

THE RELATIONSHIP OF SPEECH AND PSYCHIC ENTITIES IN EARLY GREEK POETRY

Early Greek poets, as is well-known, speak of psychological activity within human beings as taking place in several psychic entities. These entities, although similar in many ways, nonetheless possess distinctive characteristics. They include θυμός, φρήν, νόος, and three indicating "heart", ἦτορ, κῆρ, and κραδίη¹. The range of psychological activity of these en-

¹ The following are important studies of psychological terms in early Greek poetry. M. Biraud, *La conception psychologique à l'époque d'Homère: les 'organes mentaux'*, "Cratyle" 1, 1984, 27-49; 2, 1984, 1-23; J. Böhme, *Die Seele und das Ich im homerischen Epos*, Leipzig and Berlin 1929; G. Bona, *Il «Noos» e i «Nooi» nell'Odissea*, Torino 1959; J. Bremmer, *The Early Greek Concept of the Soul*, Princeton 1983; C. P. Caswell, *A Study of Thumos in Early Greek Epic*, Leiden 1990 ("Mnem." Suppl. 114); A. Cheyns, *Recherche sur l'emploi des synonymes etor, ker et kradie dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée*, "Rbph" 63, 1985, 15-73; *La notion de phrenes dans l'Iliade et l'Odyssée*, I, "CILL" 6, 1980, 121-202; *Le thumos et la conception de l'homme dans l'épopée homérique*, "Rbph" 61, 1983, 20-86; D. B. Claus, *Toward the Soul, An Inquiry into the Meaning of Psyche before Plato*, New Haven 1981; A. Dihle, *The Theory of Will in Classical Antiquity*, Berkeley 1982; K. von Fritz, *Nous, Noein and their Derivatives in Homer*, "CP" 38, 1943, 79-83; D. J. Furley, *The Early History of the Concept of the Soul*, "BICS" 3, 1956, 1-16; T. Gelzer, *How to Express Emotions of the Soul and Operations of the Mind in a Language that has No Words for them*, "CHS" 55, 1988, 1-49; E. L. Harrison, *Notes on Homeric Psychology* "Phoenix" 14, 1960, 63-80; S. Ireland and F. L. Steel, *Phrenes as an Anatomical Organ in the Works of Homer*, "Glotta" 53, 1975, 183-194; T. Jahn, *Zum Wortfeld «Seele-Geist» in der Sprache Homers*, München 1987 ('Zetemata' 83); V. N. Jarcho, *Zum Menschenbild der nachhomerischen Dichtung*, "Philologus" 112, 1968, 147-172; T. Krischer, *Noos, Noein, Noema*, "Glotta" 62, 1984, 141-149; V. Larock, *Les premières conceptions psychologiques des Grecs*, "Rbph" 9, 1930, 377-406; J. H. Leshner, *Perceiving and Knowing in the Iliad and the Odyssey*, "Phronesis" 26, 1981, 2-24; J. P. Lynch and G. B. Miles, *In Search of Thumos: Toward an Understanding of a Greek Psychological Term*, "Prudentia" 12, 1980, 3-9; R. B. Onians, *The Origins of European Thought*, Cambridge 1954²; G. Plamböck, *Erfassen, Gegenwärtigen, Innesein, Aspekte homerischer Psychologie*, Kiel 1959; J. M. Redfield, *Nature and Culture in the Iliad: The Tragedy of Hector*, Chicago 1975; J. de Romilly, *«Patience mon coeur». L'essor de la psychologie dans la littérature grecque classique*, Paris 1984; J. Russo and B. Simon, *Homeric Psychology and the Oral Epic Tradition*, "JHI" 29, 1968, 483-498; A. Schmitt, *Selbständigkeit und Abhängigkeit menschlichen Handelns bei Homer*, Stuttgart 1990; B. Snell, *Die Entdeckung des Geistes*, Göttingen 1975⁴; *Der Weg zum Denken und zur Wahrheit*, Göttingen 1978 ('Hypomnemata' 57); S. D. Sullivan, *Psychological Activity in Homer. A Study of Phren*, Ottawa 1988; *Phrenes in Hesiod*, "Rbph" 67, 1989, 5-17; *Phrenes in the Greek Lyric Poets*, "Glotta" 66, 1988, 26-61; *Phrenes in Pindar and Bacchylides*, "Glotta" 67, 1989, 148-189; *Noos in Homer and the Homeric Hymns*, "SIFC"

tities is very broad. It includes many intellectual, emotional, and volitional functions. The various entities may act as agents of these activities, as locations of them, or as means a person uses to carry them out.

One prominent feature of psychic entities is their association with speech. They frequently receive words or act as a source of them. This paper will examine different contexts where psychic entities are related to speech. In connection to this topic it will show how these psychic entities were similar and different. We shall see how frequently it was with reference to these entities that individuals assumed that speech took place. Our focus will be upon poetry of the Archaic Age: Homer, the *Homeric Hymns*, Hesiod, the lyric and elegiac poets, Pindar and Bacchylides. On the one hand, our evidence is fragmentary and this will lead us to be cautious in making general conclusions. On the other hand, this evidence is sufficient to allow us to see how early poets related speech and psychic entities.

I. Θυμός.

In the case of θυμός we see this psychic entity being used by a person in relation to speech and also itself speaking². Twice Zeus assures Athena that the words he has just spoken would not be literally put into effect. This occurs first at *Il.* 8.39 concerning the threats he has made to punish the gods if they enter battle: "not now in any way do I speak (μυθέομαι) with an earnest (πρόφρων) θυμός, but I wish to be gentle to you". He says the same concerning his suggestion about saving Hector's life from Achilles (*Il.* 22.183). In these two passages the nature of θυμός affects how a person speaks.

This is the case too when Aphrodite warns Anchises not to reveal that he has slept with her: "if you speak out and boast (ἐπεύχομαι) with foolish (ἄφρων) θυμός" (*H. Ven.* 286). In this case the influence of θυμός will prove to be negative. In the story of Polyphemus we hear three times of the way the Cyclops answers Odysseus: "thus I spoke and he immediately

7, 1989, 152-195; *Noos in Hesiod*, "Glotta" 68, 1980, 68-85; *Noos in the Greek Lyric Poets*, "Emerita" 57, 1989, 129-168; *Noos in Pindar and Bacchylides*, "Glotta" 68, 1990, 179-202; *How a Person Relates to Thumos in Homer*, "IF" 85, 1980, 138-150; *Person and Thumos in Hesiod*, "Emerita" 61, 1993, 16-40; *Thumos in Pindar and Bacchylides*, "Rbph" 71, 1993, 46-68; *The Psychic Term Etor, The Role of Ker, Kradie in Homer* (these articles forthcoming); *Kradie, Ker and Etor in Poetry after Homer*, forthcoming in "Rbph"; M. Treu, *Von Homer zur Lyrik*, München 1955; J. R. Warden, *The Mind of Zeus*, "JHI" 32, 1971, 3-14; P. Vivante, *Sulle designazioni omeriche della realtà psichica*, "AGI" 41, 1956, 113-138.

² On θυμός see in particular Biraud, Caswell, Cheyns, Jahn, Lynch and Miles, and Sullivan in note 1.

answered (ἀμείβω) with pitiless (νηλεής) θυμός" (*Od.* 9.272, 287, 368). In these passages also the nature of θυμός strongly affects the type of speech that occurs. It makes speech "foolish" or "cruel".

In two other passages we hear that θυμός is the location of speech. At *Il.* 23.769 Odysseus during the foot-race "prayed (εὔχομαι) to flashing-eyed Athena in his θυμός". So too as he comes to shore after shipwreck, Odysseus prays to the river "in his θυμός" (*Od.* 5.444). In both these passages we find an instance of silent speech occurring within θυμός.

In several passages a person "speaks" (εἶπον) to θυμός and a description of the thoughts or inner words of an individual follows³. In four of these passages we find a particular pattern⁴. The hero in distress "speaks to his great-hearted θυμός". After considering possibilities of behaviour, he then asks: "but why has my dear θυμός discussed (διαλέγομαι) these things with me?" These four passages have figured prominently in recent discussions of whether Homeric individuals are capable of decision or not⁵. These discussions have shown in a persuasive manner that Homeric individuals are capable of making true decisions. When the individual has addressed θυμός, we then find the person bringing forth possibilities of action. At *Il.* 21.552-62 we hear, for example, of Agenor wondering: "if I flee in one direction"; "if I flee into another direction". He proceeds to sum up these suggestions with a question: "why does θυμός discuss these things with me?". What we encounter, therefore, is θυμός assumed to be carrying on inner dialogue. It appears to be the source of the ideas considered. From these ideas the person is able to remain somewhat distant. The individual can either choose from its ideas or suggest new ones. We see, therefore, θυμός capable of inner speech.

In these passages θυμός is clearly an agent of speech. Elsewhere we hear of θυμός involved in asking questions. Odysseus in speaking to Alcinoos says: "but your θυμός is turned to ask (εἶρομαι) of my grievous sufferings" (*Od.* 9.12). Alcinoos at the end of *Od.* 8 had asked Odysseus to

³ These passages are: *Il.* 11.403, 17.90, 200, 442, 18.5, 20.343, 21.53, 552, 22.98; *Od.* 5.285, 298, 355, 376, 407, 464.

⁴ Namely *Il.* 11.403, 17.90, 21.552, and 22.98.

⁵ See in particular the recent discussion of R. Gaskin, *Do Homeric Heroes Make Real Decisions*, "CQ" 1, 1990, 1-15; D. Gill, S.J., *Two Decisions: Iliad 11.402-22 and Agamemnon 192-230*, in *Studies Presented to Sterling Dow*, Durham N.C. 1984, 125-134; T. G. Rosenmeyer, *Decision-Making*, "Apeiron" 23, 1990, 187-218; J.-H. Sautel, *La genèse de l'acte volontaire chez le héros homérique*, "REG" 104, 1991, 346-366; 'But Why Has My Spirit Spoken With Me Thus': Homeric Decision-Making, "G.&R." 30, 1983, 1-7; Schmitt (note 1); S.D. Sullivan, 'Self' and Psychic Entities in Early Greek Epic (forthcoming).

give details of himself. Odysseus sums up his questions by saying that his host's θυμός, interested in and concerned for Odysseus, is the source of these inquiries. Elsewhere we find quite often a formulaic line: "speak what θυμός in your chest orders you"⁶. In these passages we see words directly expressing the thoughts and desires of θυμός.

At *Od.* 20.266 θυμός is the source of a different form of speech. Telemachus, defending Odysseus the beggar, tells the suitors: "hold your θυμός from rebuke (ἐνιπή) and blows, so that no strife and quarrel arise". They are to avoid speaking in a particular way. In contrast, at *Od.* 12.266, θυμός acts as a receiver of speech. As Odysseus approaches the island of Helios, "the word (ἔπος) of the blind seer, Theban Teiresias, and of Aeaeon Circe fell" into his θυμός. Odysseus recalls their warnings to avoid this island. He then proceeds to tell his men to stay away from this island (270-276). Here we see θυμός receive words and then act as a source of these same words spoken to others.

In the lyric poets and in Pindar we find θυμός as an agent of speech in three passages. At 308 (b) Alcaeus addresses Hermes: "it is of you that my θυμός desires to sing (ὑμνέω)". Theognis too speaks of θυμός singing. At 826 he asks the Scythians how their "θυμός dared to sing (αἰδέω)", since their land was lost. Similarly too Pindar says at *Ol.* 3.38: "therefore in some way my θυμός prompts me to say (φαμί) that prestige has come to the Emmenidae and Theron".

Summary of θυμός. In these passages of early Greek poetry we see θυμός associated with speech in several ways. It is a psychic entity with which one speaks in a particular manner. It is a location where one speaks or where words are placed. It itself "asks", "rebukes", or "desires to speak", acting as an agent of speech.

II. Φρήν/ Φρένες.

Φρένες in the poetry of the Archaic Age function frequently as a location or means in which and with which people act. As such we find several associations of them with speech⁷. At *Od.* 4.676 the suitors "plan (βυσσοδομεύω) words (μῦθοι) in their φρένες", namely the killing of Telemachus. At *Od.* 15.445 we hear of sailors told to "keep (ἔχω) a word (μῦθος) in their φρένες", being called to silence about what they know. At *Od.*

⁶ See *Il.* 7.68, 349, 369, 8.6, 13.784, 20.255, 332; *Od.* 7.187, 8.27, 17.469, 18.352, 21.276. Cf. the passages where θυμός orders (ἀνάγω) to "speak": *Il.* 9.101, *Od.* 16.466, 21.94. Cf. too *Od.* 8.45 where θυμός "urges on" (ὀτρύνω) Demodocus "to sing".

⁷ On φρένες see especially Biraud, Cheyns, Ireland and Steel, Jahn, and Sullivan in note 1.

1.328 Penelope "grasped (συντίθημι) the song (ᾠοιδή) in her φρένες", as Phemius sang of the homecoming of the Greeks. Thersites too, at *Il.* 2.213, "knew (οἶδα) many disorderly words (ἔπεα) in his φρένες"⁸. At *Il.* 17.260 Homer asks: "what man could speak (εἶπον) the names in his φρένες" of all the Greeks who rushed to save the body of Patroclus. In these passages we see φρένες functioning as a psychic entity used for understanding, retaining, or speaking words.

Elsewhere φρένες are again both location and means of speech. At *Il.* 14.92 Odysseus urges Agamemnon not to speak of abandoning Troy: "be silent so that none of the Achaeans may hear this word which no man should draw through his mouth at all, whoever knows (ἐπίσταμαι) in his φρένες how to speak things suitable (ἄρτια)". Here we see φρένες as the source of "appropriate" comments, ones suited to the demands of a situation. At *Il.* 1.107 Agamemnon complains to Calchas: "seer of evils, never yet have you spoken to me what is good. Always in truth it is clear to your φρένες to prophesy (μαντεύομαι) evils nor ever yet have you spoken a noble word nor completed it". Φρένες are assumed to be the place from which prophecies arise.

In other passages too the role of φρένες as source of speech is prominent. At *Od.* 16.398 one of the suitors, Amphinomos, "pleased Penelope in particular in words, for he used (χράομαι) good φρένες". In this case "good φρένες" lead to acceptable speech. In contrast, at *Il.* 17.171, Hector answers the criticism of Glaucus: "why have you, being such as you are, spoken insolently? Good friend, surely I thought you to be above others in respect to φρένες.... Now very much I blame your φρένες in what you say, seeing that you claim I did not stand against mighty Ajax". Glaucus' earlier use of speech made Hector assume that he had superior φρένες; his present criticism makes him think otherwise. Φρένες are the location where Glaucus judges the actions of Hector and the place from which he draws the words he says. Poor speech leads to the assumption that these φρένες are inferior⁹.

Elsewhere bad speech gives the impression that φρένες are not present at all. At *Il.* 12.234 Hector tells Polydamas that his words no longer please him and that he is capable of speaking a better speech (μῦθος): "if you truly speak this in earnest, then surely the gods themselves have destroyed your φρένες". Polydamas' suggestion of not fighting the Greeks for the ships

⁸ Cf. *H. Merc.* 453 where "nothing else is so much a care to the φρένες" of Apollo as the song of Hermes on the lyre.

⁹ Compare *Il.* 15.128 and *Od.* 2.243 where Ares and Mentor are described as "crazed in φρένες" because of what they say.

seems to Hector to be utterly foolish. Φρένες, assumed to be the source of speech, must not, in his view, have been functioning at all: they seem to have been "destroyed"¹⁰.

Sometimes φρένες are affected directly by speech. At *Il.* 5.493 "Sarpedon spoke and his word (μῦθος) bit (δάκνω) the φρένες of Hector". As a result Hector hastens into battle. At *Il.* 10.139, when Odysseus hears Nestor outside his tent, "sound (ἰωή) came about his φρένες"¹¹. At *Od.* 4.777 Antinoos, referring to the plan to kill Telemachus, says: "let us... complete such a word (μῦθος), which has fitted (ἀραρίσκω) all of us in our φρένες"¹². Here a suggestion has proved acceptable and become fixed as a resolve in φρένες.

In certain other passages also φρένες act as receivers of speech. At *Od.* 22.347 Phemius says: "a god has planted (ἐμφύω) all sorts of songs for me in my φρένες". When he sings, Phemius simply expresses songs divinely placed in his φρένες. These φρένες receive inspiration and then act as the origin of words. At *Il.* 16.83 Achilles urges Patroclus to listen carefully in order that he might place "the sum of speech" in his φρένες. He tells Patroclus not to pursue the Trojans but, later, ἄρη seizes the φρένες of Patroclus (16.805) and he fails to remember. In this passage we see the importance of φρένες with regard to taking and heeding advice. When their own function is impaired, the person fails to think well and chooses disastrous behaviour. A "word" (ἔπος) too can be placed in φρένες. When Hera is about to tell Zeus of the birth of Eurystheus, she says: "father Zeus, a certain word I will place for you in your φρένες" (*Il.* 19.121)¹³. Φρένες function as a receiver of words, which will then be pondered or acted upon.

In the lyric and elegiac poets we encounter several descriptions of φρένες in relation to speech. Archilochus (120 W.) says that he knows "how to lead a song, thunderstruck in φρένες with wine". We may suppose that what he says in his song takes its origin from φρένες. Sappho, in contrast (120), speaks of having a "silent (ἄβακῆς) φρήν", not being one who is "spiteful in temperament". Φρήν perhaps refrains from thinking unkind things and thus negative thoughts do not find expression in words. Anacreon too in fragment 421 (= ia.4 W.) speaks of his φρένες having become

¹⁰ Cf. *Il.* 7.360 where Paris says the same thing to Antenor for suggesting that Helen and her treasure be given back to the Greeks.

¹¹ Cf. *H. Merc.* 421 where the "lovely sound" of music comes through the φρένες of Apollo.

¹² Cf. *Od.* 24.465 where the word of Halitherses fails to please the men of Ithaca in their φρένες.

¹³ Cf. also other passages where a "word" is placed in φρένες: *Od.* 11.146, *H. Ap.* 257 and 534.

"deaf and dumb". The context is not clear but these φρένες do not "speak" inwardly.

Once, in a fragment of Terpander, we find φρήν as an agent of song: "let φρήν sing of the far-shooting lord" (697)¹⁴. Elsewhere φρήν is an object affected by speech when Theognis says: "do not beguile my φρήν with words" (981).

Pindar mentions φρήν several times in relation to speech. At *Pyth.* 6.36 Nestor, under attack by Memnon, seeks help from Antilochus: "his shaken φρήν cried out (βοάω) to his son". Fears fills Nestor's φρήν and result in an appeal for help.

In three passages Pindar clearly shows the relationship of speech and φρήν. At *Nem.* 4.8 he says: "the word (ῥήμα) lives longer than deeds which a tongue draws forth from a deep φρήν with the favour of the Graces". With divine help words taken from a "deep φρήν" prove to be long-lasting. At *Is.* 6.71 Pindar praises Lampon as someone who pursues "measure" and gains possession of it. He then praises him: "his tongue is not outside his φρένες" (72). His words reflect his thoughts and both reveal that he has achieved moderation. In contrast, Pindar says of Theaios in *Nem.* 10.29: "father Zeus, whatever he loves with his φρήν, he is silent with his mouth". Theaios does not openly express the thoughts he entertains in his φρήν.

Twice Pindar speaks of φρήν as the source of specific words. At *Ol.* 2.90 he asks: "whom are we hitting, sending again arrows of fame from a gentle φρήν?". Pindar will bestow fame with his song. The source of what he says is his φρήν, "gentle" in nature. At *Pae.* 9.37 he speaks likewise of composing "a glorious song with the pipe by the counsels of my φρήν". What Pindar will utter rests upon the advice given by his φρήν.

Finally, at *Pyth.* 1.12 we hear that φρένες are much affected by song itself. Pindar says: "shafts of song soothe even the φρένες of the gods". Song can displace, it appears, troubled thoughts, as it enters φρένες.

Summary of φρένες. As with θυμός we see φρένες in early Greek poetry acting as a location or instrument in which or with which one can speak. We see them too functioning as the origin of speech and prophecy. If words prove pleasing or acceptable, someone is assumed to have "good" φρένες. If they do not, φρένες are thought to be functioning badly, to be inferior, or to be destroyed. Φρένες can serve too as a receiver of words. They are considered to act upon what someone else says.

Something we do not find in Homer with φρένες, which we did, in contrast, find with θυμός, is any reference to their speaking themselves or

¹⁴ Cf. also *Adesp.* 955 where φρήν is related to a hymn.

to their being directly addressed by the individual. What is true of φρένες in general is that they function most often as a location or instrument; θυμός, on the other hand, appears very frequently as an agent. We see this pattern present in relation to speech in early epic. In the lyric and elegiac poets and Pindar, however, we see φρήν become more active as an agent of speech. It can "sing" and "cry out". Φρήν acts too as a source of speech. Pindar especially makes clear that the tongue draws speech from φρήν. It functions very much as the origin of song.

III. Νόος.

Like θυμός and φρένες, νόος also is associated with speech¹⁵. In particular we will encounter it mentioned with "tongue" in passages describing different types of speaking. At *Od.* 18.332 Melanthe chides Odysseus for being so bold among the suitors: "either wine holds you in your φρένες or is now your νόος always such that you babble vain things?"¹⁶. Melanthe mentions as one possibility a permanent state of νόος that results in foolish utterance. Νόος clearly serves as the source of this type of talk.

In another passage someone is urged to speak forth what is in νόος. At *Il.* 1.363 Thetis says to Achilles about the sorrow that came to him in his φρένες: "speak out, do not conceal (κλέπτω) it in your νόος, in order that we both may know"¹⁷. Athena makes a similar request of Zeus at *Od.* 24.474: "tell me what I ask. What does your νόος conceal within (κεύθω)?"¹⁸. In both instances νόος contains the thoughts that another wishes to have expressed.

In three passages we find a contrast between νόος and speech. At *Od.* 2.92 and 13.381 Penelope encouraged each of the suitors, "sending them messages but her νόος was set on other things". At *Od.* 18.283 likewise she "beguiles" the θυμός of the suitors with "gentle words" but "her νόος was set on other things". Here we see a person speaking in one way but thinking in another. Νόος often serves as a seat of someone's true thoughts and purposes. In the case of Penelope these can be in marked contrast to outer behaviour, especially to speech.

In Hesiod also we find mention of a contrast of speech and νόος: in fr. 150.14 we hear of those in whom "νόος is above the tongue". In these

¹⁵ On νόος see in particular Biraud, Bona, von Fritz, Jahn, Krischer, Leshner, Sullivan, and Warden in note 1.

¹⁶ Cf. *Od.* 18.392 where Eurymachus says the same thing to Odysseus.

¹⁷ Cf. *Il.* 16.19 where Achilles makes the same request of Patroclus.

¹⁸ Contrast *Il.* 1.132 where Agamemnon asks Achilles not "to beguile" him with his νόος. In this case words, taking their origin from νόος, could be too persuasive.

people thought appears to be superior to words. Elsewhere Hesiod refers to *vóos* in connection with tongue in fr. 239.3 where he speaks of wine "binding feet, hands, tongue, and *vóos* in unimagined bonds". Thinking and expression fall victim to wine's effects.

In the lyric and elegiac poets we find a number of mentions of *vóos* and speech. Solon in 34.16 W. says that some people thought that his kind words to their enemies concealed actual harsh intentions. They hoped that he, "uttering smooth complaisance, would show forth a harsh *vóos*". Speech here is assumed by some people to be in contrast with *vóos* but in fact reflects it accurately.

Several times in the lyric and elegiac poets *vóos* and tongue are mentioned together. At Solon 27.13 W. someone in his seventh and eighth group of seven years is called "best in *vóos* and tongue". For fourteen years this individual excels in thinking and speaking. Theognis also connects *vóos* and tongue. At 760, in order that he may sing a "holy song", he prays: "may Apollo guide astraight my tongue and *vóos*". What he thinks in *vóos* will find expression in his prayer.

At 1163 Theognis says: "eyes, tongue, ears, and *vóos* grow in the middle of the chest of those who are wise (*συνετοί*)". *Nóos* is often placed in the chest region¹⁹. Here it is joined by both the senses, namely, eyes and ears, and also the tongue. All these operate, it appears, at a deep level in wise persons. *Nóos* perhaps ponders information given by eyes and ears and expresses it in "tongue", that is, in speech. At 1185 Theognis remarks: "*vóos* is a good thing and the tongue". These grow in few people who are stewards of them both". Ideally speech will reflect *vóos* but it appears that this happens rarely. Those with *vóos* do not express it in words; those who speak eloquently may not be wise.

In two passages Theognis presents a negative picture of *vóos* and tongue. At 87-92 Theognis asks Cyrnus to express authentic affection: "do not love me and hold your *vóos* and *φρένες* in another direction, if you love me and your *vóos* within is trustworthy. Either love me, putting on a pure *vóos*, or refuse and hate me, raising a quarrel openly. The individual who with one tongue holds *vóos* in two ways is a terrible companion, Cyrnus, better an enemy than a friend". Again we hear the ideal that speech should reflect what someone is truly thinking. This will mean open affection or dislike. *Nóos* should be "trustworthy" and "pure". It also should be held in "one way" only. Someone with a *vóos* held in "two ways" dissembles in speech and belongs correctly to the category of enemy.

Both *vóos* and tongue prove vulnerable to wine. Theognis says at 480:

¹⁹ See, e.g., *Il.* 4.309; *Od.* 2.124; Hes., *Theog.* 122; Theogn. 121, 507, and 898.

"whoever passes the measure of drinking is no longer master of tongue or *vóos*". This person cannot control what he is thinking or saying because of wine's effects²⁰. In another passage Theognis calls on Cynos to control his *vóos*: "check yourself in your *vóos*; let gentleness of tongue always follow. In truth the *καρδίη* of the worthless is rather sharp" (365). Speech reflects *vóos* but should not do so if harsh words result. Cynos is to curb certain thoughts so that his words will be gentle.

Pindar also in one passage relates *vóos* and tongue. At *Pyth.* 5.110 he praises Arcesilas: "he nourishes a *vóos* and tongue stronger than his age". Both *vóos* and tongue change with time, becoming better. In both thinking and speaking, Arcesilas shows himself superior. In another poem Pindar specifically speaks of *vóos* as the source of speech (123.4): "whether the race of mortals on earth climb a lofty tower by justice or by crooked deceits, my *vóos* is divided in telling precisely". Pindar cannot discern nor express the exact truth with regard to this question. His *vóos* ponders two possibilities, which he sets forth in speech. In another passage, *Ol.* 2.92, he can state what he believes is true: "I will utter a saying sealed by an oath with a truthful *vóos*". He asserts that Theron is the most generous person found in Acragas in the last one-hundred years (93-95). Once again thoughts in *vóos* are expressed in words. Ideally these thoughts will prove to be true²¹. In this passage we see *vóos* used as an instrument of speech.

Summary of *vóos*. In these passages of early poetry we see *vóos* connected with speech in a strong way. *Nóos* is considered to be a source of speech. Ideally, speech will reflect *vóos* and will prove to be true. But sometimes this does not happen. Speech and *vóos* are in marked contrast. What people say is not what they are actually thinking. In Hesiod, the lyric and elegiac poets, and Pindar we find several mentions of *vóos* and tongue together. They are assumed to be closely connected: *vóos* appears to be the source of what tongue says. *Nóos* can also act as an instrument with which one speaks.

In these passages where *vóos* is found, we see that it resembles *φρήν*/*φρένες* in acting as an instrument with which one speaks and in having a close relationship with tongue. Like *φρήν* in Homer, *vóos* does not itself speak in early epic. *Φρήν* does speak in Terpander and Pindar; *vóos* similarly speaks in Pindar. Like *φρήν* too, no one in Homer addresses *vóos* directly, as we have seen happen to *θυμός*.

²⁰ See further on wine's effect upon *vóos* at Theogn. 498, 500, and 507.

²¹ Cf. too the connection of *vóos* with truth at *Pyth.* 3.103.

IV. Heart.

We find the three entities indicating "heart" associated with speech²². In the following references we see them resembling θυμός in particular. First, ἦτορ, κῆρ, and κραδίη act as agents of speech. At *Il.* 15.166 and 182 Zeus says of Poseidon: "his ἦτορ does not shrink from saying that he is my equal". Here we learn that the claims that Poseidon makes come directly into expression from ἦτορ. Twice elsewhere we hear of a different form of sound deriving from the heart. At *Il.* 21.389 "the dear ἦτορ of Zeus laughed with joy" as he observed the gods rejoining battle. So too does the κῆρ of Odysseus laugh when he sees the other Cyclopes failing to come to Polyphemus' aid (*Od.* 9.413).

Heart makes yet another sound at *Od.* 20.13. The κραδίη of Odysseus "barks" as he sees the maid-servants going to sleep with the suitors. Odysseus must restrain it and urge it to endure since the action it suggests of punishing these servants would prove too dangerous for him at this time (18-24). In another reference we see a definite connection of κραδίη with speech. At *Od.* 21.198 Odysseus tells Eumaeus and Philoetius: "speak how your κραδίη and θυμός order you". This line, similar to the formulaic one in which θυμός "orders" one to speak²³, shows that the words spoken derive from κραδίη.

In the passage described above where the κραδίη of Odysseus "barks" (*Od.* 20.1-24), he also addresses it directly. At line 18 he calls on it to "endure". Then, at line 22, Homer sums up this admonition by saying that Odysseus "thus spoke, addressing (καθάπτω) his dear ἦτορ in his chest". In both cases we see the heart receiving the words of Odysseus. At *Od.* 20.326 also we hear of the heart receiving speech. Agelaus says: "I would speak a gentle word to Telemachus and his mother, if it might please the κραδίη of them both".

In Pindar we find four passages in which speech and heart are connected. Three times κέαρ functions as an agent of speech. At *Nem.* 7.103 Pindar says that his "κέαρ will not say" that he has defamed Neoptolemus. In this case κέαρ refuses to speak in a particular way. At *Is.* 5.20 Pindar says: "my κέαρ will taste of songs (ῥυμος) not without the race of Aea-cus". Κέαρ acts as the source of the song and also the choice of theme. At *Pae.* 8A.11 Cassandra's κέαρ reacts to the sight of Paris: "at once the most holy, inspired κέαρ cried aloud (κλάζω) with grievous groaning and revealed the following in sum of words". She proceeds to tell of Hecuba's dream of bearing a "fiery Fury". Κέαρ acts as the seat of prophecy in this

²² On words for heart see Cheyins and Sullivan in note 1.

²³ See above, note 6.

passage. It spills forth prophetic words never to be believed.

Once we find Pindar addressing ἦτορ directly. At *Ol.* 1.4 he says: "dear ἦτορ, if you wish to tell (γαρύω) of contests, do not consider any other shining star by day warmer than the sun". ἦτορ is treated as the source of song. Here too, under Pindar's guidance, it will choose a subject upon which to focus.

Summary of Heart. In Homer we see ἦτορ, κῆρ, and κραδίη acting as an agent of sound and speech. We see it also addressed directly and functioning as a receiver of words. In Pindar κέαρ three times acts as an agent of song. Once too he addresses ἦτορ directly.

V. Ψυχή.

As is well-known, ψυχή does not function as a psychological agent until after early epic²⁴. It begins to emerge as such in the lyric and elegiac poets. But what we find in Homer is ψυχή carrying on certain activities as the shade of the dead. In this role some passages refer to it as "unburied shade", others as "buried shade after drinking blood". As "unburied shade" ψυχή can make sounds. When it leaves the body, it "utters a shrill cry" (τρίζω)²⁵. The ψυχή of Patroclus "speaks" a word to Achilles (*Il.* 23.65). To him also it "gives orders" (ἐπιτέλλω, *Il.* 23.106). Likewise the unburied ψυχή of Amphimedon "addresses" (προσφωνέω) Agamemnon (*Od.* 24.120).

When the shades have drunk blood, they can speak. Thus the ψυχή of Teiresias "speaks" (λέγω, *Od.* 11.150) as does that of Achilles (προσσυδάω: *Od.* 11.471). Ψυχαί "ask" (εἶρομαι) about their dear ones (*Od.* 11.541). Ψυχαί can "address" (προσφωνέω) one another²⁶. The ψυχή of Teiresias "prophesies" (μαντεύω) to Odysseus (*Od.* 23.251).

In the lyric and elegiac poets there is only one humorous reference to ψυχή speaking. Xenophanes says that he recognises the ψυχή of a friend "speaking" (φθέγγω) in a dog (7a W.). In Bacchylides we find two references to the shade of Meleager "speaking" (εἶπον, πρόσφημι) to Heracles (5.77, 171). All these passages are significant in that ψυχή as shade possesses the capacity of speech. Later, when it becomes a psychological agent in the person, it becomes associated with this capacity again.

VI. Conclusion.

In this paper we have examined the relationship of speech and psychic entities. We see that this relationship varies with the different psychic enti-

²⁴ On ψυχή see in particular Biraud, Claus, Jahn, Redfield, and Sullivan in note 1.

²⁵ *Il.* 23.100; *Od.* 24.5 and 9.

²⁶ *Od.* 24.23, 35 (= 191), and 105.

ties. In Homer we find θυμός and ἦτορ functioning as agents of speech. People also speak to θυμός, κραδίη, and ἦτορ. We see θυμός and φρένες functioning as locations and instruments of speech. Both serve as well as receivers of speech. Νόος too can be an instrument of speech. It is regarded also as a source of speech. Neither φρένες nor νόος speak themselves. No one addresses them directly.

In the lyric and elegiac poets and in Pindar we find θυμός, φρήν, and νόος all as agents of speech. Φρήν and νόος act as sources of words and song. Νόος in particular is associated with the tongue and its expression. In Pindar κέαρ appears as an agent of speech.

In this early poetry ψυχή, indicating the shade of the dead, in special circumstances possesses the capacity for speech. In these instances, however, it is not yet functioning as a psychological agent in the living person.

Even though our evidence is fragmentary, this early poetry shows us that speech was often connected with psychic entities. They act as its agent, and its source; they can be receivers of it, locations of it, or instruments of it. The varying relationship speech is thought to have points to different qualities of the psychic entities themselves. Θυμός is more often an agent of speech than φρένες in Homer but this becomes less true in the lyric and elegiac poets and in Pindar. Νόος functions prominently as a source of expression that is true. Φρένες appear as a source of words that are sensible or suited to circumstances. Unsuitable or inappropriate words lead to the assumption that φρένες are not functioning well or are not acting at all. The connection of speech and psychic entities is a close one and illustrates well aspects of their range of function.

Vancouver B.C., Canada

SHIRLEY DARCUS SULLIVAN