

## ‘Pindar and the Indo-European Verb’

Timothy Barnes

1. The problem: traditions of Greek lyric present metrical forms of great antiquity, structurally older than the hexameter. It is worth wondering why they are not a repository for linguistic archaisms on a par with epic.

Basic on prehistory of Greek metre: Meillet, *Les origines indo-européennes des mètres grecs* (Paris 1923); West, ‘Greek poetry 2000–700 BC’ CQ 23 (1973) 179–192, at 184–7; Nagy, *Comparative studies in Greek and Indic meter* (Cambridge, Mass. 1974). Hexameter a junction of aeolic cola: N.Berg, ‘Parergon metricum: der Ursprung des griechischen Hexameters’ MSS 37 (1978) 11–36.

1.1. Easy answer: texts are later, the traditions have been more extensively renewed or altered.

1.1.1. Perfect ex. of lyric renewal of epic inheritance: Berlin Corinna (PMG 654) ii 34 with Diels’ very likely supplement Δεὺς [πατεῖρ, δωτεῖρ ἄ]γαθῶν, which modernizes Hesiodic (+) θεοὶ δωτῆρες ἑάων, etc. (Schmitt *Dichtung u. Dichtersprache in idg. Zeit* (Wiesbaden 1967) 142–8).

1.2. But it is not only meter that creates this expectation— genre and cultic context of choral lyric is much closer than epic to that of the RV and Avesta. Recall Durante’s words (quoted in Schmitt *op.cit.* 316) on the paradox of Homeric–Vedic correspondences:

da un lato [the RV], inni più o meno strettamente legati al culto, dall’ altro [Hom.], poesia laica e per quei tempi moderna, nell’ispirazione se non nella tecnica espressiva. Se disponessimo di inni culturali greci d’ età micenea od omerica, oppure di un corpus di κλέα ἀνδρῶν vedici, non v’ha dubbio che una ricerca comparativa avrebbe dato frutti più copiosi.

Hypothesis: Traces of such earlier cult lyric are not totally obliterated; should be uncoverable in the lyric we have.

1.3. Heuristic: Since all extant Greek literature is pervaded by the influence of epic, we must try to locate *non-epic* archaisms in lyric.

1.3.1. Problem: what constitutes ‘non-epic’? Distinguish cases in which lyric is actually prior to epic from cases in which epic has no corresponding item.

**1.3.2.** Hard to establish priority. κλέος ἄφθιτον in lyric (Sappho 44. 4 V., Ibycus PMGF S151. 47): is this an epicism (as I think likely), or does epic rather have it from some form of lyric (which will then be the source for its appearance in Sappho (and maybe Ibyc.)), or what?

**1.3.3.** Clear case of lyric priority: χθονὸς εὐρυοδεῖης # in epic (Π 635, etc.) remodels phrase found basically intact in Simonides PMG 542. 24–5 εὐρυεδέος...χθονός (so W.Schulze *Quaestiones Epicae* 488). But priority is only relative, because the phrase probably reflects an earlier (but still post-Homeric) stratum of the tradition for which Simonides is simply a witness (so Schulze). εὐρυεδής in turn corresponds to Vedic *urú...śadaḥ* (Schmitt *op.cit.* 247).

**1.3.4.** Less clear, but more interesting: s4b of the Lille Stesichorus (PMGF 222b) has the metrical structure x D x e –. The second anceps exceptionally filled by double short at 215 ἄλγεσ<σ>ι πολύστονα δακρυῶντα[– –. Read instead <sup>+</sup>δακρυ(φ)εντα, and so prior to generalization of thematic -ό(φ)εντ- (δακρυόεντα # E 737 etc.)?

**1.4.** Poetic syntax: Watkins, ‘Pindar’s Rig Veda’, JAOS 122 (2002) [= FS Insler]; id. ‘Ἐπέων θέσις. Poetic Grammar: Word Order and Metrical Structure in the Odes of Pindar’, in Hettrich (ed) *Indogermanische Syntax : Fragen und Perspektiven* (Wiesbaden 2002). Extremely important arena of inquiry.

**1.5.** Another angle: Mycenaean – Lyric ‘isoglosses’. C.Trümper, *Vergleich des mykenischen mit der Sprache der Chorlyrik* (Bern–New York 1986). In principle worthwhile exercise, since it seems likely that choral lyric has deep roots in the ‘pre-Dorian’ Peloponnese. But the results of this comparison are fairly slim (due to familiar limitations of the Linear B archives).

**1.6.** So: Worth looking around for archaic items in lyric which have no counterparts in epic and (ideally) parallels outside Greek. With some luck, such cases might shed some light on earlier stages of different forms of lyric poetry.

**1.7.** This contribution. Forms of the verb δέχομαι in Pindar display highly archaic features not otherwise attested in Greek. Structure of the argument from here: §2. Aorist, §3. Present, §4. Perfect.

## **2. Aorist.**

**2.1.** W.S.Barrett, reconstructed from his *Nachlass* (*Greek Lyric, Tragedy and Textual Criticism: Collected Papers ed. M.L. West* (Oxford 2007) 466–7):

Our texts give Pindar three instances of ἐδράκην (all participles: *P.* 2. 20 -εῖσα, *N.* 7.3 -έντες, fr. 123.3 -εῖς) and one of ἔδρακον (*N.* 4. 23 κατέδρακον); but I suppose the last (at the end of a verse and of an Alexandrian colon: κατέδρακον | Ἡρακλῆος) to be in all likelihood a fourth instance of ἐδράκην, viz. κατεδράκη.

Barrett goes on to justify the proposal by appeal to metagrammatism (ΕΔΡΑΚΕ falsely > ἐδρακε) and the well-known distribution of paragogic *nu* at verse end. All this is possible on the internal evidence of Greek alone, but...

**2.2.** There is no reason to think “ἐδράκη” ever existed at all. Examples booked under this form are actually all participles – in fact, precisely *these three participles in Pindar*. So the problem is how we understand the specifically Pindaric state of affairs, whereby a participial δρακεῖς appears to match a finite ἔδρακον. Not primarily a text-critical issue: it is more broadly philological, and requires that we know something about the Greek verb and its history.

**2.3.** Comparison with Indo-Iranian shows that the root \**derk-* originally made a root aorist; so for Vedic Wackernagel *Kleine Schriften* I, 432, confirmed by Karl Hoffmann’s short discussion (‘Zum Aorist von *drś*’, *Ausätze zur Indoiranistik* (Wiesbaden 1976) 146–7 [published first *IJ* 4 (1960) 119–20]). It was left for Forssman to draw the obvious conclusions (‘δρακεῖς’ *MSS* 16 (1964) 17–19).

[Am I being unfair to Barrett? Forssman, the main Greek specialist in Hoffmann’s circle, was known to Barrett (he refers several times to F.’s *Untersuchungen zur Sprache Pindars* (Wiesbaden 1966), e.g. in extenso op.cit. 264<sup>92</sup>) and I see no reason why he should not have read the art. in question.]

**2.4.** The Greek thematic aorist ἔδρακον shows a ‘thematization’ expectable in a root of this shape. *Communis opinio* sees the origin of thematization in the 3pl. (e.g. Hoffmann op.cit.), though it is hard to motivate the change; a look at the expectable Greek outcomes makes it clear that some such expedient would have become necessary (esp. in the 3sg. – Greek is not Irish); for my purposes here it is not significant how we motivate the process of thematization, since its occurrence is not itself in doubt:

Late PIE paradigm	Expectable Greek reflex	Actual paradigm (after 3pl.?)
* $(\acute{e})$ -derk $\acute{m}$ - $\eta$	* $\xi\delta\epsilon\rho\kappa\alpha$	-> $\xi\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$
* $(\acute{e})$ -derk $\acute{s}$	* $\xi\delta\epsilon\rho\zeta$	-> $\xi\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\epsilon\varsigma$
* $(\acute{e})$ -derk $\acute{t}$	* $\xi\delta\epsilon\rho$	-> $\xi\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\epsilon$
* $(e)$ -dr $\acute{k}$ -mé	* $\xi\delta\rho\alpha\gamma\mu\epsilon\nu$	-> $\xi\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\omicron\mu\epsilon\nu$
* $(e)$ -dr $\acute{k}$ -té	* $\xi\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\tau\epsilon$	-> $\xi\delta\rho\acute{\alpha}\kappa\epsilon\tau\epsilon$
* $(e)$ -dr $\acute{k}$ -ént (? -> -ont)	> $\xi\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\omicron\nu$	

**2.5.** The *aorist active* participle  $\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau$ - is most economically explained as a relic deriving from the originally athematic paradigm (so Forssman). That the root aorist participle had a hysterokinetic paradigm, with zero-grade of the root and e-grade of the suffix: \* $dr\acute{k}\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau$ - / gen. \* $dr\acute{k}\acute{\eta}\tau\acute{\epsilon}\varsigma$  is the view of H.Rix (*Historische Grammatik*, implicitly), accepted by Peters in 1980 (*Untersuchungen* 24–5), and J.A.Harðarson *Studien zum uridg. Wurzel-aorist und dessen Vertretung im Indoiranischen und Griechischen* (Innsbruck 1993)).

**2.5.1.** More recently Peters has claimed that all non-Narten athematic present and aorist participles were had R(z) and suffix \*-ont/- $\eta\tau$ -, while instances of \*-ent- reflect influence of the athem. 3pl. (Peters ‘On some Greek *nt* formations’ FS Morpurgo Davies (Oxford 2004)). This is of course possible (the *nt*-participle does tend to pattern with the 3pl., e.g. in Vedic); but on Peters’ reading the form  $\delta\rho\alpha\kappa\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau$ - is still a relic – i.e., it still continues an athematic paradigm, only that athem. paradigm represents an early Greek modification of the more original situation seen in e.g. \* $h_1s\text{-ont/-}\eta\tau$ -.

Vedic -ant/-at- is of no help in deciding between amphi- and hysterokinesis. For the athematic formation in the Greek aorist cf.  $\sigma\tau\alpha\nu\tau$ - < \* $sth_2\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau$ -,  $\theta\epsilon\nu\tau$ - < \* $d^h h_1\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau$ - et al.,  $\tau\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\varsigma$  ‘miserable’ < \* $tlh_2\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau$ - beside root aorist  $\xi\tau\lambda\eta$ ; definitely in  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\tau$ - ‘untiring’, which presupposes a participle  $\kappa\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\tau$ - ‘tired’ (< \* $\acute{k}\eta h_2\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau$ -) beside thematized  $\xi\kappa\alpha\mu\omicron\nu$ ; and possibly likewise  $\acute{\alpha}\delta\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\tau$ - ‘invictus’ may contain a participle  $\delta\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\tau$ - ‘tame’ (< \* $d\eta h_2\acute{\epsilon}\nu\tau$ -).

I personally find Peters’ account too complicated. Take the case of  $\xi\kappa\alpha\mu\omicron\nu$ . According to Peters, the aorist participle started as (1) an amphikinetic \* $\acute{k}\acute{\epsilon}\mu h_2\text{-ont-} / \acute{k}\eta h_2\eta\tau$ -; (2) R(z) generalized already in PIE \* $\acute{k}\eta h_2\acute{\acute{o}}\nu\tau$ -, like  $h_1s\acute{\acute{o}}\nu\tau$ -; (3) this  $\acute{k}\eta h_2\acute{\acute{o}}\nu\tau$ - in turn remodelled to \* $\acute{k}\eta h_2\acute{\acute{\epsilon}}\nu\tau$ - on the basis of athematic 3pl.  $\acute{k}\eta h_2\acute{\acute{\epsilon}}\nu\tau$ ; (4)  $\acute{k}\eta h_2\acute{\acute{\epsilon}}\nu\tau$ - > \* $k\acute{\acute{a}}\mu\acute{\acute{a}}\nu\tau$ - (preserved in  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\tau$ -) in turn thematized along with the rest of the paradigm back to \* $k\acute{\acute{a}}\mu\acute{\acute{o}}\nu\tau$ ... All possible, but do we need so many steps? Why not take hystero-looking \* $k\acute{\acute{a}}\mu\acute{\acute{a}}\nu\tau$ - (preserved in  $\acute{\alpha}\kappa\alpha\mu\alpha\nu\tau$ -), et al., at face value?

**2.6.** To conclude: the *a verbo* of δέρομαι in Pindar does not contain an innovatory aorist passive in -η, but rather an extremely old active root aorist participle. There is no reason to suppose that δρακέντ- derives from unattested epic poetry. Nor is it part of the living idiom of Pindar's Boeotian dialect. It should therefore belong to the choral lyric tradition preceding Pindar.

### 3. Present.

**3.1.** Form. The root \**derk-* made no present in the parent language. Them. pres. with R(e) δέρομαι is a Greek innovation, on the model of pairs like aor. ἔλιπον : pres. λείπω.

**3.2.** Attestations establish a pattern of metaphorical usage:

(1) N. 7. 65–6

ἐν τε δαμόταις | ὄμματι δέρομαι λαμπρόν

‘...and among his (or my) countrymen I cast a bright glance (δέρομαι λαμπρόν) with my eye’

(2) P. 3. 84–6:

τὴν δὲ μοῖρ' εὐδαιμονίας ἔπεται.

λαγέταν γάρ τοι τύραννον δέρεται,

ἢ τιν' ἀνθρώπων, ὁ μέγας πότμος.

‘A share of good fortune attends you. For as you know, of all men it is on a *tyrannos*, leader of the host, that great fate casts its glance (δέρεται)’

In (1) the expression ‘I cast a bright glance’ means something like ‘I am well-regarded’ (the passage is difficult). In (2) the fortunate ruler is the one on whom fate ‘casts a glance’. So, nothing interesting per se, but sets us up for the next section.

### 4. The perfect.

**4.1.** Three passages with the perfect δέδορκα enrich the picture of metaphorical usage:

(3) N. 3. 83–4:

τὴν γε μέν, εὐθρόνου Κλεοῦς ἐθελοί-

σας, ἀεθλοφόρου λήματος ἔνεκεν

Νεμέας Ἐπιδαυρόθεν τ' ἀπο καὶ Μεγάρων δέδορκεν φάος

‘And so for you, with Cleo willing (and) on account of your prize-winning zeal, a light shines from Nemea and Epidauros and from Megara [end of ode].’

(3Σ) Sch. N. 3. 83–4:

δέδορκε φάος : τουτέστι λελάμπρυνται ἡ δόξα τοῦ νενικηκότος καὶ ἐν Νεμέαι.

b. βουλομένης τῆς Μούσης Κλειοῦς λάμπει σου ἡ ἀρετή.

‘*dedorke phaos*: that is, the glory of the victor has been bright also at Nemea. (b) The Muse Cleo being willing, your excellence shines’

(4) N. 9. 41:

ἐνθ’ Ἀρείας πόρον ἄνθρωποι καλέοισι, δέδορκεν

παιδὶ τοῦθ’ Ἀγησιδάμου φέγγος ἐν ἀλικίαι

πρώται...

‘At the place men call the stream of Areia this light shone upon the child of Hagesidamus at the beginning of his youth’

(3) and (4) are very close. In both the expression φέγγος / φάος δέδορκε is construed with the dative of interest and refers to the victory and the fame which comes with it (note Cleo – κλέος personified in the first). In the dative is the victor: τίν ~ παιδί. The source of the light is the place of victory: ‘Nemea, Epidaurus and Megara’ ~ ‘the stream of Areia’. The precise function of the perfect tense will occupy us in a moment. I turn now to the final and most complicated instance of the verb in Pindar, in the First Olympian.

(5) O. 1. 94

νῦν δ’ ἐν αἵμακουρίαις

ἀγλααῖσι μέμικται,

Ἀλφειοῦ πορῶι κλιθεῖς,

τύμβον ἀμφίπολον ἔχων πολυξενω-

τάτῳ παρὰ βωμῶι · τὸ δὲ κλέος

τηλόθεν δέδορκε τὰν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις

Πέλοπος, ἵνα ταχυτὰς ποδῶν ἐρίζεται

ἄκμαί τ’ ἰσχύος θρασύπονοι

Race’s Loeb translation (1997) reads:

‘And now he partakes of splendid blood sacrifices as he reclines by the course of the Alpheos, having his much-attended tomb beside the altar thronged by visiting strangers. And far shines that fame of the Olympic festivals gained in the race-courses of Pelops, where competition is held for swiftness of feet and boldly laboring feats of strength.’

Translating Pindar is a thankless task. τὸ δὲ κλέος δέδορκε – whose κλέος exactly? Race follows the order of words in his choice of where to assign the various genitives we encounter here:

τὸ δὲ κλέος | τηλόθεν δέδορκε  
‘And far shines that fame...’  
τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων  
‘...of the Olympic festivals...’  
ἐν δρόμοις | Πέλοπος  
‘...(gained) in the race-courses of Pelops’.

The metrical structure – the pattern of enjambement – suggests a different rendering; that is:

τὸ δὲ κλέος |  
‘and his κλέος (possessive use of the article)’  
τηλόθεν δέδορκε τᾶν Ὀλυμπιάδων ἐν δρόμοις |  
‘...shines from afar (having its source) in the running contests of the Olympic festivals...’  
Πέλοπος ...  
‘...(the κλέος) of Pelops...’

The possessive use of the article primes us for the later genitive, which is not so radical a hyperbaton; τηλόθεν goes closely with the geographical detail given in the line. Πέλοπος is effectively functioning ἀπὸ κοινοῦ, so that both my reading and Race’s are operative: Pelops possesses the games as their founder and the κλέος of victory in them as their primordial victor. This fits the pattern established earlier (passages 3 and 4): the source of victory and the fame which comes with it is the running contest; the light of fame emanates from Olympia and is visible from afar. A constant element in these variations on the theme of the brilliance of victory and fame is the functionally archaic perfect δέδορκε in the meaning ‘shines, is visible’. This usage is remarkable and it is surprising how little attention has been paid to it.

**4.2.** That δέδορκα has a presential meaning ‘I see’ is well-known. It is likewise presential in two of the three Pindaric occurrences (in the third passage the complement ἐν ἀλικίαι πρώται dates the form, rendering it effectively preterital). It is also well known that the verb in all tenses when accompanied by an internal accusative may mean ‘emit a certain kind of look’ (e.g. Pindar has δρακεῖσ’ ἀσφαλές), and it is this usage which is usually and wrongly invoked a propos of the three Pindaric passages. What is remarkable about δέδορκε in Pindar is the simple stative-intransitive

meaning which we must assign to it – since there is no such internal acc., it *cannot* mean ‘has a certain look’; it means simply ‘is visible’. A scholiast to the First Olympian remarks a propos of the form that is used ἀντὶ τοῦ παθητικοῦ ‘instead of the passive’ – synchronically accurate and (as we shall see) exactly backwards diachronically. Nowhere else in Greek do we find it so used. And yet it fits into a pattern recognizable within Greek and with a very rich Indo-European background.

**4.2.1.** The perfect in Indo-European was functionally a present which expressed a state – often a state resulting from the completion of a process (paraphrasing Jasanoff, *Hittite and the Indo-European Verb* (Oxford 2003)). A secondary value acquired by the formation was the familiar resultative preterite: ‘I have done’. To a large extent this acquisition was *einzelsprachlich*.

**4.2.2.** Within Greek there is an observable tendency for perfects which are *active in form* but *stative-intransitive in meaning* to acquire active valence, often in opposition to formally renewed perfect middles: e.g. διέφθορα means ‘I have perished, I am lost or corrupted’ in Ionic (Homer, Herodotus), but comes to be replaced in this meaning in Attic by the mediopassive διέφθαρμαι, leaving *formally old* διέφθορα to take on the *new function* of resultative active ‘I have destroyed’ (its normal meaning in the tragedians). The pattern may be summarized in a table, where col. i shows forms reflecting the original sense of the perfect, col. ii the newer mediopassive replacement and col. iii the older form oppositionally transitivized:

i. Stative-intransitive active	ii. Neo-intransitive middle	iii. Transitive active
διέφθορα (Hom., Hdt.) ‘I am destroyed’	διέφθαρμαι ‘I am destroyed’	διέφθορα (Attic) ‘I have destroyed’

(Table 1.)

**4.2.3.** The same process operated in the prehistory of Vedic and Avestan. In several cases, Greek is demonstrably more archaic. E.g. Gk. γέγονα ‘I have come into being’ vs. Ved. perfect middle *jajñé* ‘I have come into being’, replacing the Vedic counterpart of γέγονα, *jajāna*, which then takes on the oppositional active function: ‘I have given birth’. Again, in tabular form:

i. Stative-intransitive active	ii. Neo-intransitive middle	iii. Transitive active
γέγονα ‘I have come into being’	<i>jajñé</i> ‘has come into being’	<i>jajāna</i> ‘has given birth’
cf. μέμονα ‘I have my mind on, am eager, vel sim.’	YAv. <i>mamne</i> ‘I have in mind’	—



(Table 2.)

4.2.4. This understanding of the perfect predicts IE \**dedórke* meaning initially ‘is seen, is visible’ (just as \**dorke* = ‘came to be seen appeared’), replaced within Greek and Vedic by the active transitive reading. Remarkably, Pindar preserves the form in exactly the meaning predicted by the theory, providing *direct evidence* for the original stative-intransitive meaning which one would assign *ex hypothesi* to Indo-European \**dedórke*. An analogous table constructed around δέδορκε makes this clear (together with a selection of related verbs of perception and appearance for comparison in Vedic and Avestan):

i. Stative-intransitive active	ii. Neo-intransitive middle	iii. Transitive active
δέδορκε (Pindar) ‘is visible, shines’	<i>dadṛsé</i> ‘has appeared’	δέδορκε ‘sees’ <i>dadársá</i> ‘has seen’
<i>cikéta</i> ‘has appeared’	<i>cikité</i> ‘has been noticed’	<i>cikéta</i> ‘has noticed’ Av. <i>cikaētha</i> ‘has understood’
<i>dīdāya</i> ‘shines’	—	Av. <i>dīdaiia</i> ‘has seen’

(Table 3.)

This archaism has no parallel in epic. The three passages in which it occurs are intimately related, as we have seen. All this renders it very likely that just as the perfect itself is highly archaic, so too the type of passage in which this perfect is found is also correspondingly old – *an inheritance of the tradition of choral lyric, unrelated to epic*.

5. Next step: τὸ κλέος δέδορκε – ‘fame which shines, is visible’ – an inherited motif to be added to the dossier of more well known attributes of \**kleuos*?

5.1. The dossier (familiar from e.g. Schmitt *op.cit.* 61–102): traditional phraseology involving κλέος articulated according to its attestation in (1) Pindar and choral lyric (2) Greek onomastics (3) epic and (4) in other IE traditions.

‘unperishing, undying’			
(1) cf. B.3.90–1 (below) cf. P. 2. 52 κῦδος ἀγήραον	(2) A-qi-ti-ta (Risch)	(3) κλέος ἄφθιτον, κλέος οὐ ποτ’ ὀλεῖται, ἄσβεστον κλέος	(4) <i>śravo...akṣitam</i> <i>śravo mṛtyú</i>
‘broad’			
(1) O. 10. 95 εὐρύ	(2) Εὐρυκλῆς,	(3 (Od.)) κλέος εὐρύ	(4) <i>pṛthú śrávaḥ</i> ,

κλέος	Εὐρυκλεία	α 344, δ 726, 816, γ 204, τ 333	<i>Uruśrávas-, Prthuśrávas-</i>
‘great’			
(1) O. 8. 10 μέγα τοι κλέος αiei	(2) Μεγακλῆς	(3) P 131 μέγα κλέος ἔμμεναι	(4) <i>máhi śrávaḥ</i>
‘good’			
(1) εὐκλεής P. 4. 174 κλέος ἐσθλόν	(2) Εὐκλῆς Εὐκλειος	(3) εὐκλεής, εὐκλείη κλέος ἐσθλόν	(4) <i>Su-śrávas- Haosrauuaḡha- Su-śruta-; OIr. sochlu Vasu-śruta-, vaghāu srauuaḡhi ; Illyrian PN Vescleves etc. etc.</i>

## 5.2. Choral lyric.

It is remarkable that in the First Olympian, in addition to the phrase τὸ κλέος...δέδορκε (which closes the myth), we find an almost identical expression applied to the victor Hieron (and forming the transition to the myth):

(6) O. 1. 23–25:

...λάμπει δέ οἱ κλέος  
ἐν εὐάνορι Λυδοῦ Πέλοπος ἀποικίαι·  
τοῦ μεγασθενῆς ἐράσσατο Γαῖαόχορος...

‘and fame shines for him (sc. Hieron) in the well-manned settlement of Lydian Pelops – Pelops with whom Poseidon of great strength become enamoured...’

The morphology, so to speak, of the passage is by now familiar: the victor in the dative (οἱ), the source of the ‘light’ specified (here the Peloponnese).

Related expressions are:

(7) P. 8. 96–7:

...ἀλλ’ ὅταν αἴγλα διόσδοτος ἔλθῃ  
λαμπρὸν φέγγος ἔπεστιν ἀνδρῶν καὶ μελῖχος αἰών.

‘But when Zeus-given radiance comes, a brilliant light rests upon men and their lifetime is carefree’

(8) N. 3. 64:

τηλαυγὲς ἄραρε φέγγος Αἰακιδᾶν αὐτόθεν.

‘A light of the Aiakids visible from afar has been fixed in place from there (sc. Troy)’

8Σ. Sch. N. 3. 64:

τὸ φέγγος καὶ ἡ δόξα τῶν Αἰακιδῶν τηλαυγὲς ἐστὶν αὐτόθεν, ἥ ἐξ ὧν νῦν εἶπον ἔργων ἢ ἐκ τῆς Ἰλίου · ἠρώτευσεν γὰρ ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰλίου οἱ Αἰακίδαι κτλ.

The light of (8) is that of victorious deeds in battle; its source is Troy. There is little to quarrel with in the scholiast’s understanding of the passage. We have already met the end of this ode in the previous discussion, which cannot be coincidental. In (7) the vision is highly metaphorical, but nonetheless fits the basic pattern: the ‘light’ comes from Zeus and has to do, again, with the victories of the Aiakids of Aiginetan lore, which form the template for the Aiginetan victory celebrated in the ode.

Finally:

(9) Bacchylides 3. 90–1:

ἀρετᾶς γε μὲν οὐ μινύθει  
βροτῶν ἅμα σώματι φέγγος, ἀλλὰ  
Μοῦσά νιν τρέφει.

‘The light of a man’s excellence does not perish together with his body, but the Muses nourish it.’

(which we must read together with Pindar O. 10. 95–6:

(10) ...τρέφοντι δ’ εὐρὸν κλέος  
κόραι Πιερίδες Διός

‘and the Pierides, daughters of Zeus, nourish broad fame’ )

These verses sum up the commemorative power of poetic tradition, an idea central to the meaning of κλέος . A man’s κλέος is a light nourished by the Muses.

### 5.3. Some Greek personal names:

Λαμπροκλῆς (17 X LGPN), by far the most common name in Λαμπρο-°, confirms the traditional character of Pindaric phrase λάμπει δέ οἱ κλέος.

Φᾱσικλῆς (IG V (2) 425.1 Phigaleia (Arcadia), 5<sup>th</sup>), a hapax with no obvious model (no other attested names in Φασι-!) should < (transposed) \**b<sup>h</sup>āti-kléēs* which agrees remarkably with the Vedic phrase *śrávasā ví bhāti* ‘shines forth with fame’ (below).

Possible of course that this is a misspelling for Φ<ρ>ασικλῆς or Φα<ρ>σικλῆς. But preferable to analyze the form we have before emending!

5.3.1. n.b. will also ultimately want to assign names like Κλείφωσσα, Κλειτοφῶν here, but this a bit more complicated.

#### 5.4. Vedic.

First, collocations of the noun *śrávas-* with *dyumnám*, lit. ‘brilliance’ but used metaphorically of the ‘brilliance’ of victorious deeds in battle. In our first passage the two nouns both appear in the plural, which automatically concretizes their meanings to something like ‘deeds which bring glory’ and ‘deeds which bring brilliance’:

(a) RV 3. 37. 7:

*dyumnéṣu pṛtanájye, pṛtsutúrṣu śrávassu ca*  
*índra sákṣvábhímatīṣu*

‘In deeds of brilliance in battle and in deeds of glory which win in battle, O Indra, be victorious over your foes!’

and then again at verse 10ab of the same hymn:

(b) *ágann índra śrávo bṛhád, dyumnaṃ dadhiṣva duṣṭáram*

‘You have attained lofty fame, Indra; set out for yourself unbeatable brilliance!’

In this hymn the connection between ‘brilliance’, ‘victory’ and ‘fame’ is particularly clear and recalls exactly the same constellation in Pindar’s epinicians. The two nouns are paired further at:

(c) RV 8. 5. 32ab:

*á no dyumnaír á śrávobhir, á rāyā yātam ásvinā*

‘Come here to us with brilliances, glories and with wealth, O Ásvins!’

(d) RV 1. 9. 8:

*asmé dhehi śrávo bṛhád, dyumnám sahasrasátamam*

‘Establish *for us* lofty fame, (and/as) brilliance which gains thousandfold good’

Secondly, there are the related coinages *citráśravas-* ‘whose fame is bright’ and *dyumnaśravas-* ‘whose fame is brilliant’, e.g.:

(e) RV 3. 59. 6 (hymn to Mitra):

*mitrásya carṣaṇīdhṛto, ávo devásya sānasí*

*dyumnám citráśravastamam*

‘The aid of the god Mitra, who holds fast the people, (is) victory-bringing; his brilliance possesses the brightest fame’.

Wealth is so characterized:

(f) RV 8. 24. 3ab

*sá na stávāna á bhara, rayīm citráśravastamam*

‘So, being praised, bring us wealth which possesses the brightest fame!’

Indra’s intoxicating soma-drink:

(g) RV 8. 92. 17:

*yás te citráśravastamo, yá indra vṛtrahántamaḥ*

*yá ojodātamo madaḥ*

‘Which is your most possessing of bright fame, most enemy-slaying, most strength-giving intoxicant’

(The combination with victory over enemies again recalls Pindar)

(h) Note further the hapax *dyumnáśravas-* said of the Maruts at RV 5. 54. 1

Finally, there are instances in which gods are said to ‘shine forth with *śrávas-*’:

(i) RV 6. 5. 5cd:

*sá mártiyeṣuv amṛta pracetā, rāyá dyumnéna śrávasā ví bhāti*

‘o immortal one, bright among mortals he (Agni) shines forth with wealth, brilliance and fame’

(j) Further RV 1. 92. 8a *sudamsásā śrávasā yá vibhási* (Uṣas); and cf. RV 6. 1. 11 (Agni)

Again, the phrase *śrávasā ví bhāti* ‘shines forth with fame’ has a more or less exact counterpart in the isolated Arcadian PN Φᾱσικλῆς. This name provides the crucial word equation confirming the inherited character of the basic idea under examination.

5.5. All this suggests setting up another row in the table (see below on the missing column):

‘bright’			
(1) κλέος δέδορκε, λάμπει δέ οἱ κλέος, κλέος = φέγγος, etc.	(2) Λαμπροκλῆς, Φᾱσικλῆς (plus Κλειφώσσα, Κλειτοφῶν etc.)	(3)	(4) <i>dyumnaśravas-</i> ‘whose fame is bright’; <i>citraśravas-</i> ‘whose fame is brilliant’, <i>śrávasā ví bhā-</i> , etc.

## 6. By way of conclusion

I have argued that the three Pindaric passages involving the highly archaic δέδορκε, along with a whole set of related passages, often in the same odes, reflect a very old inheritance. Further, the basic idea contained in those passages reappears in Greek personal names meaning ‘whose fame shines’, as well as the Rigveda, but is completely absent from epic (that was the condition set out in §1.3). The question of the roots of epinician poetry might then be rephrased as the question of what sort of poetic genre is most likely to have preserved such phraseology. The suppression of such phraseology in Homeric epic acquires a deeper significance in this connection. For that suppression should be understood in generic terms: the expressions we find in Pindar should refer to an aspect of *kleos* which is *off limits* for epic. We have seen that a key element in the three Pindaric passages was an indication of the source of the shining light of fame: Olympia, Nemea, and other cult places. This aspect of the fame of the hero seems to be closely tied to cult, and it is precisely this kind of localization which epic could be expected to suppress. It also seems likely that the *visual* dimension here reflects aspects of the actual experience of cult: the great cult centers were centers of conspicuous display; visiting them was θεωρία. All this makes it very attractive to locate the pre-epinician genre I am hypothesizing precisely in poetry performed within early hero-cult. It was this sort of cultic poetry that provided the model for the new epinician genre. The historical process envisioned here is recapitulated in Olympian One, where the far-shining *kleos* of the hero Pelops is at the same time the *kleos* that shines at Olympia for the victor Hieron.

[tbarnes@fas.harvard.edu](mailto:tbarnes@fas.harvard.edu)