at 24.88, fall into the sphere of incorporeal objects. The latter is usually taken to indicate that the term's meaning evolved from concrete to abstract, see e.g. H. Ebeling, *Lexicon Homericum*, s.v. *transfertur ad ea quae mente percipiuntur*; M. Treu, 'Griechische Ewigkeitswörter', *Glotta* 43 (1965), 10–12.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

metres of lyric poetry may indicate that lyric tradition preserved the expression in its original form. To quote Watkins' assessment, written in response to my article, 'In Achilles' speech the noun phrase *κλέος ἄφθιτον* has been transformed; but it is syntactically and metrically intact in line-final position in Sappho 44.4 L–P, which provides metrical and formulaic testimony independent of Homer.'[20] As far as I can see, this suggestion makes especially good sense if taken in the context of the so-called 'coalescence-hypothesis': according to the latter, it is possible to isolate earlier non-hexametric units embedded in the Greek hexameter as we know it, and thus to trace the history of this metre to its remote origins. Significantly, all the reconstructions of this kind invariably end up with lyric metres.[21] Now, if the lyric metres into which the hexameter can be analysed preceded the emergence of the latter, this would mean that the formulaic phraseology was originally designed to fit these metres. In that case, the development of the hexameter may well be envisaged in terms of uniting together formerly independent metrical units, and consolidating the traditional phraseology with which these units were originally associated into an entirely new system. Accordingly, the epic formulae, rather than being seen as directly issuing from the needs of hexametric composition, would be envisaged as having been adapted to these needs at a considerably later stage.[22]

The hypothesis certainly has merit,[23] but since neither the scope of evidence nor the criteria of analysis comparable to those we have in the case of Homer are available for the lyric tradition, the suggestion that *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is an ancient 'lyric' formula which was transformed in Homer and other hexametric poetry cannot be either proved or disproved from within lyric poetry itself. It is Homer again that supplies the missing evidence.

In Homer and other hexametric poetry, the proper position of the formulae possessing the metrical shape of *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is in the third–fourth feet, between the penthemimeral ('masculine') caesura and the bucolic diaeresis. Neither the shape nor the position is especially popular with Homer.[24] Nevertheless, we can register such

[20] Watkins (n. 2), 176; see also G. Nagy, *Comparative Studies in Greek and Indic Meter* (Cambridge, MA, 1974), 118–39. Cf. Martin (n. 2), 182–3.

[21] See e.g. B. Gentili and P. Giannini, 'Preistoria e formazione dell'esametro', in M. Fantuzzi and R. Pretagostini (edd.), *Struttura e storia dell'esametro greco* (Rome, 1995–6), 2.11–62; G. Nagy, 'Metrical convergences and divergences in early Greek poetry and song', in Fantuzzi and Pretagostini (ibid.), 63–110; N. Berg and D. Haug, 'Innovation vs. tradition in Homer—an overlooked piece of evidence', *SO* 75 (2000), 5–23; D. Haug and E. Welo, 'The proto-hexameter hypothesis: perspectives for further research', *SO* 76 (2001), 130–6.

[22] The immediate conclusion following from this approach is that it is only possible to argue in favour of Indo-European origins of Greek heroic poetry if one abandons the idea that this poetry was composed in hexameters at its earliest stages. This point was emphasized in M. L. West, 'Greek poetry 2000–700 B.C.', *CQ* 23 (1973), 187–8: 'The argument is not conclusive; there is nothing inherently unlikely in the idea that the Greek had heroic poetry of some sort in the first half of the second millennium. However, it would not have been in hexameters.'

[23] See M. Finkelberg, *BMCRev* 97.7.7, a review of Fantuzzi and Pretagostini (n. 21). Contra A. Hoekstra, *Epic Verse Before Homer* (Amsterdam, 1981), 53: 'The earliest narrative poetry that has left any traces in Homer was already composed in hexameters.'

[24] Only four proper noun–epithet combinations occur in both epics, see J. B. Hainsworth, *The Flexibility of the Homeric Formula* (Oxford, 1968), 6; better attested are common noun–epithet combinations, see id., 'The Homeric formula and the problem of its transmission', *BICS* 9 (1962), 57–68, quoted from J. Latacz (ed.), *Homer: Tradition und Neuerung* (Darmstadt, 1979), 382–3 (the category of *κλυτὰ τεύχεα*); id., *The Flexibility* (above in this note), 44–5 (the category of *δόρυ μείλινον*). M. W. Edwards, 'Some features of Homeric craftsmanship', *TAPhA* 97 (1966), 117, n. 3, points out that 'the adjective *μέγας*, in particular, is often . . . added to a name or noun

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

formulae as *Πρίαμος μέγας*, *Διὸς ἄγγελος*, *δόρυ χάλκεον*, *κλυτὰ τεύχεα*, and others. Those of them that are especially in demand sometimes move further into the fourth foot, to become part of the same colon to which *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται* also belongs. Thus, side by side with *δόρυ χάλκεον* and *κλυτὰ τεύχεα* in the third–fourth feet we have *δόρυ χάλκεον ᾔει/ἦκεν* and *κλυτὰ τεύχεα δῦναι*, starting at the fourth-foot caesura and reaching the verse-end. This seems to indicate that for the expressions of this metrical shape the position occupied by *κλέος ἄφθιτον* in *Iliad* 9 is a secondary one. It follows, then, that one can argue that *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is a traditional, albeit transformed, formula, only if one assumes that it had been as popular with Greek epic tradition as, say, *δόρυ χάλκεον* or *κλυτὰ τεύχεα* and, as a result, was also dislocated from its proper position in the third–fourth feet. Since, however, as distinct from the above expressions, *κλέος ἄφθιτον* is never found in the position in question, this is bound to remain pure speculation which, again, cannot be either proved or disproved. Accordingly, the behaviour of the expression within the hexametric poetry as we know it is the only solid evidence we are left with.

Since the publication in 1926 of 'Der kallimachische und der homerische Hexameter' by Hermann Fränkel, it is generally recognized that the hexameter line is actually divided not into the metrically identified 'feet' but, rather, into the semantically identified 'cola' created by the metrical breaks, or caesurae, which regularly emerge at certain fixed positions within the verse. The cola, therefore, are both metrical units and units of sense.[25] Although *Les formules et la métrique d'Homère* by Milman Parry (1928) was not influenced by Fränkel's work, it demonstrated beyond doubt that the principal metrical positions of the Homeric formulae correspond to the verse-breaks highlighted by Fränkel.[26] Now if we take *κλέος ἄφθιτον* at *Il*. 9.413 as part of the sequence *κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται*, we shall have an expression which precisely corresponds to one of the regular hexametric cola, that running from the fourth-foot (hephthemimeral) caesura to the end of the verse (cf. e.g. such Homeric formulae as *πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς* or *κορυθαιόλος Ἕκτωρ*).[27] The only subdivision that may occur within this sequence is the one created by the so-called 'bucolic diaeresis', a metrical break between the fourth and the fifth feet. Although there are many fourth-foot cola which are subdivided in this way, they normally do not acquire their full sense until they reach the end of the verse, see, for example, such formulae as *πόδας | ὠκὺς Ἀχιλλεύς*, *Διὸς | υἱὸς Ἀπόλλων*, *κλυτὰ | τεύχεα δῦναι*, *δόρυ | χάλκεον ἤει*, *κλέος | ἐσθλὸν ἀρέσθαι*, *κτλ*. It follows, then, that if we take *κλέος ἄφθιτον* in *κλέος | ἄφθιτον ἔσται* at *Il*. 9.413 in isolation from *ἔσται*, this will give us a highly peculiar case of a supposedly self-contained sense-unit running through the bucolic diaeresis, this 'the most obvious of all breaks in the Homeric verse', without

to extend it forwards to the C caesura [= bucolic diaeresis] (*Πρίαμος μέγας*, *τρίποδα μέγαν*, etc., eighteen times in all), in order to avoid the necessity of ending or beginning a phrase at the fourth foot caesura'.

[25] The revised version was published in H. Fränkel, *Wege und Formen frühgriechischen Denkens* (Munich, 1955), 100–56. Fränkel's discoveries have been corroborated and taken further through the application to the Homeric hexameter of contemporary theories of spoken speech, see E. J. Bakker, 'Homeric discourse and enjambement: a cognitive approach', *TAPhA* 120 (1990), 1–21, and id., *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse* (Ithaca, 1997); M. W. Edwards, *Sound, Sense, and Rhythm: Listening to Greek and Latin Poetry* (Princeton, 2002), 1–13.

[26] See M. W. Edwards, 'Homeric style and oral poetics', in I. Morris and B. Powell (edd.), *A New Companion to Homer* (Leiden, 1997), 266, and Edwards (n. 25), 2–8; cf. Finkelberg (n. 23).

[27] Cf. e.g. Milman Parry's tables in A. Parry (ed.), *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry* (Oxford, 1971), 39.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

however reaching the verse-end.[28] As far as I can judge, this is not the way in which Homer's verse-making normally works, and the fact is that the expression κλέος | ἄφθιτον αἰεί, the one in which κλέος ἄφθιτον is for the first time treated as a noun–epithet combination (see above, Section II), is also cast so as to acquire its full sense only with the reaching of the end of the verse.

The results of the formulaic and the metrical analysis thus concur. While supplying no conclusive evidence as regards its predecessors in extra-hexametric tradition, both speak against the possibility that κλέος ἄφθιτον in hexametric poetry can be interpreted as a traditional formula.

IV. SOME SEMANTIC CONSIDERATIONS

In my 1986 article I argued that, since the adjective ἄφθιτος is regularly applied in Homer to precious objects of divine origin, its use to characterize an incorporeal entity such as *kleos* indicates that its meaning was evolving from concrete to abstract; as a result, to place κλέος ἄφθιτον at the beginning of the development would make the adjective undergo a peculiar evolution from the abstract to the concrete, and back again to the abstract.[29] The same argument applies to the noun *kleos*. That is, taking κλέος ἄφθιτον as an ancient formula would necessarily involve postulating its evolution from 'fame', 'glory' to 'rumour', 'report', and then back to 'fame', 'glory'. I can see no other reason for providing both words with such peculiar histories apart from the wish to place κλέος ἄφθιτον at the beginning of the development.

It can be concluded, therefore, that, although etymologically cognate, the Sanskrit *śrávas* and the Greek *kleos* were not always synonymous with each other. The entry κλέος in *Dictionnaire étymologique* by Pierre Chantraine is worth quoting in this respect:

> *Κλέος* est un vieux nom inanimé qui se retrouve dans skr. *śrávas*- n. 'gloire', av. *sravah*- 'mot', v. sl. *slovo* n. 'mot, parole' (*noter les divergences de sens*).[30]

Chantraine's parenthetical 'noter les divergences de sens' is an important caveat, which should be taken into account whenever we confront the etymology of a word with its actual meaning in a given language. The divergences of sense he points out, together with the word's affinity with κλύω, 'to hear', indicate that *ea quae fando audiuntur*, chosen by H. Ebeling in his *Lexicon Homericum* for rendering the primary meaning of κλέος in Homer, would still supply a satisfactory common denominator for the entire group, whereas the meaning 'fame', 'glory' should be taken as a later, albeit natural, development, which occurred independently in both Sanskrit and Greek at different historical periods. The evidence at our disposal strongly suggests that the decisive shift in the meaning of Greek *kleos* from 'rumour', 'report' to 'fame', 'glory' occurred not earlier than the end of the seventh century B.C.E., and

[28] This line of argument was first suggested to me by M. D. Reeve. The quotation is from M. Edwards (n. 24), 167.

[29] Finkelberg (n. 1), 4 and n. 16. On the discrepancy between the Vedic and the Homeric expression in this specific respect see Floyd (n. 13). For the discussion see Nagy (n. 2), 244–5, n. 126.

[30] P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque* (Paris, 1968) s.v. (my italics). Chantraine, taking into account the entire history of the word's development in the Greek language, renders *kleos* as ' "bruit qui court", mais le plus souvent "reputation, renom, gloire" '. He does not mention the issue of κλέος ἄφθιτον.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press

that its combination with the epithet 'imperishable' should also be placed within the same period.

Tel Aviv University MARGALIT FINKELBERG
finkelbe@post.tau.ac.il

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838807000432 Published online by Cambridge University Press