2014 • VOLUME 6 • NUMBER 2

TRENDS IN CLASSICS

EDITED BY

Franco Montanari, Genova

Antonios Rengakos, Thessaloniki

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Alberto Bernabé, Madrid

Margarethe Billerbeck, Fribourg

Claude Calame, EHESS, Paris

Philip Hardie, Cambridge

Stephen Harrison, Oxford

Stephen Hinds, U of Washington, Seattle

Richard Hunter, Cambridge

Christina Kraus, Yale

Giuseppe Mastromarco, Bari

Gregory Nagy, Harvard

Theodore D. Papanghelis, Thessaloniki

Giusto Picone, Palermo

Kurt Raaflaub, Brown University

Bernhard Zimmermann, Freiburg

DE GRUYTER

ISSN 1866-7473 · e-ISSN 1866-7481

All information regarding notes for contributors, subscriptions, Open access, back volumes and orders is available online at www.degruyter.com/tic

Trends in Classics, a new journal and its accompanying series of Supplementary Volumes, will publish innovative, interdisciplinary work which brings to the study of Greek and Latin texts the insights and methods of related disciplines such as narratology, intertextuality, reader-response criticism, and oral poetics. Trends in Classics will seek to publish research across the full range of classical antiquity.

Submissions of manuscripts for the series and the journal are welcome to be sent directly to the editors:

RESPONSIBLE EDITORS Prof. Franco Montanari, Università degli Studi di Genova, Italy. franco.montanari@unige.it, Prof. Antonios Rengakos, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Greece. rengakos@the.forthnet.gr

EDITORIAL OFFICE Paola Ascheri, Stephanos Matthaios, Lara Pagani, Evina Sistakou

JOURNAL MANAGER Claudia Hill, De Gruyter, Genthiner Straße 13, 10785 Berlin, Germany, Tel.: +49 (0)30 260 05 – 172, Fax: +49 (0)30 260 05 – 250, Email: claudia.hill@degruyter.com

RESPONSIBLE FOR ADVERTISEMENTS Claudia Neumann, De Gruyter, Genthiner Straße 13, 10785 Berlin, Germany, Tel.: +49 (0)30 260 05-226, Fax: +49 (0)30 260 05-322, Email: anzeigen@degruyter.com

© 2014 Walter de Gruyter GmbH, Berlin/München/Boston

TYPESETTING Dörlemann Satz, Lemförde

PRINTING Franz X. Stückle Druck und Verlag e.K., Ettenheim
Printed in Germany

Cover Illustration: Signet-Entwurf für TC: Christopher Schneider, Laufen

Table of Contents

Special Issue:

Theban Resonances in Homeric Epic

Issue Editor: Christos Tsagalis

Preface — 239

PART I: Theban Epic and the *Iliad*

Ete Barker – Joel Christensen

**Even Herakles Had to Die: Homeric ‘Heroism’,
Mortality and the Epic Tradition — 249**

Corinne Pache

Theban Walls in Homeric Epic — 278

Benjamin Sammons

A Tale of Tydeus: Exemplarity and Structure in two Homeric Insets — 297

Mary Ebbott

**Allies in Fame: Recruiting Warriors in the Theban and Trojan Epic
Traditions — 319**

PART II: Theban Epic and the *Odyssey*

José Torres

Teiresias, the Theban Seer — 339

Christos Tsagalis

**γυναῖων εἵνεκα δῶρων: Interformularity and Intertraditionality in Theban and
Homeric Epic — 357**

Justin Arft

**Immanent Thebes: Traditional Resonance and Narrative Trajectory in the
Odyssey — 399**

Stephanie Larson

Thebes in the *Odyssey*'s 'Catalogue of Women' — 412

PART III: Theban and Trojan Epic Across the Lines

Malcolm Davies

Oedipus and the Riddle of the Sphinx — 431

Athanassios Vergados

**Form and Function of Some Theban Resonances in Homer's
Iliad and *Odyssey* — 437**

Bibliography — 452

General Index — 468

List of Contributors — 470

Preface

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0013

Next to Troy stands Thebes. The importance of these two cities for the way the Greeks constructed their past has been immense. This statement is equally true for the field of archaic Greek epic, since the Theban and Trojan epic traditions crystallized through poetry the mythical lore pertaining to the two chief events that, according to the early Greeks, brought the race of heroes to their end (Hes. *WD* 161–165). The importance of Theban and Trojan myth must have been recognized at an early stage, as it can be gathered on the basis of late archaic and classical iconography on the one hand, and tragedy on the other. This does not mean that other mythical cycles did not attract the interest of the Greeks. But both quantitatively and qualitatively, Theban and Trojan myth occupied a preeminent position in Greek culture. On the level of epic poetry, the most tangible manifestation of this supremacy was that the epics dealing with these two mythical traditions formed the largest part of a canon of epic poetry, which seems to have been created during the 4th century BC in Athens, the so-called Epic Cycle. With the exception of a *Theogony* and a *Titanomachy*, which comprised the first part of this collection of epics, all the other poems included in it pertain to Theban and Trojan myth, in particular to the failed expedition of the Seven, the successful expedition of the Epigonoι, and its aftermath on the one hand, and the Trojan expedition and its aftermath on the other. No less than four Theban epics (*Oedipodeia*, *Thebaid*, *Epigonoι*, *Alcmeonis*) were included in this canon of epic poetry, a sure sign of the importance and status of Theban epic even towards the end of the classical era.

Of these Theban epics that were composed in the archaic period only few fragments and very limited information has survived the test of time. Collected and re-edited three times in the last 25 years, they provide us with the bare bones of a thriving tradition of epic poetry, which Homeric epic undoubtedly knew, as it can be shown by its frequent reference to the ‘seven-gated Thebes’, as well as to heroes and heroines that formed part and parcel of Theban epic. Oedipus, Epicaste, Eriphyle, Tydeus, Capaneus, Adrastus, Diomedes, Sthenelus, Thersander, Teiresias are only some of the heroes and heroines that ‘belonged’ to the core of Theban tradition and it is very likely that Homeric epic knew them basically through their rendering in oral Theban epics, which were current during the period of the shaping of the Homeric epics.

Christos Tsagalis: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, E-Mail: christos.tsagalis@gmail.com.

The case of Heracles is a special one for a number of reasons: first, though he was born in Thebes he is only marginally tied to his home-city. Second, he plays no role in the Theban epic tradition but is connected with various exploits occurring in different places. He features as a sacker of cities (Oechalia, Pylos, Troy) but he is in no way marked by this role. Third, his Panhellenism is very different from that of Achilles, Odysseus or Tydeus. He has no 'default mode' on the level of a poetic rendering of his turbulent biography. Heracles has neither a Homer nor a genre. And yet, his marginal featuring in the *Thebaid* and the Homeric poems shows that the link between the Theban and Trojan epic traditions may go deeper than hitherto thought and may have also encompassed such an emblematic hero.

At this stage, it is necessary to treat a methodological problem directly connected to the issue of the interaction between Theban and Homeric epic. A central question associated with this problem concerns our ability to know whether Theban echoes in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* stem from Theban myth in general or from Theban epic in particular.¹ This is, of course, a much larger topic that supersedes by far the scope of this introduction, the more so since it is not restricted to Theban and Homeric epic but encompasses the entire body of epic tradition in the archaic period. The reader will, I hope, have a much better idea of what Homers think with respect to this issue after reading this special issue. Be that as it may, I will present some pertinent observations concerning this question without restricting myself to Theban resonances in Homeric epic:

1. "The way" the *Iliad* "refers to subsidiary episodes of the [Theban] saga suggests knowledge of an ample epic narrative, and there are certain lines that" it "may have adapted from" its "source":² 2.505, 563–566 [572]; 4.8, 372–399, 389–390, 401, 406, 408; 5. 125 f., 800–808; 6.222 f.; 14.114–125; 20.224, 23.346, 679. The same observation can be made with respect to resonances of episodes or figures stemming from the Trojan section of the Epic Cycle. The number of such resonances, the systematic pre-occupation of Homeric epic with them, and their dispersion in the entire body of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* indicate that this material featured in oral epics known to 'Homer'.³

2. The mythological paradigm on Meleager (*Il.* 9.524–599) and the extended digression of Nestor (*Il.* 11.670–762) seem to have been adapted from pre-existing epics, a **Meleagris* and a **Nestoris* respectively.⁴ These stories can hardly have

¹ The same question concerns Heracles.

² West (2011) 29.

³ For the *Iliad*, see Kullmann (1960); for the *Odyssey*, see Schischwani (1994).

⁴ On the **Nestoris*, see Bölte (1934) 319–347; on the **Meleagris*, see Kakridis (1944) 1–53; some new arguments are given by West (1988) 160–161.

been *autoschediasmata* invented wholesale for the occasion.⁵ In the case of the Meleager tale, the speaker (Phoenix) signals epic citation by the use of poetological terms translated into epic idiom: οὕτω καὶ τῶν πρόσθεν ἐπευθόμεθα κλέα ἀνδρῶν (*Il.* 9.524). Moreover, the iconographic record suggests that the hunt of the Calydonian boar was well known in the archaic period and this can hardly be a development parallel to the Iliadic account in Book 9. The abbreviated nature of Phoenix's narrative presupposes a fuller version in which the condensed material of its Iliadic rendering would have had the shape of a fully-fledged narrative. In the case of the **Nestoris*, the mention of Ereuthalion, a figure featuring in this episode as early as *Il.* 4.319 and 7.133–157 (see also 23.629–642) indicates that Nestor's digression in *Iliad* 11 belongs to a much larger body of verse pertaining to Pylos that the *Iliad* knows and adapts to its purposes.

3. If we deny the existence of a pre-Homeric oral epic or epics dealing with the entire Trojan saga, then we have to assume that the first hexameter renderings of such paramount events as the death of Achilles and the Fall of Troy were the work of Arctinus of Miletos in the *Aethiopis* and in the *Iliou persis* respectively. Are we really ready to endorse such a view? This untenable line of thought becomes almost absurd, if we bear in mind that the necessary concomitant of this approach is that the bards had *unanimously* decided to sing *only* the *menis* of Achilles, that this restricted narrative choice was the *sole* version current before Arctinus decided to write about Achilles' death in epic hexameters. On the contrary, the *Iliad* shows such a deeply-seated preoccupation with the theme of the death of Achilles, although such a preoccupation is not at all necessitated by its plot, that it is almost guaranteed that it draws on an epic rendering of this event. The summary of the post-Homeric *Aethiopis* by Proclus, the resonances of Achilles' death in the two Homeric epics, its echoes in Hesiod and Pindar, together with vase representations of this theme in the archaic period create a synthetic view of a pre-Homeric epic on Achilles.⁶

4. The number of 'cyclic' resonances in Homeric epic is so large and so often in agreement with the content of cyclic epic that it can only be explained in light of the existence of pre-Homeric oral poetry that influenced directly the post-Homeric written cyclic epics and indirectly the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.⁷ There is simply no alternative explanation: the view that so many scattered references to 'cyclic' myth in Homeric epic were either selected by the cyclic poets and further

⁵ As argued by Willcock (1964) 141–154.

⁶ Kakridis (1944) 113–127; Pestalozzi (1945) 33–34; Schadewaldt (1959) 155–163.

⁷ See Kullmann (forthcoming) with a list of cyclic resonances in the *Iliad* (mainly) and the *Odyssey*.

developed or that this agreement is the result of pure coincidence is an untenable position.

5. “The poems frequently signal their use of allusive motif transference. Notions of priority and of direction of influence are thus written into the poems”.⁸ Motif-transference is key to the realization that we are dealing with oral epics known to the Homeric poems and not just mythical episodes known from artistic representations or, even more vaguely, from myth.⁹

6. The ‘connection point’ (*Verknüpfungspunkt*) is crucial for determining the nature of the resonance (*Anspielungscharakter*). A given detail can either be a free invention of the Iliadic and/or Odyssean epic tradition or an epic citation of another epic tradition. For example, in *Il.* 23.826–829, the iron-weight that Achilles sets as prize and which (we are told) he had taken from Eetion (whom he had slain when he sacked his city) is an *ad hoc* invention of the *Iliad* in order to link past and present. By having Achilles set as a prize in the funeral games for Patroclus something belonging to Andromache’s father Eetion, the Iliadic tradition reminds its audience of the close link between the tales of Hector, Patroclus, and Achilles. This detail cannot have belonged to an epic tradition, since it is unlikely that a minute description of the sack of a minor city (such as Hypoplacian Thebes in the Troad) would have mentioned a relatively insignificant object.¹⁰ On the contrary, the reference to Philoctetes’ exile in Lemnos (*Il.* 2.721–725) stems from a pre-Homeric epic source. It cannot be the result of free invention (since it serves no purpose in the *Iliad*); nor can it stem from some artistic representation of Philoctetes’ wounding that would have made the Iliadic tradition refer to the Meliboean hero’s past and future role in the Trojan war expedition. The reference to Philoctetes in the Catalogue of Ships is, as it is the case with other heroes who play no part in the *Iliad*, the appropriate place for epic indexing. A careful look at the relevant verses shows that the *Iliad*’s highly condensed reference to Philoctetes spans his role in the Trojan tradition (from his exile in Lemnos to his return to Troy in the hour of Achaean need). Moreover, in at least one of the two sub-references (referring to his exile in Lemnos) we can even see that the phraseology employed by the *Iliad* and the *Cypria* is the same, since both traditions use the rare word ὕδρος to designate the snake that bit Philoctetes (*Il.* 2.723: μοχθίζοντα κακῶ ὀλοόφρονος ὕδρου/ *Cypr.* arg. l. 145 Severyns: ὕφ’ ὕδρου πληγείς). The thesis that the post-Homeric written *Cypria* ‘imitated’ an Iliadic (and Homeric) *hapax legomenon* attested in a digressive reference in

⁸ Currie (2012) 572.

⁹ See Kullmann (1960) 11; Schwischwani (1994) 19–21.

¹⁰ I deliberately use here the telling phrasing of Kullmann (1960) 14–15.

the Catalogue of Ships and transferred it to an entire episode of its plot is simply untenable.

7. The *Odyssey* (more than the *Iliad*) shows a high degree of incorporation of local or epichoric versions of Odysseus' pre-Homeric past that must have existed in epic poetry of a rather local scale.¹¹ Epichoric epic of this kind is always tied to given places and presupposes some sort of historical background, no matter how distorted, reshaped or altered it may appear when included in Panhellenic epic.

8. Homeric epic makes ample reference to professional singers of epic. These are not ῥαψωιδοί reciting epic poetry composed by others but ᾠδοί performing their own songs. Thamyras in *Iliad* 2 rivals the Muses, Demodocus in *Odyssey* 8 sings three successive songs on *different* subjects, Phemius' repertoire in *Odyssey* 1 and 24 concerns material pertaining to both the deeds of men and gods. Apart from eponymous singers, the *Odyssey* mentions two anonymous bards: in Argos (3.267–271) and in the context of the wedding ceremony in Sparta (4.17–18). Given the ample evidence offered by, at least, the *Odyssey* that “poets [can] appear in the cast of characters”¹² and its systematic preoccupation with epic singers and epic song, *a priori* dismissal of epic resonances with respect to stories embedded in speeches is dogmatic.

9. Poetological references directed to epic songs (I offer a few examples): in *Od.* 12.70 the phrase Ἀργῶ πᾶσι μέλousα makes it clear that the *Odyssey* is here citing an older Argonautic song tradition in epic verse; in *Od.* 24.197–201 the poetological terms χαρίεσσα ᾠοιδή and στρυγερή ᾠοιδή designate the epic traditions of the *Odyssey* and the **Nostoi* respectively.

10. In the case of the *Odyssey*, we are in a position to confirm that this epic has ‘written’ in its own plot traces of alternative versions concerning Odysseus' return.¹³ These versions pertain to other *Odysseys* against the backdrop of which the ‘Homeric’ version was shaped. If, then, the *Odyssey* captures in such a systematic and thorough manner other Odyssean epic traditions, why should we deprive it (and by extension the *Iliad*) of the ability to engage in source-quoting?¹⁴

11. The *Odyssey*'s sophisticated allusion to the *Iliad* not in the manner of direct quotation but through latent references is often based on phraseological reshaping, misuse, adaptation, and expansion.¹⁵ Parodic effects have been also detected. If then the epic tradition of the *Odyssey* regularly engages in oral citation of the *Iliad* (the one case we can systematically ‘check’), it must –at least

¹¹ See Marks (2008).

¹² I. Rutherford (2001) 135.

¹³ See Danek (1998).

¹⁴ On Homeric intertextuality, see Tsagalis (2011b) 413–414 with further bibliography.

¹⁵ Maronitis (1983) 277–291; Pucci (1987); I. Rutherford (2001) 117–146.

for the *Odyssey*- be acknowledged that it is doing the same thing with other epic traditions.

12. The existence of meta-epic comments in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* makes sense only if the Homeric poems are regularly involved in a critical dialogue with alternative epic traditions. Self-reflexive tendencies such as the one observed in the Iliadic *teichoscopia* (Book 3) or Helen's 'Trojan' narrative to Telemachus in *Odyssey* 4 also show that the Homeric tradition uses certain characters as 'vehicles' for the expression of meta-poetic statements. The presentation of Helen as weaving 'the *Iliad*' on her web (*Il.* 3.125–128) and her reference to the *Iliad* as a song that will survive for men to come (*Il.* 6.358) indicates that Homeric epic has developed a sense of identity and, what is more important, that it 'writes' *this identity in its plot by means of specific episodes and characters*. This is strong evidence both that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* operate within a system of other epic songs and that they systematically engage in source-quoting as part of their effort to shape their own epic identity.

The contributions included in this special issue offer a rich panorama of Theban resonances in Homeric epic and suggest ways on how to interpret such resonances.

Elton Barker and Joel Christensen study Heracles, the mythical hero par excellence, and his featuring at critical moments in Homeric epic. By applying recent frameworks in the study of oral poetics to examine the use of Heracles in the *Iliad*, they focus especially on how Homeric narrator and speakers use a Heracleian fabula implicit through the epic to evaluate their stories and communicate the relationship between *this* epic and other narrative myths. Their analysis reveals the *Iliad*'s sustained engagement with Heracles traditions, while also illustrating how Homeric epic appropriates and marginalizes other heroic traditions to suit its own needs.

Corinne Pache explores Theban traces in Homeric epic pertaining to city walls. She maintains that while Homeric epic tends to downplay other traditions to foreground its own heroes and narratives, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* self-consciously appropriate Theban themes as a way of competing with Theban epic.

Benjamin Sammons studies Tydeus, a famous Theban hero, in the *Iliad*. By drawing attention to the fact that twice in the *Iliad* (4.370–418, 5.800–813), a rousing tale of Tydeus' embassy to Thebes is told to his son Diomedes, by Agamemnon and Athena respectively, he argues that these two inset narratives reveal a unitary conception and literary form that go well beyond the rhetorical needs of these speakers. In his view, this unitary conception reveals in turn the poet's instinctive habit of seeking out and refashioning "off-center" but highly exemplary episodes within larger traditions.

Mary Ebbott's contribution pertains to the compressed narrative of the recruiting trip to Mycenae taken by Tydeus and Polyneices (*Il.* 4.376–381). By a careful analysis of phraseology she reveals through the formulas “gathering warriors” (λαὸν ἀγείρων) and “allies in fame” (κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους) that the same theme is shared by the Theban and Trojan epic traditions of recruiting warriors for a large expedition.

Passing from the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey* José Torres investigates the character of Teiresias, the famous Theban soothsayer. By a detailed analysis of the relevant material he proposes some conclusions which pay special attention to the probable pre-Homeric life of Teiresias as the protagonist of shamanic poetry. According to this interpretation, the Homeric Teiresias has become the figure who mediates between different sagas and establishes a link between the Trojan epic tradition and the Theban one.

Christos Tsagalis explores the role of interformularity and intertraditionality in the relation between Theban and Homeric epic. By an in-depth study of the formula γυναιῶν εἵνεκα δώρων in the *Odyssey*, Tsagalis reconstructs the whole process of shaping certain thematic features that run across these two epic traditions. Bringing into the discussion material from Archilochus and Pindar with respect to the myth of Telephus and the expedition of the Seven against Thebes, Tsagalis maintains that there existed an entire web of associations between the epic rendering of Theban and Trojan myth. Seen from this vantage point, interformularity and intetraditionality not only existed between epic traditions of the archaic period but they were also *signaled* in epic poetry as a manifestation of oral epic citation.

Justin Arft argues that within the *Odyssey*, Epicaste and Eriphyle serve as a vehicle for Theban myth, and their presence within the Catalogue of Heroines further encodes their reference in the epic. In considering Arete as audience to Odysseus' presentation of these Theban women, the *Odyssey* is shown to employ intratextual structures against which extratextual tradition resonates.

Stephanie Larson argues that the *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines bears traces of the formative influence exercised on it by the historical and political context of Peisistratid Athens. When the Homeric epics became part of the standard performative repertoire of rhapsodes in Athens after the change introduced in the Panathenaea by Hipparchus, “traditional Boeotian and Thessalian figures were juxtaposed with shorter Athenian stories, all of which were familiar from oral tradition”. According to Larson, it is during this period that the *Odyssey* was fixed.

The last part of this special issue is devoted to a more panoramic view of the Theban and Homeric traditions. Malcolm Davies explores the two most important cycles of Greek myth, the Theban and Trojan Wars, each of which begins, in effect, with the birth of an ultimately disaster-bringing individual, Oedipus and

Paris. His analysis centers on the shared features of these two figures, especially the communal disasters they inflict by taking an inappropriate partner.

Athanassios Vergados examines the function of allusions to the Theban saga in the two Homeric epics. He argues that the *Iliad* selects material conforming to the poem's preoccupation with the present heroes' relative worth with respect to earlier generations. In the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, the Theban material is combined with allusions to other local sagas, all of which it incorporates in order to supersede them and present itself as the 'newest song'.

Christos Tsagalis
Thessaloniki, June 2014.

PART I: Theban Epic and the *Iliad*

E. Barker – J. Christensen

Even Heracles Had to Die: Homeric ‘Heroism’, Mortality and the Epic Tradition

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0014

After Patroclus is killed, Achilles resolves to seek vengeance for his friend against Hector. Recognizing that to stay at Troy seals his own fate, Achilles offers his mother a consolation:

οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίη Ἡρακλῆος φύγε κῆρα
ὅς περ φίλτατος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίωνι ἄνακτι,
ἀλλὰ ἔ μοῖρα δάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλέος χόλος Ἥρης.

“For not even violent Heracles escaped his fate,
though he was most dear to lord Zeus, son of Cronus,
but fate tamed him and the anger of Hera, hard to endure”.

Il. 18.117–119

While many of Homer’s heroes turn to well-known myths to make sense of their situations,¹ Achilles’ use of Heracles here seems odd and at the same time particularly charged. It is odd because Achilles has never until this point referred to any other figure from myth (even though he is famously recorded as singing the “famous stories of men” when the assembly meets him in *Il.* 9.189: ἄειδε δ’ ἄρα κλέα ἀνδρῶν). Yet, not only is Heracles one of the foremost ‘heroic’ figures of Greek myth; according to other sources, he also famously survived death and lived on with the Olympians. To insist on his death, as Achilles does here, would seem to indicate some emendation – or, at least, repurposing – of his tale by Homer’s protagonist. More broadly, it provides a tantalizing glimpse into the

¹ For such mythical *paradeigmata*: Willcock (1964) and (1977); cf. Braswell (1971); Held (1987). Alden (2000). Recent scholars are less interested in Homeric innovation and more in the critical reception of mythical tradition: Edmunds (1997) 415–441; cf. Nagy (1996) 113–146.

E. Barker: Open University, E-Mail: etebarker@gmail.com.

J. Christensen: The University of Texas at San Antonio, E-Mail: joel.christensen@utsa.edu.

rivalry between Homer's poem and a Heracles epic tradition, played out over the critical issue of immortality.

Until recently, references to characters, events or themes outside the scope of the war at Troy tended to be seen through the lens of Neoanalysis, as evidence for other poems (or at least fixed traditions) that had a direct influence on the formation of our *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,² and based on literary paradigms such as allusion or intertextuality.³ Yet, models that assume stable traditions if not fixed texts have been shown to be insufficient for representing the a-hierarchical and multidirectional engagement of the living traditions of myth in oral performance. Approaching the interaction between different story traditions from an oralist perspective, specifically John Miles Foley's framework of "traditional referentiality",⁴ our earlier work has explored how *units of utterance* (from words and phrases to type-scenes and story patterns) can assist in elucidating the ways in which the Homeric poems of the sack of Troy and the return home construct and convey meaning in and against other narrative traditions.⁵ Such phrases, or 'formulas', function to unite the synchronicity of the poem in performance with its diachronic inheritance, the larger tradition out of which it is forged.⁶

In this chapter we bring additional nuance to our approach by adopting two terms recently introduced by Egbert Bakker, which further facilitate a departure from critical paradigms based on *reading* rather than listening to Homeric epic. Where intertextuality might be appropriate for describing meaningful repetitions of words, themes or plot patterns in fixed narratives, the emphasis on *texts* is not entirely apt for the echoic context of oral epic poetry, where meaningful repetition is heard in the wider and deeper sounding chamber of fluid, ever-evolving, competing forms of the 'same' stories. Instead Bakker suggests that, "in order to emphasize the fact that this intertextuality takes place within and is enabled by

² Neoanalysis: Kakridis (1949); Kullmann (1960) and (1984) 307–324; Danek (1998); Currie (2006). On its contributions to the analysis of Homer more generally, see e.g. Burgess (2001); Montanari, Rengakos, and Tsagalis (2012).

³ Allusion in Homer: Currie (2006). Intertextuality as marking the interplay between two texts without positing any claims regarding authorial intention: D. Fowler (2000); cf. Lyne (1994); and in Homer: Pucci (1987).

⁴ Foley (1999) 13–34; cf. Scodel (2002) 1–2. Kelly (2010) uses the analogy of the Web to argue that Homer's audience were invited to follow hyperlinks in the Homeric poems to other materials, in order to assess the way characters especially try to manipulate story patterns and often fail.

⁵ Barker and Christensen (2008); (2011). For a similar method applied to Archilochus in conjunction with Homer, see Barker and Christensen (2006).

⁶ Foley (2002) 127: "Oral poetry works like a language, only more so". Homeric language as composed of intonation units that correspond to the hexameter *cola*: Bakker (1997). Cf. Sifakis (1997); Foley (1999).

the formulaic system” we should consider the dynamic engagement of phrases and motifs along a “scale of increasing interformularity”.⁷ For Bakker, interformularity operates *within* a given epic tradition: when repetition takes place *across* different epic traditions, this amounts to what Bakker labels *intertraditionality*.⁸ We find these terms more helpful than intertextuality, since they acknowledge the Homeric poems as engaging not with fixed traditions (or ‘texts’) but rather with *conventional forms of language* (formula) through appropriation, re-use and modification (interformularity), and in the complementary dynamic interrogation of repeated story-patterns, motifs and narrative traditions (intertraditionality) localized around the exploits of other heroes at other times and in other settings.

From a somewhat different though complementary perspective, Barbara Graziosi and Johannes Haubold have shown how the Homeric poems fit into epic’s broader mythical space- and time-scape, by mapping out a putative ‘cosmic history’ from the birth of the gods (Hesiod’s *Theogony*) to the everyday lives of the archaic audience (Hesiod’s *Works and Days*).⁹ According to this argument, the *Iliad* takes up the story where the *Theogony* leaves off to narrate the destruction of the “race of heroes” (men born from gods – glimpsed at the end of the *Theogony*), who leave in their wake *developing* institutions that guarantee security in place of dependence on individual “shepherds of the people”. The *Odyssey* depicts a stage further on, as the gods become ever more distant and a more ‘human’ hero – the emphasis being now on the *man*, ἄνδρα (*Od.* 1.1), Odysseus – returns home to exact vengeance, that oldest form of ‘justice’ which Polemarchus paraphrases in Plato’s *Republic* as bringing pain to your enemies and pleasure to your friends (335b), a pairing that recalls for us Odysseus’ prayer for Nausicaa when he arrives

7 Bakker (2013) 158. He describes the interformularity scale thus (159): “The more restricted an expression, the more specific the context in which it is uttered, and the higher the point at which it can be placed on the scale ... the continuum of increasing specificity is quintessentially cognitive: it is based on the judgment of the performer/poet and the audience as to the degree of similarity between two contexts: the more specific a formula and/or the more restricted its distribution, the greater the possible awareness of its recurrence and of its potential for signaling meaningful repetition”.

8 Tsagalis (oral presentation at the Center for Hellenic Studies) provides an example of *Il.* 1.245–246 and *Od.* 2.80–81. These passages, which use similar motifs, language and context (a hero hurls down a scepter in an assembly), “share a high contextual surplus for they both pertain to situations that seem to be paralleled ... Telemachus did not ‘need’, so to speak do what Achilles did after the end of the assembly in another epic tradition nor is the dashing of the scepter to the ground something that heroes regularly do when they are angered and in a state of distress. The two scenes belonging to two different epic traditions are, then, closely linked between them”.

9 Graziosi and Haubold (2005). Cf. Clay (2003) and Mackie (2008) 34–40.

on the shore of the Phaeacians' home (*Od.* 6.184–185); in turn, its more human perspective is picked up by the intense interrogation of justice in Hesiod's *Works and Days*.¹⁰ Seen in these terms, extant archaic Greek hexameter epic – namely the Hesiodic and Homeric poems – help explain the cosmic separation of the gods from men.

Significantly, as the *Works and Days* looks back to the end of the race of heroes, it locates that moment in time around two specific places: Thebes (and the flocks of Oedipus) and Troy (for the sake of Helen).¹¹ From a Hesiodic perspective, the wars and traditions about Troy and Thebes are notionally equivalent, in that they both relate the extinction of this former race of heroes. As we have begun to sketch out elsewhere, the presence of Theban elements in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* can be viewed in terms of a dynamic rivalry, through which the Homeric poems shape Thebes and its tradition for the purposes of their own narrative strategies.¹² And so it is clear from considering the relationship between Hesiod and Homer and between Troy and Thebes why the Theban hero, Heracles, can be such a useful figure to 'think with'. Heracles is a hero to rank alongside any to be found in Homer, a superhuman son of Zeus who has many adventures. Yet, he barely figures in surviving epic, with hints of his heroic endeavors in Homer and Hesiod supplemented by fragments of purportedly contemporary epics.

Our purpose in this chapter is not to try to reconstruct the lost epics of Heracles but rather to use the conceptual framework of interformularity and intertraditionality to explore the ways in which the *Iliad* represents Heracles and makes his tradition speak to the concerns of this narrative. We begin by sketching out the antiquity of Heracles in myth and assessing its resonance in the fragmentary and extant poetry from the archaic period. After establishing Heracles' independent existence outside Homer, we explore how speakers in the *Iliad* relate – and relate to – the accomplishments of this hero, in trying to make sense of or influence their situations. Finally, we consider how Heracles' appearances in the *Iliad* communicate the poem's sustained engagement with Heracles traditions through the adaptation of traditional structures and the manipulation of formulaic language. This analysis helps us reconsider Achilles' curious statement as part of an agonistic process by which the *Iliad* appropriates and marginalizes a hero ill fit to its tale.

¹⁰ For justice in Homer and Hesiod, see the classic debate between Adkins (1970) and Hugh Lloyd-Jones (1971) recently revisited by Allan (2006).

¹¹ *WD* 156–165.

¹² On rivalry between Trojan and Theban traditions as witnessed in the *Iliad*: Barker and Christensen (2011). Burgess (2009, 58), however, doubts "the common view" that the epics were designed to "supersede or neutralize other traditions"; cf. Scodel (2004).

Heracleian Epic: Fame and Fabula

There can be little doubt that Heracles was one of the most popular and enduring figures in Greek mythical representations of varying kinds.¹³ In iconography Heracles adorns temple friezes and drinking vessels in equal measure.¹⁴ In cult, he ranks alongside the heroes of the Trojan War saga and others associated with protecting communities.¹⁵ But he also exceeds other heroes: in Athenian dedications and prayers we find the formula “to the twelve gods and Heracles” (e.g. IG II, 1.57).¹⁶ Quintessentially, Heracles straddles the human and divine worlds. As Herodotus remarks, he was the only figure to receive sacrifices as both hero and god.¹⁷

While iconography alone testifies to Heracles’ popularity throughout the Greek world, early literary material provides broad (if shallow) evidence of his importance and the basic elements of his *fabula*.¹⁸ For Pindar, Heracles functions as a paradigmatic figure for competing athletes, dedicating his life to completing tasks and upholding the divine order.¹⁹ Part of this athletic portrayal depicts him living out a life with the gods in an idealized representation of the acclaim and festive celebration that each victor could expect from his community when returning home.²⁰ Typically of tragedy, Heracles’ super-human aspects come tinged with darker overtones. In Euripides’ *Heracles*, at the zenith of his glory he is visited by the goddess Madness and slaughters his entire family; in Sophocles’ *Trachiniae*, it is the returning hero who perishes at the hands of his jealous wife.²¹ In both cases, the hero’s antisocial threat is emphasized and his apotheosis downplayed, even in Sophocles’ play, which depicts his final moments.

13 Heracles in the Mycenaean period: Fowler (2013) 261. Cf. Galinsky (1972); Gantz (1993) 374–381.

14 For Heracles imagery in Athens, see Boardman (1975); for images of his apotheosis, see Holt (1992).

15 Cf. Farnell (1920) 95–98; For a recent discussion of Heracleian ritual as reflected in Euripides’ *Heracles* play, see Papadopoulou (2005), 9–57. For a broader overview of scholarship on Heracleian ritual and cult since Farnell, see Stafford (2010).

16 Heracles’ divinity problematic for the Greeks: Shapiro (1983a) 9; rare from an Indo-European perspective: Davidson (1980) 198; distorted by the literary record: Verbanck-Pierard (1989).

17 Herodotus 2.44. On Pausanias: Ekroth (1999) 150.

18 On this use of *fabula*: Burgess (2009).

19 Heracles was of course associated with the foundation of the Olympic Games and invoked as such at Pind. *Ol.* 2.8, 3.11, 6.68, and 10.10. Cf. [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 2.141; Hyg. *Fab.* 273.5.

20 *Isthmian* 4.54–60 depicts Heracles’ afterlife among the gods, married to Hebe and reconciled with Hera, as a reward for his righteous deeds and support of the divine order. Cf. *Nem.* 1. 67–79. Isocrates also claims that Heracles was more honored in Thebes than all of the other deities (*Philipp.* 88) and that Pindar marks out his special significance with the phrase ἥρωες θεός; *Nem.* 3.22.

21 On Euripides’ *Heracles*: Papadopoulou (2005). On Heracles in Sophocles’ *Trachiniae*: Liapis (2006).

The further back we go, the murkier Heracles' appearances become; still, the language and motifs characteristic of Heracles in extant archaic Greek poetry intersect with elements from our epics.²² Ancient biographical accounts even associated stories about Heracles with Homer's epic output;²³ though now considered unreliable, these witnesses provide evidence for the strong similarity of the different compositions, with respect to shared language, motifs and story patterns, and suggest that any poems circulating about Heracles would have been similar in style and content to the Homeric epics that survived.²⁴ On the one hand, the early epics probably helped in part to establish Heracles' character, traits and the basic outline of his story for a Panhellenic context.²⁵ On the other, his mutable nature as hero or god (and sometimes both) necessarily positions him as an exception to the Homeric epics' emphasis on human mortality and the coordinating importance of fame.²⁶

22 In addition to the archaic Greek hexameter poems that we discuss below, there may have been a poem from Eleusis about his descent into Hades, the fragmentary *Meropis* features Heracles, and he is prominent in the archaic poetry of Stesichorus (*Geryon*, *Cycnus*, *Cerberus*): Fowler (2013) 260–261.

23 Ancient testimonia link Homer with composers of Heracles epics, counting Panyasis, Peisander and Homer among the five best poets: Procl. *Vit. Hom.* 2; Tzetzes ad Hes. *WD*: PEG 1, 166–167, 171–174; cf. Davies *EGF*, 129–131. Homer is also linked with Creophylus as teacher and student (Photius), in-laws (Σ Plato *Rep.* 600b) or as guest-friends whose relationship was sealed by the gifting of the *Sack of Oechalia*: Strabo 14.1.18; Procl. *Vit. Hom.* 30; PEG 1, 157–60. Creophylus as a “more laughable companion of Homer”: Plato *Rep.* 600b; cf. Davies *EGF*, 113–129. The dating and geographical range of these poets also echoes the broad dates and shifting locations for Homer. Creophylus and Peisander are conventionally dated to the seventh century at Samos and Rhodes respectively whereas Panyasis is dated to the sixth century in Halicarnassus: Davies *EGF*, 114, 129, and 149–153. West (2003, 21–23) dates Peisander also to the sixth century based on his representation of Heracles with a club and lion-skin.

24 On the use of the ancient biographical tradition for thinking about the reception of poetry: Graziosi (2002). West (2013) 17 imagines “no comprehensive *Herakleia* covering his whole career” but instead a “Herakles cycle” similar to a set of poems dedicated to a particular figure in the Near-Eastern traditions (e.g. Gilgamesh). Davies (1989/2001) excludes Heracles epics from his consideration.

25 According to the Suda (s.v. *Peisandros*), the Rhodian Peisander flourished in the seventh century who wrote about the “deeds of Herakles” in two books (and was the first to give him a club!). Two extant fragments of Panyasis (4 and 5 PEG 1) bestow a lion skin upon the hero.

26 Heracles' excessive violence and antisocial individualism precluded him from participation in communal warfare and reciprocal honor: Galinsky (1972) 9–10. For the non-Homeric nature of apotheosis and immortality for mortals: Griffin (1977). While it is true that the Homeric epics largely suppress narratives that grant immortality to mortals, such notions are not unknown to archaic Greek hexameter poetry. Ariadne becomes immortal at Hes. *Th.* 947–949; in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* Artemis makes Iphimedes (Iphigeneia) immortal when she is sacrificed (fr. 23.24 M-W); Ino (Leucothea), a sea nymph, is said to have once been mortal (Burkert 1985, 172).

In the absence of any extant archaic Greek hexameter poem devoted to Heracles, we have to rely on fragments of possible poems, a single Homeric Hymn, and glimpses of the hero in the *Theogony* to put flesh on the bones of the epic Heracles.²⁷ The longest of our sources is the (probably late) Hesiodic *Shield*, and it provides a good example of the kinds of interformularity and intertraditionality that we will see operating within the *Iliad*. The narrative is motivated by a divine plan and largely anticipates one-on-one combat between Heracles and Cycnus.²⁸ A great portion (139–317) of the *Shield* is occupied by an arming sequence that involves the *ekphrasis* of Heracles' shield – which betrays compositional similarity to Achilles' shield in the *Iliad* – yielding a Heracles who looks decidedly Achaean, armed with sword, helmet and shield rather than his customary iconographic lion-skin and club. This Heracles also talks like a Homeric hero, articulating the arduous tasks he must perform and anticipating his own *kleos* (94 and 106–107). Even his conception is carefully plotted. After Heracles' parents migrate to Thebes,²⁹ Zeus plans “wondrous deeds” (ἐνθα καθεζόμενος φρεσὶ μῆδετο θέσκελα ἔργα, Sc. 34). This language has broad purchase in epic: Homer uses θέσκελα ἔργα to describe the combat between Paris and Menelaus (3.130), while in the *Odyssey* in response to Alcinoos, Odysseus glosses news of ex-Trojan War comrades as θέσκελα ἔργα (11.374).³⁰ A Hesiodic fragment even describes Helen's marriage as causing Zeus to contemplate θέσκελα ἔργα, as the gods are set in strife (ἄελπτον. πάντες δὲ θεοὶ δίχα θυμὸν ἔθεντο / ἐξ ἔριδος· δὴ γὰρ τότε μῆδετο θέσκελα ἔργα, [Hes.] fr. 204.95–96 M-W). The “wondrous deeds” here concern Zeus' plan to impregnate

Ganymede and Tithonus achieve problematic forms of immortality in the *HHymn to Aphrodite*, as we shall see below.

27 See Gantz (1993) 374–460 for an extensive summary of the early evidence for Heracles' myths. According to Proclus, before going to war, Nestor tried to dissuade Menelaus by offering him tales about men ruined by women. In this list, he included the madness of Heracles as a negative example: Νέστωρ δὲ ἐν παρεκβάσει διηγείται αὐτῷ ὡς Ἐπωπεὺς φθείρας τὴν Λυκούργου θυγατέρα ἐξεπορθήθη, καὶ τὰ περὶ Οἰδίου καὶ τὴν Ἡρακλέους μανίαν καὶ τὰ περὶ Θησέα καὶ Ἀριάδην (Chrest. 114–117). Cf. *Commentary* on Plato's *Alcibiades* 214.3–6. See also Hainsworth (1993) 285; Lardinois (2000) 649. Heath (1987) 187 suggests that *all* the tales are of love-madness. Heracles' madness was popular at an early period and mentioned in the work of Stesichorus and even Pindar: Fowler (2013) 269. The epic *Sack of Oechalia* apparently told of Heracles' madness and abduction of Iole: [Hes.] fr. 26.31–33 M-W; cf. Eusth. *In Il.* 300.43. Cf. West (2013) 276.

28 Sc. 58–60. As in the *Iliad*, the primary conflict is moved by a combination of Apollo and Zeus, while Athena spearheads actual intervention.

29 Sc. 1–28. This pattern of murder, exile and reintegration recalls the plight of Bellerophon (6.155–195) and Phoenix's tale of his own life (9.457–484).

30 In its only other occurrence in extant archaic Greek hexameter poetry, θέσκελα ἔργα describes the baldric Heracles wears in Hades (11.610). On the popularity of this scene in sixth-century BC art: Shapiro (1984b) 524–525.

Amphitryon's wife, and father a "guardian against war for both gods and men"; in the *Iliad* Achilles bemoans how he failed to be a "guardian against war" (ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα) for his comrade, Patroclus.³¹ Thus, the *Shield* not only draws on motifs and language shared with the Trojan War tradition, but ranks Heracles' birth and purpose as an equivalent act as the events of that war.

Such shared points of language and theme pervade arguably earlier and more fragmentary epic remains of Heracles. Though the *Sack of Oechalia* leaves barely three lines of hexameter, one names Nestor as the sole survivor of Heracles' attack, as Nestor himself touches upon in *Iliad* 11.³² The fragments of Peisander's *Heracleia*, also three lines in length, use language recognizable from other extant archaic Greek hexameter poems alongside motifs (such as Athena helping the hero and aetiological wordplay) familiar to any modern reader of Homer and Hesiod.³³ The more extensive fragments of Panyasis' *Heracleia* (over some sixty hexameter lines)³⁴ include a catalogue of gods who suffered at Heracles' hands, not dissimilar to Dione's consolation to Aphrodite in *Iliad* 5 (385–395).³⁵ Although the content of some of the longest passages seems un-Homeric to us, the phrases and imagery certainly draw on the same larger language cloud out of which extant archaic Greek hexameter epic derives.³⁶

31 κυδιῶν λαοῖσι. πατήρ δ' ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε / ἄλλην μῆτιν ὕφαινε μετὰ φρεσίν, ὥς ῥα θεοῖσιν / ἀνδράσι τ' ἀλφειστῆσιν ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα φυτεύσαι. *Sc.* 28–30. Cf. 128 (Heracles again); *Il.* 18.100.

32 *FR.* 1, 4 and 8 *PEG* 1: ὦ γύναι, <αὐτῇ> ταῦτά γ' ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὄρραι; Ἀντιόπη κρείουσα παλαιοῦ Ναυβολίδαο; *Νέστωρ* <δ> οἶος ἄλυσεν ἐν ἀνθεμόεντι Γερήνῳ). See *PEG* 1, 161–164. On Nestor's story, see pp. 262–263 below.

33 *FR.* 7 and 8 *PEG* 1: τῷ δ' ἐν Θερμοπύλῃσι θεὰ γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη / ποίει θερμὰ λοετρά παρὰ ῥηγμῖνι θαλάσσης; οὐ νέμεσις καὶ ψεῦδος ὑπὲρ ψυχῆς ἀγορεύειν) Add to this two partial lines (*fr.* 9 and 10 *PEG* 1): νοῦς οὐ παρὰ Κενταύροις; δικαιοτάτου δὲ φονῆος. According to Athenaeus (11.783c), Peisander's epic indicated that Telamon (Ajax's father) was a favorite of Heracles; cf. *fr.* 16 *PEG* 1, 170.

34 Dionysus of Halicarnassus (*Imit.* 2.2) and Quintilian (10.1: 52–54) compare Panyasis to Hesiod and Antimachus, praising Hesiod for his language but giving Panyasis some attention for his judgment; cf. *PEG* 1, 173–174.

35 τλῇ μὲν Δημήτηρ, τλῇ δὲ κλυτὸς Ἀμφιγυῆεις, / τλῇ δὲ Ποσειδάων, τλῇ δ' ἀργυρότοξος Ἀπόλλων / ἀνδρὶ παρὰ θνητῷ †ητευσέμεν εἰς ἐνιαυτόν, / τλῇ δὲ καὶ ὀβριμόθυμος Ἄρης ὑπὸ πατρὸς ἀνάγκη. Fragment 3 *PEG* 1. See pp. 261–262 below.

36 *Fr.* 16 *PEG* 1 discusses at length the virtues of wine and even goes so far as to grant equal fame to the man who delights in the feast as to one who leads an army into battle (τοῦ κεν ἐγὼ θεῖμην ἴσον κλέος, ὅς τ' ἐνὶ δαιτὶ / τέρπηται παρεὼν ἅμα τ' ἄλλον λαὸν ἀνώγη, 8–9). Subsequent fragments moralizing about drinking (17 and 19 *PEG* 1) may function to create tension between the eventual madness or loss of control by Heracles and his heroic resolve. Of course, bereft of the larger context, the actual tone and purpose of the passage is difficult to resolve. Moreover, the fact that these two longest fragments are preserved in quotation by Athenaeus should give some pause about the contrast between *his* use of these lines and their original context(s).

One complete archaic Greek hexameter poem dedicated to Heracles does survive – the *HHymn to Heracles*. The hymn is one of the shortest of the collection, but even its mere presence in the corpus indicates that Heracles achieves unique status as a hero honored like a god. Appropriately, the hymn presents Heracles as enjoying life on Olympus with Hebe as his wife and identifies his specific sphere of influence – he is asked to bestow *excellence* and *happiness*.³⁷ At the same time, it establishes a set of values that reflect the characterization of heroes throughout Homeric poetry: he is a son of Zeus and the “best” of those born on earth (1–3) who both suffered and performed terrible things (πολλὰ μὲν αὐτὸς ἔρεξεν ἀτάσθαλα, πολλὰ δ’ ἀνέτλη, 6–7). In these lines, Cook observes “the very qualities that make the hero useful to the community leave him an inherently ambiguous figure”.³⁸ Homeric epic shares this ambivalence about the hero, since both Achilles and Odysseus are marked out in their respective epics for suffering, both their own and that which they cause to others.³⁹ Heracles too “can serve as a vehicle for exploring the social consequences of an individual’s physical pre-eminence”,⁴⁰ particularly as a figure who represents a locus of contradictions.⁴¹ While we cannot be sure that this complexity was present in the Heracles epics, the fact that it pervades his archaic *fabula* and that such complexity attends the depiction of Homeric heroes, implies strongly that the Homeric epics are engaged in a representation of heroism whose ambiguity and sophistication derives at least in part from dynamic engagement with rival traditions.

Heracles’s paradigmatic and dynamic – even contested – character is confirmed by Hesiod’s *Theogony*, where the hero slays order-threatening monsters and rescues Prometheus.⁴² Yet formulaic language betrays a tension here too between Heracles’ identities as hero and god, marking him out for the kind of interformularity with the Homer epics that we will be discussing. For example, the Hesiodic line κακὴν δ’ ἀπὸ νοῦσον ἄλαλκεν not only recalls his cult-title ἀλεξικάκος and its attendant connections; it also echoes a formula localized to *Iliad* 21 when Achilles is in his most Heracleian as he wrestles with the

³⁷ Cf. *Od.* 11.603: Galinsky (1972) 15. A not dissimilar future is imagined for Menelaus because he is married to Zeus’ daughter Helen; see *Od.* 4.563–569.

³⁸ Cook (1999) 112.

³⁹ Cf. Nagy (1979) 83–93; Haubold (2000).

⁴⁰ Cook (1999) 112.

⁴¹ Heracles as vacillating between civilized and bestial, serious and burlesque, sane and insane, savior and destroyer, free and slave, divine and human, male and female: Loraux (1990) 24; cf. Kirk (1973) 16.

⁴² *Th.* 287 (Geryon), 314 (Lernean Hydra), 332 (Nemean Lion), and 526 (the liver-eating eagle). Another of Heracles’ cult-names is Beast-slayer (θηροκτόνε: see IG V, 2 91).

river Scamander.⁴³ Furthermore, special language highlights his divine status: Hesiod describes him as the husband of Hebe who lives “painless and ageless all of his days” (ναίει ἀπήμαντος καὶ ἀγήραος ἥματα πάντα, 950–955).⁴⁴ This line echoes the magical formula “deathless and ageless for all days” that appears when Demeter tries to make Demophoon immortal in the *HHymn to Demeter* or when Eos succeeds in making Tithonus deathless but not ageless in the *HHymn to Aphrodite*.⁴⁵ This Heracles is *a priori athanatos*, it seems, and, through his connection with Hebe, both *ageless* and ultimately without pain. For Homeric characters, in contrast, there is only ever the *wish* to be ageless and deathless (as expressed by Hector in *Iliad* 8 and Sarpedon in *Iliad* 12).⁴⁶ Calypso offers the possibility to Odysseus, but – perhaps seeing the perils of the promise – he refuses and asserts his human will to return home to his wife.⁴⁷ Indeed such miraculous

43 See below pp. 273–275 for a discussion of this passage and the significance of its manipulation for the interpretation of the *Iliad*. For inscriptions with this cult name see IG IV, 3416; SEG Attica 28 232. IC 2, XIX, 71 gives this cult name to Zeus when coupled with Heracles. See Farnell (1920) 147–149. For the wide range of this cult name especially in Attica, see Fowler (2013) 313 n. 180. The rescue of Prometheus signals a reconciliation with Zeus that earns the “strong son of Alcmena ... the Theban-born Herakles, kleos” (again, a rather Iliadic series of events).

44 Two reconstructed Hesiodic fragments also connect Heracles’ divinity to his marriage. In one (fr. 25 M-W) he dies and then ends up living with the other gods “deathless and ageless because he has fine-ankled Hebe as his wife.” – ἀθάνατος καὶ ἄγηρος, ἔχων καλλ[ίσ]φρον Ἥβην, 29); in the other, the hero lives “grieffless and without sorrow for all time, ageless and immortal because he has great Hebe” (ναίει ἀπήμαντος] καὶ ἀκηδῆς ἥ[ματα πάντα / ἀθάνατος καὶ ἄγη]ρος ἔχων μεγαλ[ῆ] Ἥβην, fr. 229.8–9 M-W).

45 For Zeus and Ariadne, see *Th.* 947 (τὴν δέ οἱ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήρων θῆκε Κρονίων); see also the reconstruction of [Hes.] fr. 23a M-W, (θῆκε]εν δ’ ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀγήραον ἥ[ματα πάντ]α, 12); *HHymn to Demeter* (2) 242 (καὶ κέν μιν ποίησεν ἀγήρων τ’ ἀθάνατόν τε) and 260 ἀθάνατόν κέν τοι καὶ ἀγήραον ἥματα πάντα); *HHymn to Aphrodite* (5) 214 (where Ganymede becomes immortal; ὥς ἔοι ἀθάνατος καὶ ἀγήρως ἴσα θεοῖσιν); and *HHymn to Aphrodite* (5) 218–224 where Eos asks for Tithonus “to be immortal and live for all days” (ἀθάνατόν τ’ εἶναι καὶ ζῶειν ἥματα πάντα) but forgets to ask for “youth” and to “wipe away ruinous old age” (ῥῆβην αἰτῆσαι, ξύσαι τ’ ἄπο γῆρας ὀλοῖόν). For an analysis of the *HHymn to Aphrodite*, see Van Eck (1978), Falkner (1995) 121–123; Segal (1974); and Faulkner (2011). For the development of the formula, see Janko (1981). This formula generally seems to indicate that for the Greeks immortality was bipartite, but it specifically marks figures – apart from Heracles – who are not Olympian gods, e.g., Medusa’s head on the Aegis (2.247); Achilles’ horses (19.408–416); Calypso and Alcinoos’ guard dogs; Medusa (277) and Echidna (304) in the *Theogony*. Things thus described are typically marginal to other divinities or in some way *fabricated*.

46 Hector’s awareness of his mortality: 6.440–493; 7.87–91. On Sarpedon’s famous speech (*Il.* 12.310–328): Pucci (1998) 49–68; cf. Rubino (1979).

47 Calypso mentions the possibility *after* Zeus has commanded her to release Odysseus *Od.* 5.135–6: cf. 7.251, 336). Of course, Odysseus’ immortality in epic song is contingent upon him not living an immortal life with Calypso.

transformation is explicitly denied to the heroes of the Trojan War in the *Iliad*, as Zeus is warned of the destabilizing circumstances of extending the life of his son Sarpedon – a critical moment in the epic, as we shall see.⁴⁸

Homer's Heracles

Given the varied representations of Heracles in the archaic and classical Greek popular imagination, we can posit that Heracles was already a hero of some pedigree by the time of Homer, and that he enjoyed an epic tradition on par with that of Troy. We have identified key aspects to be, on the one hand, his mighty strength, many labors and role in establishing (Zeus') order, and, on the other, an emphasis on his suffering and hints of his excessive violence. The balance is encapsulated by his ultimate fate – as a man, who suffers and dies, and as the son of Zeus, who lives on with his divine consort. Yet, while Heracles makes several appearances in Homer, both in the narrative⁴⁹ and in the speeches by characters,⁵⁰ Homer never treats Heracles at any length or in any detail.⁵¹

⁴⁸ In one of the Hesiodic fragments that alludes to his apotheosis through his marriage to Hebe, Heracles dies in a very mortal – even a rather Homeric – way as a “city sacker” poisoned by his wife before he achieves agelessness and immortality (Ἀμφιτρωνιά[δ]ηι Ἡ[ρακλῆ]ι πολυπό[ρ]θωι / δ[εξ]αμένωι δέ οἱ αἴψα τέλος θανάτοι]ο παρέστη, 25.23–24 M-W). This, in combination with some of our testimonia and the fragments discussed earlier [pp. 255–266], provides some evidence for an epic and more mortal Heracles.

⁴⁹ The narrator includes his son (and grandsons) in the roll call of the Achaean army in the Catalogue of Ships (2.653–670, 679); upon regaining his supremacy in battle, Hector kills the go-between for Eurystheus and Heracles (15.638–640); the gods gather on the battlefield at the site where Heracles built a wall (20.144–148). Cf. the *Odyssey*: Heracles killed the son of Eurystus in defiance of all rules of hospitality (21.14–41).

⁵⁰ Dione consoles Aphrodite for the wound that she receives from Diomedes, by complaining about the injuries that the gods suffered from Heracles (5.392–404); Heracles is a point of contention as his son Tlepolemus clashes with Sarpedon (5.628–654); Athena recalls the help that she once gave to Heracles (8.362–369); Nestor tells how Heracles killed all of his brothers (11.689–693); Sleep reminds Hera of how Zeus was greatly angered when she made Heracles suffer greatly (14.249–266). After he recounts his lovers and his offspring with them, Heracles included (14.323–325), Zeus recalls the pain he felt for his son (15.18–30); Achilles faces up to his own death by recalling that even Heracles had to die (18.117–119); Agamemnon relates how Zeus too was deceived, which meant that Heracles suffered long at the hands of Eurystheus (19.95–133). Cf. the *Odyssey*: along with Eurystus, Heracles could rival the gods with the bow (*Od.* 8.224–226). He now enjoys a life of pleasure with his consort Hebe among the gods while his shade (*eidolon*) ranges furiously in Hades, bow in hand, remembering his suffering and the unenviable task of entering Hades (11.601–627).

⁵¹ This noticeable reticence about an alternative heroic tradition is typical of the Homeric poems,

Nevertheless, the Homeric epics seem to understand something of the outline *fabula* of the Heracles narrative. A survey of his appearances indicates a consistent portrayal of the hero, which largely align with evidence outside Homer.⁵² Heracles is born of both mortal and immortal fathers (*Il.* 14.324–325; *Od.* 11.267–269); he must accomplish many labors (*Il.* 133–135) and is long-suffering (*Od.* 11.620–622), at the service of Eurystheus (*Il.* 15.635–640 and 19.74–140). He is helped by Athena (8.362–369; and Hermes: *Od.* 21.14–40), loved by Zeus (15.24–32), but hated by Hera (14.242–265) and fights with, or rivals, other gods (5.381–400). He sacks many cities, including Troy (*Il.* 635–645; cf. 14.266, 20.145).⁵³ He also commits violent acts, even against a host (*Il.* 5.381–400; *Od.* 21.14–41).⁵⁴ He dies but lives on with the Olympian gods (*Od.* 11.603). Homeric reference to these events and use of similar language can be shown to establish a dynamic engagement with the Heracles tale on both the level of language and traditional themes that functions almost exclusively to raise the profile of Homer's heroes and themes.

Citations of Heracles are not only more frequent in the mouths of Homer's characters (eleven out of a total of sixteen occasions across both Homeric poems); they also enjoy a different status than instances in the narrative. While the Homeric narrator is presented as a reliable conduit for the tradition with full control over the material, his characters lack the same degree of authority. Their use of traditional material is often represented as sitting uneasily with the surrounding narrative,⁵⁵ which makes their strategies more readily transparent and

where citations of Thebes in the *Iliad*'s version of a siege are similarly restrained and indirect. In contrast, the *Odyssey* is *not* completely silent on the tradition of the Argonauts: Circe mentions the "Argo sung by all men", i.e. *an epic song on the Argo* (Ἀργὼ πᾶσι μέλουσα, 12.70). The story of the Argo was likely of great importance to the *Odyssey*: West (2005). In itself, this silence can be regarded as a sign of the Homeric poems' agonism. A similar pattern can be detected in later literature: the Athenian tragedians rarely depict material from the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* though they fed at Homer's table; Thucydides avoids Herodotean material.

⁵² For a similar summary of Heracles in Homer: Mackie (2008) 1–11.

⁵³ While the epics clearly reflect some details, they may not reflect others such as Zeus' Amphitryon disguise: Fowler (2013) 260. Other references to the Sack of Troy by Heracles among early mythographers (especially Hellanicus's rather full account): Fowler (2013) 311–315; Gantz (1993) 400–402.

⁵⁴ Heracles is most often cited in the formulaic adjective-noun epithet βίη Ἡρακλεΐη, in the manner of expressions like ἵς Τηλεμάχιοι and βίη Πριάμοιο. Therefore, this particular expression entails no idea of a violent, unmanageable Heracles, which is the essence of his traditional role in epic: Nagy (1999) 318.

⁵⁵ Kelly (2010) 275: "Examples ... where a character deploys a story in order to make a rhetorical point indicate the difference from the narrator, since, unlike the Homeric poet, characters deploy stories without full cognisance or control over the relationship between traditional story and narrative context."

analyzable. A good example is when Athena, prevented by Zeus from helping the Achaeans, recalls the time she did Zeus a favor by helping Heracles complete his labors (*Il.* 8.362–369) – but she recounts this story to *Hera*, Heracles' avowed enemy. The citation of Heracles sounds off key and somehow out of place in this context.⁵⁶ In the following section we examine other cases where Heracles is explicitly used as a *paradeigma* by gods and men, and which sit uncomfortably with the narrative unfolding, and explore how Heracles is deployed as a subject of contestation and the means for stimulating reflection on the status and use of that *other* heroic tradition.

Heracles Out of Time

In part, Homer allows Heracles to be appropriated by his speakers as a negative *paradigm*. After a passing mention in the Catalogue of Ships as the father and grandfather of two contingents of troops, Heracles appears next when Dione consoles Aphrodite by explaining that many Olympians have suffered at the hands of men (*Il.* 5.384: ἐξ ἀνδρῶν, χαλέπ' ἄλγε' ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισι τιθέντες).⁵⁷ Two men, Otus and Ephialtes, assaulted Ares. Worse, however, was Heracles, who though alone wounds not only Hera but even Hades.

In passing over Heracles' heroic exploits, Dione *also* withholds his name, referring to him instead periphrastically as “the strong son of Amphitryon” or simply as “the man, the son of Zeus”. The striking, and unique, collocation of man and son of Zeus in one complete hexameter line, εὖτέ μιν **ὠντός ἀνὴρ υἱὸς Διὸς** αἰγιόχοιο, points to what is at stake in Dione's description – the portrait of a man who is daring enough to fight with the gods.⁵⁸ Of course, Dione is making a rhetorical point, comforting Aphrodite for a wound that Diomedes has just given her.⁵⁹ Even so, the violence that Dione describes is colored in a particular way. Her

⁵⁶ Kelly (2010) 274–275.

⁵⁷ An indication of the insult here – that *men* have pained the gods – comes in the description of pains as ‘difficult’, a collocation that is elsewhere only used by Odysseus, who looks forward to punishing his traitorous servant Melanthius (*Od.* 22.177).

⁵⁸ The image of Heracles taking on the gods with his bow implicitly complements the *Odyssey*, when Odysseus tempers his claims about being able to handle a bow by expressly refusing to rival the gods, unlike Eurytus and Heracles (*Od.* 8.224); cf. the picture of the image (*eidolon*) of Heracles raging in Hades with his bow (*Od.* 11.601–630).

⁵⁹ Indeed, Dione's description of the treatment that Hades receives for his wound (τῷ δ' ἐπὶ Παιῶνι ὀδυνήφατα φάρμακα πάσσω / ἤκέσατ': οὐ μὲν γάρ τι καταθητός γε τέτυκτο) is repeated soon after, when Diomedes wounds Ares (5.900), and the god of war is forced to leave the

account of both the assault on Ares by Otus and Ephialtes and Heracles rivaling the gods describes a world where gods and men are in regular and direct conflict with each other. Similarly, the description of Heracles αἰσυλα ῥέζων is picked up in a similar context, when the river god Scamander complains to Achilles about the shamefulness of his assault (21.214 – an example to which we will return).⁶⁰ At this moment, Diomedes has been acting like a Heracles by laying violent hands on the gods. But Diomedes' actions here are marked out as extreme in the *Iliad*. Soon after – in fact, immediately once Diomedes has also wounded Ares – Apollo will police the boundary between men and the divine and explicitly rule out men competing with gods.⁶¹ In this process, Heracles' own actions become consigned to a period before the *Iliad*. Unrestrained violence of this kind is not, and *cannot* be, part of the world inhabited by Homer's heroes.

This picture of a wild man Heracles is also touched upon later by Nestor, who refers to the hero maltreating Pylos and killing his brothers, all twelve of them; he *alone* survived (ἐλθὼν γάρ ῥ' ἐκάκωσε βίη Ἡρακλεΐη / ... τῶν οἷος λιπόμεν, οἱ δ' ἄλλοι πάντες ὄλοντο, 11.690, 693). The minimal detail may imply that the whole story was well known; but it is also important that Nestor mentions the event to put the focus on his own heroic deeds. Paradoxically, those deeds are part of a narrative of collective action, not dissimilar to the battle that is taking place before Troy. For, when Nestor reaches the climax of his story, describing how all glorified him among men (11.761), he turns suddenly to the case at hand and adds: "But Achilles will enjoy his own valor in *loneliness*" (αὐτὰρ Ἀχιλλεὺς / οἷος τῆς ἀρετῆς ἀπονήσεται, 762–763). The motif of isolation is transferred from epic activity (such as in the Heracleian *Sack of Oechalia*),⁶² seen in distortion here as Nestor is bereft of his siblings following Heracles' onslaught, to being left to enjoy one's excellence *alone* – the very antithesis of ἀρετή, a virtue which, at least in Homer, demands communal sanction.⁶³ Furthermore, Nestor relates this story to Patro-

field of battle. The repeated τλῆ μὲν / τλῆ δ' (x2) resonates with the same structure in Panyasis' *Heracleia*: fragment 3 PEG 1.

60 It is used too by both Mentor and Athena, who proclaim that Odysseus should be allowed to act harshly as a king, if his people are going to treat him so shabbily (*Od.* 2.232; 5.10). The point here is clearly a provocative one, with the implication being precisely that kings should not commit shameless deeds, since ideally they are part of a symbiotic relationship with their people.

61 *Il.* 5.433. Cf. Nagy (1999) 318: the flexibility of the adjective noun combination implies that the "Herakles figure and *bie* are traditionally linked on the level of theme".

62 Nestor use of the 'individual' (οἷος) motif recalls his presence in one of the few surviving fragments of Heracles's epic, the *Sack of Oechalia* (Νέστωρ <δ> οἷος ἄλυσεν ἐν ἀνθεμόεντι Γερήνῳ): see n. 32 above. While we don't know how that epic played out, here Nestor moves swiftly to recounting a battle between the Pylians and Epeians, in which he stars.

63 Adkins (1960) 37–38.

clus, in the hope of attracting him back into battle. At present, one man, Achilles, is refusing to fight: Nestor's proposal, implicit in this story, is for Patroclus to fight in his place. Therefore, while the story would seem to put emphasis on the lone fighter, the very dynamics of this tale depend on the associations between the heroes. And it works. Patroclus is motivated to fight for the Achaeans; after his death, Achilles too will return, but not for his individual glory, rather to avenge his fallen comrade.

There is one additional point. Nestor frames his fleeting reference to Heracles as being set in the age before (τῶν προτέρων ἔτέων, 11.691). As the poem has already determined, Nestor knows a thing or two about previous generations (cf. *Iliad* 1.250–252). A consistent pattern begins to emerge. A speaker raises the example of Heracles in order to make the point about (excessive) violence. It's not that the *Iliad* condemns violent acts per se; but such individual acts of brutality are generally consigned to the past.

Arguably the disjunction between citations of Heracles and the narrative of the *Iliad* is most clearly evident in the confrontation between his son, Tlepolemus, and Sarpedon. Tlepolemus, previously introduced in the Achaean catalogue, is the only one of Heracles' sons at this current war for Troy.⁶⁴ Facing him is Sarpedon, king of Lydia, whose entry brings to a close the Trojan catalogue; his credentials in this poem, moreover, have already been established by his rebuke of Hector.⁶⁵ But more is at stake than a battle between individual heroes; their meeting reflects upon traditions associated with Heracles and the uniqueness of this story of Troy.⁶⁶

The terms of engagement are established in the narrator's opening verses. Elsewhere, the line that describes their advance (οἱ δ' ὅτε δὴ σχεδὸν ἦσαν ἐπ' ἀλλήλοισιν ἰόντες, 5.630) is followed by action. Here, however, "the poet surprises us with an 'extra' verse (631)".⁶⁷ This additional line, "son and grandson of Zeus the cloud-gatherer" (υἱὸς θ' υἱωνός τε Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο), not only identi-

⁶⁴ As the leader of the nine ships from Rhodes (*Il.* 2.653–654), he is set apart from the other Heracleidae as a kin-slayer who had to flee his relatives into exile (*Il.* 2.653–670). One might fairly wonder if this is the best of the Heracleidae Homer could choose as a representative or if this choice is strategic.

⁶⁵ *Il.* 5.471–492.

⁶⁶ This scene is similar in tone to the objections made by Sthenelus to Agamemnon about the differences between the Seven against Thebes and the Epigoni in *Iliad* 4 (387–400 and 404–418), an exchange which may be read in light of engagement with Theban traditions: Barker and Christensen (2011); cf. H. Mackie (2008) 34–40 for both passages. For other discussions of this exchange, see Kelly (2010) 264 for a bibliography; Lohmann (1970) 27; Martin (1989) 127; Mackie (1996) 77–78; and Alden (2000) 157–161.

⁶⁷ Kelly (2010) 263–264.

fies the two men as related to Zeus but also sets up the dominant theme of the two speeches. This clash will be about genealogy. Whose father is better?

The power of this contrast relies on its interformularity. Tlepolemus, whose description here recalls his introduction in the Catalogue (as “the big and noble son of Heracles” (Τληπόλεμον δ’ Ἡρακλεΐδην ἦν τε μέγαν τε, 5.628; cf. 2.653), immediately identifies genealogy as the decisive factor in this confrontation. “They are liars,” he says to Sarpedon, “who say that you are the son of Zeus, holder of the aegis” (ψευδόμενοι δέ σέ φασι Διὸς γόνον αἰγιόχοιο / εἶναι, 635–636). It is he, through his own father Heracles, who can truly claim a bond of kinship with Zeus.⁶⁸ But the additional verse highlighted above undercuts Tlepolemus’ charge. Back when Tlepolemus was first introduced, Homer uses the phrase “sons and grandsons of the violent Heracles” (υἱέες υἱώνοι τε βίης Ἡρακλεΐδης, 2.666). Here, we have the near echo “son and grandson of Zeus the cloud-gatherer” (υἱὸς θ’ υἱόνος τε Διὸς νεφεληγερέταο).⁶⁹ Plurality gives way to singularity; Heracles gives way to Zeus. The audience hears an echo of Tlepolemus’ paternity even in the very description of Sarpedon’s: the former is the son of Heracles; the latter is the son of Zeus. Tlepolemus already comes across as inferior, even before he speaks.

The critical importance of this displacement is evident from Tlepolemus’ basic argument where he denigrates the core subject of *this* narrative. His father, he boasts, has *already* sacked Troy – since he is the son of Heracles, he is therefore far superior to the Trojan ally whom he is about to fight. But, while Tlepolemus uses Heracles as a paradigm for the present situation, and as a means of determining the outcome, the intertraditional resonance is far from easy to control. By Tlepolemus’ own admission, Heracles sacked Troy with only six ships and few men; Tlepolemus and the vast catalogue of Achaean heroes, however, are now in their tenth year of fighting, and Troy remains intact, which hardly reflects well on him.⁷⁰ But it is not only the case that Tlepolemus’ choice to focus on Heracles’ sack of Troy runs the risk of diminishing his own heroic credentials; the sack itself loses stature by being passed over so presumptuously and briefly.

⁶⁸ “Such men as, they say, was the great strength of Heracles” were begotten of Zeus (637–638).

⁶⁹ The only other occurrence of “son and grandson” (υἱὸς θ’ υἱόνος τε) comes from Laertes at the end of the *Odyssey* (24.515), which certainly would blunt Tlepolemus’ attack. Kelly (2010) 264 n. 18.

⁷⁰ “By linking his own story with the hypertext of Heracles and the previous sack of Troy, Tlepolemus sets up an unrealistic – in fact, unflattering – model for himself.” To bring up Heracles in this context, even if he is Tlepolemus’ father, is “just not a good link to make”: Kelly (2010) 269.

The point that Heracles needed only six ships and few men could suggest the reverse – that the whole enterprise didn't really amount to much.⁷¹

The fact that Heracles has already sacked Troy ought to be an important counterpoint for this tale of a war at Troy.⁷² Fittingly, the *Iliad* demonstrates interest in the subject of Troy's sack.⁷³ Yet the epic doesn't represent the sacking itself – mention of the sack is left to the *Odyssey*, when Demodocus sings of the fall of Troy at Odysseus's behest (*Od.* 8.495). But Heracles' sack is not only passed over immediately; it is the product, again, of a character recalling “the past generation of men”.⁷⁴ Displaced from the authority of the narrative voice, this previous sack of Troy will have little relevance to or impact on this poem, the epic about the fall of Troy.

Sarpedon's pithy response, dismissive of not only Tlepolemus' posturing but also his father's epic career, articulates this irrelevance. At one level, he undercuts the magnitude of Heracles' deeds by attaching blame to Laomedon: Troy fell because of his folly (ἄφραδία, *Il.* 5.649), a state of mind associated with people or creatures like the Cyclops who bring evil upon themselves;⁷⁵ Sarpedon's reference to “sacred Troy” (ἱλιον ἱρήν, *Il.* 5.648) economically re-establishes the sanctity of city in contrast to the actions of its founder.⁷⁶ More pointedly, Sarpedon robs Heracles of his name, labeling him simply ‘that man’ (ἦτοι κείνος, 648). Given

71 Just such a strategy is used by Thucydides precisely to big up his war in contrast to the Trojan War, which only lasted so long because, he adduces, the Achaeans lacked sufficient supplies and continually had to forage (1.11).

72 Tlepolemus uses the Trojan past “as an informative paradigm for the present, indeed future, of the city”: Kelly (2010) 266.

73 The phrase ἱλίου ἐξαλάπαξε has already been used by Zeus in shock at Hera's apparent vindictiveness (she wants Troy's sack, *Il.* 4.33), as it is used by Agamemnon, who wishes that Zeus grant him Troy's sack (*Il.* 8.288).

74 Tlepolemus identifies “past generation of men” (ἐπεὶ πολλὸν κείνων ἐπιδεύει ἀνδρῶν / οἱ Διὸς ἐξεγένοντο ἐπὶ προτέρων ἀνθρώπων, *Il.* 5.636–637), of which his father was a part. The expression προτέρων ἀνθρώπων occurs twice elsewhere. Hesiod uses it to describe a poet (ᾠοιδός) who sings of the glorious deeds (κλεῖα) of former men and the gods who hold Olympus (*Th.* 100). In the *Iliad*, Nestor instructs Antilochus, for the chariot race by pointing to the turning post, either a grave marker of someone who died long ago or a racing goal made by earlier men (*Il.* 23.331–332). For Nestor, this difficult symbol (σῆμα) has lost its meaning. From the *Iliad*'s perspective, the generation of former men (προτέρων ἀνθρώπων) marks an age before, whose symbolism is now lost in the mists of time.

75 *Il.* 2.368; 5.649; 10.122, 350; 16.354; *Od.* 9.361; 10.27; 17.233; 19.523; 22.288. Cf. *WD* 134, 330. While Trojan actions in the *Iliad* can be interpreted as acts of folly (Pandarus breaking the truce; Paris refusing to give up Helen), for the most part Homer is remarkably even-handed in his treatment of both sides.

76 *Il.* 4.46, 164, 416; 5.648; 6.96, 277, 448; 7.82, 413, 429; 8.551; 11.196; 13.657; 15.169; 17.193; 18.270; 20.216; 21.128, 515; 24.27, 143, 383; *Od.* 11.86; 17.293.

the importance of names and their revelation – think, for example, of Odysseus's concern to make sure that his escape from Polyphemos' cave shouldn't go without his name being attached to it – the withholding of a name runs counter to the impulse of epic poetry to record *kleos*. In fact, the combination of κείνος with the intensifier ἥτοι tends to be used by speakers in an aggressively dismissive manner.⁷⁷ Deliberate in his response, Sarpedon downplays the glory of that man's previous deeds and, at the same time, denies the relevance of Heracles to this sack of Troy.

The payoff is both immediate and more complex than it might first appear. The two heroes simultaneously cast their spears; Tlepolemus is killed instantly. The implication is similarly emphatic: Heracles' progeny have no role to play in this epic tale of Troy's sack. Yet, the scene is more multifaceted and fraught than that: Sarpedon *too* almost dies. The reasons why he doesn't perish here shed important light on the *Iliad*'s deployment of Heraclean themes. On the one hand, Sarpedon is rescued from the battle and protected by the swift actions of his comrades (663, 692). The action of our *Iliad* differs from the action of a hero who could sack a city with only six ships. On the other hand, Zeus ultimately saves Sarpedon. Capping his description of the spear's path through Sarpedon's thigh, Homer changes tack and adds: his *father* ward off destruction (πατήρ δ' ἔτι λοιγὸν ἄμυνεν, *Il.* 5.662). Here, then, is the final riposte to Tlepolemus' taunts about genealogy. Zeus is Sarpedon's father and intervenes on his behalf.

The dynamic engagement between the traditions is not yet complete, since the epic leaves Sarpedon's fate hanging in the balance. This "son of Zeus" (Διὸς υἱός) is threatened by Odysseus and protected by Athena, before finally begging Hector for help.⁷⁸ This appeal looks like his last – in a sophisticated manipulation of epic formulas, Homer implies that Sarpedon is on the brink of death. As his companions leave Sarpedon by a great oak, "his spirit left him, and dark mist fell on his eyes" (τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχὴ, κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς, *Il.* 5.696). At this remarkable moment, Homer has combined the formulas τὸν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχὴ and

⁷⁷ Such as when Diomedes dismisses Achilles' rejection of the embassy (*Il.* 9.701), Nestor recalls the evil deeds of Aegisthus (*Od.* 3.195), and various authoritative speakers anticipate the suitors' doom (Zeus at *Od.* 5.24 and 24.480; Teiresias at *Od.* 11.118). There appear to be two exceptions, one in either epic. Priam uses ἥτοι κείνος to denote Peleus (*Il.* 24.490), while Eumaeus uses it of Telemachus, when talking with the disguised Odysseus at *Od.* 14.183.

⁷⁸ Odysseus, who doesn't miss much, notices Sarpedon's plight and ponders in his mind whether to go after "the son of Zeus" (Διὸς υἱόν, *Il.* 5.672). Athena wards him off, since it was not the destiny (μόρσιμον) for him to kill "the son of Zeus" (Διὸς υἱόν, *Il.* 5.675). If these signs weren't proof enough, Homer again names him as "the son of Zeus" (Διὸς υἱός, *Il.* 5.683), in the same position in the line, when Sarpedon pleads for Hector to protect him.

κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς that elsewhere denote death.⁷⁹ From the perspective of traditional language, Sarpedon *should* die here; but instead, he breathes again (αὖτις δ' ἀμπνύνθη, *Il.* 5.597).

This manipulation of formulas confirms that Sarpedon is a hero of special note in the *Iliad*.⁸⁰ But, in implicit comparison to Tlepolemus' father, Heracles, Sarpedon's destruction is not being warded off permanently; he is saved here only to die another day. Just before Sarpedon and Patroclus meet in their fateful clash, Zeus ponders whether to save his son. Hera intercedes and disagrees, not because Zeus *couldn't* save his son – he could – but rather because it would set a dangerous precedent: all the gods would want to save their favorites. Thus she persuades Zeus to accept fate and instead focus on saving Sarpedon's body for burial.⁸¹

This, then, is the critical difference between a hero like Sarpedon in the *Iliad* and Heracles, who now lives with his consort Hebe among the immortals, forever blessed. Sarpedon, a son of Zeus to rank alongside Heracles, *could* have received the same treatment from his father – but Homer has the gods expressly deny this as an option. Behavior like this, when gods and men fought with each other, and men *could* become gods, is typical of a prior world, where heroes and gods were not yet that distinct, where Zeus' authority was not quite so unassailable, and where a *Theogony* was still in the making.

This exchange, on the surface a battlefield clash of arms between two heroes of famous fathers, is in effect the meeting, weighing and resolution of competing epic traditions and ways of conceptualizing and valorizing heroic activity. To Tlepolemus' bluster about a famous father who took Troy, Sarpedon offers a derogatory interpretation of the myth – Heracles was successful because his opponent was dishonest and stupid – that both minimizes alternative accounts and amplifies his. In addition, the stakes of that war – horses fought over by a handful of men – function to magnify the reality of *this* one. But the real stakes are higher still. This scene sets the tone of the *Iliad*, as a world in which Achilles

⁷⁹ ὄν δ' ἔλιπε ψυχὴ (*Il.* 16.452; *Od.* 14.426); κατὰ δ' ὀφθαλμῶν κέχυτ' ἀχλὺς (*Il.* 16.344). For the argument here, see Barker (2011).

⁸⁰ “Homer’s sophisticated comment on the partiality of their perspectives is surely not unconnected with the progress of the subsequent combat itself ..., for it eventuates in Tlepolemus’ death and Sarpedon’s wounding and removal from battle, something that happens in no other major duel in the *Iliad*. Given the fact that Sarpedon needs to be kept healthy for his combat with Patroclus ... Homer was not constrained to construct the scene in this way.” Kelly (2010) 273–74. Indeed not. Kelly, however, fails to explain *why* Homer would construct the scene in this way.

⁸¹ Tlepolemus comes into conflict with Sarpedon, being roused by “resistless fate” (μοῖρα κραταῖ, 5.629). This phrase occurs only in the *Iliad*: 5.83; 16.334, 853; 19.410; 20.477; 21.110; 24.132, 209.

must die and where Zeus heeds Hera's advice to let Sarpedon die lest it cause divine discord.⁸² Sarpedon *could* be another Heracles: but on this occasion Zeus chooses not to save his son. This brave new world represents heroes as men, struggling to come to terms with their role in communities – as articulated by *Sarpedon* in *Iliad* 12 (310–328) – and especially with their mortality.

So far we have seen how Homeric speakers characterize Heracles as mighty and violent, while at the same time marginalizing him as a figure from the epic cosmos' dim and *different* (less real?) past. But Heracles is most frequently cited in the *Iliad* when, not insignificantly, the gods take center stage. When the Achaeans are hemmed in behind their walls, Hera sets out to disrupt Zeus' plan by enlisting Sleep in her plan of seduction. Sleep is wary, however, because of what happened when he helped Hera in her machinations against Heracles. Once again, details are minimal: Sleep withholds Heracles' name (using "that man" again, 14.250) and presents an abbreviated narrative of Heracles' deeds – just one hexameter line for Heracles to sack Troy and start home, like an Odysseus (ἔπλεεν Ἰλίοθεν Τρώων πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξας).⁸³ Instead Sleep focuses on Hera's plotting, who ensures that Heracles is carried over the sea far from his friends (νόσφι φίλων), as Achilles is from his father (19.422).⁸⁴ The interformularity suggests Heracles' capacity to be a hero on par with the Homeric Achilles and Odysseus, but, crucially, we never see this in its fullness; Homer is not interested in the deeds of Heracles per se, but how they function within this epic.⁸⁵

Similarly, when Zeus regains his senses and expands on Sleep's allusive narrative, his focus is less on his suffering son (πολλά περ ἀθλήσαντα, 15.30), than on the pain he himself feels (ἐμὲ δ' οὐδ' ὥς θυμὸν ἀνίει / ἀζηχὴς ὁδὺνη Ἡρακλῆος θείοιο, *Il.* 15.34–35) and Hera's agency in opposing him (τὸν σὺ .../ πέμψας ἐπ' ἀτρύγετον πόντον κακὰ μητιόωσα, / καὶ μιν ἔπειτα Κόων δ' εὗ ναιομένην ἀπένεικας, *Il.* 15.36–38).⁸⁶ Once again Heracles' epic endeavors are held up as

⁸² *Il.* 16.439–458.

⁸³ In the *Odyssey*, when Telemachus uses this line to ask for information about his father (*Od.* 3.85), we are witness to Odysseus' *kleos* in action, as Nestor gives a lengthy report about Odysseus and his heroic qualities.

⁸⁴ This idea also engages with the motif "though I have come from afar": Sarpedon (*Il.* 5.471–492).

⁸⁵ Hera reassures Sleep that, while Zeus may have cared about his son, he won't help the Trojans (Τρώεσσιν ἀρηξέμεν, *Il.* 14.265). Ironically, while seeming to confirm Heracles' unique status as Zeus' favorite, she is also wrong. Zeus aids the Trojans throughout the poem from the moment when Achilles asks for his honor to be respected (*Il.* 1.408). Elsewhere Zeus makes his assistance explicit as a warning to the gods (*Il.* 8.11), and turns his eyes from battle safe in that knowledge (*Il.* 13.9). Ares defends the Trojans (*Il.* 5.507). Hera manages to trick Aphrodite into helping her by using this line (*Il.* 14.192).

⁸⁶ For the especially forceful use of language in this speech: Christensen (2010) 558–559.

an implicit comparison to the *Iliad*'s narrative: just as Hera interfered then and caused Zeus grief, so she is now. But there is a crucial difference. Hera's betrayal of Zeus barely sets his plan back at all: in fact, it leads to Zeus' most explicit and fullest enunciation of it (*Il.* 15.49–77). The time has passed for such cosmic infighting, as we see when Zeus, full of desire for Hera, catalogues his female conquests (*Il.* 14.315–328). For, while undoubtedly not the most tactful line for seduction, the catalogue of women is deadly serious. That much is hinted at as Zeus enumerates the sons who were born from these unions – Minos, Radamanthys, Perseus, Peirithoos and, of course, Heracles, his “violence-minded” son (*Il.* 14.324). From an intertraditional perspective, a divine union and catalogue of women resonates powerfully with Hesiod's *Theogony*, where we see Zeus fathering heroes who clear the world of monsters and evildoers. More generally, the coalescence of themes around divine conflict, deception and reproduction reveal the latent danger in the coming together of the father of gods and men and his divine consort: Hera's deception of Zeus could herald *another* Theogony.

But no son rises to challenge the father from this union. That kind of narrative belongs to a world prior to Homeric epic.⁸⁷ Instead, though this section anticipates the birth of *heroes*, the poignant irony that unfolds is that the *Iliad* is an epic of *dying* heroes, not the birth of new ones. The motif transference from such primeval struggles between Zeus and Hera as well as the triple invocation of Heracles results in an oddly underwhelming take on one of the central motifs of the Heracles myths.⁸⁸ But it also anticipates the problems caused by the sons of mortals in human worlds and the Iliadic motif that the gods only derive pain from involvement in mortal affairs.

The Heraclean Achilles

So far we have seen how references to Heracles contribute to a consistent picture. While events (sacking cities, labors under Eurystheus, fighting the gods) and themes (suffering and doing violence in equal measure) relate to traditional Heraclean epos (so far as we can tell from the available evidence), the positioning of

⁸⁷ The potential overthrow of Zeus has already been circumvented: Thetis, prophesied to give birth to a son greater than the father, has already been married off – to a mortal: Slatkin (1991).

⁸⁸ As if to illustrate the point, after Zeus announces that his plan is back on track, Hector regains his primacy in the field. The fact that he kills only one man should not diminish the significance of this act, since that man is the son of the intermediary between Heracles and Eurystheus (*Il.* 15.639–640).

the hero as ‘out of time’, we suggest, derives from the *Iliad*’s posture as the epic that tells the story of the separation of the worlds of gods and men. In this final section we consider the consequences for thinking about Achilles if Heracles represents a bygone world. While continuing our investigation of characters’ (mis) use of Heracles as a paradigm, we turn the spotlight on to those moments in the narrative where Achilles and Heracles are brought into some kind of implicit comparison with each other. In this case both Achilles’ difference from and similarities with Heracles are significant, which goes beyond their shared possession of the epithet “lion-hearted” (θυμολέοντα).⁸⁹

When Achilles calls the assembly in *Iliad* 19 to announce his intention to return and rouse the troops for war, Agamemnon intercedes to lay the ground for formal reconciliation. To compensate Achilles he offers goods, but at the same time provides a story to account for his earlier slight: he was, he explains, temporarily blinded by the goddess *Atē* (*Il.* 19.78–145), just as Zeus had once been.⁹⁰ According to Agamemnon, Zeus, in excitement at Heracles’ impending delivery, gathers the gods to announce the birth of a man who will be lord over the Argives.⁹¹ Seeing an opportunity for mischief, Hera elicits an oath from Zeus that whoever is born that day will rule over all; subsequently, she delays Heracles’ birth and induces Eurytheus’, thereby making the former subservient to the latter. And so it came to pass that Heracles suffered long at the hands of Eurystheus, and all the time Zeus suffered.⁹²

There are a number of observations that build on our analysis thus far. First, this story is explicitly set in a time before (ποτε, 95; ἤματι τῷ ὄτ’, *Il.* 19.98). In fact,

⁸⁹ It is used of Heracles at *Il.* 5.639 by his son, Tlepolemus, and at *Od.* 11.267, where Odysseus describes his birth. At *Il.* 7.228, Ajax refers to Achilles as “man-breaker, lion-hearted” (ῥηξήνορα θυμολέοντα). As the only hero in the *Iliad* who receives Heracles’ traditional epithet, Achilles is implicitly compared to this other great hero: Nagy (1999) 137. It should be noted, however, that interestingly, Hesiod also uses the epithet for Achilles, to describe Thetis giving birth to the hero (*Th.* 1007). A similar case can be found in the *Odyssey*, where Penelope describes her husband, in ‘Heracleian’ terms (*Od.* 4.724). For the use of this epithet in each epic to align Achilles and Odysseus respectively with Heracles, see Wilson (2002).

⁹⁰ On the use and meaning of *Atē* in archaic Greek thought: Sommerstein (2012) cf. Dodds (1951) 1–27. On this final Achaean assembly: Barker (2009); Elmer (2013).

⁹¹ The speech introduction used by Agamemnon (κέκλυτέ μεν πάντες τε θεοὶ πᾶσαι τε θέαιναί, *Il.* 19.101), appears twice elsewhere. In the *HHymn to Apollo* (3) 311, Hera uses it to press her claim that Zeus has slighted her by giving birth to Athena. Earlier in the *Iliad*, Zeus warns the other gods not to get involved in the warring between the Trojans and Achaeans (*Il.* 8.5). Thus it seems to indicate moments of critical importance on Olympus.

⁹² Just as Zeus “used to always groan” (αἰεὶ στενάχεσθ’, *Il.* 19.132) at seeing his dear son labor on behalf of another by doing slave work (ἔργον αἰεὶ: *Il.* 14.13; 19.133; 24.733; *Od.* 3.265; 11.429; 15.236; 23.222), so Priam laments Hector’s death (*Il.* 24.639).

Agamemnon's conclusion – that *Atē* now makes mischief among men – underlines the point that she no longer operates on Olympus: Zeus has thrown her out. Olympus is no longer subject to this kind of intense rivalry and dissension among the gods; Zeus' authority is unassailable, as much as Hera and others may rail against it at times. Instead, the focus of the *Iliad* is on conflict among men, which bubbles to the surface again here. By recalling Zeus' blindness as a precursor for his own, Agamemnon exalts himself in the position of the king of kings,⁹³ and once again reveals his concern to exert authority over Achilles.⁹⁴ But in his following account Achilles comes across not so much as a Hera-like subordinate in the council of gods as a hero like Heracles, forced to complete tasks at the behest of a superior (Eurystheus/Agamemnon).⁹⁵

This multifaceted example functions to mark social and cosmic relationships as well as to advance particularly Iliadic concerns. Agamemnon may be using the exemplar of Heracles to explain the hierarchy that makes a more valiant warrior subordinate, if he is looking beyond his self-comparison to Zeus at all; ironically, however, his account also anticipates Achilles' role-playing as Heracles, at the very point when the poem's protagonist is finally about to rejoin battle and perform his own heroic endeavors. In this Heracleian guise, Achilles remains uninterested in talk and social contracts, eager instead for the blood, toil, tears and sweat of battle.⁹⁶ And yet, Achilles ends up frustrated in his desire to play this role as Agamemnon and Odysseus insist on making formal reparations. In his attempt to resist the kinds of social obligations that he had fought to see respected in the first place, Achilles diverges from his Iliadic search for a new political world in which might does not make right and where human institutions are required to adjudicate conflicts.⁹⁷ In turning away from the *Iliad* – and, we suggest, towards a Heracleian narrative of all might – Achilles shows both the complexity of the

⁹³ The scholia extend this connection to the rest of the poem: “and he compares him [Agamemnon] to Zeus in other places: his eyes and head (*Il.* 2.478); father of men and gods (*Il.* 22.167) and shepherd of the host (*Il.* 2.243). His scepter is from Zeus (*Il.* 2.101–108); his shield is similar to the aegis (*Il.* 11.36. cf. *Il.* 5.742, 17.593, and 21.400) his thoughts [are compared to] whenever [Zeus] makes thunder and lightning (10.5):” Σ bT *Il.* 11.36b *exeg.* 1–7.

⁹⁴ Agamemnon's opening comments as an attempt to assert his authority: Barker (2009) 80–82. The formal elements of the *paradeigma*: Lohmann (1970) 75–80; cf. Edwards (1991) 245.

⁹⁵ “The fact that Agamemnon admits his own *atē* by citing this Herakles story ironically establishes him as a parallel to Eurystheus and Achilles as a parallel to Herakles”: Davidson (1980) 200; This passage also shows beyond doubt that the Homeric epics were aware of the basic outline of Heracles' story: Fowler (2013) 260–261.

⁹⁶ A rather ironic turn of events given how instrumental he was in establishing the assembly as a place for dissent from the king at the beginning of the *Iliad*: Barker (2009) 40–66.

⁹⁷ Hammer (2002); Elmer (2013).

Iliad's narrative about heroic exploits and the danger of cleaving to that earlier exemplar.

This struggle between heroic definitions (and missions) has been a feature of the poem from the very first mention of Heracles in the Catalogue of Ships. Soon after the introduction of Tlepolemus comes Achilles, who, Homer reminds us, is presently sitting out the war (*Il.* 2.685). The way in which Homer describes Achilles pointedly resonates with Heracles' epic characterization, while at the same time marking the difference between them. As we have seen, Heracles is closely associated with enduring and completing tasks. Here, Homer describes Achilles as "having labored much" (πολλὰ μογήσας, *Il.* 2.690), a phrase that is also used to denote Odysseus' heroic activity and that could be considered cognate with Heracles' own labors. Yet we see each Homeric protagonist engaging with the theme of laboring in ways significantly different from Heracles. In its first occurrence at *Il.* 1.162, Achilles asserts his toils in war: in place of a lone hero enduring all manner of tasks set for him, Achilles talks about his endeavors in the war, his hard work in battle, and the collective good this work has achieved.⁹⁸ In the *Odyssey* the phrase becomes attracted to the idea of *nostos* through the labors Odysseus must endure.⁹⁹

This repositioning of the hero through a cognate, yet subtly different, motif (interformularity) can also be read as an appropriation of an alternative tradition (intertraditionality). Here in the Catalogue, Homer expands upon those efforts by associating them specifically with the sack of Lyrnessos and "destruction of the walls of Thebes" (διαπορθήσας καὶ τείχεα Θήβης, *Il.* 2.691). Of course, Homer is describing Achilles' sack of a minor settlement on the Troad, from which the hero gained Briseis as a spoil of war (*Il.* 1.366). Yet the audience could be forgiven for also thinking of the far more famous *Boeotian* Thebes, from which Heracles hails (as Homer knows: *Il.* 14.323–324) and which also has an epic tradition of a siege associated with it.¹⁰⁰ Later, as the poem draws to an end, the narrator describes the gods gathering at the "high wall of divine Heracles, which Pallas Athena and the Trojans made so that the sea-monster might be warded off whenever it came

⁹⁸ In the embassy Phoenix appeals to Achilles through this phrase (*Il.* 9.492). In Patroclus' funeral games, Menelaus praises Antilochus, who at this point comes across as Achillean, for his efforts (*Il.* 23.607).

⁹⁹ In the *Odyssey* the phrase relates most often to Odysseus: *Od.* 2.343; 4.170; 5.223, 449; 6.175; 7.147; 8.155; 19.483; 21.207; 23.101, 169, 338. See also: *Od.* 3.232: Athena, as Mentor, to Telemachus; *Od.* 15.489: Odysseus to Eumaeus; *Od.* 16.19: the narrator about Eumaeus welcoming Telemachus; *Od.* 24.207: the narrator about Laertes. In its only occurrence in Hesiod, Jason is the hero described in these terms (*Th.* 997).

¹⁰⁰ Significantly, the only other occurrence of this phrase is at *Il.* 4.378, where it does indeed denote Boeotian Thebes.

from the beach to the plain” (τεῖχος ἐς ἀμφίχυτον Ἡρακλῆος θείοιο / ὑψηλόν, τό ῥά οἱ Τρῶες καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη / ποίεον, ὅφρα τὸ κῆτος ὑπεκπροφυγῶν ἀλέαιτο, / ὅπποτε μιν σεύαιτο ἀπ’ ἡϊόνος πεδίων δέ, *Il.* 20.144–177).¹⁰¹ Heracles’ presence is again restricted to a bygone age, when walls were needed to ward off monsters from the sea, not the world of the *Iliad*, where men fight each other. Added to this is the importance to the Iliadic tradition of Troy’s walls, whose construction is discussed bitterly by Poseidon at *Il.* 21.441–457, where he reminds Apollo of all the evils that they endured for Ilium – walls which Heracles has of course already breached. But the walls that are the focus of the most intense fighting in the *Iliad* are those hastily erected by the Achaeans to protect their ships, whose construction Poseidon too complains about (*Il.* 7.451–453). The Achaean walls both stand in for the Trojan walls of myth¹⁰² and represent the appropriation of a core element from the Theban tradition – besieged Achaeans behind their seven-gated walls.¹⁰³ Here, Heracles’ “lofty walls” replace “lofty-gated Thebes” in the *Iliad*’s narrative, introducing a blithely Theogonic moment, starring gods and monsters and the singular Heracles.¹⁰⁴ Indeed, the gods gathering at these walls ushers in a passage unlike any other in the *Iliad*, where, finally, Zeus allows the gods to enter the battle themselves.¹⁰⁵ Achilles and his narrative become, for a short time at least, Heraclean in tone.

The Heraclean tonality of the *Iliad*’s final scenes of battle extends to a complex case of interformularity. As discussed above, Heracles appears in cult-language as a “protector from evils” (ἀλεξίκακος) – a title that is echoed in hexameter poetry when Heracles “wards evil disease” from Prometheus (κακὴν δ’ ἀπὸ νοῦσον ἄλαλκεν, *Hes. Th.* 527)¹⁰⁶ and Theognis asks Artemis to “ward away the evil fates” (κακὰς δ’ ἀπὸ κῆρας ἄλαλκε, 13).¹⁰⁷ In the *Iliad* the verb ἀλέξω is

101 Again, the information about Heracles is minimal, carefully limiting his role and impact in the narrative.

102 These Achaean walls become the focus of the most intense fighting in the central section of the war narrative, from Book 12 to 16 (*Il.* 12.12, 64, 223, 257, 261, 352, 458; 14.15; 15.361; 16.558).

103 Cf. Tsagalis (this volume) 371.

104 τεῖχος ὑψηλόν: *Il.* 12.388; 16.397, 512, 702; 21.540. The epithet ὑψίπυλος, is used only of Troadic Thebes (*Il.* 6.414) and Troy (*Il.* 16.698; 21.544). Cf. the new Archilochus fr. 19 *IEG* (... ὑψίπυλον Τρώων πόλιν ...): Barker and Christensen (2006).

105 The gods taking shelter by Heracles’ walls acts as a prelude to the clash between Achilles and Aeneas, a metapoetic meeting of heroes from rival traditions: Nagy (1979).

106 Cf. [*Hes.*] *Asp.* 28–29 when Zeus conceives Heracles to be “a defender against ruin for the gods mortal men” (ὥς ῥα θεοῖσιν / ἀνδράσι τ’ ἀλφειστῆσιν ἀρῆς ἀλκτῆρα φυτεύσαι). Cf. [*Hes.*] fr. 195.36 M-W.

107 From a diachronic perspective forms of ἀμύνω replace ἀλέξω: Christensen (2013) 268–272. Hesiod calls the golden race, δαίμονες (*WD* 123) “warders against evil” (ἀλεξίκακοι). Asclepius

deployed in highly specific places where a stronger party defends a weaker.¹⁰⁸ As powerful as this language seems to be, however, it shares formulaic elements with the verb ἀμύνω, most clearly evident in the formula *λοιγὸν ἀμυν-.¹⁰⁹ This formula is introduced at the very beginning of the epic, as Achilles looks for someone to ward off the danger resulting from Apollo's anger (βούλεται ἀντιάσας ἡμῖν ἀπὸ **λοιγὸν ἀμύναι**, *Il.* 1.67), and becomes especially marked when Achilles points out that his withdrawal will deprive his people of someone who can ward off danger for them (*Il.* 1.341 and 398).¹¹⁰ One of the many elements of the embassy negotiations during *Iliad* 9 centers on this theme, as first Odysseus and then Phoenix try to reestablish Achilles as the defender of the Achaeans.¹¹¹ At the end of his speech, Phoenix even replaces Odysseus' traditional formula (which uses the more *traditionally* restricted ἀλέξω) with Achilles' alternative variation (applying the more contextually marked ἀμύνω), taken from the beginning of the epic,¹¹² engaging in the type of dynamic manipulation of conventional language that, we suggest, characterizes the formation of the Homeric epics in general. Later on, as his implicit associations with Heracles become stronger, Achilles is no longer the hero who wards off danger, but he who must be warded off. Thus, for the only time in the epic, Homer substitutes the combination *λοιγὸν ἀμυν- with the phrase λοιγὸν ἀλάλκοι at the moment when the river Scamander rises up

wards off disease (Ἀσκληπιὸς[ν] εἵσατο Διοῖ νοῦσον ἀλεξή[σ]αντ', Attica IG II/III 3,1: 4781 2); the compound ἀλεξικάκος appears with Apollo (e.g. Ἀ[πόλλωνι τῷ] Ἀ[λεξικάκῳ], SEG 21: 469 C54 and ἀλεξικάκου Ἀπόλλωνος, MAMA 4:275 A6), Heracles (Ἥρακλεις, αἶμα Διός, θηροκτόνε, οὐ νυ τι μούνος/ ἐν προτέροις ἐτέεσσιν ἀλεξικάκος τις ἐτέχθης, Clara Rhodos 2:208, 45,2) and Zeus (Ζῆν' ἀτ' ἀλεξικάκον καὶ Ἥρακλέα πτολίπορθο[ν], Crete (Phalasarna) IC II: xix 7 2).

108 Christensen (2013) 271. Some of this is prefigured by the poetics of ἀλκή as described by Collins (1998).

109 This formula is particularly Iliadic: Christensen (2013) 266 and 273–274. For special associations for the formula: Nagy (1979) 72–76; Slatkin (1991) 87–88.

110 Much of this argument is summarized from Christensen (2013) 271–279.

111 Odysseus uses the ἀλέξω form (φράζου ὅπως Δαναοῖσιν ἀλεξήσεις κακὸν ἦμαρ, *Il.* 9.251), only to be countered by Achilles, who for the first time uses a form of ἀλέξω himself (φραξέσθω νήεσσιν ἀλεξέμεναι δῆϊον πῦρ, *Il.* 9.347). In turn, Phoenix appropriates Achilles' earlier language, as he criticizes Achilles for withholding his protection out of anger (οὐδέ τι πάμπαν **ἀμύνειν** νηυσὶ θοῆσι / πῦρ ἐθέλεις αἰδοῖσθαι, ἐπεὶ χόλος ἔμπεσε θυμῷ, *Il.* 9.435–436), and makes the protection both personal (ποιεύμην, ἵνα μοί ποτ' αἰεκέα **λοιγὸν ἀμύνῃς**, *Il.* 9.495) and political (οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγέ σε μῆνιν ἀπορρίψαντα κελόμην / Ἀργείοισιν **ἀμυνέμεναι** χατέουσι περ ἔμπτῃς, *Il.* 9.517–518).

112 ὥς ὁ μὲν Αἰτωλοῖσιν ἀπήμυνεν κακὸν ἦμαρ, *Il.* 9.597; cf. φράζου ὅπως Δαναοῖσιν ἀλεξήσεις κακὸν ἦμαρ, *Il.* 9.251. Lest Achilles or anyone else miss the rhetorical point, Phoenix deploys the reduplicated aorist participle of ἀλέξω to warn that Achilles will lose honor, should he delay warding off war (οὐκέθ' ὁμῶς τιμῆς ἔσσει πόλεμόν περ ἀλαλκῶν, *Il.* 9.605).

in offence at Achilles' indiscriminate massacre of Trojans and describes the god's attempt to shield the Trojans from their destruction (*Il.* 21.138, 250 and 539).¹¹³ At his most Heracleian, wrestling gods and slaughtering men in their dozens, Achilles is described in language that inverts the relationship between Heracles the protector and the audience, yet stays true to the dangerous nature of heroes in general.¹¹⁴ At once, through the adaptation of traditional imagery and the inversion of conventional language, Homeric epic invokes the nature and name of Heracles but indicates the problematic ambiguity of heroes in its world. While we cannot know whether Heracles' epics effected the same complex tension between tradition and depiction, it is clear that our *Iliad* builds upon thematic and lexical foundations to establish new, dynamic levels of meaning.

Thus, when Achilles cites Heracles as the example of a hero who could not escape his fate, "though he was most dear to Zeus, son of Cronus, / but fate tamed him and the anger of Hera" (οὐδὲ γὰρ οὐδὲ βίη Ἡρακλῆος φύγε κῆρα, / ὅς περ φίλτατος ἔσκε Διὶ Κρονίῳνι ἄνακτι, / ἀλλὰ ἐ μοῖρα δάμασσε καὶ ἀργαλέος χόλος Ἥρης, *Il.* 18.117–119),¹¹⁵ he activates a latent theme that runs through the *Iliad*. The way that Heracles is treated should now be familiar: the brevity of the citation perpetuates the de-emphasis on Heracles; the attribution of Heracles' death to "fate" and "Hera" (*Il.* 18.119) casts the former hero as collateral damage in the conflict of the gods – he is not an agent or really a god at this point, but just another mortal who suffered because of the gods;¹¹⁶ in this case Heracles is even denied explicitly the one thing that signified his unique importance in the whole of the tradition – survival beyond death.

The collocation of the death of Zeus' dearest son and the inescapability of fate (as represented by Hera) recalls Sarpedon. As noted above, Zeus' love and care extends only so far as to secure Sarpedon's body, not to keep him alive, precisely because of the issue of fate. We are now firmly in a world where men aren't rescued from death like Heracles in myth. Accordingly, Achilles looks forward to a future life not with the blessed gods but on the lips of men. He will win *kleos* (νῦν δὲ κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀροίμην, *Il.* 18.121), bringing wretched mourning upon Trojan

¹¹³ Christensen (2013) 277–278.

¹¹⁴ Heracles imagery in Achilles' characterization: Nagy (1979) 318; Schein (1984) 134–136.

¹¹⁵ In this passage Achilles imagines a Heracles who eventually submitted to the κῆρες. This is strange because, as a cult-hero, Heracles was specifically invoked as an avener of the κῆρες; Galinsky (1972) 14; Harrison (1980) 166.

¹¹⁶ This idea of not being able to escape one's fate returns near the end of the *Odyssey*, where Athena ensures that even the most considerate suitor, Amphimedon, doesn't escape his fate (φύγε κῆρα, *Od.* 18.155). Similarly, Odysseus observes that the gods and fate tamed the suitors (μοῖρα δάμασσε, *Od.* 22.413).

and Dardanian women alike (*Il.* 18.122–125).¹¹⁷ By embracing the heroic paradigm of a short life for eternal renown, concomitant with the suffering it entails, Achilles willingly performs his story as a Heraclean tale. He accepts that he has caused destruction to his own and is resolved to turn this force against his enemies. On the other hand, while Achilles uses the paradigm to explain that this type of suffering is necessarily a component of his mortality, implicitly he is *not* Heracles, who died to be reborn. Rather, he will die and be reborn in the tale he is now part of, equally uniquely as himself, swift-fated Achilles.¹¹⁸

Ultimately, Achilles' epic frustrates his attempt to be a Heracles, even as he dismisses his social obligations (*Iliad* 19), fights a river god (*Iliad* 21), denies a fallen hero right of burial (*Iliad* 22), all the time nourished by the food of the gods dispensed by Athena. For we see him first establish funeral games for his fallen comrade, which allow his community to mourn and honor that man, and, ultimately, respect the supplication of the father of his friend's killer, to allow even that man burial. It is this love for his fallen comrade, Patroclus, whose death is the very stimulus behind his thinking here, which marks Achilles out as different from a hero like Heracles. Even as Achilles is being at his most singular and extreme – his most Heraclean, as it were¹¹⁹ – we see the effect of his ties of friendship (*Il.* 18.98, 103). Ultimately, Heracles represents a marginalized hero, projected into the past, and separated from the important world of today.

A Wish Never to See the Like Again

As the other chapters in this book show, Homer's epics are intimately engaged with other traditions even when they are quiet about them. And Thebes, that other city that brought the race of heroes to its end, is never far from the epic at hand. In this chapter, we have seen how the *Iliad's* careful engagement with Heraclean

¹¹⁷ For this collocation of Trojan and Dardanian (/Achaean) women, see also: e.g. Helen (*Il.* 3.127), with again metapoetic resonances.

¹¹⁸ There may be engagement as well with external traditions on the afterlife and worship of Achilles; see Hooker (1988) for Achilles-cults and Hommel (1980) for Achilles worship in the Black Sea basin. Hedreen (1992) presents an updated discussion drawing on archaeological, epigraphic and literary evidence. Tension between ritual and poetic traditions are significant to epic meaning, see Nagy (1999) 67–174.

¹¹⁹ At least according to the *Iliad*. Elsewhere we see Heracles engaged in the kind of companionship that could make him a suitable paradigm for the Achilles-Patroclus relationship. Consider his nephew Iole or his lover Hylus. The fact that the Homeric poems *only* show Heracles in isolation seems significant.

fabula – avoiding naming the hero, never giving away too many details – reveals its antagonistic relationship with the tradition even as it draws on language and themes from it; as the Theban hero par excellence, Heracles is modified to fit the world of Homer's *Iliad*. Through the use of his genealogy, the downgrading of the importance of expedition, and the selection of details whereby he becomes rather less Theban (or the gloriousness of his Theban identity is obscured), he is positioned primarily as a counter-model for the sacking of cities and the mortality of Achilles (and others). Taken together, Heracles' appearances in the *Iliad* point to a hero out of time, a semi-god from a prior generation. In contrast, the *Iliad* and its heroes represent a world further on from the world of the *Theogony*. In fact, through its appropriation of Heracles, as well as other means, the *Iliad* both represents and *reproduces* the separation of the race of heroes from the Olympian gods and establishes a world of men in its wake.

In the Odyssean underworld, as the shade or image (εἶδωλον, *Od.* 11.602) of Heracles tries to stress the similarity of their plights, Odysseus notices a baldric that this Heracles is wearing, depicting terrors strikingly resonant of those on the *Shield*.¹²⁰ So fierce are these images, in fact, that Odysseus expresses the wish never to see anything of the like of them ever again (*Od.* 11.610–614).¹²¹ The kind of valor and heroism that Heracles stood for has no place in the world of Homeric epic.

120 Wondrous things (θέσκελα ἔργα): *Il.* 3.130; *Od.* 11.374, 610; *Sc.* 34; Boars and lions (σύες χαροποί τε λέοντες): cf. only *Sc.* 177; battles (ὕσμιναί τε μάχαι τε φόνοι τ' ἀνδροκτασίαι τε): cf. only *Th.* 228; cf. *HHymn to Aphrodite* (5) 11; *Sc.* 155; hard labours (χαλεπούς ἐπετέλλετ' ἀέθλους): cf. only *Sc.* 94.

121 Andersen (2012).

Corinne Pache

Theban Walls in Homeric Epic

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0015

Throughout the *Iliad*, the Greeks at Troy often refer to the wars at Thebes in their speeches, and several important warriors fighting on the Greek side at Troy also fought at Thebes and are related to Theban heroes who besieged the Boeotian city a generation earlier. The Theban wars thus stand in the shadow of the story of war at Troy, another city surrounded by walls supposed to be impregnable. In the *Odyssey*, the Theban connections are less central, but nevertheless significant as one of our few sources concerning the building of the Theban walls. In this essay, I analyze Theban traces in Homeric epic as they relate to city walls. Since nothing explicitly concerning walls remains in the extant fragments of the Theban Cycle, we must look to Homeric poetry for formulaic and thematic elements that can be connected with Theban epic. While the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* tend to downplay other traditions to foreground their own heroes and narratives, both poems not only exhibit an awareness of poetic traditions dealing with the Theban conflicts, but they also self-consciously appropriate Theban themes as a way of competing with Theban epic.¹

The walls of Thebes are brought into play in several important ways, and the connection between Homeric and Theban traditions can be made both thematically and structurally. Wall building as city founding is an important theme, and walls play a central role in the *Iliad* as the site of battles, while their fall symbolizes the ultimate destruction of cities. City walls are also a place for viewing, which hints at a possible connection between a Trojan and a Theban *teichoscopy*. Finally, as the setting of combat, walls – whether standing or fallen – are also a site of mourning and memory.

Let us start with *Odyssey* 11, which describes the building of the Theban walls. In the *Odyssey*, Thebes does not appear in any explicit martial context, but

¹ For a Theban tradition as oral poetry analogous to Homeric poetry, see Burkert (1981). For extant sources concerning the Theban tradition, see Gantz (1993) 467–530. For a survey of the Theban Cycle and its connections with Homeric epic, see Torres-Guerra (1995). For specific ways in which the Theban tradition interacts with Homeric epic, see Barker and Christensen (2008), Ebbott (2010), and Slatkin (2011).

Corinne Pache: Trinity University, E-Mail: corinne.pache@trinity.edu.

the walls appear in Odysseus' catalogue of the heroines he meets in the Underworld, and the focus of the episode is on building walls as an act of foundation (11.262–265). To mythographers and scholars, Thebes is well known for its double foundation myth and the chronological puzzle it creates.² In one version, the hero Cadmus consults the Delphic oracle, which instructs him to follow a cow to the site of his future city.³ The Σ to *Il.* 13.302 refer to Pherecydes who states that Amphion and Zethus first built the walls of the city, which was subsequently deserted and refounded by Cadmus (*EGM* 41a). The later arrival of Cadmus is also attested in the Σ to *Od.* 11.262, while [Apollodorus] *Bibl.* 3.5.5, Pausanias 9.5.6, and Diodorus Siculus 19.53.4–5 all agree that the chronology is the opposite, with Cadmus establishing the city first. Pausanias and Diodorus go one step further by ascribing to Cadmus the foundation of the old city, the Cadmeia, and to Amphion and Zethus the fortification of the lower city as they could see it in their own time.

Homeric epic already includes traces of both stories. We can find confirmation of the importance of Cadmus at Thebes in the *Iliad*'s name for the Thebans (Καδμείοι) and in the presence of Ino-Leucothea, the daughter of Cadmus, in the *Odyssey* where the Theban heroine is presented as a goddess, while the Amphion narrative is privileged in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as the foundation story of the city of Thebes, implicitly placing the story of Cadmus later.⁴

Among the heroines of the past Odysseus meets in Hades in *Odyssey* 11 is Antiope, the mother of Amphion and Zethus:

τὴν δὲ μέτ' Ἀντιόπην Ἰδον, Ἀσωποῖο θύγατρα,
ἣ δὴ καὶ Διὸς εὖχετ' ἐν ἀγκοίνῃσιν ἰαῦσαι,
καὶ ῥ' ἔτεκεν δύο παῖδ', Ἀμφιονά τε Ζηθόν τε,
οἳ πρῶτοι Θήβης ἔδος ἔκτισαν ἑπταπύλοιο
πύργωσάν τ', ἐπεὶ οὐ μὲν ἀπύργωτόν γ' ἔδύναντο
ναιέμεν εὐρύχορον Θήβην, κρατερῶ περ ἔόντε.

After her I saw Antiope, who was the daughter
of Asopos, who claimed she had also lain in the embraces
of Zeus, and borne two sons to him, Amphion and Zethus.
These first established the foundations of seven-gated
Thebes, and built the towers, since without towers they could not
have lived, for all their strength, in Thebes of the wide spaces.

Od. 11.260–265⁵

² For a different take on this doubleness as reflecting two different traditions of composition, see Berman (2004).

³ On the sources for Cadmus, see Gantz (1993) 467–473.

⁴ On the various legends surrounding the figure of Ino, see Pache (2004) 135–153.

⁵ The translations of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are modified from Lattimore's translations (1951 and 1965).

The passage equates city foundation with wall building. Amphion and Zethus were the first to found (ἔκτισαν) the city of Thebes, by encircling the city with walls and towers (πύργωσαν). Lines 264–265 emphasize Thebes' status as a city that is fought over. The same connection between walls and city founding is also found in Poseidon's description of how he and Apollo built the Trojan wall and thus made Troy into a *polis* (πολίισαμεν, *Il.* 7.453), a passage to which I will return below.⁶

Whether the building of the Theban walls was included in the Theban Cycle we do not know, but the same story was included in Hesiod's *Catalogue of Women* ([Hes.] fr. 182 M-W), according to Palaephatus' *De incredibilibus* 41:⁷

Περὶ Ζήθου καὶ Ἀμφίωνος ἱστοροῦσιν ἄλλοι τε καὶ Ἡσίοδος ὅτι κιθάρα τὸ τεῖχος τῆς Θήβης ἐτείχισαν. δοκοῦσι δὲ ἔνιοι κιθαρίζειν <μέν> αὐτούς, τοὺς δὲ λίθους αὐτομάτως ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ τὸ τεῖχος. τὸ δὲ ἀληθές ἔχει ὧδε. κιθαρωδοὶ οὗτοι ἄριστοι ἐγένοντο καὶ ἐπεδείκνυντο μισθῷ. ἀργύριον δὲ οὐκ εἶχον οἱ τότε ἄνθρωποι. ἐκέλευον οὖν οἱ περὶ τὸν Ἀμφίονα, εἴ τις βούλοιτο ἀκούειν αὐτῶν, ἐρχόμενος ἐργάζεσθαι ἐπὶ τὸ τεῖχος· οὐ μέντοι οἱ λίθοι εἶποντο ἀκροώμενοι. εὐλόγως οὖν ἔλεγον οἱ ἄνθρωποι ὅτι λύρα τὸ τεῖχος ἐτείχισθη.

Among others, Hesiod relates that it was with a lyre that Zethus and Amphion built the walls of Thebes. Some people imagine this to mean that Zethus and Amphion played their lyres and the stones spontaneously took their places on the wall. But the truth is as follows. Zethus and Amphion were outstanding lyre-players who performed for compensation. But the people of their day did not use money. Instead, Amphion and Zethus told anyone who wanted to hear them to go and work on the city walls. It was not that the stones listened and followed along; yet it was with good reason that people said that the wall was built with a lyre.

Hesiod, according to Palaephatus, agrees with the Odyssean tradition that both brothers were involved in building the walls of Thebes (ἐτείχισαν), though there is no emphasis in the summary of Palaephatus on the building of the walls as an act of foundation.⁸ Palaephatus' main concern instead is to counter the

⁶ On Homeric epic equating wall building with the foundation of cities, see Scully (1990) 47–48. Erwin Cook pointed out to me that the same pattern can be found at *Od.* 6.9, where building a wall is the first act of Nausithoos upon arriving in Scheria. On the *Odyssey's* treatment of Oedipus, who is also mentioned in the *Nekyia*, and his connection to a Theban poetic tradition, see Barker and Christensen (2008) 1–3.

⁷ Text and translation from Stern (1996).

⁸ Like Homer, Palaephatus presents the two brothers as working together, while, as Stern (1996) 74 notes, other authors stress the difference: in several sources, the Theban twin brothers are presented as opposites of one another with Amphion the master of the lyre, and Zethus the catleman and warrior; see, e.g., Apoll. Rhod. 1.736–741 and [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.5.5. There is an analogous distinction in the second version of Poseidon's account of building the Trojan wall, where he tells how he built the wall while Apollo guarded the herds of Laomedon (*Il.* 21.446–449).

seemingly prevalent notion that Amphion and Zethus were able to move stones with the power of their lyres, a detail that is absent from the Homeric version – unsurprisingly given Homer’s avoidance of magical events – but survives in later authors.⁹ According to Palaephatus, Zethus and Amphion are professional poets who perform for compensation, in a time when money does not exist. Instead the brothers take as their pay the building of the wall. Gone is the Odyssean notion of the building of the wall as an act of foundation, but gone along with it is the logic of the narrative. Palaephatus explains the mystery of the self-moving stones but he creates another enigma: why would professional poets want to be paid with a wall?

We can turn to the Roman elegist Propertius for another later source for the story of Amphion and his lyre. In two poems addressed to the epic poet Ponticus, who is writing a *Thebaid* of his own, Propertius contrasts the potential rewards of composing erotic elegy to the fruitless pursuit of epic poetry. In both poems, Propertius equates Homeric poetry with telling the story of the wars at Thebes, agreeing with Greek sources ascribing the *Thebaid* to Homer.¹⁰ In 1.7, Propertius compares his own poetic ambitions to those of Ponticus, who writes of Cadmus and Thebes, and “the sad conflicts of fraternal wars” (*armaque fraternae tristitia militiae*, 1.7.2) as a way of vying with Homer (*primo contendis Homero*, 1.7.3). In the second poem, Propertius once again stresses Thebes as a Homeric *topos*:

*quid tibi nunc misero prodest grave dicere carmen
aut Amphioniae moenia flere lyrae?
plus in amore valet Mimnermi versus Homero:*

What good is it for you now, wretched one, to speak your serious song,
or to weep for the walls of Amphion and his lyre?
A verse of Mimnermus is worth more in love than Homer:

Propertius 1.9.8–10

To a lover, Homeric epic is useless compared to the might of a verse of Mimnermus, and “Homer” here is clearly meant as a generic term that encompasses all of Homeric poetry. We do not know if a lament for “the walls of Amphion and his lyre” was in fact included in the Theban Cycle, but be that as it may Propertius’

⁹ Besides the two passages cited in the preceding note, see also the fragmentary *Antiope* by Euripides (fr. 223 TrGF 5.1), Hor. *Od.* 3.11.2 and *Ars Poetica* 394–6, Propertius 1.9.9–10 and 3.2.5–6, and Pausanias 9.5.8. Cf. Callimachus’ *Hymn to Apollo* 12–15 for the role of music in restoring old city walls.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Pausanias 9.9.5. The *Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi* 15 (= *Thebaid* fr. 1 GEF) also attributes both the *Thebaid* and the *Epigoni* to Homer and quotes the first line of each poem.

choice to refer to Homeric poetry in this way rather than by alluding to events of the *Iliad* or the *Odyssey* is striking and results in a neat formulation that encapsulates the whole Theban narrative, from the foundation of the city's wall to its fall.

We find a similar compressed narrative of the foundation and the fall of Thebes expressed through the variation of the formulaic language used to describe the city in Homeric epic. Slatkin has examined how the *Iliad* keeps the Theban tradition in play with the figure of the Theban hero Diomedes, even as the poem defuses the power of the Theban conflict as a potential poetic rival and threat to the glory of the Greeks at Troy. Diomedes begins as a foil to Achilles, Slatkin argues, but despite his great battle deeds, he eventually disappears from the narrative to make room first for Patroclus and eventually Achilles.¹¹ But while Diomedes takes a back seat in the narrative, Thebes itself, and specifically its wall as we will see below, remain a concern throughout the *Iliad*.

An Iliadic speech echoes the language from the Odyssean passage about the building of the walls of Thebes, but instead describes the city's fall. Sthenelus reacts to Agamemnon's denigration of Diomedes with a reminder of the superiority of the Epigonoι over the Seven (including Diomedes' father, Tydeus) praised by Agamemnon:

ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι·
ἡμεῖς καὶ Θήβης ἔδος εἴλομεν ἑπταπύλοιο
παυρότερον λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ' ὑπὸ τεῖχος ἄρειον

We two claim we are better men by far than our fathers.
We actually took the seat of the seven-gated Thebes
though we led fewer people beneath a wall that was stronger.

Il. 4.405–407

Here again we find “the seat of seven-gated Thebes,” as we did in *Odyssey* 11, but the verb to found (ἔκτισαν, 11.263) is replaced by the verb to seize (εἴλομεν, 4.406).¹² It is of course not surprising that descriptions of city walls would resemble one another, but as Bakker observes, repetitions “are not merely uttered in similar contexts; they actively *create* similarity between contexts.”¹³ The *Odyssey's* and the *Iliad's* use of ἔδος to describe a city is uncommon, and occurs only

¹¹ Slatkin (2011, 116–117) notes that as soon as Patroclus “rises up – Diomedes disappears, and with him the traces of Thebes”; see also Nagy (1979) 162–163.

¹² On this passage and the ways in which the *Iliad* represents competing versions of its own epic past, see Turkeltaub (2010) 136–144; on the metapoetic connotations of this passage, see Tsagalis (2012b) 217–220.

¹³ Bakker (2013) 164; for more on his concept of “interformularity”, see 157–169. For more on intertextuality in the Homeric poems, see Tsagalis (2008).

twice in the *Odyssey* (once of Thebes, once of Ithaca, 13.344) and twice in the *Iliad* (once of Thebes, and once of Lesbos, “the seat of Macar,” *Il.* 24.544). Because the expression is otherwise used of the seat of the gods, Olympos, the description of Thebes as “the seat of seven-gated Thebes” stands out.¹⁴ When Homeric epic evokes “the seat of seven-gated Thebes” moreover, it is always in the context of the rise and fall of that city’s walls, a narrative of foundation that leads to war and culminates in the city’s annihilation.

The *Iliad* creates another set of associations with the Theban tradition by using the same epithets for both Troy and Thebes, thereby actively creating a link between the two. The two cities have much in common: encircled by walls supposed to be impregnable, they are both besieged, and ultimately destroyed. The *Iliad* consistently stresses the similarity between what befalls the two cities through the use of common language focusing on the two cities’ strength, beauty, and sacredness.

Thebes and Troy are both remembered in epic poetry as everything they no longer are: high-gated (ὕψιπυλος), well-built (εὐκτίμενος), and holy (ἱερή). Thebes and Troy are both renowned for their gated walls, and for being “high-gated” (ὕψιπυλος), but this adjective is always used in the *Iliad* in the context of the sacking of a city, in fact (6.416) or in intention but prevented by divine intervention (16.698 and 21.544). In *Il.* 16 and 21, Patroclus and Achilles get very close to breaching the walls of “high-gated Troy” and we see the walls, as it were, from the perspective of the attackers. While it is true that such epithets as “high gated,” “well-walled,” and “well-made” are almost always spoken by the Greeks and “evoke a view of the city as it is seen from the eyes of the besieger,” there is one intriguing exception to this rule.¹⁵ When Andromache narrates the sack of her own city, she uses ὕψιπυλος, perhaps because Placaeon Thebes cannot help but be drawn into the same formulaic world as its seven-gated Boeotian homonym (“high-gatedness” is also implicit in the epithet “seven-gated,” e.g., at *Od.* 11.263–264 and *Il.* 4.406, which implies a monumental wall), but the epithet also adds pathos to her remembrance. Placaeon Thebes, like Boeotian Thebes and like Troy, from the perspective of the poet and his audience, was “high-gated,” and is no more.¹⁶

¹⁴ For ἔδος used to describe Olympos, see *Il.* 5.360, 5.367, 5.868, 8.456, 24.144, and *Od.* 6.42. The word is also used to describe simple chairs: of the gods at *Il.* 1.531 and 581, 23.205; of mortals at *Il.* 9.194 and 11.647. For the connotations of Macar as “blessed” (*selig*), see Kamptz (1982) 128. Bacch. 9.46 mentions “the seat of high-gated Troy” following a reference to Thebes.

¹⁵ See Scully (1990) 49.

¹⁶ The improvised protection built by the Trojans and Athene to give shelter to Heracles as he battles a sea monster is also described as a high wall, but with a different epithet that involves no gates, τεῖχος... ὕψηλόν, *Il.* 20.145–146.

A similar incongruity is present in the description of Thebes in the catalogue of ships:

οἱ θ' Ὑποθήβας εἶχον ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον,

they who held the lower Thebes, the strong-founded citadel,

Il. 2.505

Hypothēbai must refer to the settlement “below the city” that survived the destruction of the Cadmeia by the Epigonoī. Kirk argues that the epithet ἐϋκτίμενος, “well-built,” thus “does not accord with a particularly low status for Hypothēbai, but seems to be applied somewhat arbitrarily.”¹⁷ While the epithet ἐϋκτίμενος may seem out of place, it is not used arbitrarily, and as in Andromache’s description of her own fallen city of Placaeān Thebes as “high-gated,” “well-built” lower Thebes also calls our attention to what once was but is no longer there. Thebes may have been “strong-founded”, to use Lattimore’s evocative translation, just as Placaeān Thebes once may have had an impressive wall, yet both cities have been reduced to nothing. The epithet ἐϋκτίμενος thus calls attention not to the present condition of Hypothēbai, but to the glorious past of Thebes and the ominous fall of its supposedly impregnable walls.

Placaeān Thebes is again drawn into the nexus of parallels between Troy and Thebes when Achilles describes it as a “holy” city:

ψόχομεθ' ἐς Θήβην ἱερὴν πόλιν Ἑτίωνος,
τὴν δὲ διεπράθομεν τε καὶ ἤγομεν ἐνθάδε πάντα

We went against Thebe, the sacred city of Eetion,
and the city we sacked, and carried everything back to this place

Il. 1.366–367

Here too Placaeān Thebes partakes of the same formulaic language as Boeotian Thebes, but it is important to stress again that the similarity is not simply a *reflection* of the similarity of contexts, but rather the result of a poetic choice to emphasize the similarity between those cities, effectively reduplicating Thebes, whose image is thus refracted and multiplied. In this passage, Achilles uses an unusual (as is usual for him) phrase, combining ἱερὴν with πόλιν at *Il.* 1.366, although

¹⁷ See Kirk (1985) 194, though I do not share his assumption that the passage necessarily refers to an actual historical location. On the poetic topography of Thebes, see Mastronarde (1994) 647–650. See also Berman (2004) and (2007), especially 87–115, on the connections between Theban myth and geography.

ἱερός is otherwise a traditional epithet for Troy. Just as “well-built” Hypothebai reminds us of the past glory of the Theban citadel, Achilles remembers Placaeon Thebes as both holy and fallen. And while the epithet “holy” commonly applies to cities, only two cities have walls that are specifically described as “holy:” Troy and Boeotian Thebes.¹⁸ Agamemnon remembers how Tydeus gathered men to attack the city:

οἳ δὲ τότε' ἐστρατόωνθ' ἱερὰ πρὸς τείχεα Θήβης,

since these were attacking the sacred walls of Thebe

Il. 4.378

The holiness of the city walls provides no protection and is brought into play at a city's most distressing moments.

The holiness of the walls of Troy and Thebes is also connected to the feminine aspect of walls imagined as a woman's crown or a head-binding. When Achilles fantasizes about destroying Troy with Patroclus, he pictures their undoing the city's ἱερὰ κρήδεμνα (“holy head-binding”, *Il.* 16.100).¹⁹ Many have already noted the ways in which epic equates a city's walls – a symbol of a city's manly strength – to a woman's headdress, equating a city's sacking to rape, as if city walls became more feminine when they fall.²⁰

The city can also be refigured as a maternal figure, for example, in the prophesies concerning the fall of Troy, where the city is envisioned as a mother bird whose offspring's death portends the sack of the city (*Il.* 2.311–320) or in similes that describe the city as a place where soldiers take refuge away from the fighting, like “fawns” (*Il.* 22.1).²¹ The poet plays upon the same association when Hecuba, standing on the wall, begs Hector to pity her and come back within the walls (*Il.* 22.79–89). As Scully already noted, when Hecuba holds her breast to her son, “[t]he figures of sheltering mother and protecting walls naturally merge”.²²

18 On Achilles' language and his ability to combine traditional motifs in new ways, see Martin (1989) 146–205; on “holy” Troy, see, e.g., *Il.* 7.20, with Kirk's commentary; on “holy” as a generic attribute, see Scully (1990) 16–40, and on the holy walls of Thebes and Troy, see 20 and 50.

19 For Hera adorning herself with a “headband” see *Il.* 14.184; see also the [Hes.] *Asp.* 104–105; for Poseidon as defender of Thebes, who guards the city's κρήδεμνον; see also Hoekstra (1990) 187–188.

20 Nagler (1974) 44–60 for metaphorical connotation of head-coverings.

21 For an analysis of the simile of the fawn, see Tsagalis (2008) 188–205; for the Scaean gates as the “dividing line” between the feminine and masculine worlds of the *Iliad*, see Katz (1981) 31.

22 See Scully (1990) 66 and 64–68 for his discussion of the city's identification with the female.

While Troy partakes both in the feminine and maternal imagery for city and walls, Thebes is feminized in a unique way in Homeric epic. When Agamemnon remembers how Zeus was deluded by Hera when Alcmena gave birth to Heracles in Thebes, he describes the city as “well-crowned:”

καὶ γὰρ δὴ νύ ποτε Ζεὺς ἄσατο, τὸν περ ἄριστον
 ἀνδρῶν ἡδὲ θεῶν φασ’ ἔμμεναι· ἀλλ’ ἄρα καὶ τὸν
 Ἥρη θῆλυς ἐοῦσα δολοφροσύνης ἀπάτησεν,
 ἥματι τῷ ὅτ’ ἔμελλε βίην Ἡρακληεῖην
 Ἀλκμήνῃ τέξεσθαι εὖστεφάνῳ ἐνὶ Θήβῃ.

Yes, for once even Zeus was deluded, though men say
 he is the highest one of gods and mortals. Yet Hera
 who is female deluded even Zeus in her craftiness
 on that day when in strong wall-circled Thebe Alcmena
 was at her time to bring forth the strength of Heracles.

Il. 19.95–99

At first glance the epithet may seem unsurprising: Heracles was born in Thebes, which is famous for its walls, and thus “well-crowned” or “wall-circled” as Latimore interprets the epithet. A crown resembles the imagery of the κρήδεμνον, or headband, which we have seen is a common way of referring to walls, yet there is something unique about this way of describing Thebes. “Well-crowned” is typically used elsewhere in Homeric epic to describe Aphrodite, and often in conjunction with her erotic allure and power of deception.²³ “Well-crowned Thebes” thus is a way of connecting the city to deception and the kind of delusion brought about by Aphrodite’s power.²⁴

While the *Odyssey* does not use εὐστέφανος to describe Thebes, it does emphasize a similar quality in Thebes with a different epithet in a passage involving Oedipus:

ἀλλ’ ὁ μὲν ἐν Θήβῃ πολυηράτῳ ἄλγεα πάσχω
 Καδμείων ἦνασσε θεῶν ὀλοὰς διὰ βουλὰς·

²³ For “well-crowned Aphrodite,” see *Od.* 8.267, 8.288, and 18.193. As Tsagalis (2012b) 223–224, notes, the birth of Heracles is remembered twice, once by Zeus (*Il.* 14.323–5) and once by Agamemnon (*Il.* 19.95–99, 112–113) in two passages that highlight deception.

²⁴ The same epithet in two Hesiodic passages: in *Th.* 978 “well-crowned Thebes” is where the children of Harmonia and Cadmus were born, and in the [Hesiodic] *Asp.* 80, Heracles describes how Amphitryon sinned against the gods when he came to “well-crowned Thebes”.

But he, for all his sorrows, in beloved Thebes continued
to be lord over the Cadmeians, all through the bitter designing
of the gods;

Od. 11.275–276

“Beloved”, “much loved”, or “very lovely” is an epithet otherwise used in Homeric epic for marriage, bed, and youth. Scholiasts, troubled by this description of Thebes, tried to explain the incongruity away by interpreting the adjective as “much cursed”.²⁵ Like εὐστέφανος, πολυήρατος points to the erotic rather than the heroic and epic realms, and Homeric epic’s emphasis on Thebes as a “well-crowned” and “very lovely” city paint Thebes as a city of excessive love or perhaps a city that is ultimately, from the perspective of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, out of place in epic.²⁶

There is only one “lovely” city in the *Iliad*:

τὴν δ' ἐτέρην πόλιν ἀμφὶ δὺν στρατοὶ ἦατο λαῶν
τεύχεσι λαμπόμενοι· δίχα δέ σφισιν ἦνδανε βουλὴ,
ἥ ἐ διαπραθέειν ἢ ἀνδιχα πάντα δάσασθαι
κτῆσιν ὅσῃν **ποτολίεθρον ἐπήρατον** ἐντὸς ἔεργεν·
οἱ δ' οὐ πω πείθοντο, λόχῳ δ' ὑπεθωρήσσοντο.
τείχος μὲν ῥ' ἄλοχοί τε φίλαι καὶ νήπια τέκνα
ρύατ' ἐφεσταότες, μετὰ δ' ἄνδρες οὓς ἔχε γῆρας·
οἱ δ' ἴσαν· ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν Ἄρης καὶ Παλλὰς Ἀθήνη

But around the other city were lying two forces of armed men
shining in their war gear. For one side counsel was divided
whether to storm and sack, or share between both sides the property
and all the possessions **the lovely citadel** held hard within it.
But the city's people were not giving way, and armed for an ambush.
Their beloved wives and their little children stood on the rampart
to hold it, and with them the men with age upon them, but meanwhile
the others went out. And Ares led them, and Pallas Athene.

Il. 18.509–516

²⁵ Marriage: *Od.* 15.126; bed, *Od.* 23.354; and youth, *Od.* 15.366. See the discussion of this word in Barker and Christensen (2008) 24–25, on the ways in which the *Odyssey* brings in the Theban tradition through the figure of Oedipus, and how Thebes is a “much-loved” city but effectively consigned, along with its poetic tradition, to Hades by Odysseus.

²⁶ Barker and Christensen (2008) 25, already make this point about Thebes in the *Odyssey* passage: “its ruling family is much loved, excessively so, as the son marries his mother and begets his brothers and sisters”.

The city at war depicted on the shield of Achilles is in many ways generic, and as such could stand in for various cities, but the epithet ἐπήρατος is unusual and echoes the Odyssean passage about πολυήρατος Thebes. The scene from the city at war also suggests three other famous passages of the *Iliad* when women look upon the battlefield from the city walls, the *teichoscopia* (3.145–244), Hecuba's supplication of Hector (22.79–89, discussed above), and Andromache's lament (22.475–515).

On the basis of the Iliadic *teichoscopia* and the description of the besieged city on the shield of Achilles, it is likely that a poem narrating a Theban siege would have included scenes taking place on the wall. Some have tried to argue for a Theban source for the Iliadic *teichoscopia* on the grounds that it seems out of chronological place in the poem and thus must have been imported from a different one.²⁷ But even if the scene from *Iliad* 3 is inspired by Theban epic, Homeric epic develops the motif of looking from the wall in a unique way. We can look towards later sources, such as Euripides' *Phoenissae*, which must have drawn on a Theban *teichoscopia*, to reconstruct earlier traditions, and by exploring the similarities and contrasts between the Iliadic passage and the *Phoenissae*, we can recover some aspects of the relationship between a Theban and a Trojan *teichoscopia*.²⁸

In *Iliad* 3, Helen describes the Greek warriors for Priam as if he were seeing them for the first time in the tenth year of the war. The scene has seemed anachronistic and thus problematic to readers from antiquity on, but it fulfills an important narrative function of introducing the characters to the poem's audience, while also linking the present conflict to the past by alluding to Helen's suitors and the Greeks' agreement to defend her union to Menelaus. On the basis of Indic parallels, Jamison has connected the Iliadic *teichoscopia* to an Indo-European narrative pattern about wooing, bride abduction and counter-abduction.²⁹ And Helen in fact goes to the wall after Iris disguised as Laodice tells her Menelaus will fight Paris:

²⁷ See Torres-Guerra (1995) 55 for attempts to connect the Iliadic *teichoscopia* to Theban epic. Cook (2012) xxxvi, argues that the scene is less implausible than it seems, since Priam would have mostly seen the Greek leaders while they were wearing their armor.

²⁸ While some scholars have argued that the Euripidean *teichoscopia* is a later addition to the text, Mastronarde (1994, 168–173) argues for its authenticity. Besides *Iliad* 3, Euripides may have also drawn on the *parodos* of Aeschylus' *Seven Against Thebes*; see Mastronarde (1994) 168, and 29–30 on our "total" ignorance of the origins of stories concerning Antigone.

²⁹ See Jamison (1994), where she describes how the Iliadic *teichoscopia* forms a mirror image of the motif of the wooing of a bride by a groom's companions who describe him and his lineage in Indic epic.

αὐτὰρ Ἀλέξανδρος καὶ ἄρηϊφίλος Μενέλαος
μακρῆς ἐγγείησι μαχίσονται περὶ σεῖο·
τῷ δέ κε νικήσαντι φίλην κεκλήσῃ ἄκοιτις.

But Menelaus the warlike and Alexandros will fight
With long spears against each other for your possession.
You shall be called beloved wife of the man who wins you.

Il. 3.136–138

Helen's viewing from the wall is thus connected to the narrative of her marriage: the scene recalls the wooing of her suitors before she married Menelaus by gathering them all beneath the wall, while it also brings to mind her subsequent abduction by Paris, and it also has the potential to develop into a counter-abduction (following the Indic parallels) that would restore her to her lawful husband, Menelaus.³⁰

After a prologue spoken by Jocasta, Euripides' *Phoenissae* opens with Antigone and a servant climbing onto and looking out from the wall, discussing what they see. There are many superficial resemblances and a few explicit allusions to the Homeric scene, but also several indications that Euripides was drawing on a Theban tradition significantly different from the Homeric scene. In both the Iliadic and the Euripidean *teichoscopiai*, Helen and Antigone are observing warriors about to attack a city and its walls, but whereas Helen recognizes old suitors and a former husband, Antigone sees enemies intent on taking her city. Another important contrast is between Helen's knowledge and Antigone's ignorance. While both scenes include a dialogue, Helen answers Priam's questions, while Antigone questions her servant.

Priam asks Helen about the identity of the Greek warriors in surprisingly positive terms: Agamemnon is "noble and huge", "beautiful", "lordly", and "like a king" (ἡϋς τε μέγας τε, καλός, γεραρός, βασιλεύς, *Il.* 3.166–170), while Antenor praises Odysseus' extraordinary speaking skills (*Il.* 3.221–224). To Antigone, by contrast, the warriors she sees from the wall are "haughty," "threatening" (γαῦρος, φοβερός, *Phoen.* 127), half-barbarian (μειξοβάρβαρος, *Phoen.* 138), and terrible (γοργός, *Phoen.* 146), and her first concern is for the gates and locks and solidity of the wall built by Amphion (*Phoen.* 114–116).

Despite the fundamental difference between Helen's and Antigone's perspectives on what they see from the wall, there are several points of contact between the two scenes. Helen and Antigone both express a desire to see their brothers.

³⁰ See, for example, the catalogue of Helen's Suitors in the [Hesiodic] *Gynaikon Katalogos*, fr. 196–204 (M-W). On the connection of the catalogue and the Epic Cycle, see Cingano (2008).

Unaware of their deaths, Helen looks for her brothers but cannot find them on the battlefield. Euripides' *Phoenissae* alludes to this passage at line 156, when Antigone asks the servant about her brother:

ποῦ δ' ὃς ἔμοι μᾶς ἐγένετ' ἐκ ματρὸς
πολυπόνωι μοίραι;
ὦ φίλτατ', εἶπέ, ποῦ 'στι Πολυνείκης, γέρον;

And where is he whom my selfsame mother bore
to a painful fate?

Dear ancient, tell me, where is Polyneices?

Eur. *Phoen.* 156–159 (Wyckoff transl.)

Antigone's language is very close to Helen's (τῷ μοι μία γείνατο μήτηρ, *Il.* 3.238), and Euripides here (and elsewhere) self-consciously alludes to the Iliadic scene.³¹ Antigone does get a glimpse of Polyneices in the distance, resplendent with his golden weapons in the light of the dawn, standing near the tomb of Niobe's daughters (*Phoen.* 168–169).

Both Homeric epic and Euripides also highlight the pleasures of seeing. Priam and Antenor seem to take delight in observing the Greek leaders, and even as Antigone describes what she sees as threatening, she also enjoys the play of reflected light on bronze weapons that brighten the scene.³² The spectacle of impending war has its pleasures, even for the besieged, who look upon the battlefield from the wall like Zeus watching with pleasure from Olympos (ὀρόων φρένα τέρψομαι, *Il.* 20.23). And as we can already see in the north frieze from Thera, *teichoscopiai* and sieges were popular early on as subjects for visual artists.³³

Besides these similarities, important differences between Euripides' *Phoenissae* and the *Iliad* point to the ways in which a Theban *teichoscopia* must have differed from the scene with Helen on the wall. While *Iliad* 3 draws on an Indo-European pattern of bride abduction, Antigone on the wall would emphatically not be looking upon former or potential suitors. Other Iliadic wall scenes, such as Andromache's lament and the city at war depicted on Achilles' shield thus provide better parallels for a Theban tradition that would have emphasized the

³¹ See Mastronarde (1994) 195, who describes the line as “borrowed” from *Il.* 3.238. See also Mastronarde (1994) 184, on the description at *Phoen.* 110–111 of the plain shining with bronze and the parallel at *Il.* 20.156 when gods watch the battlefield just before Aeneas and Achilles fight.

³² Mastronarde (1994) 186 notes that Antigone is particularly attuned to “details of reflected light and graceful movement”.

³³ See Morris (1989) 524–529.

destruction of both a city and a family. The *teichoscopia* of *Iliad* 3 is in effect distancing itself from Theban tradition.

But there is one important way in which both scenes resemble one another: they both look towards the past, with Helen and Antigone looking for long lost brothers and seeing physical reminders of the past such as tombs. Both scenes also bring in the past by having characters reminisce about their own past as they contemplate the view from the wall. Helen remembers her former life, while Priam recalls his youthful trip to join the Phrygian forces against the Amazons, which he expresses in the form of a compliment for the great force that Agamemnon oversees, with no apparent discomfort at the Greeks' intentions towards his city. The servant in *Phoenissae* remembers how he accompanied Eteocles on an expedition to attempt a truce with Polyneices, which is why he is able to recognize the warriors on the plain (*Phoen.* 95–98). Euripides here again plays up the contrast between his and the Homeric scene: instead of a noble king reminiscing about the wars of his youth, the servant remembers accompanying his master on a doomed mission. Tombs of ancestors, including city founders, are also visible from both the walls of Troy and Thebes: Ilus at Troy, Amphion and Zethus, and the children of Niobe at Thebes, providing a connection between past and present, but also pointing toward the destruction awaiting both Thebes and Troy.³⁴ The *Iliad* thus constantly calls attention to the supposedly permanent qualities of objects such as walls and tombs while alluding to their relative impermanence compared to the everlasting power of poetry. And the walls at Troy, including the one built by Poseidon and Apollo, by the Trojans and Athene for Heracles, and by the Achaeans to protect their camp, can also be seen as repositories of memories of different stages of the Trojan tale, and taken together, “the memories evoked by the walls amount to a history of Troy”.³⁵

I want to turn now to the building and the destruction of the Achaean wall in *Iliad* 7 and 12, an episode much commented upon for its strangeness, both in terms of the narrative's lack of rationale for such an action at this late stage of the war, and for the poem's insistence that the wall will be completely destroyed. Many ancient and modern commentators have been bothered by the ill-timed edifice, and some have resorted to interpolation to explain its oddness. But the Achaean wall, and its eventual destruction, are in many ways central to the narrative of the *Iliad*. It makes sense for the Greeks to need more protection once Achilles withdraws from the fighting. And the wall allows the poet to stage battles near the Achaean camp in a move that turns the Greeks into the besieged rather than

³⁴ For more on the topography of Thebes, see note 17.

³⁵ Grethlein (2008) 34, and see also discussion of walls in 32–35.

the attackers.³⁶ The foretold destruction of the wall also allows the poet to extend his narrative well beyond the confines of the story of Troy.

There is a thematic connection with the Theban tradition in the motif of the *teichomachia*, the battle at the wall, yet by its very nature, the motif is also somewhat generic, as we can infer from the siege scene on Achilles' shield.³⁷ Both the motifs of the Theban *teichomachia* and the Iliadic destruction of the wall also share intriguing ancient Near Eastern parallels: Burkert has argued that the "tale of the 'Seven Against Thebes is the epic transposition of a purification ritual of ultimately Babylonian origin", while Scodel points out the resemblances between the destruction of the Achaean wall and ancient Near Eastern flood myths.³⁸ Burkert's theory argues for the direct influence of a Babylonian text and ritual on a Greek oral poem sometime after 750 BC, suggesting that while the Theban tradition, and especially the story of the Epigonoι, may have included memories of a Mycenaean Thebes, the story of the Seven and the seven gates of Thebes were a later innovation.

The story of the seven warriors and gates and the Achaean wall may thus share an ancient Near Eastern origin. While the *Iliad* does not explicitly connect the Achaean wall to the seven gates of the Theban tradition and remains vague about the number of gates, seven leaders are named as guardians (ἑπτὰ ἑσσαν ἡγεμόνες φυλάκων, 9.85).³⁹ The numerical correspondence stops there, with Hector sending five contingents of warriors to attack the wall, but the number of Achaean leaders nevertheless suggests a connection between the Achaean and Theban wall.

The Theban tradition may also be key to understanding the role of the wall in the narrative. The *Iliad* may be deliberately vague about the number of gates, but, as others have noted before, the wall is crucial in allowing the poet to turn the longest day of battle at Troy (*Iliad* 11–18) into an unexpected kind of narrative, one that portrays the Greeks as defenders rather than besiegers, an obvious connection with Theban epic: the Greeks, like the Trojans, and like the Thebans

³⁶ See West (1969); for the wall as a fictional object and the critical response to it, see J. Porter (2011). For the function of the wall in the poem and its identification with Achilles, see Nagy (1979) 160, and Boyd (1995).

³⁷ See Torres-Guerra (1995) 55–57 for a discussion of this motif in its connection with the Theban tradition.

³⁸ See Burkert (1981) especially 42, and Scodel (1982); see also West (1997) 455–457.

³⁹ See Hainsworth (1993) 313–314 for a summary of the question and Aristarchus' determination to argue for a single gate. Singor (1992) argues on the basis of the seven leaders and the river named Ἑπτάπορος ("Seven Streams") that the idea of a wall with seven gates, both in the *Iliad* and the Theban tradition, go back to Mesopotamian myth.

before them, are put in the position of defending their wall.⁴⁰ The building, and eventual destruction, of the Achaean wall are also both included in the poem, transforming the few days of battle witnessed by the *Iliad* into a narrative of a city's symbolic foundation, siege, and destruction.⁴¹

Homeric epic thus presents a typology of walls, including three stages (building, battle at the wall, destruction), that connects the Theban and the Trojan narratives. When the Greeks build their walls in *Iliad* 7, they effectively become city founders, doomed to lose their city on the Trojan shore:

τοῖσι δὲ μύθων ἦρχε Ποσειδάων ἐνοσίχθων·
 Ζεῦ πάτερ, ἦ ῥά τίς ἐστι βροτῶν ἐπ' ἀπείρονα γαῖαν
 ὃς τις ἔτ' ἀθανάτοισι νόον καὶ μῆτιν ἐνίψει;
 οὐχ ὀράς ὅτι δ' αὐτε κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
 τεῖχος ἐτειχίσσαντο νεῶν ὕπερ, ἄμφι δὲ τάφρον
 ἤλασαν, οὐδὲ θεοῖσι δόσαν κλειτὰς ἐκατόμβας;
 τοῦ δ' ἦτοι κλέος ἔσται ὅσον τ' ἐπικίδναται ἡώς·
 τοῦ δ' ἐπιλήσονται τὸ ἐγὼ καὶ Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων
 ἦρω Λαομέδοντι πολίσσαμεν ἀθλήσαντε.
 Τὸν δὲ μέγ' ὀχθήσας προσέφη νεφεληγερέτα Ζεὺς·
 ὦ πόποι ἐννοσῖγαι' εὐρυσθενές, οἷον ἔειπες,
 ἄλλός κέν τις τοῦτο θεῶν δείσειε νόημα,
 ὃς σέο πολλὸν ἀφαιρότερος χεῖράς τε μένος τε·
 σὸν δ' ἦτοι κλέος ἔσται ὅσον τ' ἐπικίδναται ἡώς.
 ἄγρην μὲν ὅτ' ἂν αὐτε κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ
 οἴχωνται σὺν νηυσὶ φίλῃν ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν
 τεῖχος ἀναρρήξας τὸ μὲν εἰς ἄλλα πᾶν καταχεῦαι,
 αὐτίς δ' ἥϊόνα μεγάλην ψαμάθοισι καλύψαι,
 ὥς κέν τοι μέγα τεῖχος ἀμαλδύνηται Ἀχαιῶν.

and the god Poseidon who shakes the earth began speaking among them:

“Father Zeus, is there any mortal left on the wide earth
 who will still declare to the immortals his mind and his purpose?
 Do you not see how now these flowing-haired Achaeans
 have built a wall landward of their ships, and driven about it
 a ditch, and not given to the gods any grand sacrifice?
 Now the fame of this will reach as far as dawn scatters her light,
 and men will forget that wall which I and Phoebus Apollo
 built with our hard work for the hero Laomedon's city”.
 Deeply troubled, Zeus who gathers the clouds answered him:
 “What a thing to have said, earth-shaker of the wide strength.

⁴⁰ The point has been made before, see, e.g., Clay (2011) 59 who notes that “during the longest day of battle, the Greeks besieging Troy become the besieged, their camp a city under attack” with note. On building walls as the equivalent of founding a city, see Scully (1990) 48.

⁴¹ For the Greek camp as a symbolic *polis*, see Raaflaub (1993) 47–48.

Some other one of the gods might fear such a thought, one who
 is a god far weaker of his hands and in anger than you are;
 but your fame will reach as far as dawn scatters her light.
 Come then! After once more the flowing-haired Achaeans
 are gone back with their ships to the beloved land of their fathers,
 break their wall to pieces and scatter it into the salt sea
 and pile again the beach deep under the sands and cover it;
 so let the great wall of the Achaeans go down to destruction.”

Il. 7.445–463

The Achaean wall exists in an agonistic relationship with other walls. As Poseidon points out, he made Troy into a city (πολίισσασμεν) by encircling it with a wall, and so are the Greeks notionally founding a city when they build their wall. Poseidon is angry on two counts: the wall has been built without any sacrifice to the gods, and the wall's κλέος will reach the ends of the earth. Some have dismissed Poseidon's complaint about the absence of sacrifice as trivial, but it points to the uniqueness of the Achaean wall, which is built by human beings without recourse to divine help, and has its very foundations up against the remains of warriors burned on the funeral pyre that day.⁴² The humanity thus embodied in the wall contrasts with the divinely and quasi-magically built walls of Troy and Thebes.

Another crucial detail makes the Achaean wall unusual. The conversation between Poseidon and Zeus takes place as the wall is in the process of being finished, and so the audience learns of its future destruction before its completion in the narrative. The spectacular act of erasure is foretold by Zeus in *Iliad* 7 and again by the narrator in *Iliad* 12:

ὄφρα μὲν Ἑκτωρ ζωὸς ἔην καὶ μῆνι' Ἀχιλλεύς
 καὶ Πριάμοιο ἄνακτος ἀπὸρθητος πόλις ἔπλεν,
 τόφρα δὲ καὶ μέγα τεῖχος Ἀχαιῶν ἔμπεδον ἦεν.
 αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ μὲν Τρώων θάνον ὅσοι ἄριστοι,
 πολλοὶ δ' Ἀργείων οἳ μὲν δάμεν, οἳ δὲ λίποντο,
 πέρθετο δὲ Πριάμοιο πόλις δεκάτῳ ἐνιαυτῷ,
 Ἀργεῖοι δ' ἐν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδ' ἔβησαν,
 δὴ τότε μητιόωντο Ποσειδάων καὶ Ἀπόλλων
 τεῖχος ἀμαλδύναι ποταμῶν μένος εἰσαγαγόντες.
 ὅσοι ἀπ' Ἰδαίων ὀρέων ἄλα δὲ προρέουσι,
 Ῥησός θ' Ἐπτάπορος τε Κάρησός τε Ῥοδῖος τε
 Γρήνικός τε καὶ Αἴσηπος διός τε Σκάμανδρος

⁴² See, e.g., Kirk (1990) 289 on *Il.* 7.450; similarly Scodel (1982, 34) argues that Poseidon's complaint about the lack of hecatombs “seems like motive-hunting”. The lack of sacrifice provides another connection with the Trojan wall, which is built through the treachery of Laomedon so that in both instances the construction of the walls can also be understood as cheating the gods.

καὶ Σιμόεις, ὅθι πολλὰ βοάγρια καὶ τρυφάλειαι
 κάππεσον ἐν κονίησι καὶ ἡμιθέων γένος ἀνδρῶν·
 τῶν πάντων ὁμόσε στόματ' ἔτραπε Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων,
 ἐννῆμαρ δ' ἐς τεῖχος ἴει ρόον· ὃε δ' ἄρα Ζεὺς
 συνεχές, ὄφρα κε θάσσον ἀλίπλοα τείχεα θείη.
 αὐτὸς δ' ἐννοσίγαιος ἔχων χεῖρεσι τρίαῖναν
 ἡγεῖτ', ἐκ δ' ἄρα πάντα θεμεῖλια κύμασι πέμπε
 φητρῶν καὶ λάων, τὰ θέσαν μογέοντες Ἀχαιοί,
 λεῖα δ' ἐποίησεν παρ' ἀγάρροον Ἑλλήσποντον,
 αὐτίς δ' ἥϊόνα μεγάλην ψαμάθοισι κάλυψε
 τεῖχος ἀμαλδύνας· ποταμοὺς δ' ἔτρεψε νέεσθαι
 κὰρ ρόον, ἧ περ πρόσθεν ἔεν καλλίρροον ὕδωρ.

So long as Hector was still alive, and Achilles was angry,
 so long as the city of lord Priam was a city untaken,
 for this time the great wall of the Achaeans stood firm. But afterward
 when all the bravest among the Trojans had died in the fighting,
 and many of the Argives had been beaten down, and some left
 when in the tenth year the city of Priam was taken
 and the Argives gone in their ships to the beloved land of their fathers,
 then at last Poseidon and Apollo took counsel
 to wreck the wall, letting loose the strength of rivers upon it,
 all the rivers that run to the sea from the mountains of Ida,
 Rhesos and Heptaporos, Caresos and Rhodios,
 Grenicos and Aesepos, and immortal Scamandros,
 and Simoeis, where much ox-hide armor and helmets were tumbled
 in the river mud, and many of the race of the half-god mortals.
 Phoebus Apollo turned the mouths of these waters together
 and nine day long threw the flood against the wall, and Zeus rained
 incessantly, to break the wall faster and wash it seaward.
 And the shaker of the earth himself holding in his hands the trident
 guided them, and hurled into the waves all the foundations
 of logs and stones the toiling Achaeans had set in position
 and made all smooth again by the hard-running passage of Helle
 and once again piled the great beach under sand, having wrecked
 the wall, and turned the rivers again to make their way down
 the same channel where before they had run the bright stream of their water.

Il. 12.10–33

The Achaean wall, built in one day out of improvised materials, leaning against the ashes of dead warriors, is remarkably hard to destroy. Poseidon was right to worry about the κλέος of the Achaean wall, which is paradoxically guaranteed by its very destruction, which outdoes all other destructions in its quasi-cosmic annihilation. The connection between the divine flood that destroys the wall and ancient Near Eastern myths of destruction has been well established, but what is

interesting is the poet's choice to use this end-of-the-world motif specifically to describe the divine erasure of one single man-made wall.⁴³

Because it shares in the same unusual diction, the passage has often been connected with Hesiod's description of the fourth race of the heroes, whom he also calls the ἥμιθεοι, and who include both those who fought at Thebes and those who fought at Troy (Hes. *WD* 156–65). The Hesiodic passage implies that these two groups are the subjects of comparable poetic traditions, but Homeric epic by contrast singles out those who fought at Troy as constituting the race of ἥμιθεοι.⁴⁴

Homeric epic thus seems not only aware of Theban traditions, but is also keen on referring to it in an agonistic way. The *Iliad* alludes to Thebes directly, by comparing its heroes to those of the past, or indirectly by using epithets and motifs common to both the Theban and Trojan settings, but highlights its own uniqueness, as in the episodes of the *teichoscopia* and the Achaean wall. Consequently, in the typology of epic walls, the construction and annihilation of the Achaean wall is the most spectacular of all. We can be certain that the audience listening to the *Iliad* would never be able to think of Homeric poetry as the equivalent of mourning “the walls of Amphion and his lyre”. Homer's Achaeans manage to be better than the Thebans at everything, both at winning the war and losing their wall in an unforgettable cosmic event, which, by ignoring it, also erases the Theban tradition.⁴⁵

⁴³ See Scodel (1982); West (1992) 377–380.

⁴⁴ See Nagy (1979) 159–160; see also Barker and Christensen (2008) 3. ἀμαλδύνειν (‘to efface’ or ‘to wipe out’) only appears in these two passages in Homer; for a metapoetic reading of the erasure of the wall, see Ford (1992) 150–152.

⁴⁵ I would like to thank Christos Tsagalis for inviting me to participate in this collection of essays, and Nicolle Hirschfeld, Tom Jenkins, Shannon Mariotti, Tim O’Sullivan and David Rando for conversations on writing, Homer, and walls. For reading this essay and offering their insights and many helpful suggestions, I am grateful to Erwin Cook and Peter Mazur.

Benjamin Sammons

A Tale of Tydeus: Exemplarity and Structure in Two Homeric Insets

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0016

A number of myths surrounding the city of Thebes consolidated at an early date into a lengthy saga encompassing four generations of heroes: Laius, his son Oedipus, Oedipus' sons and the war of the Seven, and the sons of the Seven or "Epigonoι". We know of several archaic epics treating the three main phases of the story, such that they could later on be collected into a "cycle" encompassing the whole myth: These are the *Oidipodeia*, the *Thebaid*, the *Epigonoι*, and the *Alcmeonis*. It seems probable that behind these surviving poems there existed an oral tradition of poetic performances on the same subject matter, and therefore that not only the myth but poetic performances of the myth were likely to have been familiar already to Homer and his audiences.

In light of this, what is striking is not so much that we find scattered references to Theban mythology throughout the *Iliad*, but the fact that these references are so sparse and so restricted in scope.¹ Indeed, all the substantial narrative allusions² to the Theban Wars cluster around the hero Diomedes and have

¹ Aside from those discussed within, see *Il.* 2.505 ("Hypothēbae" mentioned in place of Thebes proper), *Il.* 2.572 (brief mention of Adrastus' kingship over Sicyon, without reference to the expedition against Thebes), *Il.* 6.222–223 (Diomedes does not remember Tydeus since he was small "when the host of the Achaeans perished in Thebes"), *Il.* 14.114 (Diomedes says that Tydeus is buried at Thebes), *Il.* 23.345–347 (Adrastus' horse Arion is mentioned as paragon of swiftness), *Il.* 23.679–680 (victory of Mecisteus at the funeral games for Oedipus). See further Kullmann (2002) 167–169. References that are not connected somehow with Diomedes appear incidental and random, leaving large swathes of the myth unaccounted for (e.g., the downfall of Oedipus, the quarrel of the brothers, the identity of the Seven, and their respective backgrounds and fates).

² By narrative allusions I mean those that have some narrative form, i.e. are narratives, rather than those that merely indicate a fact or a moment, as for example when Diomedes notes that his father Tydeus is buried at Thebes (*Il.* 14.114) or when reference is made to the funeral of Oedipus. Of course the latter sort of allusion may imply a narrative, but this is something different. On Diomedes' allusion to his father's death at Thebes in *Iliad* 14, see below.

Ben Sammons: New York University, E-Mail: benjamin.sammons@gmail.com.

to do specifically with his father Tydeus. Yet even here the focus is not where we might expect it to be, e.g. on the attack of the Seven against Thebes or the colorful tale of Tydeus' demise,³ but rather on a single episode belonging not to the decisive battle but to a mere preliminary of little strategic importance. The passages are as follows:

1. *Il.* 4.370–400: Agamemnon recounts to Diomedes how Tydeus visited Mycenae with Polyneices, seeking allies in the attack on Thebes. Later, Tydeus went to Thebes alone, where he challenged and beat the Thebans in athletic contests and then single-handedly destroyed an ambush of 50 picked men, leaving only two survivors. Agamemnon's aim is to spur Diomedes to deeds of valor that would be worthy of his father's name.⁴

2. *Il.* 5.800–813: Athena appears to Diomedes in the midst of battle and tells the same story. She emphasizes the fact that she herself had urged Tydeus to keep quiet among the Thebans, but he challenged them to the athletic contests on his own initiative. Her point is that Tydeus acted bravely even when she urged restraint; all the more should Diomedes fight with her encouragement.⁵

3. *Il.* 10.284–294: Diomedes mentions both embassy and ambush in a prayer to Athena, again emphasizing the goddess's aid. He adds the detail that Athena actively plotted with Tydeus over the destruction of the ambush. His point is that Athena should now help him on a similar ambush-like enterprise.⁶

The three passages together reflect a unitary narrative that is complete and free of contradiction, though each rendition offers different details and emphases.⁷

Contemporary discussion of such inset narratives rightly focus on their rhetorical or paradigmatic function, with due consideration for the context, speaker and addressee in each case. This is usually our primary method for explaining

³ Tydeus was mortally wounded and attempted to save himself by consuming the brain of his slain enemy; just at that moment Athena appeared seeking to award him immortality, but turned back in disgust at the sight of his cannibalism. It is uncertain how this story may have been presented in the Cyclic *Thebaid*; see Stoneman (1981) 56–57.

⁴ On the objections of Sthenelus, see below p. 311–312.

⁵ Some interpretations press her words too hard; see below, pp. 304–307.

⁶ Diomedes' prayer to the goddess at *Il.* 5.115–120, which mentions Athena's help to Tydeus in war, includes no further details but could be taken to refer to the same episode. It may be situated between the two main passages in order to keep the story fresh in the audience's mind.

⁷ Slatkin (2011) 104–105 sees the passages as “providing an ideal demonstration of the capacity of oral storytelling for expansion and compression, elaboration and selective emphasis”.

why this or that poetic tradition appears in Homer in a particular form, especially when traditional tales are noticeably modified by glaring omissions, unusual emphases or even alterations to the stories themselves. Considerations of the kind explain a great deal about why, out of the whole saga of the Theban Wars, this episode in particular should come in for detailed treatment within the *Iliad*. Clearly Tydeus is selected because of his importance to his son, Diomedes, who in each case is called upon or seeks to emulate his father's example. The story of the ambush is chosen because it offers a more appropriate paradigm for Diomedes than (for example) his father's later defeat in battle.⁸

Another approach seeks to connect such narratives to poetic sources outside of the *Iliad*, on the assumption that Homer may occasionally avail himself of material available to him from other poems, songs, or performance traditions.⁹ This approach is obviously not irreconcilable with the first, since Homer could naturally draw on such sources to find material to use paradigmatically within his own poem. Yet the obvious contextual refashioning of these narratives discourages us from reading them back into hypothetical sources in a detailed way. When explaining the form of an inset narrative, rhetorical or narratological considerations must be treated as primary.¹⁰ This is particularly so with matters of emphasis. In all three narratives mentioned above, the emphasis lies on Tydeus' visit to Thebes and his defeat of the ambush. Given that Homer here chooses, perhaps largely crafts, an episode particularly suitable to serve as paradigmatic for Diomedes' role in the *Iliad*, how can we be confident that a corresponding episode loomed large or even existed in some archaic poem, or even performance tradition, to which we could imagine him alluding? To draw such an inference we need details that seem external to the rhetorical gist of the Iliadic context but would serve well in a more fulsome epic composition. In the present case it is worth noting that each rendition of the story somehow includes a theme of obedience to divine signs, a point that would seem extraneous at least to Agamemnon's rhetorical aim.¹¹ It seems reasonable enough, moreover, to suppose that the ques-

⁸ Andersen (1978) 34–35.

⁹ For the idea that Homer knew some kind of fixed or textual Theban epic, see Vermeule (1987) 139–140; Kullmann (2002) 167–169; Torres (2012) 517–530. For the view that such a poem was part of Homer's own repertoire, see West (2011) 36–37. For attempts to see allusions between traditions rather than texts, see Ebbott (2010) 240–242; Barker and Christensen (2011) 9; Slatkin (2011) 108–109. Turkeltaub (2010, 131) suggests that the *Iliad* recasts extra-Iliadic myths into “ideated constructs” and presents these as the “presumed antecedents” to its own tradition.

¹⁰ Cf. Lang (1983) 140.

¹¹ Agamemnon mentions divine signs twice (*Il.* 4.381, 398) and the theme is taken up again by Sthenelus (*Il.* 4.408); Athena directly addresses the issue of Tydeus' obedience to her commands (see below).

tion of human obedience to the gods could have been thematic for an archaic *Thebaid*, since later poets repeatedly emphasize that the Seven marched αἰσιᾶν οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν.¹² On the other hand, even if the theme seems pointless in Agamemnon's speech, it really is not in Athena's; and it could after all reflect the fact that among the heroes of the *Iliad* Diomedes enjoys a particularly high level of divine aid and is, if anything, overly punctilious in his obedience to Athena's commands.

In what follows I argue that not merely content and theme but the very structure of narrative allusions can reflect the influence of other poems on the *Iliad*. Ultimately, however, I remain pessimistic that even this can constitute compelling evidence that Homer's allusions are based on an external source, since I think that ultimately we are dealing with the poet's own conception of proper narrative form. Before positing an external source for the structure of a narrative allusion, we must fully account not only for the rhetoric of the characters but the poet's own rhetoric. For the form of a mythological allusion – that is, the narrative form in which a traditional tale is embedded in Homer's own story – can be paradigmatic, *on the level of form*, for the form of poems generally or Homer's poem in particular; and can contribute not only to the thematic argument of the work at hand, but to a deeper argument, pursued implicitly by the poet, about how an epic poem *per se* ought to be constructed. Finally, we must account for the interaction between a character's rhetoric and the poet's. For Homeric speakers, adherence to the poet's own conception of epic storytelling often corresponds to rhetorical success, while departure from it corresponds to rhetorical failure.¹³

First I will take a closer look at the two main passages, Agamemnon's speech from *Iliad* 4 and Athena's from *Iliad* 5, to show that their narrative form is governed by an internal principle that arguably goes beyond the rhetorical aims of each speaker, or even the thematic emphases of Diomedes' *aristeia*. I will then consider some aspects of the larger context of Agamemnon's speech, which comes under direct criticism from Diomedes' companion Sthenelus. Finally I will consider this debate in relation to several other passages in Homer that seem to exemplify competing strategies for relating (and relating to) the epic past.

¹² Pind. *Nem.* 9.13–27; cf. Bacch. 9.14–18. The unwilling participation of the seer Amphiaraus contributed to this theme (see, e.g., Aesch. *Sept.* 568–596).

¹³ For an example of this approach, see my discussion of Agamemnon's "catalogue of gifts" (*Il.* 9.120–157) in Sammons (2010) 115–131.

Agamemnon and Athena on Tydeus

Agamemnon's account begins with a detail that has sometimes bothered critics, namely the fact that Tydeus first visited Mycenae with Polyneices seeking war-allies:

ἦτοι μὲν γὰρ ἄτερ πολέμου εἰσῆλθε Μυκῆνας
 ξεῖνος ἅμ' ἀντιθέω Πολυνεϊκῇ λαὸν ἀγείρων·
 οἳ δὲ τότε ἔστρατόωνθ' ἱερὰ πρὸς τείχεα Θήβης,
 καὶ ῥα μάλα λίσσοντο δόμεν κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους·
 οἳ δ' ἔθελον δόμεναι καὶ ἐπῆνεον ὥς ἐκέλευον·
 ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἔτρεψε παραΐσια σήματα φαίνων.

Indeed he came in peace to Mycenae
 a visitor with god-like Polyneices, gathering a host.
 They were then marching on the sacred walls of Thebes
 and earnestly begged the Mycenaeans to give illustrious allies.
 And the Mycenaeans wanted to contribute, and spoke in favor of the request
 but Zeus turned them aside, showing signs of ill-omen.

Il. 4.376–381

The visit to Mycenae appears arbitrary and has been called an *ad hoc* invention of the poet.¹⁴ Various explanations have been offered for its inclusion: It may serve to explain Agamemnon's knowledge of Tydeus and the Seven;¹⁵ with it Agamemnon may imply that just as the Mycenaeans were inclined to help Tydeus, so Diomedes should now help him;¹⁶ or it may serve to introduce a theme of obedience to divine signs (the Mycenaeans were turned back by omens) that appears at the end of the story as well as in the response of Sthenelus.¹⁷ But the detail should also be considered from the standpoint of narrative form: The key point to notice is that the embassy to Mycenae is not so much arbitrary as it is redundant; Agamemnon's narrative is fashioned so that Tydeus participates in two embassies, one

¹⁴ Cf. Andersen (1978) 35; Stoneman (1981) 56; West (2011) 147. On the other hand Vermeule (1987) 139–140 thinks the episode has a ring of historical truth, suggestive of “a friendly alliance between Argos and Mycenae to place a partner-king on the throne of Thebes”.

¹⁵ West (2011) 146–147. Of course Homer need not explain how Agamemnon knows about Tydeus any more than he needs to explain how Diomedes knows about Lycurgus or how Achilles knows about Niobe; a simple φάσαν suffices (but even this is not obligatory).

¹⁶ Cf. Andersen (1978) 35. The sly rhetorical innuendo attributed to Agamemnon can hardly be disproved, but the supposed argument seems rather feeble (“my ancestors almost helped your ancestor, but not quite, therefore you should help me now, assuming that nothing ominous turns you back”).

¹⁷ Il. 4.398, 4.408. Cf. Andersen (1978) 35–36; de Jong (1987) 156.

to Mycenae and one to Thebes. Moreover, the first embassy could be described as a relatively tame and risk-free dry run for the second: In the first embassy, Tydeus arrives in the company of another hero, he is treated with gracious hospitality, and his mission is nearly a success. In the second embassy, he goes alone, he is visiting a hostile city, and the embassy ends not only unsuccessfully but with an outbreak of violence.¹⁸ Hence the first part of Agamemnon's story is something like a low-key preparation for the second part. In a more fulsome narrative the account of the first might have set out the basic forms of a peaceful embassy so that these could then be complicated, elaborated and ultimately perverted in the more complex episode that follows. What we have here, in my opinion, is an example in miniature of a device well-known from Homer, the "anticipatory doublet." Fenik used this term to describe doublets (two or more passages based on a single narrative template) where the first rendition of a narrative pattern is relatively brief and condensed, whereas the second represents an expanded and elaborate version of the same, often featuring the inclusion of additional elements. The audience, thus introduced to what is essentially a narrative and thematic template, is then well-prepared to follow and to interpret correctly the second, more complex and elaborate, rendition of the pattern, which usually follows relatively soon after the first.¹⁹ The device is well-documented in Homer and other early epic, and would appear to be a typical instance of the oral bard's artistic use of repetition and mirroring.²⁰

Just as we see doublet construction between the embassy to Mycenae and the embassy to Thebes, so the latter episode itself seems to resolve into a double structure:

ἔνθ' αὖτ' ἀγγελίην ἐπὶ Τυδῇ στεῖλαν Ἀχαιοί.
αὐτὰρ ὃ βῆ, πολέας δὲ κιχήσατο Καδμεΐωνας
δαινυμένους κατὰ δῶμα βίης Ἑτεοκλήϊης.
ἔνθ' οὐδὲ ξεινός περ ἑὼν ἱππυλάτα Τυδεὺς
τάρβει, μῶνος ἑὼν πολέσιν μετὰ Καδμείοισιν,
ἀλλ' ὃ γ' ἀεθλεύειν προκαλίζετο, πάντα δ' ἐνίκᾳ
ρήϊδιως· τοίη οἱ ἐπύρροθος ἦεν Ἀθήνη.

18 Not to mention the added complication of athletic contests, on which see below. Presumably the purpose of the embassy was to demand that Eteocles surrender kingship to Polyneices, as in Statius' *Thebaid* and [Apollodorus] *Bibl.* 3.6.5.

19 Fenik (1974) 142–207, esp. 154–157; cf. Fenik (1968) 213–214.

20 See Scodel (1984) 55–58 (citing further examples in Greek tragedy) and Kelly (2007) (with attention to the Hesiodic corpus) who contrasts “increasing doublets”, roughly equivalent to Fenik’s anticipatory doublets, and “decreasing doublets”, in which the more elaborate rendition of the pattern goes first. In Sammons (2013), I argue that anticipatory doublets were common in the Epic Cycle, even to the point of defining the structure of entire poems.

οἳ δὲ χολωσάμενοι Καδμεῖοι κέντορες ἵππων
 ἄψ ἄρ' ἀνερχομένῳ πυκινὸν λόχον εἶσαν ἄγοντες
 κούρους πεντήκοντα· δὴ δ' ἡγήτορες ἦσαν,
 Μαίων Αἰμονίδης ἐπιείκελος ἀθανάτοισιν,
 υἱός τ' Αὐτοφόνιο μενεπτόλεμος Πολυφόντης.
 Τυδεὺς μὲν καὶ τοῖσιν ἀεικέα πότμον ἐφῆκε·
 πάντας ἔπεφν', ἓνα δ' οἷον ἱεὶ οἶκον δὲ νέεσθαι·
 Μαίον' ἄρα προέηκε θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας.

Then in turn the Achaeans sent Tydeus as a messenger.
 He went, and found the Cadmeans in their numbers
 dining throughout the house of the might of Eteocles.
 Then, though horse-driving Tydeus was a visitor, nor did he
 fear, though he was alone among the many Cadmeans,
 but he challenged them to contests and won them all
 easily – such a helper did he have in Athena!
 But the horse-goading Cadmeans grew angry
 and for him returning they laid a close-set ambush, leading
 fifty youths. There were two leaders –
 Maeon the son of Haemon like to the immortals,
 and the son of Autophonus, Polyphontes steadfast in battle.
 Verily Tydeus inflicted an unseemly doom also on these men.
 He killed them all, and sent only one to go back home –
 he sent away Maeon, obeying the omens of the gods.

Il. 4.384–398

Tydeus first challenges the Thebans to athletic contests and defeats them; later he is waylaid by a Theban ambush and defeats them in battle. Hence two challenges, two contests, and two victories. Here as well the format has caused some consternation, since the athletic contests, like the embassy to Mycenae, has struck some as redundant and oddly pointless.²¹ Clearly the ambush is more relevant to Agamemnon's paradigmatic rhetoric than the games, since he urges Diomedes to acts of martial valor against a perfidious enemy. Consider the two episodes together, however, as an anticipatory doublet: The first episode is preparatory to the second; the second an elaboration and intensification of the themes and tensions already laid out in the first – or it could be so, in a more fulsome epic nar-

²¹ Willcock (1964, 144–145) argues that the embassy is traditional but the ambush is invented. Andersen (1978, 37–38) notes that the ambush is poorly motivated, since the Thebans could hardly restore their honor by such a treacherous act. Already the scholiast struggled to explain it (ἵνα μὴ τοῖς Ἀργείοις ἐξαγγελίῃ τὴν ἀσθένειαν Θηβαίων, [BT] *Il.* 4.392 [Erbse]). Note that Statius omits in his *Thebaid* both the embassy to Mycenae and the athletic contests, keeping only a brief visit to Thebes and the ambush.

rative.²² In fact Agamemnon's narrative as a whole has a careful and graduated structure, consisting of two couched pairs of doublets: Two embassies, and then within the second embassy narrative, two conflicts. There are even intimations of thematic linkages within this structure, e.g. the fact that Tydeus spares Maeon in obedience to divine signs (θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας, *Il.* 4.398) just as the Mycenaean had declined to join Polyneices in obedience to divine signs (παραίσια σήματα, *Il.* 4.381).

Athena's version of the story (*Iliad* 5) supplements Agamemnon's in various interesting ways, but especially by recounting events from the divine perspective.²³ Not merely confirming Agamemnon's vague sense that Tydeus enjoyed the goddess's aid, Athena gives more specifics about how she helped him and what advice she gave. But besides this, *she seems in general to place less emphasis on her own aid to the hero and more on Tydeus's inborn heroic temper* – the “strong heart” that he had even before these events (*Il.* 5.800–813):

ἧ ὀλίγον οἱ παῖδα εἰκότα γείνατο Τυδεύς.
 Τυδεύς τοι μικρὸς μὲν ἦν δέμας, ἀλλὰ μαχητὴς·
 καὶ ῥ' ὅτε πέρ μιν ἐγὼ πολεμίζειν οὐκ εἵασκον
 οὐδ' ἐκπαιφάσσειν, ὅτε τ' ἤλυθε νόσφιν Ἀχαιῶν
 ἄγγελος ἐς Θήβας πολέας μετὰ Καδμείωνας·
 δαίνυσθαί μιν ἄνωγον ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἔκκλητον·
 αὐτὰρ ὁ θυμὸν ἔχων ὃν καρτερόν ὥς τὸ πάρος περ
 κούρους Καδμείων προκαλίζετο, πάντα δ' ἐνίκᾳ
 ῥῆϊδίῳ· τοίη οἱ ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθος ἦα.
 σοὶ δ' ἦτοι μὲν ἐγὼ παρὰ θ' ἵσταμαι ἡδὲ φυλάσσω,
 καὶ σε προφρονέως κέλομαι Τρώεσσι μάχεσθαι·
 ἀλλὰ σευ ἢ κάματος πολυδαΐξ γυῖα δέδυκεν
 ἦ νύ σέ που δέος ἴσχει ἀκήριον· οὐ σύ γ' ἔπειτα
 Τυδέος ἔκγονός ἐσσι δαΐφρονος Οἰνεΐδαο.

I omit to translate for the moment in order to discuss the meaning of these words in greater detail. The speech has often been misunderstood based on an assumption that Tydeus challenged the Thebans *despite Athena's prohibition*. Athena's point to Diomedes, on this view, is that while Tydeus bravely challenged the Thebans *despite her express command not to*, Diomedes hangs back from battle *despite her express encouragement* (*Il.* 5.809–12).²⁴ Already in antiquity this inter-

²² West (2011) 147 remarks of the athletic contests that “such an inorganic episode implies an epic narrative on an ample scale”.

²³ Cf. de Jong (1987) 156.

²⁴ Erbse (1961) 158–159; Lohmann (1970) 14; Andersen (1978) 79; Kirk (1990) 142–143; Alden (2000) 121–122; Turkeltaub (2010) 139.

pretation helped to cast doubt on *Il.* 5.808 (“such a helper was I to him”) since it seemed to contradict Athena’s statement that she did not encourage Tydeus – how could she have helped him when she was actively discouraging him from action?²⁵ Omission of the verse makes the proposed reading even stronger: Tydeus challenged the Thebans against Athena’s command and *without her help*, whereas Diomedes hangs back despite her encouragement *and her immediate assistance*.²⁶ The attraction of this reading is that it creates a near-total antithesis between father and son. In fact it is not supported either by the rhetorical situation or Athena’s own words.

Nothing in the text implies that Tydeus defied a direct command from his divine patron. Athena says that she would not allow Tydeus to “make war” (πολεμίζειν) or to “dart forth,” i.e. “attack” (ἐκπαιφάσσειν).²⁷ She ordered him rather to sit still and enjoy his meal. But his courageous heart moved him to challenge the Cadmeans to athletic contests.²⁸ It seems obvious that Tydeus obeyed the goddess in avoiding hostilities at first. It was only in the following episode, the ambush recounted by Agamemnon, that Tydeus fought the Thebans; but this was a wholly new situation, pointedly not mentioned in Athena’s speech, and anyway a situation in which the Thebans themselves were the aggressors.²⁹ As for the challenge to athletic contests, this clearly *does not* contradict her prohibition and does not obviously contradict her command that he dine with the Thebans contentedly.³⁰ Athletic contests are a venue for competition among friends and

²⁵ Σ (A) *Il.* 4.390 (Erbse). Apthorp (2000) gives good reasons to question the line on external grounds, but his argument for its incongruity within Athena’s speech (adopted also by Nagy 2004, 36–37) is less convincing.

²⁶ For detailed explication see Apthorp (2000) 8.

²⁷ On the meaning of ἐκπαιφάσσειν, see n. 30 below.

²⁸ Turkeltaub (2010, 139) correctly notes that προκαλίζετο has martial connotations, but its appearance in Agamemnon’s speech together with *Od.* 8.142 (a closely parallel passage, as I argue below) suffice to establish its appropriateness to athletics, and given Agamemnon’s earlier use of it together with ἀεθλεύειν, there is really no ambiguity as to what is meant here (though the infinitive is omitted). For this reason I cannot agree with Turkeltaub that Athena emphasizes Tydeus’ “overweening aggression” such that it is he who violates the conventions of *xenia* rather than the Thebans as in Agamemnon’s account.

²⁹ It was clearly not Athena’s recommendation that Tydeus decline to fight when ambushed by fifty armed men.

³⁰ Some treat ἐκπαιφάσσειν as though it meant something like “distinguish oneself”, such that Tydeus does violate Athena’s command when he draws attention to himself with the challenge, e.g. Cunliffe (“make oneself prominent”), Ameis-Hentze (“sich hervortun”), Lattimore (“drawing men’s eyes”). Kirk (1990, 141) and de Jong (1987) 156 translate “provoke them”, yet as Kirk acknowledges *ad* 802–804, the verb should mean “‘darting out’, i.e. rushing forward into battle”. Cf. *Lfgre* s.v. παμφάσσω, “dart forth”, “make impulsive attacks” (with reference also to

allies; they are therefore the business of peace rather than war – indeed, games are typically associated with the feasting to which the goddess urged the hero.³¹ These particular contests may have emerged from or resulted in ill-will between Tydeus and the Thebans, and this is probably the point: Having been barred from *violent* action Tydeus found another way, entirely in accord with his divine helper's directions, to show his superiority to his Theban hosts.

Rhetorically, as well, the traditional interpretation works rather poorly despite the attractiveness of the exhaustive antithesis supposedly drawn between father and son. First of all, it would be strange for Athena to say that Tydeus defied her express command, and (if we follow through by athetizing *Il.* 5.808) that her assistance was after all completely superfluous. Moreover, although Athena does tendentiously imply an antithesis between the situations of Tydeus and Diomedes, she rather playfully sidesteps a crucial parallel.³² As Diomedes immediately points out to her in his response (*Il.* 5.818–824), she herself prohibited him from fighting any gods apart from Aphrodite, and he presently hangs back from battle because he has seen Ares fighting at the side of Hector. Athena's own speech, with its emphasis on her command to Tydeus *not to fight*, clearly anticipates this rejoinder.³³ Hence her argument is rather: "Tydeus was a fighter: Even when I ordered him not to fight, his overweening heart compelled him to challenge the Thebans to ostensibly peaceful contests. He did not use my prohibition as an excuse to hang back; rather *he* found another way to confront his adversaries –

παιφάσσουσα at *Il.* 2.450, and noting the implied contrast with προκαλίζετο); similarly *LSJ* ("rush madly into the fray"). In any case it would make no sense for the verb to have such a banal meaning as "distinguish oneself" – how could Tydeus fail to distinguish himself when he is already in the role of an emissary? The difficulty is perhaps felt already in the scholiast's gloss (τῷ ἀνερπύον ἑαυτὸν, ἀλλ' ἐν ἀγγέλου σχήματι μένειν). The two verbs of Athena's prohibition are probably not distinct ("do not make war, and also do not distinguish yourself in any other way" – rather uninspiring, as divine commands go) but rather constitute a forceful hendiadys ("do not make war by darting forth into their midst").

³¹ So the scholiast on *Il.* 4.389 (μετὰ τὸ δεῖπνον γὰρ οἱ ἄγῶνες) citing *Od.* 8.100; on Scheria the games emerge naturally as an amusement to be pursued after everyone has eaten (see esp. *Od.* 8.98–101); the suitors typically feast and compete in alternation (*Od.* 4.624–627, 17.167–171). I do not deny the intimate connection between athletics and war as described by Dickie (1983, 241–243), or his remark that "Tydeus' competitive zeal and prowess in athletics are then treated as proof of his martial spirit as though athletic and marital prowess were hardly to be separated" (242). It is precisely for these reasons that the athletic contests could constitute an anticipation of the ambush. On the comparison with *Od.* 8, see below.

³² Cf. Erbse (1961) 159–160; Andersen (1978) 81.

³³ On the humorous cajolery of Athena's speech, see Andersen (1978) 80 and de Jong (1987) 156, both of whom defend verse *Il.* 5.808.

but *you* are quite content to stand around and do nothing”. Or to translate the text itself:

Verily, Tydeus begat a son little like to himself.
 Tydeus was a small man bodily, but he was a fighter –
 even when I did not allow him to make war
 or dart forth, when he came apart from the Achaeans
 as a messenger to Thebes into the midst of the Cadmeans.
 I ordered him to dine at his ease in the palace.
 But he, holding that strong heart of his, even as before,
 challenged the sons of the Cadmeans, and won them all
 easily – such a helper was I to him!
 You indeed I stand beside and defend
 and you I enthusiastically command to fight the Trojans,
 but either a manifold weariness has entered your limbs
 or, I suppose, dispiriting fear holds you back; therefore
 you are no offspring of the resourceful son of Oeneus.

Il. 5.800–813

Insofar as one can (or should) try to extract a narrative from this allusive speech, it would be something like this: Tydeus arrives in Thebes. He is invited to eat, as is proper, but he is somehow provoked nearly to violence. Perhaps he was mocked about his life as an exile, or about the diminutive stature that Athena mentions at the beginning of her account.³⁴ Like any doughty hero, he at first reacts to insult by reaching for his sword, but Athena appears (only to him, of course) and orders him to keep his peace.³⁵ Only later does he vent his anger, and prove his superiority, by challenging the Thebans to contests and winning them all. **One can think of a few obvious parallels. In *Il.* 1.188–218, Achilles responds to Agamemnon’s insult with the intention of rushing the king and killing him. Athena holds him back, encouraging him to a more diplomatic course of action. As for the athletic contests, one thinks naturally of Odysseus in Scheria:** Advised by Nausicaa and Athena, Odysseus supplicates Arete and tries in vain to keep a low profile among the Phaeacians. He is invited to a feast, and then to athletic games. He is not at first inclined to participate, until Euryalus insults him by comparing him to a common merchant-marine (*Od.* 8.159–164). Odysseus is riled up and throws a winning toss of the discus. Athena herself announces his victory, and Odysseus then vindicates his honor with a lengthy boast (*Od.* 8.202–833) in which he chal-

³⁴ Cf. Σ (bT) *Il.* 4.389 (Erbse). Some provocation must be posited, since Athena’s restraint would not otherwise have been necessary; [Apollodorus] seems to assume that Tydeus’ message was rudely received.

³⁵ Alternatively, she gave her advice earlier and the hero now thinks back on it.

lenges the Phaeacian youth to further contests, excepting only the footrace.³⁶ Neither parallel is exact, but between them they show the conventional elements out of which our hypothetical Theban narrative could have been constructed (one emphasizing the hero’s checked rage, the other the hero’s self-assertion through athletics).

Hence the passage defines more precisely what happened and how exactly Athena helped Tydeus: She averted him from a rash, perhaps suicidal, outbreak within Thebes itself, and (accepting *Il.* 5.808) helped him best his hosts in athletic contests. So defined, the goddess’ role is particularly meaningful within the structure of couched doublets already set out in Agamemnon’s speech. For example, the more nuanced portrait of the relationship between goddess and hero puts a finer point on Agamemnon’s superficial and moralistic emphasis on the latter’s obedience to mere “signs”. But there is a still deeper pattern at work. In Agamemnon’s speech the detail of the embassy to Mycenae was the peaceful counterpart to the more developed embassy to Thebes, which is marred by violence and strife. We have already noted that the second of these two embassies has its own doublet structure, itself resolving into an ostensibly peaceful episode (athletic contests) and a violent one (ambush). Athena’s speech gives more details on the former episode; but note also how (on the present interpretation) the role of the goddess in momentarily restraining the hero reinforces the opposition of peace vs. war already visible in the large-scale structure sketched out by Agamemnon. The whole structure can be mapped as follows:

³⁶ For the comparison with Tydeus, see Kirk (1985) 369–370 and West (2011) 147, who suggests in fact that the *Odyssey* here borrows from a *Thebaid*.

Here we have the framework for a narrative in which Tydeus' qualifications, both military and diplomatic, could be methodically set out; but what is more, a framework in which Athena's command to the hero to restrain his violent impulses would have participated in a general narrative tension, a series of retardations culminating finally in the ambush where the hero's fury could finally go unbridled. Within this framework Tydeus could be portrayed as courageous, even spirited, but not wantonly belligerent – a hero who was, perhaps, more open to peaceful measures than his fellows, but forced into war by circumstances.

The passage from *Il.* 10.284–294, in which Diomedes himself alludes to the episode in a prayer to Athena, requires less discussion since *Iliad* 10 is widely recognized as being a somewhat later addition to the finished *Iliad*. The passage explains something that is only implicit in the earlier accounts, specifically that Tydeus came to Thebes as a messenger of peace (ἄγγελος, *Il.* 10.286; μείλιχιον μῦθον φέρει, *Il.* 10.288).³⁷ Diomedes also mentions that Athena helped Tydeus plot “baneful deeds” against the Thebans, presumably by warning him about the impending ambush, hence making clear that Athena stood by the hero in both stages of his conflict with the Thebans (i.e., both the athletic contests and the ambush).³⁸ Hence the poet has devoted careful attention both to the two-fold structure of the implied narrative of Tydeus' visit to Thebes (Athena helped the hero in each of two episodes) as well as the thematic contrast between peace and war (Tydeus came in peace, but defeated the Thebans in war).³⁹

We have then two passages, set apart by many hundreds of verses within the *Iliad* and put into the mouths of two different speakers, that seem to imply a unitary narrative of great literary artistry, both of a formal and of a thematic kind. What is the significance of this? I have already noted that narratological, rhetorical and thematic explanations ought to be exhausted before resorting to the idea that Homer necessarily adapts material from extra-Iliadic epics. This is not because

³⁷ On this point see Ebbott (2010) 252.

³⁸ Cf. de Jong (1987) 157. Although the ambush is not explicitly mentioned, the reference to Tydeus's return voyage (ἂψ ἄπιών, *Il.* 10.289) makes it sufficiently clear what is meant; the poet relies on the audience's knowledge of Agamemnon's account. The μέρμερα ἔργα plotted by Tydeus and Athena clearly look forward to the slaughter inflicted on the camp of Rhesus by Diomedes and Odysseus later in this Book (cf. *Il.* 10.524). Note that the poet has correctly interpreted Athena's speech in *Iliad* 5, since he sees that her discouragement of hostilities in Thebes itself has no bearing on her assistance to the hero in the matter of the ambush.

³⁹ This confirms what has long been argued about the *Doloneia*-poet, namely that he knows the *Iliad* very well and seeks to supplement it in various ways. See Sammons (2009), with further references. For the same reason one cannot really argue, as Alden (2000, 144), that such congruencies prove Homeric authorship of *Iliad* 10.

Homer cannot achieve his aims through the use of such sources; but when he does make specific *use* of a story for the sake of his poem, it is hard to measure the degree to which he has reformed, refashioned, or even freshly crafted a narrative or any of its elements. Yet it must be noted that the reconstructed narrative underlying the speeches of Agamemnon and Athena displays conventional forms that, in aggregate, go well beyond the rhetorical aims of these speakers or even the structural or thematic requirements of the passages themselves, particularly in the assiduous use of doublets. This latter feature seems to reflect, in miniature, the typical use of doublets in Homer for “anticipatory” function, wherein a smaller, less developed rendition of a narrative pattern is presented in order to prepare the audience for a later, more elaborate or developed version of the same. Besides their anticipatory function, such doublet pairs can be used for the progressive development of themes, as in the present example the two sets of doublets appear to develop a theme of obedience to divine signs and a theme contrasting contexts of peace and war.

But what is most striking is this: In a full-scale epic narrative, anticipatory doublets underlie relatively large-scale narrative structures and development of themes across passages; these functions are not relevant or even particularly desirable in such small-scale narratives as those we are discussing. If anything, they create confusion, which is the opposite of what doublet composition does in a fully elaborated composition, where they tend to increase clarity of presentation and to condition the audience’s response to the developing story.⁴⁰ It is almost as though we are dealing not so much with a fragmentary narrative as a miniaturized one, i.e. something that Homer derived from “an epic narrative on an ample scale”, as West puts it,⁴¹ by reducing it to smaller proportions but retaining its basic form. Should we suppose that Homer here appropriates an episode from the Cyclic *Thebaid* or some oral antecedent to the Cyclic *Thebaid*, or, as West himself argues, draws upon a Theban epic of his own? It seems reasonable to suppose that Tydeus was always among the most important figures in epic treatments of the tale.⁴² But this supposition is also disappointingly limited, and our evidence

40 There is a contrast here with other devices belonging to the main narrative that are appropriated for composition of insets. The best example is the way in which many inset narratives begin with a “proem” closely matching the typical openings of full-scale epic songs; see most recently Petropoulos (2012) 297–308. But these serve in general the same purpose within the inset as within the main poem, namely to formally introduce and define the subject that will be treated in what follows; naturally this is not to deny the possibility that such passages “quote” actual epic poems (cf. Petropoulos 2012, 305–307).

41 In connection with the athletic contests; see n. 22 above.

42 He seems to have been the first hero to have joined the cause of Polyneices, as a son-in-law of Adrastus. Like Polyneices, he had been an exile, and he could well have served as an ideal-

even for the Cyclic *Thebaid* is hardly adequate to prove or disprove the presence or absence of a passage in the poem directly matching the form implied in our Homeric passages.

There is good reason to believe, nevertheless, that **even if Homer does not allude to a particular Theban epic, he is interacting in some way with the tradition underlying the Cyclic *Thebaid*. In doing so he probably does not aim to define this external tradition precisely so much as to define his own work in opposition to it.**⁴³ Attention has been rightly devoted to the words with which Sthenelus attempts to refute the paradigmatic gist of Agamemnon's tale:

Ἄτρεΐδῃ μὴ ψεύδε' ἐπιστάμενος σάφα εἰπεῖν·
 ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι·
 ἡμεῖς καὶ Θήβης ἔδος εἴλομεν ἑπταπύλοιο
 παυρότερον λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ' ὑπὸ τεῖχος ἄρειον,
 πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν καὶ Ζηνὸς ἄρωγῃ·
 κεῖνοι δὲ σφετέρῃσιν ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο·
 τῷ μὲ μοι πατέρας ποθ' ὁμοίῃ ἔνθεο τιμῇ.

Son of Atreus, do not lie when you know how to speak truly.
 We boast that we are better by far than our fathers.
 We even took the seat of seven-gated Thebes
 though we led a smaller force under a better wall,
 trusting in the portents of the gods and the aid of Zeus.
 Our fathers perished from their own recklessness.
 Do not, then, place our fathers in equal honor as ourselves.

Il. 4.404–410

It is quite rare for the appropriateness of a mythological *paradeigma* actually to become a matter of explicit debate.⁴⁴ Sthenelus objects both to Agamemnon's selection of mythological episode (implying that the end of the war of the Seven rather than this isolated episode would be more relevant) and to his overall inference

ized counterpart to the morally ambiguous Theban. Huxley (1969, 45) argues that the attention devoted to Tydeus' lineage in [Apollodorus'] account of the saga reflects a corresponding focus of the Cyclic *Thebaid*. The *Thebaid* of Antimachus, which could have owed something to the Cyclic epic, may have devoted an entire book to Tydeus' embassy to Thebes; cf. Matthews (1996) 23. The embassy is also a major part of Statius' epic.

⁴³ E.g., Slatkin (2011, 108–109) argues that the *Iliad* strives to “integrate the Theban paradigm and relegate it to the position of a respected, but subsidiary, precedent”.

⁴⁴ The closest parallel is Sarpedon's response to Tlepolemus with regard to Heracles – a passage that, as I note below, has a particularly strong connection with this one. For some other examples of contested paradigms, see Grethlein (2006) 58–62. Typically those addressed with *paradeigmata* offer no response, replying as though nothing of the sort had been said.

(stating outright that the Epigonoι are decidedly better than their fathers). The departure from standard ideology tips us off that something is not right here.⁴⁵ Indeed, Sthenelus is quickly silenced by Diomedes, a fact that is usually taken to indicate that Homer himself does not endorse his words. But what is wrong, after all, with his argument?

Sthenelus' logic is not unimpeachable.⁴⁶ One can hardly rank two bands of heroes in absolute terms based on the outcomes of two different wars. Circumstances can conspire against even superior men, and aid the worse. True, the epigones faced a higher wall, but were the defenders of the city as valiant as the adversaries of the Seven? True, they obeyed while the Seven disregarded the signs of the gods; but does this mean they enjoyed the divine aid that is a natural concomitant of heroic superiority, or merely that they were fated to win? If the former, how does Sthenelus account for the failure of Tydeus while leaving the aid of Athena an uncontested fact? Finally, granting even that the challenge of the war was, on balance, equal for the two generations, Sthenelus passes over a deeper question as concerns the account of Tydeus in particular: How do you measure a hero's greatness? Where in his story do you look to judge his mettle? **As Scodel rightly points out, Sthenelus measures excellence relative to ultimate success or failure.**⁴⁷ He looks to the final outcome: **was the hero's major enterprise a success or a failure – did he win the war?** This is, of course, **not the only way to measure heroic excellence.**⁴⁸ Another way is to look not at the outcome but the pinnacle of a hero's career,⁴⁹ and precisely this view seems to be implicit in Agamemnon's choice of episode. Agamemnon looks to the acme of the career: the finest moment

⁴⁵ In general fathers are better than their sons. At the risk of psychologizing, one cannot help but imagine that Sthenelus is particularly anxious to distance himself from the memory of his own father Capaneus, by all accounts the most impious of the Seven and the only one to be destroyed by Zeus himself. Alden (2000, 119–120) sees the poet using Sthenelus' objection to draw attention to the impiety and punishment of the Seven; similarly Barker and Christensen (2011) 26.

⁴⁶ As Tsagalis (2012b, 218–220) points out, Sthenelus actually advances five distinct but interwoven arguments, some of which may be directed equally well to comparison of the war of the Epigonoι to Agamemnon's war against Troy.

⁴⁷ Scodel (2008) 60–61.

⁴⁸ It may be particularly dubious in the case of Theban mythology. Cf. Scodel (2008) 60–61: "To judge by later literary treatments, Greeks generally thought the Seven were 'greater' than their sons, although they did not capture Thebes, while their sons, the Epigoni, did. It is, at least in part, precisely their spectacular 'recklessness' that makes them interesting to poets and sustains their *kleos*".

⁴⁹ Somewhat by the same token characters in the *Odyssey* faced with an ignominious end tend to wish they had died at some earlier heroic pinnacle: see esp. *Od.* 5.308–312, 24.30–34 with the discussion of Dova (2012) 11–13.

that shows the hero at his very best, or displays his essence most clearly. He obviously knows that the expedition of the Seven failed, and that Tydeus perished with them; he himself alludes to their doom through the inauspicious signs that turned back the Mycenaeans. But this does not disturb his argument: Through a structurally staged but unitary episode he constructs, as Andersen puts it “a comprehensive image of the great hero” in the roles of diplomat, athlete, warrior, and divine favorite. As Andersen notes further, it is precisely this narrative trick for presenting the hero “in the brightest possible light” by “falsifying the *Gesamtbild* of the war” that infuriates Sthenelus.⁵⁰ But is Agamemnon’s trick anything other than Homer’s own? In composing the *Iliad*, he, too, eschews any narrative of the war’s ending, even any narrative of Achilles’ final battle, choosing rather to focus inwardly on a single narrative (the wrath of Achilles) slightly off-center from these “main” events.

This is not to say, however, that the *Iliad* never alludes to Achilles’ death (it does so frequently) or to the ultimate outcome of the Trojan War. But it is questionable how much this global perspective can define the ultimate estimation of a hero, his rank as it were relative to other heroes, and the *kleos* he deserves to enjoy after his death. Diomedes himself excuses Agamemnon to Sthenelus by noting that “his will be the *kudos* if Troy is taken, his the *penthos* if the Achaeans are defeated” (*Il.* 4.415–417). Interestingly, this formulation seeks to evaluate Agamemnon according to Sthenelus’ own standard – it looks to the end result of Agamemnon’s enterprise, hence holding final judgment in abeyance. Yet the strength of Diomedes’ own logic can be seen in the fact that he fails to consider the obvious possibility of Agamemnon dying in battle before the end of the war, not to mention innumerable other possibilities (such as the ignoble death that will mar his homecoming after victory at Troy).⁵¹ Indeed, the tension between a result-oriented, teleological assessment of heroic accomplishment versus the focus on an exemplary episode can be seen in a few other places in the *Iliad* where a hero is depicted not paradigmatically but through a kind of comprehensive account of his career:

⁵⁰ Andersen (1978) 37–39. Turkeltaub (2010, 140–141) rightly notes that in rejecting Agamemnon’s procedure, Sthenelus implicitly questions the very custom of using paradigmatic stories for instruction and guidance, and that this in turn calls into question “the process by which the Iliadic heroes inherit their heroic ethos as well as the veracity and pedagogic value of epic poetry itself”.

⁵¹ It has been suggested that Diomedes basically endorses an ideology of sole leadership (Barker and Christensen 2011, 29), that he is willing to accept an insult for the greater communal good of success at Troy (Scodel 2008, 62–63), or that Diomedes concedes Sthenelus’ point but “embraces” Agamemnon’s message (Turkeltaub 2010, 141). All these explanations assume that Diomedes tacitly agrees with Sthenelus against Agamemnon.

1. In *Il.* 6.156–202, Glaucus undertakes a comprehensive biography of his grandfather Bellerophon. The majority of the narrative is devoted to Bellerophon's successful completion of tasks set for him by the hostile king of Lycia, himself assigned to assassinate the hero by king Proetus. Like Tydeus, he accomplishes his deeds θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας (*Il.* 6.183 ~ 4.398). As with Tydeus, the pinnacle is the defeat of an ambush of picked men (*Il.* 6.187–190).⁵² At this point the king of Lycia “recognized the goodly offspring of the god” (*Il.* 6.191), gives Bellerophon his daughter in marriage, “half his royal *timē*” (*Il.* 6.193) and a generous bequest of land. The narrative seems throughout to be aiming at this happy ending. In fact Glaucus must admit that Bellerophon ultimately became a vagabond hateful to all the gods (*Il.* 6.200–202), famously omitting to mention the reason for this catastrophe. Glaucus' silence suggests a strained effort to place emphasis on the pinnacle of Bellerophon's career, but his commitment to the form of a full-scale biographical narrative creates difficulties. He would have done well to select an illustrative episode, if indeed he aims to glorify his grandfather.

2. In *Il.* 14.114–125 Diomedes justifies his right to speak by rehearsing his lineage, with special emphasis on the heroic biography of Tydeus, whom he mentions at the outset as being buried in Thebes. He notes that Tydeus “excelled all” with the spear and that he left his brothers at home, a wanderer (πλαγχθεῖς, *Il.* 14.120) by the will of the gods. He married one of the daughters of Adrastus and had a home with many flocks, gardens and wheat (*Il.* 14.121–124). So, Diomedes, concludes, his race is not contemptible and his words should be heard. It is needless to point out what is missing from Diomedes' account of his father – precisely that which would connect the prosperous marriage out of exile with which he ends to the burial at Thebes with which he begins; but Diomedes stops short of mentioning the Theban wars, no doubt because it cannot but reflect on his father ambiguously.⁵³ There is a clear parallel to the tale of Bellerophon: there, too, the speaker practically ends the narrative proper with the hero's prosperous marriage and generous land-dowry, with only a thin acknowledgement of the troubles that followed.⁵⁴

⁵² For the comparison with Tydeus, and the close similarity between *Il.* 6.187 and *Il.* 4.392, see Kirk (1985) 370–372.

⁵³ As Janko (1992) 164 observes, the beginning of Diomedes' story also conceals the family conflicts that were the real reason for Tydeus' exile. On Diomedes' citation of his father burial at Thebes rather than his own victory there, see Turkeltaub (2010) 137.

⁵⁴ For the comparison with Bellerophon, and the contrast between Diomedes' version of Tydeus and Agamemnon's, see Barker and Christensen (2011) 33–34.

3. In *Il.* 9.121–156, Agamemnon recounts the gifts he will offer Achilles should the latter return to battle. At first a conventional list of treasures, the catalogue takes on a narrative dimension when Agamemnon includes gifts contingent on victory at Troy and safe homecoming. With the latter eventuality, Agamemnon will marry Achilles to one of his daughters and give him seven cities to rule over. The comparison with Bellerophon's happy ending is again clear, and again the happy ending cannot come true. By revealing his famous choice of fates, Achilles makes clear that he can never receive the most fabulous of Agamemnon's gifts because victory at Troy and successful homecoming are not possible for him.⁵⁵

Homer frowns upon the heroic biography as a form.⁵⁶ It may well seem comprehensive and compendious, therefore most suited to memorialize and glorify the hero because it gives an exhaustive account of his deeds. But it implies the true evaluation of a hero and is to be found in the aggregate of his deeds. This is the totalizing method implied by Sthenelus' objection to Agamemnon, and the totals do not compute. "Look to the end" belongs to the ideology of Greek tragedy; it was not Homer's creed. He favors the depiction of the hero through a carefully-chosen, pointed and illustrative episode, artfully and economically presented. According to this argument, the rather restricted narrative recoverable from our two speeches about Tydeus represent the hero more vividly, but also more accurately, than the same hero is represented in Diomedes' later speech.

I offer one final example for the sake of a positive parallel to our passages about Tydeus. This has to do with Heracles. It goes without saying that **Heracles** was already a storied hero for Homer and his audience. In fact, he is mentioned quite often in the Homeric poems, albeit for the most part through very brief allusions. Among the handful of narrative allusions to the myth of Heracles, two offer complementary accounts of one and the same episode:

1. In *Il.* 14.247–262, when Hera seeks the assistance of Sleep in her famous "deception of Zeus" (*Dios apatē*), Sleep recounts how he once before put Zeus to sleep so that Hera could drive Heracles to Cos on his way home from Troy, and how he had to face an angry Zeus after the event. He argues (unsuccessfully) against helping Hera in a similar fashion now.

⁵⁵ For this interpretation see Sammons (2010) 115–131.

⁵⁶ This was noted already by Aristotle (*Poetics*, chapter 8), who contrasts Homeric poetry with *Heracleids* and *Theseids* that aimed (it seems) at comprehensive accounts of these heroes' careers.

2. Shortly thereafter (*Il.* 15.18–30) Zeus, upon waking, gives another rendition of the same narrative, adding a number of colorful details: He hung Hera from the sky with anvils suspended from her legs, while tossing out of heaven any god trying to help her. He also mentions Hera's collusion with Boreas. Again the central point is Heracles being driven off course to Cos (*Il.* 15.28 = *Il.* 14.255), though Zeus adds pointedly that he succeeded in restoring his son to Argos, albeit only after many struggles for the latter (πολλά περ ἀθλήσαντα, *Il.* 15.30).

There are a number of striking similarities between these two passages and our two major inset narratives dealing with the embassy of Tydeus to Thebes. Here as there we have two speeches from two different speakers. Here as well the two speeches clearly deal with a single incident, but do so in a complementary fashion, with the second version omitting details that are established in the first but providing new information and a fresh perspective.⁵⁷ Just as the two narratives about Tydeus are embedded within the *aristeia* of Diomedes, so the two narratives about Heracles are embedded in the *Dios apatē*. Just as the paradigm of Tydeus is highly relevant to the conduct of Diomedes in the former, so the wrangling over Heracles is paradigmatic for the conflict of Hera and Zeus exemplified in the latter. Just as the reconstructed tale of Tydeus has a traditional form that is easily paralleled from other Homeric passages, so the reconstructed tale of Heracles' *nostos* follows a traditional story pattern, namely that of a hero swept up in a god-sent storm. But what is perhaps most striking is this: in the case of Tydeus we are dealing with a hero on his way to a major war; in the case of Heracles we meet a hero on his way home from a major war, namely his own successful assault on Laomedon's Troy. Leaving aside the difference between coming and going, in both cases the poet avoids recounting the "main event", the successful or unsuccessful attack on a city, and focuses instead on an episode that is peripheral to that event.

Given Homer's obvious interest in Heracles, his clear knowledge of many traditions about him, and the great many places where he briefly alludes to isolated details of his story, why is it that this particular episode should come in for so much attention?⁵⁸ One might expect in particular that in a poem about an Achaean conquest of Troy, Heracles' earlier attack on the city would receive more detailed treatment. One could posit an archaic epic about Heracles in which his *nostos*

⁵⁷ Zeus does not mention that Heracles was on his way home from Troy; Hera hardly needed to be reminded of this, but neither does Homer's audience since they have already heard it from Sleep.

⁵⁸ Lang (1983, 149–152) shows how Homer's various references suggest his knowledge of a comprehensive tale concerning Heracles' sack of Troy.

from Troy was a prominent or central episode.⁵⁹ In my view, however, the answer is to be sought again in Homer's instinctive tendency to correlate his choice of episode with qualities intrinsic to the hero. The answer is clear if one considers the third major passage dealing with Heracles' career: Agamemnon's story of the hero's birth (*Il.* 19.95–133). Agamemnon, in an attempt to excuse his own victimization by *atē*, explains to the Achaeans how even Zeus had his wits beguiled by Hera. When Heracles was about to be born, she fooled Zeus into swearing an oath that the next hero to be born should be king over the others. The goddess of childbirth then easily suppressed the birth of Heracles and hastened that of Eurystheus, Heracles' future taskmaster. Whatever one thinks of Agamemnon's paradigmatic rhetoric, his depiction of Heracles is entirely congruent with our passages from the *apatē*, and one could fairly suppose we are dealing here with Homer's own conception. It is an essential trait of the hero that he is the hapless pawn in a divine struggle between Hera and Zeus, harried by misfortune despite his obvious superiority. His success in the war for Troy is hardly illustrative of this essential trait; his troubled homecoming is.⁶⁰

Indeed, the one place where Heracles' conquest of Troy is mentioned involves something of a rhetorical failure. This occurs in *Il.* 5.628–669 when Heracles' son, Tlepolemus, encounters Sarpedon on the battlefield. He questions whether Sarpedon is truly a son of Zeus, arguing that he falls short in valor of others who boast this lineage, such as his father Heracles. He goes on to observe that his father successfully sacked Troy with a much smaller army (*Il.* 5.640–642) than the Achaeans now bring; just so Sarpedon and the present-day Trojans are likewise doomed. Just as Sthenelus had adduced a results-oriented perspective on the career of Tydeus, so Tlepolemus urges a perspective on his father's career oriented to the successful conclusion of his expedition against Troy. Just as Sthenelus compared two wars against Thebes, Tlepolemus compares two expeditions against Troy. Sthenelus assumes that the two expeditions against Thebes were essentially identical tasks; if his own generation accomplished their goal successfully with a smaller force, surely they are better than their fathers. Tlepolemus assumes that the two expeditions against Troy are essentially identical tasks; if his father could do it with a smaller force, then surely he can as well.⁶¹ Tlepolemus' logic is just as faulty as Sthenelus', and his unspoken premise (that he is his father's equal) just as ideologically suspect as Sthenelus' conclusion.⁶² Tlepolemus is no Hera-

⁵⁹ Cf. Janko (1992) 191: "The poet in fact draws on an early gigantomachy or *Herakleia*".

⁶⁰ Cf. Lang (1983) 152.

⁶¹ For the parallels with Sthenelus's speech, see Andersen (1978) 74–75; Turkeltaub (2010) 145.

⁶² Sarpedon's rejoinder (648–651) that Heracles' victory was due to the recklessness of Laomedon is not particularly forceful, since the Trojans are equally in the wrong in the present conflict.

cles; his failure to apprehend the fact, and the resulting overconfidence, finds its inevitable sequel in his immediate defeat at the hands of Sarpedon. Tlepolemus could have drawn a more valuable lesson from his father's misfortunes than he did from his father's success. Heracles' sack of Troy says no more about Heracles than Tydeus' failure to sack Thebes says about Tydeus. In each case a true picture of the hero should be sought in a single and ostensibly peripheral episode – or so goes the argument I seek to attribute to Homer.

Is it a coincidence that our passages on Tydeus, Tlepolemus' speech about Heracles, and the tale of Bellerophon are all so closely grouped together in *Iliad* 4–6? I doubt it. In this portion of the poem, between the disappearance and the reappearance of its hero Achilles, the poet engages his audience with an extended contemplation on the nature of heroism. But Homer is too good a storyteller not to realize that the question of the ideal hero is inseparable from the question of how to compose an ideal epic. Hence he leads us through this pageant of possible poems. Homer's own views are not far to seek. In *Iliad* 9 he has Agamemnon recount a promise of gifts that is really an open-ended narrative proposed for Achilles' career, complete with victory at Troy, successful *nostos* and a marriage not unlike Bellerophon's. Achilles' revelation of his choice of fates makes clear that such a narrative is impossible. In fact Homer will not even take his own narrative as far as Achilles' death, let alone the eventual Achaean victory at Troy. He crafts his vision of the past, and his vision of Achilles, on the foundation of what is essentially a single episode, but an episode particularly illustrative of Achilles' essence as a hero. That essence is no more to be found, for Homer, in Achilles' death before the gates of Troy at the hands of Paris and Apollo than is Tydeus' essence to be discovered in his final battle before the walls of Thebes, or even Heracles' in his successful sack of Troy. In all three cases what is central to the hero is an episode that is slightly off-center relative to the larger saga. In juxtaposing that vision with others of a more global nature, Homer also crafts an argument about how to show the past in poems. So in the case of Tydeus and the Theban Wars. It is, after all, Homer who draws our attention away from the feud of the brothers, away from the gathering of the Seven great heroes, away from the climactic scene of battle and the tragic victory of Eteocles, and draws our attention inward, to a single moment of preeminent excellence of a single hero, fighting alone and reveling, momentarily, in the aid of the gods and his own great strength. We can only guess whether there was ever a poem on the Theban Wars that manipulated its audience's attention in such a way, but I suspect that here, as elsewhere, Homer is not talking about other poems so much as he is talking about his own.

Mary Ebbott

Allies in Fame: Recruiting Warriors in the Theban and Trojan Epic Traditions

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0017

References in ancient authors to the Theban epic tradition, and to particular epic poems from that wider tradition, convincingly indicate that stories centered on Thebes and the family of Oedipus formed a contemporaneous tradition to the stories about the war against Troy.¹ In an earlier article,² I considered what the *Iliad* could tell us about those lost Theban epics by examining the stories told about Tydeus, one of the Seven against Thebes, within the narrative of the *Iliad*. I argued that these stories were hypertextual in nature, but that because the *Thebaid* did not survive, they were like “broken links” to a resource no longer available. That is, the link still exists, but not its “target page.” I contrasted how these links within the *Iliad* operate for a traditional audience, for whom the link is to another song, another epic within their song tradition, and for us, who need them to be linked to another text if we are to fully grasp the connection. I then offered ways in which we could understand the link better (although still not completely) by understanding the traditional referentiality of the Homeric epics and their system of language and by paying attention to the context in which these “links” appear. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, as surviving epic poems from this wider ancient epic song culture that included both the Trojan stories and the Theban stories, are now among our best surviving sources for the Theban epic tradition. How can we further investigate the Theban tradition – its content and structure – through the Homeric epics?

¹ For similar assumptions and arguments about an ancient oral epic tradition concerning the Theban wars, see Burkert (1981); Vermeule (1987); Singor (1992); Tsagalis (2008) 13–29; Slatkin (2011) 99–119. Davies (2014, 42–51) takes a different approach to considering the relationship between the Trojan and Theban epics, yet still concludes “Homer’s numerous references to the Theban war do, indeed, presuppose a tradition very similar to what we would independently guess to have stood in the *Thebais*” (50).

² Ebbott (2010).

Mary Ebbott: College of the Holy Cross, E-Mail: mebbott@holycross.edu.

The character of Diomedes, who belongs in both the story of Thebes and the story of Troy, provides a strong point of contact between these tales, bending what might otherwise be parallel stories into an intersection. I will once again be examining one of the stories about Tydeus, Diomedes' father, as told to Diomedes, as an entry way into considering such intersections.³ From that entry point, I will consider how we can broaden our understanding of the Theban epic tradition through the compositional unit of the theme, as that term is used by Milman Parry and Albert Lord.⁴ Indications of shared themes between these epic traditions will help us to understand how such themes operate in both stories, and are found to be useful in conceiving and composing the stories. The theme I will first focus on here is that of gathering allies for a major expedition, whether the one made against Thebes by the Seven, or that made against Troy by the collective Achaeans. I will then explore how this theme is related in both traditions to themes of being "allies in fame" and to portents sent by Zeus about the ultimate outcome of the expedition. I have chosen these related themes in particular because we do have evidence for them in the story about Tydeus, and also because they relate to events that must be "recalled" about the Trojan expedition as well within the action of the *Iliad*. In both cases, then, we see only compressed versions of these themes.⁵ But through the traditional referentiality of the Homeric epics, the compressed forms of these themes can nevertheless communicate to a traditional audience the resonance of the expanded form.⁶ Casey Dué succinctly described this ability of oral traditional poetry this way: "The traditionality of Homeric poetry allows the phrases, in the words of Lord, to 'resound with overtones from the dim past whence they came'. In other words, the traditional themes and phraseology carry with them powerful associations for a traditional audience, the "echoes" of many past performances. Words can resonate within their context, recalling by association countless other song traditions".⁷ Leonard Muellner also advances the idea that "a given traditional theme can carry with it ideas that poet and audience have learned to associate with it elsewhere".⁸ By

³ See Nagy (2004) 2§ 31–2§ 36 for his argument about how the stories of Tydeus also reveal the multiformity of the Homeric epics.

⁴ Lord (1960/2000²) 68–98.

⁵ Lord (1960/2000²) 88 explains that compression and expansion are natural features of themes: "the poet has a choice of using a short form of these themes (or of omitting them entirely) or of elaborating them".

⁶ See Foley (1999) 89–111 for the term traditional referentiality; see Dué (2002) and Muellner (1996) for examples of applying this approach.

⁷ Dué (2002) 2.

⁸ Muellner (1996) 15.

recapturing as much of that traditional referentiality as we can, we too will be able to hear something of those resonances and make some of those associations.

My focus for this exploration is Agamemnon's story about Tydeus told during the ἐπιπώλησις in *Iliad* 4. After the hostilities with the Trojans begin again, Agamemnon exhorts his fellow Achaeans to fight. Speaking to individual warriors, he first appeals positively to some of them in terms of their status and abilities, and then reproaches others for supposedly hanging back in an attempt to fire up their competitive spirit (*Il.* 4.251–364). Diomedes and Sthenelus are the last of the individuals upbraided in this way (*Il.* 4.365–421). Agamemnon uses Diomedes' father Tydeus as his motivational tool, since, as he says, Tydeus always fought in front. He then explains how he knows this, since he never met Tydeus himself, and it is in this explanation that the war Tydeus fought, the war against Thebes, is referenced. In other investigations,⁹ I have focused on the latter part of this description, about Tydeus' embassy to the Thebans, his victory in athletic contests against them, and their subsequent ambush of him on his return, an ambush which he survived. But here I am going to focus on the very beginning of this story, in which Agamemnon tells of how Tydeus came to Mycenae with Polyneices to gather allies for the attack on Thebes.

οὐ μὲν Τυδεΐ γ' ὥδε φίλον πτωσκαζέμεν ἦεν,
ἀλλὰ πολὺ πρὸ φίλων ἐτάρων δηϊοισι μάχεσθαι,
ὥς φάσαν οἱ μιν ἴδοντο πονεύμενον· οὐ γὰρ ἔγωγε
ἦντησ' οὐδὲ ἴδον· περὶ δ' ἄλλων φασὶ γενέσθαι.
ἦτοι μὲν γὰρ ἄτερ πολέμου εἰσῆλθε Μυκῆνας
ξεῖνος ἄμ' ἀντιθέω Πολυνεϊκῆϊ λαὸν ἀγείρων·
οἱ δὲ τότε ἔστρατόωνθ' ἱερὰ πρὸς τείχεα Θήβης,
καὶ ῥα μάλα λίσσοντο δόμεν κλειτοῦς ἐπικούρους·
οἱ δ' ἔθελον δόμεναι καὶ ἐπῆνεον ὥς ἐκέλευον·
ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἔτρεψε παραίσια σήματα φαίνων.

"It was not to Tydeus' liking to shrink back this way,
but far in front of his dear comrades he would fight the enemy,
so they say who saw him at work. I myself neither
met nor saw him. They say he surpassed all others.
He came to Mycenae once, not to make war
but as a guest-friend, gathering warriors together with Polyneices, a match for a god;
they at that time were making a campaign against the sacred walls of Thebes
and were fervently requesting that they give them allies in fame.
They were willing to give and approved what they asked,
but Zeus turned them back, revealing signs of ill-omen".

Il. 4.372–381

⁹ Ebbott (2010); Dué and Ebbott (2010). Ambush is another theme shared by both traditions.

We learn from his telling that Agamemnon's impression of Tydeus is second-hand – although Tydeus came to Agamemnon's city Mycenae, Agamemnon himself did not meet the man. An unspecified "they", other Mycenaeans presumably, are credited with the characterization of Tydeus as a preeminent warrior. These unspecified Mycenaeans continue to appear through this section of the story, once again being simply οἱ in *Il.* 4.380. Already much is left unsaid in this allusion. It is these six lines that encapsulate the purpose of Tydeus and Polyneices' visit to Mycenae (*Il.* 4.376–381) that I will investigate as a traditional theme of both the Trojan epic tradition and the Theban epic tradition: the gathering of allies for the expedition. Agamemnon's indirect point of contact with Diomedes' father is through Tydeus' visit to Mycenae when he was "gathering warriors" (λαὸν ἀγείρων, *Il.* 4.377) and, together with Polyneices, "fervently requesting that they [the Mycenaeans] give them allies in fame" (καὶ ῥα μάλα λίσσοντο δόμεν κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους, *Il.* 4.379). The next two lines (*Il.* 4.380–381) credit the Mycenaeans with agreeing to join the expedition, and then explain why they did not actually do so, suggesting that this theme can have two different outcomes – an agreement to join the expedition, but also the possibility of an alliance not fulfilled. That a theme can have more than one possible outcome, that it can go in more than one possible direction, has already been noted by Albert Lord as a feature of a traditional theme.¹⁰

What indications are there that Agamemnon's description of Tydeus and Polyneices' visit to Mycenae refers to an episode in a wider tradition about the Seven against Thebes? As I have argued before about these stories featuring Tydeus,¹¹ the compressed, allusive nature of these references presupposes a knowledge of the events, suggesting that the traditional audience would understand this passage in relation to their deep familiarity with a Theban epic tradition. As we attempt to recover some of their familiarity, we have as a resource the scholarly commentary that is part of the textual tradition of the *Iliad*. Information about these other stories is sometimes provided in these comments, or *scholia*, and we are fortunate to have that sort of background provided about this part of the Theban story. In the Venetus A manuscript (Marciana 822 = Marcianus Graecus Z. 454), there is a somewhat lengthy scholium keyed to line 4.376 which puts this event into a narrative sequence from the Theban tale. I quote here the scholium as the manuscript has it, including its abbreviations, accentuation, and punctuation, some of which is "nonstandard" from our point of view but is typical within

¹⁰ Lord (1960/2000²) 81–82, 94–98.

¹¹ Ebbott (2010) 240–242; see also Torres-Guerra (1995) 31–34, and Tsagalis (2008) 13–29 on Theban references in particular and Nagy (2003) 7–19, on "cross-references" more generally in oral poetry.

the manuscript itself.¹² I do so because knowing exactly what the manuscript reads, rather than some edited version, is a more historically grounded approach to the scholia. The scholium begins with the lemma ἄτερ πολέμου to key it to this line, and then gives the story of how Polyneices and Tydeus ended up together in Mycenae, and shows how it is part of the sequence that Agamemnon relates:

ἄτερ πολέμου:

Οἰδίπους ἀποβαλὼν Ἰοκαστην ἐπέγημεν Ἄστυμέδουσαν, ἣτις διεβαλε τοὺς προγόνους ὡς πειράσαντας αὐτήν· ἀγανακτήσας δὲ ἐκεῖνος ἐπειράσατο αὐτοῖς δι αἵματος παραλαβεῖν τὴν χώραν καὶ παρέδωκε τὴν βασιλείαν αὐτοῖς. Ἐτεοκλῆς δὲ ὁ (υἱὸς) αὐτοῦ ἐξεβαλε Πολυνείκην τὸν (ἀδελφόν) αὐτοῦ ὡς πρεσβύτερον παραγενόμενος δὲ (οὐτ(→ οὗτος)) εἰς Ἄργος εὔρε Τυδέα φυγάδα βοηθῶν γὰρ κακεῖνος τῷ (πατρί) τον ἐναντιούμενον ἀποκτείνας ἀνεψιὸν ἔφυγεν Ἄδραστος δὲ θεάσασμενος αὐτοὺς ἡμφιεσμένους θηρῶν δорας Τυδέα μὲν συὸς Πολυνείκην δὲ λέοντος συνέβαλε τὸν χρησμόν. ἦν γὰρ αὐτῷ δεδομενὸν κάπρῳ καὶ λέοντι ζεύξαι τὰς θυγατέρας. δίδωσι Τυδεῖ μὲν Διῖπύλῃν · Ἀργεῖαν δὲ, Πολυνείκει · πέμψαι δὲ εἰς Μυκήνας συμμαχίαν ἣται ἐπὶ Θηβαίους · Θυέστης μὲν προ θυμῶς ἐδίδου. σημεῖα δὲ αὐτὸν ἐκώλυσε φαῦλα ἐπελθόντες οὖν ἐν ταῖς Θήβαις, οἱ γὰρ Ἀργεῖοι πέμπουσι πρεσβευτην Τυδέα. ὃς κατα λαβὼν γυμνικὸν ἀγῶνα καὶ συμμαχούσης Ἀθηνᾶς νικᾷ τὰ πάντα ὑποστρέφων δὲ (πεντήκοντ(→ πεντήκοντα)) νεανίας ἐνεδρεύοντας αὐτόν. συλλαβῶν ἀναρεῖ *

urn:cts:greekLit:tlg5026.msA.hmt:4.578

"Apart from war"

Oedipus, after losing Jocasta, married as his next wife Astymedousa, who slandered her stepsons, saying that they had made a pass at her. That man, being vexed, attempted to hand over the land to them because of their blood ties and he gave over the kingship to them. Eteocles his son cast out Polyneices his brother because he [Polyneices] was older. When he was near Argos he found Tydeus, a fugitive. For, helping his father, he [Tydeus] killed his cousin who was opposed to his father and fled. Adrastus, seeing them wearing the skins of wild animals, Tydeus that of a boar and Polyneices that of a lion, understood the oracle. For it had been given to him that he would yoke his daughters to a boar and a lion. He gave Diipyle to Tydeus and Argeia to Polyneices. Sending them to Mycenae he asked for an alliance against the Thebans. Thyestes eagerly tried to grant it. But poor signs prevented him. Thus going towards Thebes, the Argives send Tydeus as an ambassador, who, undertaking an athletic contest and with Athena as an ally, wins them all. On his return, fifty young men ambush him. Seizing them, he slays them.

¹² I thank Stephanie Lindeborg, Neil Curran, and Francis Hartel for their diplomatic edition of this scholium, which is part of an edition of *Iliad* 4 from the Venetus A that will be published as part of the Homer Multitext.

The scholium summarizes in a condensed manner how both Polyneices and Tydeus ended up in Argos by first reviewing Polyneices' family history, starting from the detail of Oedipus remarrying after the death of Jocasta, and the subsequent "Potiphar's wife" mythical pattern between her and the sons of Oedipus. After Polyneices leaves Thebes, he encounters Tydeus, who is described as a "fugitive". The scholium then explains briefly that his exile status was the result of his killing a cousin who had opposed Tydeus' father. They arrive at Adrastus' house wearing animal skins, and Adrastus interprets their appearance as the lion and the boar that the oracle said he would marry his daughters to. The section mentioning their delegation to Mycenae also reports the initial agreement to the alliance and the "poor signs" (σημεία [sic] ... φαῦλα) as the reason why it was not fulfilled. It adds the important detail that it was Thyestes who agreed to the alliance. The scholium then covers the rest of the episode in a way that is similar to how Agamemnon continues his story within the *Iliad*.

The scholium presents the embassy to Mycenae by Polyneices and Tydeus as part of the known narrative about the war against Thebes. The scholiast feels no need to comment on any of what he includes as different from the *Iliad*'s telling, even though he does provide more of the story and further information on some aspects of the parts that it shares with the poetic text. For example, in the scholium's description, Adrastus motivates the recruiting trip taken by Tydeus and Polyneices. The detail included here that it was Thyestes to whom they made their appeal for allies even helps explain the Iliadic description: it provides reasons why Agamemnon was not there during the event to meet Tydeus in person and also suggests motives for leaving the Mycenaeans in his story unnamed. The scholium thus provides further evidence that the visit to Mycenae that Agamemnon alludes to was part of the tradition about the Seven against Thebes.

The language within the *Iliad* itself in its brief allusion to the Theban tradition also indicates an entire story through the traditional referentiality of its formulas. As Lord has shown, formulas and themes are closely related,¹³ and thus particular formulas can help us to see what themes are being used, even when they are highly compressed, as they are here. The first formula I will investigate is that of "gathering warriors" (λαὸν ἀγείρων, *Il.* 4.377). That this formula can equally be used of gathering warriors for the expedition to Troy can be seen in Achilles' words when he likens Agamemnon's taking of Briseis from him to Paris' taking of Helen from Menelaus. He asks,

¹³ Lord (1960/2000²) 94–97.

τί δὲ δεῖ πολεμιζέμεναι Τρώεσσιν
 Ἀργείους; τί δὲ λαὸν ἀνήγαγεν ἐνθάδ' ἀγείρας
 Ἀτρεΐδης; ἢ οὐχ' Ἑλένης ἔνεκ' ἡϋκόμοιο;

“Why must Argives fight with Trojans?

Why did the son of Atreus *after he gathered the warriors lead them here?*
 Was it not for the sake of Helen with her beautiful hair?”

Il. 9.337–339

The gathering of the warriors happens before bringing them to Troy, and so similar to the visit of Tydeus and Polyneices to Mycenae before their expedition to Thebes, the formula indicates that Agamemnon put together the collective forces of the Achaeans and, in Achilles' words, did so for the express purpose of making war on Troy for the sake of Helen.

The same idea of gathering the collective forces to fight against Troy is seen in another use of the formula. At the beginning of *Iliad* 4, Hera argues against Zeus' suggestion that the war could end with the duel between Paris and Menelaus. She characterizes such an outcome as making her own labor useless and unfulfilled, mentioning in particular that “my horses wore themselves out as I gathered the warriors, an evil for Priam and his children” (καμέτην δέ μοι ἵπποι / λαὸν ἀγειρούση, Πριάμω κακὰ τοῖό τε παισίν, *Il.* 4.27–28). For the credit of gathering the warriors going to a goddess, we can compare Nestor's description of Athena as the one who gathered the warriors for the Pylians' battle against the Epeians:¹⁴

ἄμμι δ' Ἀθήνη
 ἄγγελος ἦλθε θεόουσ' ἀπ' Ὀλύμπου θωρήσσεσθαι
 ἔνυχος, οὐδ' ἀέκοντα Πύλον κάτα λαὸν ἀγειρεν
 ἀλλὰ μάλ' ἐσσυμένους πολεμίζειν.

To us Athena
 came, running from Olympus, as a messenger to arm ourselves
 during the night, and not unwilling were *the warriors she gathered* throughout Pylos
 but very eager indeed to go to war.

Il. 11.714–717

Although Athena's gathering is an emergency situation during the night and on a more local scale, in both cases the gathering of warriors is a precursor to war, done deliberately for that purpose: in that latter case “to go to war” (πολεμίζειν,

¹⁴ The one doing the gathering can also be left unspecified along with the specific λαός named in such compressed allusions, such as when Nestor reminisces about the “gathered Pylians” fighting the Arcadians (*Il.* 7.134). See Frame (2009) 715–717 for more on the location of this battle and the traditionality of the story.

Il. 11.717) and in Hera's case, to be "an evil for Priam and his children" (Πριάμῳ κακὰ τοῖό τε παισίν, *Il.* 4.28).¹⁵

These uses of the formula, Achilles' question about why Agamemnon gathered the warriors for the Trojan expedition and Hera's characterization of gathering them as labor performed by her and her horses, thus indicate that gathering the warriors for the expedition is part of the Trojan tradition as well. Also like the reference to the Theban expedition, however, both of these are compressed references which give us no further details about what was involved in doing so. But there is one slightly more expanded story about the gathering of the warriors for Troy. It is narrated by Nestor when he is trying to convince Patroclus to persuade Achilles to return to battle, or to take his place in doing so.¹⁶ He reminds Patroclus of the instructions his father Menoetius gave to him before he and Achilles left for Troy, setting the scene this way:

ὦ πέπον ἦ μὲν σοί γε Μενότιος ὦδ' ἐπέτελλεν
 ἥματι τῷ ὅτε σ' ἐκ Φθίης Ἀγαμέμνωνι πέμπε,
 νῶϊ δέ τ' ἔνδον ἐόντες ἐγὼ καὶ δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς
 πάντα μάλ' ἐν μεγάροις ἠκούομεν ὡς ἐπέτελλε.
 Πηληϊός δ' ἰκόμεσθα δόμους εὖ ναιετάοντας
 λαὸν ἀγείροντες κατ' Ἀχαιΐδα πουλυβοτείραν.

My dear friend, this was surely how Menoetius instructed you
 on that day when he sent you from Phthia to Agamemnon.
 The two of us, I and radiant Odysseus, were inside
 and in the halls we heard everything that he instructed.
 We came to the well-placed home of Peleus
 gathering warriors throughout Achaea that nourishes many.

Il. 11.765–770

¹⁵ The formula can also be used for gathering warriors before a specific battle, such as Achilles mustering the Myrmidons before they enter battle after sitting out with him (λαὸν ἀγείρω, *Il.* 16.129). Because Hera describes her gathering of the warriors in the general sense of being an evil to Priam and his children, however, it seems to me that this refers to gathering warriors for the overall war effort rather than any particular battle. We can also see this element of gathering the warriors for making war on Troy in *Iliad* 2, when they have to be gathered once again to restart the war after the threat of leaving Troy altogether. Even after they have been brought back from departing, Nestor suggested to Agamemnon that his heralds gather the warriors (λαὸν κηρύσσοντες ἀγείρόντων κατὰ νῆας, *Il.* 2.438) so that they, the leaders, can awaken keen Ares in them (*Il.* 2.437–440). The Catalogue of Ships, which details who is among the gathered forces, follows not long after.

¹⁶ For the relationship between Nestor's story about himself in battle with the Eleians at *Il.* 11.670–761 and what he persuades Patroclus to do in this part of his speech, see Frame (2009) 105–130.

The formula “gathering warriors” (λαὸν ἀγείροντες, *Il.* 11.770) once again refers to the process of recruiting allies for the war on Troy, and in Nestor’s recollection, we also see that he and Odysseus on this occasion were in roles parallel to those of Polyneices and Tydeus in the Theban story.¹⁷ Could the theme of gathering warriors normally involve a pair of leaders making these recruiting visits? We will see later that there is further evidence to support such a claim. For now we can also see as Nestor continues the story what the theme of “gathering allies” might look like in expanded form. The recruiters show up and find their intended warriors (*Il.* 11.771–777). They are greeted and shown proper hospitality (*Il.* 11.777–779).

After the meal, the appeal to the warriors is made: Nestor recalls, “I began the speech urging you to accompany us” (ἤρχον ἐγὼ μῦθοιο κελεύων ὕμμι’ ἄμ’ ἔπεσθαι, *Il.* 11.781). Both Achilles and Patroclus were very willing to do so, and both of their fathers then gave them instructions (*Il.* 11.782–790). Although this is a somewhat expanded version, most of these elements are still compressed, to get to the point of Nestor’s story, the instructions that both fathers gave to their sons that he wants to remind Patroclus of.¹⁸ But using this relatively more expanded version, we can imagine a bit more fully what the Theban episode might have included: Polyneices and Tydeus arrived in Mycenae, came to Thyestes (as in the version the scholium provided), were greeted and shown hospitality, and then made their request for the Mycenaeans to join them in the war against Thebes. Later I will explore more fully the line in Agamemnon’s story that encapsulates making that request (καὶ ῥα μάλα λίσσοντο δόμεν κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους, *Il.* 4.372). But for now I want to emphasize how Nestor’s story suggests the outlines of the theme, which could in a performance of the Theban epic or in a telling of the beginnings of the Trojan expedition be expanded into a full narrative.

We do have further indications that there were such narratives about the gathering of warriors for the war on Troy from the *Odyssey* (thus the story is also told retrospectively). The recruiting of Odysseus by Agamemnon and Menelaus is referred to when Agamemnon sees the ψυχαί of the suitors arriving in Hades

¹⁷ The Townley scholium to *Il.* 11.770 (see Maass 1887, 426) reconciles Nestor’s description of gathering warriors with Hera’s claim to doing it in *Il.* 4.28 by explaining that Hera was doing it through Nestor and Odysseus. This comment supports my argument that Hera there is referring to the process of recruiting warriors for the entire expedition, not gathering them for a specific battle.

¹⁸ I note that the Venetus A scholia on these lines explains that *Il.* 11.767–785 were athetized. But the reasons given are that their “composition is prosaic” (ἡ σύνθεσις αὐτῶν πεζή) and because the advice given to Achilles here is not that which Odysseus said Peleus gave in his own attempt to convince Achilles to return in *Il.* 9.252–259. (The Townley scholium to *Il.* 11.765 [Maass 1887, 425] explains how they can both be true). But there is not a suggestion that the gathering of warriors itself did not happen.

and recognizes Amphimedon. Agamemnon claims that he and Amphimedon are guest-friends from that trip he made to Ithaca:

εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένω· ξείνος δέ τοι εὔχομαι εἶναι.
ἧ οὐ μέμνη, ὅτε κείσε κατήλυθον ὑμέτερον δῶ
ὄτρυνέων Ὀδυσῆα σὺν ἀντιθέῳ Μενελάῳ
"Ἴλιον εἰς ἅμ' ἔπεσθαι ἐϋσσέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν;
μηνὶ δ' ἐν οὐλῳ πάντα περήσαμεν εὐρέα πόντον,
σπουδῇ παρπεπιθόντες Ὀδυσσῆα πτολίπορθον.

Tell me what I ask. I claim that I am your guest-friend.
Or do you not remember, when I came there to your home
urging Odysseus, with Menelaus, a match for a god,
to accompany us to Ilium on the well-benched ships?
We were across the entire broad expanse of the sea for a whole month
prevailing with effort upon Odysseus the sacker of cities.

Od. 24.114–119

In Agamemnon's recollection of his recruiting trip to Ithaca, he mentions that he stayed with Amphimedon and that it took much time and effort to persuade Odysseus to join the expedition.¹⁹ When we compare it to Nestor's description of Patroclus and Achilles eagerly joining, we can see how the subtheme of each individual recruiting mission (these taken together then make up the larger theme represented by the formula "gathering warriors") can have the variety natural to such themes.²⁰ It might seem logical that Agamemnon and Menelaus made this recruiting trip together, but it is also another example of pairs of recruiters going together, just like Nestor and Odysseus to the home of Peleus and Tydeus and Polyneices to Mycenae, adding to our evidence that such a pair is part of the structure of the traditional theme. The recruitment of Odysseus is also highlighted in other sources, such as Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* (lines 119–121 Severyns), which adds the infamous detail that he feigned madness in an attempt to get out of going to Troy.²¹

¹⁹ Donlan (2002) 158 argues that Agamemnon's staying at someone else's home "reveals the delicacy of asking and granting such a large favor," (that is, the χάρις of joining the expedition). He also argues that although this allusion does not include the topic of their protracted negotiations, "we can be pretty sure that the rules for the distribution of spoils – the chief incentive for joining up – was a major topic". Thus he also argues for latent associations present within a compressed theme.

²⁰ See Lord (1960/2000²) 71 and 81–82 on subthemes and how variety is natural to themes.

²¹ Regardless of the date of the poem summarized by Proclus as the *Cypria* attributed to Stasinus of Cyprus, I consider the episodes themselves to be traditional.

There are many pieces of evidence, then, that the gathering of Achaean warriors for the expedition to Troy was a traditional theme in the Trojan epic tradition. There is also a suggestion in the *Iliad* that the same theme could be used to refer to the Trojans gathering their allies. As Hector attempts to rouse these allies to seize the body of the fallen Patroclus, we see that he, too, gathered warriors for this war:

ὄτρυνεν δὲ ἕκαστον ἐποιοχόμενος ἐπέεσσι
 Μέσθλην τε Γλαῦκόν τε Μέδοντά τε Θερσίλοχόν τε
 Ἀστεροπαῖόν τε Δεισὴννορά θ' Ἴπποθοόν τε
 Φόρκυν τε Χρομίον τε καὶ Ἐννομον οἰωνιστήν·
 τοὺς ὃ γ' ἐποτρύνων ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα·
 κέκλυτε μυρία φύλα περικτιόνων ἐπικούρων·
 οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ πληθὺν διζήμενος οὐδὲ χατίζων
 ἐνθάδ' ἀφ' ὑμετέρων πόλεων ἤγειρα ἕκαστον,
 ἀλλ' ἵνα μοι Τρώων ἀλόχους καὶ νήπια τέκνα
 προφρονέως ῥύσισθε φιλοπτολέμων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν.

Approaching each one he urged them with words,
 Mesthles and Glaucus and Medon and Thersilochus
 and Asteropaeus and Deisenor and Hippothoos
 and Phorcys and both Chromius and Ennomus the bird-sign interpreter.
 Urging them on he spoke winged words:
 "Hear me countless nations of neighboring allies!
 Not seeking or needing a multitude did I
 gather each of you here from your cities,
 but my intention was that the wives and innocent children of the Trojans
 you would readily defend from the war-loving Achaeans".

Il. 17.215–224

The names of the men Hector addresses here are reminiscent of the Trojan catalog, as Mesthles (*Il.* 2.864) was there named a leader of the Maeonians; Glaucus (*Il.* 2.876) one of the leaders of the Lycians; Hippothoos (*Il.* 2.840) the leader of the Pelasgians; Phorcys (*Il.* 2.862) the leader of the Phrygians; and Chromis and Ennomus (*Il.* 2.858) the leaders of the Mysians. Thus when Hector says that he "gathered each" (ἤγειρα ἕκαστον, *Il.* 17.222), the implication might be ἕκαστον λαόν.²² The theme when it comes to gathering warriors on the Trojan side might never have been as fully developed as the evidence suggests was the case for the stories of recruiting on the Achaean side, but the Trojan allies do bring us to the next formula I will consider from my original passage: κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους, from

²² The distributive ἕκαστοι λαοί is used at *Il.* 24.1 to refer to each contingent of the Achaeans returning to their own ships after the funeral games of Patroclus.

Il. 4.379: καὶ ῥα μάλα λίσσοντο δόμεν κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους, “and they were fervently requesting that they give them allies in fame”.

Except for this use within the Theban allusion, the term ἐπικούροι in the plural refers only to the Trojan allies in the *Iliad*.²³ They are indeed also called their “allies in fame” (with κλειτοί at least six times, τηλεκλειτοί “far-famed” at least four times, and ἀγακλειτοί “very famous” at least once).²⁴ Because this term is used almost exclusively for the Trojan allies, Lavelle suggests that the word ἐπίκουρος, as well as the concept of “fighting alongside” in a war that does not directly concern you, may have been derived from the Carians of southern Anatolia before the end of the Bronze Age.²⁵ But that suggestion does not take into account this Theban allusion. Donlan points out that the Trojan allies are called ἐπικούροι, while the term is not applied to the Achaean “allies”, such as Achilles and Odysseus, who have made promises to help Menelaus and Agamemnon. He argues that the allies on both sides have made what he calls a χάρις arrangement that defines the terms of their alliance, yet sees some differences in how the epic wants to portray each alliance.²⁶ He also sees the terms of the arrangements on each side as slightly different, since “as the defenders, the Trojan allies could not expect to forage and raid around Troia; their opportunities for amassing booty were limited to spoils from the battlefield and honorific gifts promised for valuable service”.²⁷ Donlan notes, however, that the Theban alliance referred to in *Il.* 4.379 is an offensive alliance, not a defensive one like the Trojan allies. So what then do the “famous allies” fighting on behalf of the Trojans defending their city have in common with what Tydeus and Polyneices were requesting from the Mycenaeans in the Theban tradition?

To answer this question, I think we have to consider the whole formula κλειτοὺς ἐπικούρους to understand what it may connote. I wonder if it refers to the allies on the losing side of a war, whether originally the attackers or the defenders, who are “famous” because they end up with κλέος as their only compensation for fighting. In support of this idea, I point to the story of one Trojan ally, Iphidamas. During his *aristeia*, Agamemnon kills this young man and we are given an evocative description of his life (*Il.* 11.221–247). The death of Iphidamas immediately follows an invocation to the Muses:

²³ The singular ἐπίκουρος is used once by Priam to refer to his going to help the Phrygians in a war against the Amazons (*Il.* 3.188), and once by Athena referring to Aphrodite as the defeated “ally” of Ares (*Il.* 21.431).

²⁴ κλειτοί at *Il.* 3.451, 6.227, 11.220, 17.14, 17.212, 18.229; τηλεκλειτοί at *Il.* 5.491, 6.111, 9.233, 12.108; ἀγακλειτοί at *Il.* 12.101.

²⁵ Lavelle (1997) 257.

²⁶ Donlan (2002).

²⁷ Donlan (2002) 159.

Ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι
 ὅς τις δὴ πρῶτος Ἀγαμέμνωνος ἀντίον ἦλθεν
 ἢ αὐτῶν Τρώων ἢ ἐκλειτῶν ἐπικούρων.

Tell me now, you Muses who hold Olympian homes
 who was the first to come face to face with Agamemnon
 either of the Trojans themselves or of their allies in fame.

Il. 11.218–220

Iphidamas was raised in Thrace, so although he is Antenor's son, he comes to fight this war from afar (he even comes with an force of twelve ships, *Il.* 11.221–222, 228). Most crucially for my point, Iphidamas left his newly wedded wife and “went after the fame of the Achaeans” (μετὰ κλέος ἵκετ' Ἀχαιῶν, *Il.* 11.227). The question that includes the “allies in fame” in the invocation to the Muses is answered with the warrior explicitly coming to the war for such fame. Perhaps the formula in the Theban allusion, just as it used in the *Iliad* for the Trojan allies, looks both forward and back. The Mycenaean might have, like Iphidamas, seen the possibility for fame in becoming allies, and although they themselves did not end up fighting alongside the others, those who did attack Thebes, as the losing side, receive fame as their compensation, just as Iphidamas does, through the medium of epic.

In the Theban allusion, the theme of gathering warriors is closely followed by the possibility of their becoming allies in fame. In the Trojan tradition, except for the passage in *Iliad* 17 in which Hector claims to have gathered the Trojan allies, those two themes appear split between the two sides, with gathering the warriors more developed on the Achaean side, and “allies in fame” used exclusively on the Trojan side. Thus I think we should think of them as two subthemes to the larger theme of making preparations for the war, that can be closely linked or can be separated as the needs of the song require.²⁸ Lord explains that the associations between themes in a traditional singer's composition need not be linear and can be both adjusted and still latently felt:

“Habitual association of themes, however, need not be merely linear, that is to say, theme b always follows theme a, and theme c always follows theme b. Sometimes the presence of theme a in a song calls forth the presence of theme b somewhere in the song, but not necessarily in an a-b relationship, not necessarily following one another immediately. Where the association is linear, it is close to the logic of the narrative, and the themes are generally of a kind that are included in a larger complex. I hesitate to call them “minor” or “nonessential”

²⁸ Although Donlan (2002) does not express his argument in terms of themes, he does offer one possible reason for why such a “split” might happen when he says that the poem has an interest in portraying the Achaean side as more like a single δῆμος.

or “subsidiary,” because sometimes essential ideas may be expressed in them. Where the association is not linear, it seems to me that we are dealing with a force or “tension” that might be termed “submerged”. The habit is hidden, but felt. It arises from the depths of the tradition through the workings of the traditional processes to inevitable expression. And to be numb to an awareness of this kind of association is to miss the meaning not only of the oral method of composition and transmission, but even of epic itself. Without such an awareness the overtones from the past, which give tradition the richness of diapason of full organ, cannot be sensed by the reader of oral epic. The singer’s natural audience appreciates it because they are as much part of the tradition as the singer himself.”²⁹

Thus the themes that do seem to have what Lord calls “an a-b relationship” in the Theban reference, recruiting warriors to be your allies in fame, can be separated within the Trojan story and still have that submerged association with one another. And if I am right that the formula “allies in fame” signals that those allies are on the ultimately losing side, there is yet another deeply felt association of that particular formula and the themes in which it is used.

Just as themes, or their component subthemes, need not always follow the same order, themes can also have divergent outcomes. That feature brings us to the final element in the Theban reference to gathering allies: the Mycenaeans are at first willing to join up, but turn back after receiving foreboding portents (οἱ δ’ ἔθελον δόμεναι καὶ ἐπὶ γένεον ὥς ἐκέλευον· / ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς ἔτρεψε παραίσια σήματα φανών, *Il.* 4.380–381). Thus there can be two possible outcomes for these recruiting visits, either the would-be-recruited becomes an ally or does not – or, at least, fulfills the agreement of the alliance or does not. To see how this is a feature of traditional epic we can look to Foley’s discussion of the *Odyssey* as an oral poem. He notes that the song of the husband’s return is shown to have two different possible outcomes: one exemplified by a faithful Penelope, the other by the unfaithful Clytemnestra.³⁰ The relationship between the two outcomes of the same theme is also a deeply felt tension in the song.

The Theban reference offers the example of the unsuccessful outcome to the recruitment, and it relies specifically on the Mycenaeans paying attention to the “signs of ill-omen” sent by Zeus. We have another indication that such signs were significant in the Theban tradition when Sthenelus, in his rebuttal to this speech of Agamemnon, asserts the success of the Epigonoι, including Diomedes and himself, because of their attention to such portents:

²⁹ Lord (1960/2000²) 97.

³⁰ Foley (2002) 166–169.

ἡμεῖς καὶ Θήβης ἔδος εἶλομεν ἑπταπύλοιο
 παυρότερον λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ' ὑπὸ τεῖχος ἄρειον,
 πειθόμενοι *τεράεσσι θεῶν* καὶ Ζηνὸς ἀρωγῇ·

We did take the abode of seven-gated Thebes,
 leading fewer warriors under a stronger wall,
 obeying *the portents of the gods* and the aid of Zeus.

Il. 4.406–408

The *τεράεσσι θεῶν* are also what, in Agamemnon's further story about Tydeus, convinced Tydeus to leave one of his ambushers, Maeon, alive (*Il.* 4.398).³¹

Is this attention to the signs sent by Zeus before starting a war a theme shared by the Trojan tradition? We see indications that it was in *Iliad* 2, as the Achaean warriors are re-gathered to once again fight against the Trojans. Odysseus recounts the sign sent to the Achaeans at Aulis, before they embarked on their journey to Troy (*Il.* 2.301–332). He introduces it as a μέγα σῆμα (2.308) and describes the snake who consumes the eight nestling sparrows and their mother, but then was turned to stone by Zeus (*Il.* 2.308–320).³² He concludes the description by calling it “fear-inducing omens from the gods” (δεινὰ πέλωρα θεῶν, *Il.* 2.321) and then quotes Calchas' interpretation that the Achaeans will fight for nine years and be victorious in the tenth. The “quoted” words of Calchas refer to the petrified snake as a τέρας μέγα: “so to us Zeus the deviser revealed this great portent” (ἡμῖν μὲν τόδ' ἔφηνε τέρας μέγα μητίετα Ζεὺς, *Il.* 2.324). Nestor speaks after Odysseus concludes and also recounts signs of good omen from Zeus:

φημὶ γὰρ οὖν κατανεῦσαι ὑπερμενέα Κρονίωνα
 ἥματι τῷ ὅτε νηυσὶν ἐν ὠκυπόροισιν ἔβαινον
 Ἀργεῖοι Τρώεσσι φόνον καὶ κῆρα φέροντες
 ἀστράπτων ἐπιδέξι' *ἐναίσιμα σήματα φαίνων*.

For I claim that the greatly powerful son of Cronus nodded in assent
 on that day when the Argives were embarking on the swift-traversing ships
 bringing death and destruction to the Trojans,
 flashing lightning on the right side, revealing *signs of good omen*.

Il. 2.350–353

³¹ They also appear in the story of Bellerophon, who obeys the portents of the gods in slaying the Chimera: καὶ τὴν μὲν κατέπεφνε θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας, *Il.* 6.183.

³² See Nagy (2009b) 74–91 for more on the poetics of this sign. We can also compare the sign of the fox and dog being turned to stone in the Theban tradition, an episode reported in the *Suda* in the entry for Teumesia, as another shared element within the portents. West (2003, 56–57) assigns the event to the *Epigonoι* (fr. 5 PEG 1 = p. 74 EGF = 3 GEF).

Both at Aulis and on their departure from that gathering place, there were positive signs that the Achaeans would prevail in their war. Odysseus' characterization of the τέρας μέγα that Zeus revealed are like τεράεσσι θεῶν καὶ Ζηνὸς ἄρωγῃ that the Epigonoι obeyed in their successful attack on Thebes. Thus in both traditions, the attackers receive signs from Zeus portending their success. Nestor's ἐναίσια σήματα (*Il.* 2.353) are the opposite of the παρὰισια σήματα (*Il.* 4.381) that turned the Mycenaeans back from participating in that Theban expedition. So with the signs the Mycenaeans obeyed, we can see that these signs can signal the ultimate failure of the expedition as well as the ultimate success. Once again, we can imagine from the details of the description of the snake eating the birds and being turned to stone followed by an interpretation by a prophet that this theme as well could be expanded in the telling of the Theban story, with a full narrative of the signs that they received, and the Mycenaeans' decision to heed the warning of failure and quit the alliance.

I have attempted to show two things through my arguments. One is that in the compressed allusion to the visit by Tydeus and Polyneices to Mycenae, there are traditional themes that could be expanded in a longer telling of the story – that is, in a Theban epic. These themes are strongly associated with one another: gathering warriors as allies for a large-scale attack, and the divine portents that signal the outcome of this attack and require the warriors to decide whether to continue. Although the description of these events occupies a mere six lines in our *Iliad*, they could make up a much longer episode within a Theban epic. The second thing is that the *Iliad* also indicates that these same themes are part of the Trojan tradition through the recollection of earlier events by Nestor and Odysseus. In these compressed accounts, the gathering of allies is given some shape in terms of how the recruiting visits would be structured, and what some of the key elements are that make up the theme, depending on the age and status of the intended recruits. The signs the Achaeans received while in Aulis and as they left for Troy offer two different models for the form that such portents might take, and both may happen for the same expedition. The formula “allies in fame” is closely associated with the gathering of the warriors in the Theban allusion, and yet is separated in the Trojan tradition to apply only to the Trojan allies. This resonance between the Theban request for allies and the Trojan “allies in fame” may show us a traditional implication of the formula: that allies so called fight on the ultimately losing side. Such traditional referentiality for a formula is to be expected in this poetry. In any case, if we had a fuller epic account of the early stages of the war on Troy, we might also there see fuller versions of the recruiting visits and of (even) the portents received in Aulis.

What are the implications of the fact that the two traditions seem to have shared these themes? One is that it provides further indications that the two tradi-

tions were contemporary. Being part of a shared song culture, and perhaps being sung by the same poet, or by rival poets, the songs could influence the shape of one another, especially in terms of how the themes were expressed in each. To understand that possibility better, let us turn once again to Albert Lord for his characterization of how themes operate:

“The theme in oral poetry exists at one and the same time in and for itself and for the whole song. This can be said both for the theme in general and for any individual singer’s forms of it. His task is to adapt and adjust it to the particular song he is re-creating. It does not have a “pure” form either for the individual singer or for the tradition as a whole. Its form is ever changing in the singer’s mind, because the theme is in reality protean; in the singer’s mind it has many shapes, all the forms in which he has ever sung it, although his latest rendering of it will naturally be freshest in his mind. It is not a static entity, but a living, changing, adaptable artistic creation. Yet it exists for the sake of the song. And the shapes that it has taken in the past have been suitable for the song of the moment. In a traditional poem, therefore, there is a pull in two directions: one is toward the song being sung and the other is toward the previous uses of the same theme”.³³

As the theme of gathering warriors is composed time and again, in a song about Thebes or in a song about Troy, each composition affects how a singer sings it the next time, when perhaps he is singing it for the other story. Or it could influence the way another singer who hears that composition sings the theme when he next composes in performance. Recognizing the shared nature of these themes between the two traditions helps us to understand these themes, their structure and meaning, in a way that is more true to the oral tradition and its poetics.³⁴ The slightly more expanded versions in the *Iliad* suggest ways for us to imagine what the Theban versions may have been like, but we must remember that it is equally plausible that at some early stage, the Theban tradition influenced the Trojan in developing these themes. Both epic traditions, after all, tell a similar story: a large-scale expedition with multiple armies and multiple leaders. Gathering warriors to be allies in fame is thus a shared, necessary theme. Since the two traditions resonate with each other not only through characters and events but on the level of theme, they have a deep structural affinity with one another.

³³ Lord (1960/2000²) 94.

³⁴ Lord (1960/2000²) 91: “As with the South Slavic poets, the very presence of the theme has a meaning beyond that of description for description’s own sake”.

PART II: Theban Epic and the *Odyssey*

José Torres

Teiresias, the Theban Seer

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0018

Theban Identity

Thebes, the main town in Boeotia, the “seven-gated city”, is mentioned several times in both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*;¹ the name Θῆβαι is also used in relation to Egyptian Thebes, which had one hundred gates according to the reference made by Achilles.² The usual word in Greek for “Theban”, Θηβαῖος, is used only once in the *Iliad* (8.120), and then as a proper name, Thebaeus.³ In both epic poems, it is usual to designate the inhabitants or the people born in Thebes with another adjective, “Cadmean” (Καδμείος, Καδμείων), derived from Cadmus, the legendary founder of the city. The Cadmeans are first mentioned in the *Iliad* in the context of Tydeus’ embassy to Thebes before the breaking out of the war between Polyneices and Eteocles.⁴ The alternative form, Θηβαῖος, is used six times⁵ in the *Odyssey*, where it always refers to Teiresias, a fixed figure in the Theban saga who plays no role in the Trojan legend and is not even mentioned in the *Iliad*.⁶ His Greek name, Τειρεσίας, related to τέρας, “sign, wonder”, may be regarded as a speaking name which characterizes him as “qui interprète les signes”.⁷

This paper is not intended to be a complete study of Teiresias in ancient literature, not even in archaic epic. Its goal is to analyze the character of Teiresias in

¹ The first occurrences of its name are *Il.* 4.378; *Od.* 11.263. The Catalogue of Ships (*Il.* 2.505) includes a reference to Hypothebai, the lower town grounded after Thebes was conquered by the Epigonoι. Hypoplacian Thebe (Θῆβη Ὑποπλακία), the city Andromache comes from, is also mentioned in the *Iliad* several times (1.366; 2.691; 6.397, 416; 22.479).

² See *Il.* 9.381–384.

³ He is the father of Eniopeus, Hector’s chariot driver.

⁴ See *Il.* 4.382–398.

⁵ See *Od.* 10.492, 565; 11.90, 165; 12.267; 23.323.

⁶ In relation to Teiresias, the main references are Buslepp (1919–1924); Schwenn (1933); García Gual (1975); Brisson (1976); Ugolini (1995); and Di Rocco (2007). On the possibility of Teiresias playing a role in the *Nostoi*, see below.

⁷ See *DELG* 1106 and *Lfgre*, s.v. “Τειρεσίας”.

José Torres: University of Navarra, E-Mail: jtorres@unav.es.

the *Odyssey* from a point of view that assumes, when necessary, the neoanalytical and oralist approaches to the Homeric epic.⁸ The following pages present and discuss what the *Odyssey* recounts about the soothsayer. Then the fragmentary epic texts (shamanic poetry and Stesichorus included),⁹ together with the testimony of Attic tragedy and iconography, are analyzed to put the evidence of the *Odyssey* against a wider backdrop. Finally, this paper makes some suggestions that pay special attention to the probable pre-Homeric life of Teiresias and also to the way in which the *Odyssey* adapts the figure of the seer to its own narrative purposes.

Teiresias in the *Odyssey*: Dead but Almost Alive

The *Odyssey* mentions Teiresias for the first time in Book 10, when Circe answers (10.488–495) Odysseus' request (10.483–486): if he wants to go back to Ithaca, he must first visit the house of Hades and consult the soul of the Theban seer:

διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη, πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,
μηκέτι νῦν ἀέκοντες ἐμῷ ἐνὶ μίμνετε οἴκῳ.
ἀλλ' ἄλλην χρὴ πρῶτον ὁδὸν τελέσαι καὶ ἰκέσθαι
εἰς Αἴδαο δόμους καὶ ἐπαινῆς Περσεφονείης
ψυχῇ χρησομένους Θηβαίου Τειρεσίου,
μάντιος ἁλαοῦ, τοῦ τε φρένες ἔμπεδοί εἰσι·
τῷ καὶ τεθνηῶτι νόον πόρε Περσεφόνεια
οἶῳ πεπνῦσθαι· τοὶ δὲ σκιάι ἄϊσσουσιν.

Royal son of Laertes, Odysseus of the nimble wits, I am not going to keep you in my house against your wishes. But before I can send you home you have to make a journey of a very different kind, and find your way to the Hall of Hades and Persephone the Dread, to consult the soul of Teiresias, the blind Theban prophet, whose understanding is unimpaired. For

⁸ The combination of both methodologies may have seemed odd in the twentieth century; it is more widely accepted nowadays. See, e.g., Torres (1995) 13–14; Willcock (1997) 189; Burgess (2006); Currie (2006); Tsagalis (2008) 66–68, (2011); Torres (2012) 517–518. Meanwhile, see Fowler (2004) 230 n. 42.

⁹ Clearly, the case of *P.Lille* 76 (= fr. 222b *PMGF*), containing a fragment of the sometimes called Stesichorean *Thebaid* (see Campbell 1991, 137), must be taken into account. The poetry of Stesichorus may be regarded as a bridge between lyric and epic (see Haslam 1978); some scholars (see Russo 1999, 347) have even argued that Stesichorus should be regarded “as an epico-lyric composer”.

dead though he is, Persephone has left to him, and him alone, a mind to reason with. The rest are mere shadows flitting to and fro.¹⁰

Od. 10.488–495

Some scholars thought in the past that Odysseus' visit to the Underworld was unmotivated,¹¹ since it was not necessary for the hero to travel to Hades to discover his way back to Ithaca; it would have been enough if Circe had instructed him, which she does actually do in *Odyssey* 12. An interpretation of this kind overlooks two important points. First, Odysseus' journey is essential because it presents him as the best possible sailor, who could go with his ship farther than anybody else, beyond the limits of the human world, even so far as the realms of death (εἰς Ἄϊδος δ' οὐ πώ τις ἀφίκετο νηὶ μελαίνῃ, "No-one has ever sailed a black ship into Hell", *Od.* 10.502). And such a singular voyage also had a very definite goal, the encounter with Teiresias, who is presented as a unique character, almost as a living person among the dead. As Circe puts it, his φρένες, his mental capacities, are still ἔμπεδοι (*Od.* 10.493) and, thanks to a very special privilege granted by Persephone, he retains his mind (νόον, *Od.* 10.494) as it once was, which makes him singularly exceptional among the dead (*Od.* 10.495: τοὶ δὲ σκιᾶὶ αἴσσουσιν, "the rest are mere shadows flitting to and fro").¹²

Before Odysseus tells his shipmates about the new journey that lies before them, he receives detailed information from Circe concerning the procedures they are supposed to follow (*Od.* 10.504–540). They must reach Persephone's sacred forest and Hades' home of Decay (*Od.* 10.509–512). Once there, Odysseus will make an offer to the dead and promise them a rich sacrifice after his return to Ithaca; then he will kill two black victims, a ram and a ewe, to appease Teiresias (*Od.* 10.516–537)¹³; after the seer has come and drunk from the blood of these animals, he will explain to Odysseus how he can reach his home (*Od.* 10.538–540).¹⁴ Circe's instructions are followed by Odysseus in *Odyssey* 11, the so-called *Nekyia*.¹⁵

¹⁰ All translations of the *Odyssey* included in this contribution are based (with slight adaptations) on Rieu (1945).

¹¹ For an analytical approach to the *Nekyia*, see Merkelbach (1951) 185–192; see also Heubeck (1983) 259–260.

¹² For the difference between "νόος" and "φρένες", see *Lfgre*, s.v. As Heubeck (1983, 252) notices, the *Odyssey* (10.240) also says, in the case of the comrades of the hero converted into pigs by Circe, that their νοῦς ἦν ἔμπεδος ὡς τὸ πάρος περ.

¹³ On the peculiarities of the sacrifice and ritual depicted in *Od.* 10.516–534, see Reinhardt (1960) 111–112; Heubeck (1983) 254–255. For Teiresias as oracular divinity, see below.

¹⁴ These verses (10.539–540) are a repetition of *Od.* 4.389–390; see Heubeck (1983) 256–257. On the similarities between Odysseus-Teiresias and Menelaus-Proteus, see Reinhardt (1960) 94–97.

¹⁵ See *Od.* 11.25–33 (= 10.517–525).

Modern readership may be surprised to discover that, contrary to what might be expected, Odysseus does not descend in principle to Hades as other Greek heroes are supposed to have done.¹⁶ A νέκυια is actually a consultation of the dead and, therefore, something different from a κατάβασις or descent to the Underworld. Then it is surprising that the “consultation of the dead” that Odysseus has initiated turns into a visit to Hades where he “sees” (ἴδον)¹⁷ those dead men or women who are worth seeing. The hero will speak later of his voyage to the Underworld as being a descent.¹⁸

After some among the dead have desperately tried to drink from the blood of the victims, the soul of the Theban seer appears, bearing, as a distinctive feature, a golden scepter¹⁹: ἦλθε δ' ἐπὶ ψυχῇ Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο, / χρύσειον σκήπτρον ἔχων, ἐμὲ δ' ἔγνω καὶ προσέειπε, “And the soul of the Theban Teiresias now came up, with a gold rod in his hand, saw who I was, and saluted me” (*Od.* 11.90–91). Teiresias, who retains his φρένες ἔμπεδοι and his νόον as Circe said (*Od.* 10.493–494), can recognize Odysseus before drinking the blood that will provide fresh consciousness to other dead.²⁰ Once the seer has drunk the blood and after asking Odysseus how he has come to Hades (*Od.* 11.93–94), he tells the hero what will happen afterward (*Od.* 11.100–137): the perils provoked by Poseidon that await him in the sea, the prohibition on disturbing the cattle of Helios in Thrinacia, his arrival alone in Ithaca, the killing of Penelope's suitors, the journey of atonement he will undertake to propitiate Poseidon, and his own death ἐξ ἁλὸς (*Od.* 11.134), “far from the sea” according to some interpreters, or perhaps “coming from the sea”²¹:

16 The most famous heroic *katabasis* may be that of Heracles, also mentioned in this song (*Od.* 11.601–626); see Hooker (1980) and Tsagalis (2011a) 223; see also *Il.* 5.395–404; 8.362–369. In the *Nekyia* (*Od.* 11.631), there is also a reference to the descent of Theseus and Peirithous; the verse is suspicious and held to be an Attic addition; see Heubeck (1983) 308–309.

17 See *Od.* 11.235, 260, 271, 281, 298, 306, 321, 326, 329, 568, 576, 582, 593, 630.

18 When Odysseus speaks with his mother, his voyage to Hades is already a descent (see *Od.* 11.164: μήτηρ ἐμῇ, χρειώ με κατήγαγεν εἰς Ἄϊδαο). It is the same when he tells Penelope of Teiresias' prophecy (*Od.* 23.252: ἥματι τῷ, ὅτε δὴ κατέβην δόμον Ἄϊδος εἶσω). On this change of perspective and the transformation of the *Nekyia* into a *katabasis*, see Clarke (1999) 215–225; Santamaría Álvarez (2011) 26; see also Reinhardt (1960) 110–112.

19 In a similar way, Chryses appears in the *Il.* 1.14–15 as στέμματ' ἔχων ἐν χερσὶν ἐκηβόλου Ἀπόλλωνος / χρυσέῳ ἀνὰ σκήπτρῳ.

20 The first such instance is Anticleia, Odysseus' mother; see *Od.* 11.152–153. Teiresias had explained to Odysseus (*Od.* 11.140–149) that dead bodies need fresh blood to recover their speech.

21 On the problems arising from the prophecy, see Reinhardt (1960) 99–104; Heubeck (1983) 272–273; Ballabriga (1989); Peradotto (1990) 60–76; Danek (1998) 214–220, 285–287; Malkin (1998) 120–155; Marks (2008) 100–104; Tsagalis (2011a) 218, 221. The events here prophesied seem to be given their narrative development in the *Telegony* (see below and *Tel.* arg. 7–8 Bernabé; [Apol-

θάνατος δέ τοι ἐξ ἁλὸς αὐτῷ
 ἀβληχρὸς μάλα τοῖος ἐλεύσεται, ὅς κέ σε πέφνη
 γήρα ὑπο λιπαρῷ ἀρήμενον· ἀμφὶ δὲ λαοὶ
 ὄλβιοι ἔσσονται. τὰ δέ τοι νημερτέα εἶρω.

As for your own end, Death will come to you out of the sea, Death in his gentlest guise. When he takes you, you will be won out after an ease old age and surrounded by a prosperous people. This is the truth that I have told you.

Od. 11.134–137

This prophecy involves many problems that have been repeatedly discussed since antiquity itself. The different interpretations of ἐξ ἁλὸς comprise only one example among others. If the meaning of ἐξ ἁλὸς is open to discussion, something similar can be said about the ἀβληχρὸς (*Od.* 11.135) death that awaits Odysseus. Is this really “Death in his gentlest guise”, as the cited translation proposes, or should we write, in line with Ballabriga’s interpretation,²² “a feeble death”? In the expression ὅς κέ σε πέφνη (*Od.* 11.135), does the verb πέφνη imply a death in combat, as is usual in the Homeric poems?²³ And last but not least, is there an ironic sense to the ambiguous words of the soothsayer who, despite the ambivalence of his prophecies, proclaims definitively τὰ δέ τοι νημερτέα εἶρω, “this is the truth that I have told you” (*Od.* 11.137)?²⁴

It has been already said that Odysseus’ journey into Hades is essential because it presents him as the best possible sailor and that its ultimate justification is the encounter with Teiresias. So it is striking that Teiresias does not actually explain to Odysseus what Circe had promised²⁵ (see, “your journey, and the distances to be covered, and the return”), and that it is Circe herself who will later (*Od.* 12.37–141) outline the particularities of the return voyage. Circe had made clear that Odysseus needed to consult Teiresias, but the question is: why necessarily Teiresias? At this juncture, it should be recalled that, according to Plutarch, there was an oracular shrine to the Theban soothsayer in Orchomenos;²⁶ therefore, it has sometimes been supposed that the role he plays in the *Odyssey* is an

lod.] *Epit.* 7.34). But the intertextual relations between this passage of the *Odyssey* and the *Tel-e-gony* could be more intricate than expected, as Ballabriga (1989) notes. On this question, see Tsagalis (forthcoming).

²² See Ballabriga (1989) 294.

²³ See, e.g., *Il.* 21.55–56: ἦ μάλα δὴ Τρῶες μεγαλήτορες οὓς περ ἔπεφνον / αὐτίς ἀναστήσονται ὑπὸ ζόφου ἡρόεντος.

²⁴ On the ironic sense which may be embedded in Teiresias’ prophecy, see Ballabriga (1989).

²⁵ See *Od.* 10.538–540: μάντις (...) / ὅς κέν τοι εἴπησιν ὁδὸν καὶ μέτρα κελεύθου / νόστον θ’.

²⁶ *De def. orac.* 434c.

extension of the role that pertained to him as an oracular divinity.²⁷ But in so far as the cult of Teiresias is not attested to until a late date, it seems more probable that the truth runs the other way around: the role played in the *Nekyia* provided him later with the status of subterranean oracle.²⁸

The best possible theory is perhaps simply that the best sailor must speak with the best seer, who unfortunately is dead. Meanwhile, what could have been an insurmountable setback becomes *a contrario* a positive challenge for Odysseus, who is forced to undertake the most difficult journey of his life. It is true that Teiresias will not tell Odysseus anything specific concerning his voyage. But he will explain the main events of his future life. Is Teiresias really the best possible seer? Yes, if Calchas²⁹ is not considered to be the greatest, or, at least, he is the most famous soothsayer in the Theban saga, in which he seems to be the μάντις κατ' ἐξοχήν. Certainly, Odysseus plays no role within Teiresias' legendary complex. Fortunately, death, the final frontier, seems to have removed the borders between different sagas, so that Teiresias can have a place of his own in the literary afterlife of the *Odyssey*.

It may be assumed that the reason that allowed the migration of Teiresias into the Trojan saga must have been the important role the Θηβαῖος μάντις played in his own saga, within which he is, as noted already, the seer par excellence. Was he always so? Yes, at least in the earliest phase of the legend's shaping. Teiresias, thanks to the extraordinary length of his life, was the seer who counseled all the Theban kings since Cadmus and Pentheus, with whom he appears on stage in Euripides' *Bacchae*, and he remains there until the age of Laodamas, the son of Eteocles.³⁰ It is significant that, when Circe speaks of Teiresias in the *Odyssey* for the first time, she does not need to say very much about him. For the audience of this passage, the Phaeacians with whom Odysseus speaks, and the real audience who attended the rhapsodic performance, a brief indication (*Od.* 10.492–493: ψυχῇ ... Θηβαίου Τειρεσίου / μάντιος ἀλαοῦ, τοῦ τε φρένες ἔμπεδοί εἰσι, “the soul of Teiresias, the blind Theban prophet, whose understanding is unimpaired”) seems to have been enough. This implies that Teiresias was a familiar figure to the audience of the *Odyssey*. The question to be answered now is if he was so well

²⁷ This hypothesis was proposed by Buslepp (1915) 187, 192, 200.

²⁸ The analogous case of Amphiaraus, who also had an oracular sanctuary at Oropos, is discussed by Schachter (1981–1994) I 19–26.

²⁹ Calchas must also be dead at this point of the story. This is so according to the epic tradition which says that Calchas died in Colophon after losing in a contest against Mopsus; see *Nost.* arg. 7–9 Bernabé; [Hes.] *Melamp.* fr. 278 M–W (see fr. 279 M–W).

³⁰ For Teiresias and Laodamas, see [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.73. On the longevity of the character, see below.

known because of the role he played in the general stuff of legend or through specific epics with which both poet and public were acquainted.³¹ The second possibility may seem to be the most probable at first sight.³² Some specific, factual evidence must be adduced in relation to this point.

A textual hint of Teiresias' presence in previous dactylic poetry can be found in the Homeric phraseology about him: the expressions used to designate the seer in the *Odyssey* could be part of a formulaic system³³ that was most likely inherited by "Homer", as Teiresias does not play such an important role in the *Odyssey* as to merit his own set of formulas. The space between the *penthemimeral caesura* and the end of the verse is filled by the word-group Θηβαίου Τειρεσίου ("Teiresias, the Theban"), the first formula used for Teiresias in *Od.* 10.492 and on five other occasions (*Od.* 10.565; 11.90, 165; 12.267; 23.323); the group μάντιος ἀλαοῦ ("blind seer") occupies the space between the beginning of the hexameter and the *penthemimeral caesura* (*Od.* 10.493; 12.267); for the space between the beginning of the verse and the *trochaic caesura*, the poet can use Τειρεσίου ἄνακτος ("lord Teiresias"), with only one such occurrence in the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 11.151). Some of these possible traditional formulas could also be modified as usual in the formulaic systems; this is the case of Τειρεσίου ἄνακτος, which could be inverted (ἄνακτος Τειρεσίου) to occupy the space between the *trochaic caesura* and the end of the verse.

The epic fragments have not transmitted other possible formulas used to refer to the Theban seer. But it should also be noted that Stesichorus, in his poem sometimes labeled "*Thebaid*" that is partially preserved in the Lille papyrus, may be speaking about Τειρ[ε]σίας τερασπό]λος, "Teiresias, acquainted with prodigies", and (according to the more probable reconstruction) [Τειρεσίου ὀ]νυμάκλυτος, "renowned Teiresias".³⁴ Both expressions, although dactylic, cannot be inserted in the metrical structure of the hexameter; notwithstanding this, the epithets could have been employed to designate the seer in groups such as ὀνομάκλυτος or τερασπόλος ἀνήρ. It is also interesting that Teiresias is called once by Euripides (*Phoen.* 767) οἰωνόμαντις, "one who takes omens from the flight and cries of birds".³⁵ It is tempting to detect here a trace of dactylic phraseology and recon-

31 This hypothesis was already proposed in Torres (1995) 72–73. In the precedent bibliography, see, e.g., Reinhardt (1960) 99; Heubeck (1983) 252.

32 For a similar case (the information in the *Iliad* concerning the expedition of the Seven against Thebes and their relationship with the Theban epics), see Torres (1995) 32–44; see, in general, Tsagalis (2011a) 229–230.

33 As first defined by Parry (1971) 276–278.

34 See, respectively, fr. 222b, 232, 291 PMGF. τερασπόλος, if sound, is only attested in this fragment; Teiresias is called τερασκόπον in Eur. *Bacch.* 28.

35 See LSJ⁹, s.v. On Teiresias as *augur* and his θᾶκον ὀρνιθοσκόπον, see Soph. *Ant.* 999–1004.

struct a hexametrical formula that fills the space between the beginning of the verse and the *penthemimeral caesura*: οἰωνῶν μάντις.

If it is accepted that the *Odyssey* presupposes the existence of previous poetry in which Teiresias figured, the question then should be which specific poems are being referred to by the Homeric poem. This is a point that will be dealt with in the next section. But before this, it may be helpful to take into account the broader context of Teiresias' intervention, in particular, the first exchanges Odysseus takes part in in the world of the dead.

After the seer had uttered his prophecy,³⁶ the narrator (Odysseus himself) begins his consultation of the inhabitants of Hades by speaking first with his mother Anticleia, whom he left alive in Ithaca when he departed for Troy (*Od.* 11.86). When their dialogue (*Od.* 11.152–224) is over, the so-called “Homeric Catalogue of Women” (*Od.* 11.225–330) begins;³⁷ it is Persephone herself who encourages them to come before Odysseus: αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες / ἤλυθον, ὥτρυνεν γὰρ ἀγαυή Περσεφόνηα, / ὅσσα ἀριστήων ἄλοχοι ἔσαν ἡδὲ θύγατρες, “and now, impelled by dread Persephone, there came up all the women who had been the wives or the daughters of princes” (*Od.* 11.225–227). It may seem strange that Odysseus does not speak immediately with the heroes who are in Hades but with their wives and daughters.³⁸ It is even more surprising that many of these women are Theban heroines. This is not the case of Tyro, the first woman the narrator speaks about (*Od.* 11.235–259).³⁹ But afterward, Odysseus will see Antiope, the mother of Amphion and Zethus, who built the wall around Thebes (*Od.* 11.260–265, see 262–263: Ἀμφιόνά τε Ζῆθόν τε, / οἱ πρότεροι Θήβης ἔδος ἔκτισαν ἑπταπύλοιο, “Amphion and Zethus, the founders of Thebes of the Seven Gates”), Alcmene, the mother of Heracles, the most famous Theban hero, his wife Megara (*Od.* 11.266–270), and Epicaste, better known in the tradition as Iocaste, the mother and wife of Oedipus, king of Thebes (*Od.* 11.271–280; see ἐν Θήβῃ πολυηράτῳ, “in lovely Thebes”, in 275).⁴⁰ Odysseus speaks later about Eriphyle (*Od.* 11.326–327), also connected with the Theban legend through her husband Amphiaraus, whom she betrayed and forced to become one of the Seven who marched against Thebes. It

³⁶ In *Od.* 23.264–287, Odysseus will repeat it almost verbatim to his wife Penelope.

³⁷ The expression “Homeric Catalogue of Women” is used, e.g., by Nagy (2009a) 296. On the relationship between this passage and the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*, see Heubeck (1983) 278–279; West (1985) 6, 32; Larson (2000) 194.

³⁸ This fact led to different analytical interpretations of the passage; see Heubeck (1983) 278. Meanwhile, various scholars have called attention to the functional aspects they have traced in this episode; see Doherty (1995) 65–69, 82–83, 92–121; Larson (2000) 196.

³⁹ Tyro is directly related to Thessaly; see Larson (2000) 197–198.

⁴⁰ On the passage relating to Epicaste and the version of the Theban legend that it presupposes, see Torres (1995) 67–69.

should be remembered that some heroines who seem to have no connection with Thebes are at least linked to Boeotia, as is the case of Chloris (*Od.* 11.281–297), daughter of another Amphion, king of Orchomenos.⁴¹

The “Homeric Catalogue of Women”, foreshadowed in Teiresias’ preceding speech, contains a kind of feminine summary of the Theban legend, from the time of the legendary builders Amphion and Zethus until the days in which the city was attacked by the Seven. The inclusion of this survey is very probably with a clear reflection of the eminent status of Teiresias as a Theban figure. Moreover, the analysis of the text suggests at least two other questions which deserve a brief analysis.

First, it must be recognized that a reference to Teiresias’ role as a seer in the Theban court might have been expected when Epicaste and Oedipus discover their true situation. Instead of this, the text (*Od.* 11.274) says: ἄφαρ δ’ ἀνάπυστα θεοὶ θέσαν ἀνθρώποισιν, “the gods soon let the truth come out”. Probably, this silence about Teiresias does not necessarily imply that he was not yet connected with the kings of Thebes in the eyes of the poet of the *Odyssey*.⁴² This would be an argument *ex silentio*, and the fact that the soothsayer is not the point of interest in these verses should also be acknowledged; meanwhile, this sentence (ἄφαρ δ’ ἀνάπυστα θεοὶ θέσαν ἀνθρώποισιν) does not exclude the mediation of Teiresias as the seer who transmitted the divine message.

The second question that deserves attention is more speculative: might the presence of the Theban theme within the Catalogue of Women in the *Odyssey* have something to do with a Pan-Hellenic cultural policy, as other scholars have tried to show?⁴³ Something more will be added in relation to this point by the end of this paper.

Teiresias in the Epic Cycle, Shamanic Poetry, and Archaic Iconography

The presence of Teiresias in the *Odyssey* has been explored above. It has been suggested that the role he plays in the poem may indicate his special status and recognition, probably through previous epic poetry in which he appeared as the soothsayer by *antonomasia*. Now it is time to explore fragmentary archaic epic

⁴¹ See Larson (2000) 199–200.

⁴² See Ugolini (1995) 168–169, 171–173. According to Ugolini, Teiresias first became part of the legend with Stesichorus.

⁴³ See Larson (2000) 206, 220–222; Nagy (2009a) 296.

and search for Teiresias. The first poems in this regard are those that dealt with the Theban saga, the *Oedipodeia*, the *Thebaid*, the *Epigonoï*, and the *Alcmeonis*.

In the case of the *Oedipodeia*, the poem must have told the main events concerning the legendary king of Thebes. A scholium to Euripides' *Phoenissae*, attributed to Pisander and supposed to be an argument of the epic poem, affirms that Teiresias advised Laius not to consult the Delphic oracle but appease Hera as it was she who had sent the Sphinx against Thebes:⁴⁴

τότε μὲν οὖν ὁ Τειρεσίας ὡς μάντις εἰδὼς ὅτι θεοστουγῆς ἦν ὁ Λαίος, ἀπέτρεπεν αὐτὸν τῆς ἐπὶ τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα ὁδοῦ, τῇ δὲ Ἥρᾳ μᾶλλον τῇ γαμοστόλῳ θεᾷ θύειν ἱέρα.

Therefore Teiresias, who, being a seer, knew that Laius was hated by the gods, dissuaded him from going to Apollo; instead of this he obliged him to make a sacrifice to Hera, who arranges marriages.⁴⁵

It cannot be confirmed that this refers to the *Oedipodeia*. This possibility seems indeed dubious because of the many inconsistencies in the scholium.⁴⁶ Meanwhile, it is true that oracles and soothsayers must have played an important role in this poem, which would at least have mentioned the prophecy received by Laius concerning the birth of a son who would bring disgrace to him.⁴⁷ But it is not known definitively who proclaimed the prophecy in the *Oedipodeia*, a seer (Teiresias?) or the Delphic oracle.

The situation is even worse in the case of the second Theban epic, the *Thebaid*. Teiresias' role can be reconstructed for this poem only by way of conjecture. The testimony of Stesichorus, for example, lets us know that Teiresias could have played an important role in the portion of the Theban saga narrated in the *Thebaid*. Whether in this poem, as it is the case in the Lille papyrus, the seer spoke with the queen of Thebes about the future of her sons is another matter.⁴⁸

⁴⁴ Σ Eur. *Phoen.* 1760 (Schwartz) = Pisander, *FGrHist* 16 F 10 = *Oed. arg.* (?) PEG 1. According to this version, Hera, the goddess of marriage, was angry with Laius because he kidnapped Chrysippus to have sexual intercourse with him. The scholium applies to Hera the epithet γαμοστόλος, which could be employed in a hexametric formula (γαμοστόλος Ἥρη); see Nonn. *Dion.* 7.296 (e.g.), Mus. 7 and 282.

⁴⁵ Author's translation.

⁴⁶ Nowadays, scholars who defend the pertinence of this scholium are a minority; neither Davies (*EGF*) nor West (*GEF*) include the text in their editions of the epic fragments. See Bethe (1891) 4–12; Robert (1915) 149–167; Jacoby (1923–1954) Ia 494–496; de Kock (1962) 15–37; Valgiglio (1963) 154–166; Bernabé (1987) 17–19; Mastronarde (1994) 31–36; Lloyd-Jones (2002) 2–10; Sewall-Rutter (2008) 61–65; Cingano (forthcoming-a).

⁴⁷ According to the usual version of the legend, as can be read in [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.5.7.

⁴⁸ For the problems concerning the interpretation of the text (fr. 222b *PMGF*), see Parsons (1977) 7; West (1978); Bremer (1987); Davies fr. 213–218 *PMGF*; Ugolini (1995) 151–177; Macinnes (2007).

The most legible section of the papyrus contains a speech by the queen (201–231), who explains how Oedipus' heritage should be divided between his sons. Although the introduction to this speech has not been preserved, she must be speaking with Teiresias, who has communicated to her Apollo's prophecies concerning the destiny of her sons (see 209–210: μαντοσύνας δὲ τεὰς ἄναξ ἐκάεργος Ἀπόλλων / μὴ πάσας τέλεσσαι).⁴⁹ There is an allusion to a previous intervention by the soothsayer at 227 in the queen's speech (μάντιος φραδαῖσι θείου, "the considerations of the divine prophet") and he is probably mentioned by the narrator in 234 (Τειρ[ε]σίας τ[ε]ρασπό[λ]ος, "Teiresias, acquainted with prodigies").

It is usually supposed that the Theban legend evolved toward an always greater influence of the Delphic oracle, which displaced native Theban elements such as the seer Teiresias;⁵⁰ the earlier the texts are, the more probable it is that the role played by those elements remains active. An epic text proceeding from the *Epigoni* (fr. 4 GEF) actually speaks about the conflict between the Theban seer and Delphi, personified in the story according to which Manto ("Soothsaying"), Teiresias' daughter,⁵¹ was offered to Delphi by the Argives after their victory during the second expedition against Thebes.⁵² Although the fragment was assigned by its source, a scholium to Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica* (1.308b Wendel), to the *Thebaid*, the text must proceed from the *Epigoni*.⁵³

Teiresias appears again in some conjectures proposed in relation to the reconstruction of the *Thebaid*, the *Epigoni*, and the *Alcmeonis*. The cases of the two latter poems will be discussed first. It is possible that Teiresias had advised the Theban citizens to leave their country and flee in the *Epigoni*, as happens in authors and texts such as Diodorus Siculus, Pausanias, and [Apollodorus'] *Bibliotheca*.⁵⁴ The death of Teiresias at Tilphussa, attested in other sources, could also have been included.⁵⁵ In the case of the *Alcmeonis*, it is possible (albeit it is only another conjecture) that the epic told a different story about Teiresias' daughter. According to the *Epigoni* (see above), Manto went to Delphi and married Rhacius, a man from Colophon; afterward, she went with her husband from

⁴⁹ These verses can be interpreted in two different ways, with the queen addressing Teiresias (Segal 1985) or Apollo (Campbell 1991).

⁵⁰ Robert (1915, 69–70, 107) already commented on the progressive infiltration of Delphi in the Theban saga. The idea was later developed, among others, by Vian (1963) 76–93.

⁵¹ There are no references to Teiresias' ascendants or descendants in Homer. According to [Apollodorus] *Epit.* (3.6.7), he was a descendant of the Spartoi, and so a native of Thebes; Vian (1963, 179) regards this genealogy as an ad hoc invention.

⁵² On this fragment and its implications, see Cingano (forthcoming-b).

⁵³ On this question, see Welcker (1865²) 194; Immisch (1889) 141, n. 1; Cingano (forthcoming-b).

⁵⁴ See Cingano (forthcoming-b) and Diod. Sic. 4.66.4–5.67.1; [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.7.3; Paus. 9.33.1.

⁵⁵ See Cingano (forthcoming-b).

Delphi to Asia Minor and founded in Claros an oracle of Apollo.⁵⁶ The concurring Delphic tradition says that Manto remained in Delphi. This tale, which is to be found in [Apollodorus] (*Bibl.* 3.7.3–4), could have been included in the *Alcmeonis* as an alternative version according to some scholars.⁵⁷

More interestingly, perhaps, there are hints in Attic tragedy that suggest that Teiresias may have played a decisive role during the assault launched by the Seven against Thebes.⁵⁸ When Creon and Teiresias appear together on stage in Sophocles' *Antigone*, they speak allusively⁵⁹ about a previous occasion in which Creon saved the city by following the counsel of Teiresias:

Κρέων· τί δ' ἔστιν, ὦ γεραιὲ Τειρεσία, νέον;
 Τειρεσίας· ἐγὼ διδάξω, καὶ σὺ τῷ μάντει πιθοῦ.
 Κρέων· οὐκ οὐν πάρος γε σῆς ἀπεστάτου φρενός.
 Τειρεσίας· τοιγὰρ δι' ὀρθῆς τήνδ' ἐναυκλήρεις πόλιν.
 Κρέων· ἔχω πεπονθὼς μαρτυρεῖν ὄνησιμα.

Creon: What news do you have, old Teiresias?

Teiresias: I will explain – and you will obey the seer!

Creon: I never shunned your thinking, in the past.

Teiresias: That is why you captained this ship of a city rightly.

Creon: I am a witness, from experience, to your services.⁶⁰

Soph. *Ant.* 991–995

Modern readers may not fully understand what is meant here because of the allusiveness of the verses.⁶¹ Sophocles presupposes in his audience knowledge of events that were perhaps recounted in the epic tradition, maybe in a poem as significant as the *Thebaid*. It has been argued that in that tradition, the soothsayer could have prophesied that the city would be saved only if a son of Creon died.⁶² This son would not have been the young Menoeceus, as in Euripides' *Phoenis-*

⁵⁶ See Immisch (1889); Sakellariou (1958) 152–160; Debiasi (forthcoming).

⁵⁷ See Debiasi (forthcoming), with references to previous bibliography.

⁵⁸ See Sommerstein (forthcoming).

⁵⁹ See also 182–183 and especially 1058 (Teiresias to Creon: ἐξ ἐμοῦ γὰρ τήνδ' ἔχεις σώσας πόλιν); both parallels are mentioned in Sommerstein (forthcoming), the second one in Kamerbeek (1978) 172.

⁶⁰ The translations of the *Antigone* are based (with later adaptations) on Gibbons and Segal (2003).

⁶¹ Kamerbeek (1978, 173) explains that these verses allude to the sacrificial death of a son of Creon, Megareus (see v. 1303): “We have to assume that the audience knew of Megareus’ death as a well-established fact in the legend”.

⁶² See Griffith (1999) 350–351; Sommerstein (forthcoming).

sae, but Megareus, who is mentioned near the end of the play, when a messenger refers to Eurydice's words, also in an allusive way:⁶³

κωκύσασα μὲν
τοῦ πρὶν θανόντος Μεγαρέως κλεινὸν λάχος,
αὐθις δὲ τοῦδε, λοίσθιον δὲ σοὶ κακάς
πράξεις ἐφυμνήσασα τῷ παιδοκτόνῳ.

After she wailed for the empty bed of dead Megareus and for this son, too; and last, she chanted hymns of evil curses on you, killer of sons.

Soph. *Ant.* 1302–1305

If Megareus perished *pro patria sua* in the epic tradition, following Teiresias' prophecy and, perhaps, the counsel of his father,⁶⁴ this would have been an emotive and impressive moment. The Athenian public could very well have been reminded of it by Sophocles' verses.

The evidence in relation to the Theban epics is therefore scanty and elusive. Teiresias is assumed to have been mentioned also in a Trojan poem, the *Nostoi*. When Proclus (*Nost. arg.* 7–9 PEG 1) summarizes it, he says strikingly (because of chronological and thematic reasons) that, after the Trojan War, Teiresias died and was buried in Colophon: οἱ δὲ περὶ Κάλχαντα καὶ Λεοντέα καὶ Πολυποίτην πεζῇ πορευθέντες εἰς Κολοφῶνα Τειρεσίαν ἐνταῦθα τελευτήσαντα θάπτουσι, “The group around Calchas, Leonteus, and Polypeites make their way on foot to Colophon; Teiresias dies there and they bury him”.⁶⁵ This is most likely a textual mistake and Teiresias' name appears instead of Calchas', as suggested by the comparison with [Apollodorus] *Epit.* 6.2: Ἀμφίλοχος δὲ καὶ Κάλχας καὶ Λεοντεύς καὶ Ποδαλείριος καὶ Πολυποίτης ἐν Ἰλίῳ τὰς ναῦς ἀπολιπόντες ἐπὶ Κολοφῶνα πεζῇ πορεύονται, κάκεϊ θάπτουσι Κάλχαντα τὸν μάντιν, “But Amphilochochus, and Calchas, and Leonteus, and Podalirius, and Polypoetes left their ships in Ilium and journeyed by land to Colophon, and there buried Calchas the diviner”.⁶⁶

⁶³ Jebb (1888, 231) thought that Megareus and Menoeceus were the same figure. They must be seen as separate characters according to Sommerstein (forthcoming).

⁶⁴ See Sommerstein (forthcoming). In the *Oedipodeia* (fr. 3 GEF), another son of Creon, Haemon (who in this version, having lived before Oedipus became king of Thebes, clearly could not be Antigone's betrothed), had been killed by the Sphinx.

⁶⁵ West's translation (2003).

⁶⁶ Frazer's translation (1921). See Wilamowitz-Moellendorff (1884) 178; Rzsch (1922) 2426; West (2003) 155; Danek (forthcoming). Mopsus, Teiresias' grandson, was involved in the death of Calchas (see n. 29); the next sentence in [Apollodorus'] text (*Epit.* 6.2) says ἦν γὰρ αὐτῷ <sc., Κάλχαντι> λόγιον τελευτήσειν, ἐὰν ἑαυτοῦ σοφωτέρῳ περιτύχη μάντι.

It was also to be expected that the Theban seer should be mentioned in the *Telegony*, as here Odysseus fulfills what Teiresias prophesies to him in the *Nekyia*. The fragments of the poem do not contain any information concerning the soothsayer but Proclus' summary (*Tel. arg. 7–8 PEG 1*), supplemented by [Apollodorus'] *Epit. 7.34*, says:

ἔπειτα εἰς Ἰθάκην καταπλεύσας τὰς ὑπὸ Τειρεσίου ῥηθείσας τελεῖ θυσίας, καὶ μετὰ ταῦτα εἰς Θεσπρωτοὺς ἀφικνεῖται <καὶ κατὰ τὰς Τειρεσίου μαντείας θυσιάσας ἐξίλασκειται Ποσειδῶνα>.

Then he sails back to Ithaca and performs the sacrifices specified by Teiresias. After this he goes to the land of the Thesprotians <and appeases Poseidon by making sacrifice in accord with Teiresias' prophecies>.⁶⁷

The expression employed by Teiresias in the *Odyssey* when he foretells Odysseus' death (see *Od. 11.134*: θάνατος δέ τοι ἐξ ἄλλος αὐτῷ) was presumably reinterpreted in the *Telegony*, which recounts how Telegonus killed his father Odysseus without knowing their mutual relationship (*Tel. arg. 16 PEG 1*); according to [Apollodorus] *Epit. 7.36*, he did so when he hit Odysseus with his spear, which had at its tip the barb of a sting ray: καὶ Ὀδυσσέα βοηθοῦντα τῷ μετὰ χειρας δόρατι Τηλέγονος <τρυγόνος> κέντρον τὴν αἰχμὴν ἔχοντι τιτρώσκει, καὶ Ὀδυσσεὺς θνήσκει, "When Odysseus comes to defend it, he wounds him with the spear he carries, which has the barb of a sting ray as its point, and Odysseus dies".⁶⁸

Conjecture is a normal part of analyzing epic fragments. It may be even more unavoidable still if the scholar turns to shamanic poetry, as our evidence concerning this genre is scarcer still. Notwithstanding this, in the case of the Hesiodic *Melampodia*, the situation may not be as disappointing as might be expected.⁶⁹ The poem received its name from the seer Melampus and tells of soothsayers like Teiresias, Calchas, and Mopsus.⁷⁰ The fragments of the poem contain the first references to two features of the Theban seer that exceed what may be regarded as natural.

It was a very well-known story in antiquity that Teiresias was born a man, had become a woman after watching the intercourse of two snakes, and converted

⁶⁷ Proclus' and [Apollodorus'] texts are combined in West's edition. See West (2003) 166.

⁶⁸ For this story, its presence in the *Telegony* and the sense of the intertextual relation that connects the Cyclic poem with the *Odyssey*, see Ballabriga (1989); Tsagalis (forthcoming).

⁶⁹ On this poem and Greek shamanic poetry, see Löffler (1963); Huxley (1969) 51–59; Burkert (1983); Ugolini (1995) 33–65; Dillery (2005) 173–178; Lane Fox (2008) 224–223.

⁷⁰ See [Hes.] *Melamp.* fr. 273 M–W (Melampus), fr. 275–276 M–W (Teiresias), fr. 278 M–W (Calchas), fr. 278–279 M–W (Mopsus).

again later into a man.⁷¹ It is also well known what came later: Zeus and Hera argued about the respective pleasure that man and woman take in sexual relations, so they asked Teiresias, the only human being with both experiences. Hera blinded him when she heard his answer, transmitted in this form in the Hesiodic *Melampodia* (fr. 275 M–W)⁷²: οἷν μὲν μοῖραν δέκα μοιρέων τέρπεται ἀνὴρ, / τὰς δέκα δ' ἐμπίλῃσι γυνὴ τέρπουσα νόημα, “in only one portion out of ten portions a man has delight / but the ten a woman fills out, delighting her senses”.⁷³

The supposed life span of the Theban seer is also extraordinary, seven generations according to the *Melampodia* (fr. 276 M–W): μακρόν γέ μ' ἔθικας ἔχειν αἰῶνα βίοιο / ἐπτά τ' ἐπὶ ζῶειν γενεὰς μερόπων ἀνθρώπων, “you who established that I would have a long period of life / and live as long as seven generations of speech-endowed human beings”.⁷⁴ This transgenerational span of Teiresias as a character enables him to know, as already noted above, the reigns of all the Theban kings from Cadmus to Laodamas. This feature is directly linked to his special status as a shaman: Teiresias' longevity and clairvoyance are presented in the texts as compensations Zeus or Athena granted him for his blindness.⁷⁵ Longevity is typical for other shamans or shaman-like figures, as in the case of the Cretan Epimenides, who was supposed to have lived almost three hundred years.⁷⁶

The *Odyssey* does not speak about the transsexual experiences of Teiresias, nor does it speak about a human being living seven times the life of a normal man. This silence is not surprising if the selective character of the Homeric mythology, which usually avoids stories of this kind,⁷⁷ is taken into account, as is clear from the case of the birth of Helen. “Homer” does not speak, like the *Cypria*,⁷⁸ about

⁷¹ For different approaches to the transsexual experiences of Teiresias, see Delcourt (1958); Loraux (1989); Brisson (1997).

⁷² For the alternative version of Teiresias' blindness (Athena blinded him when he saw her naked), see Pherec. fr. 92 EGM; Callim. *Lav. Pall.* 75–84; Nonn. *Dion.* 5.337–345.

⁷³ The translations of the *Melampodia* are those of Most (2007). The fragment is only cited and translated according to [Apollod.] 3.6.7; see also Σ Lyc. 2.226 (Scheer).

⁷⁴ The three first verses of this fragment include the lament of Teiresias, who complains about his long life: Ζεῦ πάτερ, εἴθε μοι εἴθ' ἥσσω μ' αἰῶνα βίοιο / ὠφελλες δοῦναι καὶ ἴσα φρεσὶ μῆδεα ἴδμεν / θνητοῖς ἀνθρώποις· νῦν δ' οὐδέ με τυτθὸν ἔτισας.

⁷⁵ On the relationship between bisexuality and divination, see Delcourt (1958) 33–43; Duplain-Michel (1991); Brisson (1997) 111–112; Loraux (1989), (2010). There may be also a relationship between clairvoyance (wisdom) and longevity (vitality), as Nagler (1980, 103) notes.

⁷⁶ See *FGrHist* 457 T 1, 2, 4 d; Dodds (1951) 140–147; West (1983) 45–53.

⁷⁷ This was the general thesis of Griffin (1977), a contribution which explored the differences between “Homer” and the Cyclic epic. For its critics, see Ballabriga (1989) 301 n. 17; see also Tsagalis (2011a) 214–217.

⁷⁸ See fr. 10 GEF.

Zeus turning into a swan to seduce Nemesis, who had transformed herself into a goose. In the *Cypria*, the goose (Nemesis) laid an egg after being impregnated by Zeus; Leda later got the egg and hatched it until Helen was born.⁷⁹ Whether or not the poet of the *Odyssey* knew myths like this and preferred to overlook them is another matter. A tenuous hint indicates that this could be the case of the transsexual Teiresias. However, at the very least, it should be noted that the long speech he utters in the *Odyssey* (*Od.* 11.100–137) opens the way to the Catalogue of Women (*Od.* 11.225–330), preceded by the dialogue of Odysseus and Anticleia (*Od.* 11.152–224). It seems coherent with the feature under discussion here: Teiresias, a man who had also been a woman, as the audience was probably aware, introduces into the masculine world of the Homeric heroes the feminine elements that have prompted surprise among analytical scholars.⁸⁰ If the audience was aware of the story of the transsexual Teiresias, it would have remembered, despite the Homeric silence, that the seer had been once a Theban woman that could have had theoretically a place of its own in this catalogue.

As regards the visual arts, it seems surprising that Teiresias, such a traditional figure in the Theban legend from our point of view, simply does not feature in archaic iconography: he appears depicted for the first time ca. 450 BC in a red figure crater, in which King Oedipus receives, seated on his throne, the visit of the seer.⁸¹ In a similar chronology (fifth century BC, second third) Teiresias was also represented in Delphi in Polygnotus' *Nekyia*.⁸² Later, there are some illustrations that show Odysseus consulting the dead Teiresias. The author may have had in mind the scene narrated in the *Nekyia*, as in the case with a well-known crater (ca. 380 BC), the work of the Dolon Painter, on which Odysseus is sitting, holding a sword, and staring at Teiresias, whose face emerges from beneath the earth.⁸³ There are only fourteen ancient representations of the Theban seer according to the *LIMC*.

The question is how this silence concerning Teiresias is to be interpreted. Clearly, what is being dealt with once again here is an argument *ex silentio*. Therefore, Teiresias' absence from iconography might be the result of fragmentary evidence. Meanwhile, it cannot be denied that this silence is not what might have been expected *a priori*, just as the fact that the Theban seer features so poorly in the archaic fragmentary epics is likewise unexpected, in light of an analysis of

⁷⁹ See Griffin (1977) 40, 48; Currie (forthcoming).

⁸⁰ See n. 38.

⁸¹ Teiresias 10 *LIMC*. See Schmidt (1982); Schefold and Jung (1989) 61; Zimmermann (1997) 1190–1191.

⁸² Teiresias 1 *LIMC*; see Paus. 10.28.1, 29.8.

⁸³ Teiresias 11 *LIMC*; see Zimmermann (1997) 1190–1191.

his outstanding appearance in the *Odyssey*. It is interesting to draw a comparison and recall that other soothsayers like Melampus or Mopsus are poorly attested in iconography, as is also the case with Calchas despite the role he plays in the *Iliad*.⁸⁴

Provisional Conclusions

The archaic evidence concerning Teiresias has been reviewed and analyzed in this paper. In another work (1995), I have suggested that the *Odyssey* could presuppose in its audience a knowledge of Teiresias through epic poetry; at the same time, that study also acknowledged that the scanty cyclic fragments did not allow definitive proof of this point.⁸⁵ A new examination of the evidence and a broader sample of materials can lead now to new conclusions or at least can suggest some provisional considerations.

In the first instance, it must be stressed that, because of the lack of evidence, it would be conjectural to affirm that the audience of the *Odyssey* knew Teiresias through specific epic poems (e.g., the oral forms of the *Oedipodeia* or the *Thebaid*).⁸⁶ Meanwhile, it may be argued that the rejection of this possibility is based on an argument *ex silentio*. But it is superfluous to explain in this way the knowledge of Teiresias presupposed in the audience of the *Nekyia* when the seer is so clearly attested to in another archaic genre that seems to have been his original “home”, dactylic shamanic poetry.⁸⁷ It should be noted that, when Teiresias appears in the *Odyssey*, the role he may have played as the counselor to Laius or his son is irrelevant. In the Homeric poem, he is characterized as the “Theban” Teiresias, which connects him to the city, not with the Labdacids; he is even “lord Teiresias” (Τειρεσίαο ἄνακτος). In the archaic period, the evidence speaks of him above all as the protagonist of shamanic poetry, which cannot preclude of course

⁸⁴ Melampus is attested in 9 items according to the *LIMC* (see Simon 1992a), Mopsus in 4 (see Simon 1992b); in relation to Melampus, Simon (1992a, 409) observes: “Die Darstellungen der Bildkunst entsprechen nicht seiner Popularität”. Calchas appears in 28 items, the oldest (Calchas 8 *LIMC*) dating to the fifth century BC; see Saldino (1990) 934: “La fortuna iconografica di Calchas appare ... relativamente recente”.

⁸⁵ See Torres (1995) 73–74.

⁸⁶ This idea was central to the approach of Neoanalysis adopted by Torres (1995). See also n. 41 and Torres (forthcoming).

⁸⁷ A modification to Tsagalis (2011a, 236) is being proposed here: Homeric poetry interacted not only with other epic song-traditions – it may also have interacted with other dactylic song-traditions.

his occasional appearance in Theban epics, just as Calchas did in the *Iliad*. The absence of iconography seems to be another feature shared with figures like Calchas, Melampus, and Mopsus.

It is usual to speak about Teiresias as the mythical mediator who resolves contradictions. He is the one who mediates between man and woman, between human beings and gods,⁸⁸ between what is divine and profane, between past and future, between life and death. Some of these mediations do not appear in the Homeric poems, or at least they may be only hinted at, as in the conjectural case of the transsexual Teiresias. At a thematic level, it is also interesting to discover in the Homeric Teiresias the figure who mediates between different sagas, who can establish a link between the Trojan complex and the Theban one, possibly because of his shamanic “potential”. The possibility of linking this fact with the Pan-Hellenic cultural policy of the *Odyssey* should also be taken into account.⁸⁹

Having made my finishing remarks, let me briefly revisit the adjective with which my analysis began: Θηβαῖος. A student of Wolfgang Kullmann told me in 1991 that this could mean that Teiresias was “the man from the *Thebaid*”.⁹⁰ Such a proposal is suggestive but improbable⁹¹ and open to discussion from the point of view of grammar, as “the man from the *Thebaid*” would have been called not Θηβαῖος but probably Θηβαϊδικός. Therefore, it seems that Θηβαίου Τειρεσίαο cannot mean “Teiresias, the man from the *Thebaid*”, but it could mean perhaps “Teiresias, the man of the Theban saga”, though its ultimate meaning was, most likely, “Teiresias, the shaman of Thebes”.

88 Also between human beings and animals, as is usual in the case of other shamans in ancient Greece (Melampus: see [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 1.9.11–12) and many other cultures. For Teiresias’ special relationship with snakes and birds, see above.

89 On Homeric poetry and Pan-Hellenism, see the general considerations of Tsagalis (2011a) 236–237.

90 This is a proposal made by a student (Markus Klämt) in the seminar “Motivgeschichtliche Probleme in der Homerforschung (Neoanalyse)” conducted by Kullmann in Freiburg (Germany). See Torres (1995) 73, n. 150.

91 There are no mentions to the titles of poems in archaic poetry, probably not before Herodotus; see Davison (1968) 79.

Christos Tsagalis

γυναιῶν εἵνεκα δῶρων:

Interformularity and Intertraditionality in Theban and Homeric Epic

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0019

Introduction

One of the most salient issues pertaining to the ongoing debate about written versus oral or oral-derived literature is the discrepancy between repetition and recurrence. Here is a recent presentation of this difference:

To repeat is to do something again, with the rhetorical force of the second and subsequent repetitions stemming from their imitation or echoing of the initial item. On the other hand, to recur is to arise idiomatically – not because of a specific prior occurrence, but rather because the element or pattern is itself associated with the compositional and artistic task and redolent with inherent, embedded meaning. Thus formulas and typical scenes and story-patterns do not repeat in oral traditional epic. Homer does not resort to ‘rosy-fingered dawn’ at any given juncture because he deployed the phrase recently and wishes to capitalize on that salient usage. Nor do the elaborate scenes of feasting in the *Odyssey* or lamentation in the *Iliad* depend primarily on parallel instances that happen to precede them. The *Odyssey* as a whole is one very prominent recurrence of the Return pattern that proliferates throughout Indo-European story traditions. Formulas and typical scenes and story-patterns index the epic tradition, serving as lemmata to a finally untextualizable body of story. In this sense they do not repeat; they idiomatically recur as the poet (re-)makes the poem-instance.¹

If then repetition is intentional, whereas recurrence is symptomatic, are they representative of written versus oral or oral-derived literature or is the general picture rather blurred, as meaningful and intentional repetition can be observed in oral or oral-derived literature and recurrence in written literature? A second question connected with the prior one concerns a particular form of duplication in Greek epic tradition, namely the doublet.² Is the doublet a manifestation of repetition

¹ Foley and Arft (forthcoming).

² See Bowra (1950) 94–96; Schadewaldt (1966³) 150 and n. 2; Fenik (1968) 213–214, (1974) 142–207; Edwards (1987) 50–51, (1991) 19–20; Scodel (2002) 26–27; Kelly (2007).

Christos Tsagalis: Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, E-Mail: christos.tsagalis@gmail.com.

or recurrence? Is it intentional and derivative or symptomatic and formulaic? It is these questions that I will aim to answer by recourse to a telling example of phraseological and thematic duplication in the *Odyssey* that resonates through both the Theban and Trojan sections of the Epic Cycle.

But before I turn my attention to the *Odyssey* and Cyclic epic, I would like to dwell on the theoretical debate around which the following analysis will unfold. The question pertaining to the use of meaningful allusion in early Greek hexameter tradition is a notorious interpretive *crux* that has been treated in divergent ways from different scholars and schools of interpretation. According to oral theory, phraseology and theme are both traditional in the universe of early Greek epic, and as such they do not repeat but only recur. This does not mean that meaningful allusion does not exist for oralists, but that it is created by manipulation of the audience's familiarity with traditional structures. For oralists, meaningful allusion comes 'from within the song' that is *pars pro totum* of the song-tradition it belongs to. For them allusion is never derivative, as the very idea of priority is excluded within the universe of oral song.³ Conversely, neoanalysts argued that the most fundamental form of meaningful allusion in early hexameter poetry is text-based intertextuality, which in the case of Homeric epic takes a very particular form known as 'motif-transference': by studying the function of a motif in the 'target text' neoanalysts trace its 'history' all the way back to the 'source text'. This is made possible, according to the neoanalyst argumentation, because motifs have progressively become particularized to a given context in the stable skeleton of narrative or the *Faktenkanon* of early Greek epic. This distinction between a 'primary' and a 'secondary' text or poem results in the re-use of the motif in a novel, non-traditional way in the 'target text'. For neoanalysts derivative allusion can only result from the genius of the individual poet and requires a level of fixity that can be solely provided by written texts.⁴ According to a third line of interpretation, meaningful allusion of an intertextual nature is possible within the universe of oral poetry. The proponents of this approach argue for an oral neoanalysis and opt for a textless intertextuality.⁵ Meaningful allusion and

³ See, for example, Kelly (2012) 3–24, who stresses the importance of a scene's 'structural grammar' and studies "how the poet manipulates his audience's familiarity with that grammar in order to create uncertainty, excitement, and meaning, to direct, misdirect, and control their response, and on the smallest scales of narrative" (3).

⁴ Some main proponents: Pestalozzi (1945); Kakridis (1949); Kullmann (1960), (1991) 425–455 [= (1992) 100–34], (2002) 162–176; Reichel (1994), (1998) 1–22; Willcock (1997) 174–189; Griffin (1977) 39–53; Currie (2006) 1–45.

⁵ Main proponents: Burgess (1997) 1–19; (2001), (2006) 148–189, (2009); Finkelberg (2000) 1–11, (2011) 197–208; Tsagalis (2008), (2011a) 209–244, (2012a) 309–345.

derivative resonance are fully operable in oral poetry that has reached a degree of fixity by means of *diffusion*, *self-awareness*, *cross-referencing*, and a “*stable skeleton of narrative*”.⁶

Transferred Phraseology and Transferred Motif

My investigation focuses on a case of repeated or recurrent phraseology and repeated or recurrent motif respectively. The phrase γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων is used in *Od.* 11.519–521 (in the context of the *Nekyia*) and 15.243–248 (in the context of the genealogy of the seer Theoclymenus).

ἀλλ' οἶον τὸν Τηλεφίδην κατενῆρατο χαλκῶ,
ἦρω' Εὐρύπυλον, πολλοὶ δ' ἄμφ' αὐτὸν ἑταῖροι
Κήτειοι κτείνοντο γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων.

But well I remember how the heroic Eurypylus son of Telephus fell to his sword, and how many of the Ceteioi, his men-at-arms, were slaughtered at his side, all on account of a bribe that a woman had taken.

Od. 11.519–521

Ἀντιφάτης μὲν ἔτικτεν Οἰκλήα μεγάθυμον,
αὐτὰρ Οἰκλείης λαοσσόον Ἀμφιάραον,
ὃν περὶ κῆρι φίλει Ζεὺς τ' αἰγίοχος καὶ Ἀπόλλων
παντοίην φιλότῃτ' οὐδ' ἔκετο γήραος οὐδόν,
ἀλλ' ὄλετ' ἐν Θήβῃσι γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων.
τοῦ δ' υἱεῖς ἐγένοντ' Ἀλκμαίων Ἀμφίλοχος τε.

Antiphates became the father of the bold Oicles, and Oicles in his turn, of that great leader Amphiararus, a man whom aegis-bearing Zeus and Apollo loved and blessed with every mark of their favour. Even so he never trod the path of old age, but fell at Thebes, the victim of a woman's avarice, leaving two sons, Alcmaon and Amphilocheus.⁷

Od. 15.243–248

Is the expression γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων traditional or has it been constructed by the *Odyssey*? As far as the dictional and metrical constraints of early hexameter poetry are concerned, the phrase γυναίων εἵνεκα δώρων occupies the same metrical position, i.e. after the feminine or trochaic caesura, in verses ending in

⁶ For the term “stable skeleton of narrative”, see Lord (1960/2000²) 99; see also Tsagalis (2011a) 211.

⁷ All translations of *Odyssey* passages are by Rieu (2003) with some modifications.

a strong pause that is marked by the lack of any form of enjambment. In other words, its two sole attestations in the entire Homeric corpus show that it is used at verse-end but also at the end of a short section devoted to a specific motif.⁸ The phrase at hand flags for both singer and audience the completion of a brief thematic unit (*Od.* 11.519–521 and *Od.* 15.243–248) embedded to a larger one, the exploits of Neoptolemus at Troy (*Od.* 11.510–537) and the genealogy of Theoclymenus (*Od.* 15.223–256) respectively.

The epithet γυνάϊων is employed only in these two cases, in Moschus (2.45), and the Orphic *Argonautica* (673: γυνάϊων εἵνεκα φίλτρων) in the whole of Greek literature. In Homer, the word δῶρα (10 times in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*) is attested only three times at verse end,⁹ but it is only in *Od.* 11.521 and 15.248 that is preceded by εἵνεκα. The highly abbreviated and elliptical form of the two references, in which the phrase γυνάϊων εἵνεκα δῶρων belongs, covertly shows that the audience was familiar with the relevant contexts, which it could easily evoke. I believe that these contexts were epic and not lyric or artistic. This is what I have argued elsewhere:¹⁰

The performance context is a decisive factor for screening out the multiplicity of traces and consolidating the function of significant allusion. The practicalities of the performance, few of which are really retrievable today, would have exercised considerable pressure on the interpretation of mythological traces employed in Homeric epic. A useful comparandum may be the example of a modern rock concert. Huge crowds, great enthusiasm that often is out of control, shouting and responding to the rock star's gestures, lack of space between the numerous spectators, standing instead of seating, loud noise, casual or provocative dress-code followed by both the rock band and the spectators are some of the performative circumstances that function as generators and constraints of meaning: the provocative content of many rock songs is thus mirrored on the entire performance procedure and, by extension, on the audience itself. It does not really matter whether spectators belong to different social strata or educational levels. Performance context erases difference and absorbs variation, when the band appears on stage. I would like to argue that performance context was even stronger in archaic Greece as far as epic songs are concerned. A symposium or a religious festival as the locus of the performance, the single bard, the size of the poem, the unchanging tone of the dactylic hexameter, the musical accompaniment of the *phorminx*, the silence of the audience, the duration of the performance, and of course the status of epic song itself would have channeled mythical allusion towards other epic songs performed under similar conditions. As modern rock fans would be tuned to the specific musical universe of a rock festival and not to that of a classical concert (even if both were

⁸ The convergence of phraseological- and motif-completion indicates the existence of a thematic surplus that is both synchronically contextual and diachronically intertextual. See also the last section of this paper.

⁹ In the genitive plural (δῶρων): *Il.* 24.68; *Od.* 11.521; *Od.* 15.248.

¹⁰ Tsagalis (2011a) 231–232.

dealing with the same topic, say love), so ancient audiences would be keyed to a specific epic note, when listening to an epic performance, and not to a lyric performance. Under such conditions, mythological reference equals oral intertextual reference, and oral intertextual reference becomes oral epic allusion.

Is it possible, then, that this phrase has been transferred or adapted from a context¹¹ in which it would specifically refer to the ‘archetypal’,¹² within the universe of archaic Greek epic, deception through bribery, i.e. the case of Eriphyle who is the only figure bribed twice by gifts (by Polyneices and Thersander) in early hexameter poetry?

In fact, our ancient sources inform us that such a transfer was possible and, moreover, was made with respect to the *very same motif*, i.e. ‘the gifts of Eriphyle’. According to Clement (*Strom.* 6.12.7),¹³ Agias of Troezen adapted a verse referring to the gifts of Eriphyle in the *Epigoni*, and used it in a scene relating to Eriphyle in the Underworld that featured in his own poem, the *Nostoi*.

Ἀντιμάχου τε του Τηϊῦ εἰπόντος (*Epig.* fr. 4 PEG 1 = 2 GEF)

ἐκ γὰρ δώρων πολλὰ κακ’ ἀνθρώποισι πέλονται,

Ἄγιας ἐποίησεν (*Nost.* fr. 8 PEG 1 = 7 EGF = 7 GEF)

δῶρα γὰρ ἀνθρώπων νόον ἤπαφεν ἥδ’ ἐ καὶ ἔργα.

And where Antimachus of Teos had said (*Epig.* fr. 4 PEG 1 = 2 GEF)

For from gifts much ill comes to mankind,

Agias wrote: (*Nost.* fr. 8 PEG 1 = 7 EGF = 7 GEF)

For gifts delude peoples minds and (corrupt) their actions.

¹¹ That this context was poetic and not simply mythological can be seen by the “transfer of phrasing”. In this case, allusion not only “embraces the lexical level”, it is also *signalled* in it; on this point, see Currie (2012) 572.

¹² Eriphyle is the “archetype” of the evil woman; see Rivero García (2008) 274–279.

¹³ Clement’s citation must be placed within the context of a standard topic in Christian apologetic literature written in Greek, namely whether the Greeks had taken their knowledge from the Jews. A further ramification of this topic is “Greeks drawing their knowledge from other Greeks”. The “theft of the Greeks” topic seems to dominate in *Stromateis* I and V. This observation has led Bousset (1915) to argue for the existence of an intermediary source, different from his famous “Pantaenus-Quelle” (the notes of Pantaenus that were used and published by his disciple Clement) that had been used in the *Excerpta*, the *Eclogae*, and the *Stromateis* VI and VII. This theory, though refuted by Munck (1933), is not to be wholly discredited, for even if the scenario of the “Pantaenus-Quelle” and intermediary sources are not on the right track, still the stress given to the the topic “theft of the Greeks” is valid.

This example makes it plain that there was transference of phraseology and motif within Cyclic epic, and that the story of Eriphyle was fertile for exactly this kind of resonance between two different epics. Moreover, it shows that transference was possible between the different sub-sections of the Epic Cycle, i.e. the Theban section (*Epigoni*) and the Trojan section (*Nostoi*). The case presented above is also instructive as far as the ‘mechanics’ of transference of phraseology are concerned. The phrase ἐκ γὰρ δώρων ... ἀνθρώποισι (*Epig.* fr. 4 PEG 1 = 2 GEF) has become δῶρα γὰρ ἀνθρώπων (*Nost.* fr. 8 PEG 1 = 7 EGF = 7 GEF), which shows that the key elements of the motif, i.e. gifts (δώρων – δῶρα) and their destructive force on humans (ἀνθρώποισι – ἀνθρώπων) were preserved when the transference was effected, since they belonged to the deep structure of the motif. What is perhaps the most important conclusion one should draw from this example is that the deep structure of the motif (δώρων / δῶρα – ἀνθρώποισι / ἀνθρώπων) is analogous to the Odyssean phrase γυναιῶν εἵνεκα δώρων,¹⁴ and (tellingly enough), the phrase ἐκ γὰρ δώρων of the Cyclic *Epigoni* corresponds exactly to the Odyssean expression εἵνεκα δώρων.

Given that the Cyclic *Epigoni* and the *Nostoi* are later than the *Odyssey* and that the abbreviated form of these references in the *Odyssey* by means of the phrase γυναιῶν εἵνεκα δώρων amounts to mere citations of epic sources, it is plausible that the *Odyssey* has transferred and, perhaps, adapted a motif and its built-in phraseology from an oral epic tradition, where they would have been at home. Since one of the attestations of this motif in the *Odyssey* alludes to the Theban cycle (15.243–248),¹⁵ while the other to the Trojan cycle (11.519–521),¹⁶ it is worth exploring the question pertaining to the reason(s) and way(s) this interconnection was developed in the first place. Once this is done, we will be able to draw some more general conclusions with respect to both the nature and function of the link between the Theban and the Trojan epic traditions.

¹⁴ By “analogous” I posit a certain degree of adaptation: while in the Odyssean passages the emphasis is on the gifts taken by women, in the Cyclic fragments the stress is on humans in general.

¹⁵ The first bribery of Eriphyle by Polyneices belongs to the *Thebaid* (see fr. 7* GEF), but could very well have been mentioned in the *Epigoni* (fr. 4 PEG 1 = 2 GEF) (and *en passant* even in the *Alcmeonis*).

¹⁶ See *Ilias parva* fr. 29 PEG 1 = 6 EGF = 6 GEF. See also Σ *Od.* 11.520–521 (Dindorf).

Going to War: Female Guile and Male Prowess

One of the most important motifs of early hexameter poetry is that of a hero's or heroes' departure for war. The two main strands of martial epic, the Theban and Trojan traditions had placed considerable emphasis on the mustering and departure of the Argive and Achaean armies to Thebes and Troy respectively. Both traditions had also put enormous stress on the departure of individual heroes, whose role in the relevant expeditions was to be crucial. In the Theban tradition, the departure of Amphiaraus in the first, unsuccessful expedition of the Seven, and the subsequent departure of his son Alcmaon in the second, successful expedition of the Epigonoι were integral parts of the stable skeleton of narrative pertaining to the Theban War epic tradition.¹⁷ Knowing, due to his ability as a seer to see the future, that the expedition of the Seven would fail, Amphiaraus was reluctant to take part in the war. But Amphiaraus was bound by oath to follow his wife's (Eriphyle) advice in case there ever was another dispute between himself and Adrastus, since Adrastus had given him his sister Eriphyle as wife (with the proviso that she would arbitrate between them in the future). Taking advantage of this fact, Polyneices, who had convinced Adrastus that an expedition should be organized against Thebes, bribed Eriphyle by offering her the golden necklace of Harmonia, a gift from the gods for Harmonia's marriage to Cadmus. When Eriphyle advised Amphiaraus to take part in the war, he could not refuse, although he knew that the expedition would be unsuccessful. He told his son Alcmaon to avenge his death and departed for Thebes where he died. Before the expedition of the Epigonoι, in which the sons of the Seven attacked and sacked Thebes, Eriphyle attempted to bribe her son Alcmaon by accepting a gift (the robe of Harmonia) from Thersander, Polyneices' son. Alcmaon remembering his father's words for revenge killed his own mother, either before or after the expedition. He then wandered around Greece persecuted by the Erinyes in search of a place on which the sun would not have set his rays. This was the new river banks of Acheloos. Even this cursory narrative makes it plainly clear that the theme of the departure of father (Amphiaraus) and son (Alcmaon) for the war constituted a doublet that dramatized important heroic issues, such as the conflict between fate and heroism, human vanity, love for profit, deception, and revenge.

In the Trojan War epic tradition a hero's departure for war is equally an important theme. According to the *Cypria*, Menelaus and Nestor traveled through Greece to muster an army by reminding various Greek leaders of the oath they

¹⁷ For an excellent review of the legend of Amphiaraus before Pindar, see Braswell (1998) 27–41 with bibliography.

had given to Tyndareos as suitors of Helen, by which they were bound to help Menelaus and Helen in case they were faced with danger.¹⁸ The Trojan War tradition must have thematized the departure of the two key figures of the Trojan expedition, i.e. Achilles and Odysseus, who were not bound by oath to take part in the war. Although the former's willingness to participate in the war was not doubted by either the *Iliad* or the written *Cypria*, a version narrating his hiding at Scyros may have featured in some other oral version of the *Cypria* or in some lyric tradition.¹⁹ In the case of Odysseus, his faked madness that was exposed by Palamedes was undoubtedly narrated by the *Cypria*.²⁰ Although bribery is not linked in the Trojan War tradition with either Achilles or Odysseus, it features with respect to the participation of another important hero in the war, Eurypylus, son of Telephus, the Mysian ally of the Trojans. What makes this information particularly relevant to this investigation is that Eurypylus is killed in Troy by Neoptolemus, Achilles' son who is fetched from Scyros after his father's death. As for Eurypylus, he is convinced to join the Trojans against the Achaeans by his mother, Astyoche, who is bribed by her brother Priam with the golden vine of Dionysus,²¹ the same god who had trapped Telephus' horse in a vine when wounded in the thigh by Achilles during the Teuthranian expedition.²² This connection becomes all the more important, if one bears in mind that Telephus had killed, before being wounded by Achilles, Thersander,²³ one of the Epigonoι who had attempted to bribe Eriphyle with the robe of Harmonia and had joined the expedition to Troy like other Epigonoι (Diomedes, Sthenelus, and Euryalus).

18 [Hes.] *GK* fr. 204.78-85 M-W; [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.10.9; see also Procl. arg. *Cypr.* ll. 118–119 Severyns: ἔπειτα τοὺς ἡγεμόνας ἀθροίζουσιν ἐπελθόντες τὴν Ἑλλάδα (“then they gather the leaders after going around Greece”).

19 On this issue, see Tsagalis (2012c) 257–289, especially 278–283. For an analogy with Amphiaraus' reluctance to participate in the expedition of the Seven, see [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.60.

20 Procl. arg. *Cypr.* ll. 119–121 Severyns: καὶ μαίνεσθαι προσποιησάμενον Ὀδυσσεῖα ἐπὶ τὸ μὴ θέλειν στρατεύεσθαι ἐφώρasan, Παλαμῆδους ὑποθεμένου τὸν υἱὸν Τηλέμαχον ἐπὶ κόλασιν ἐξαρπάσαντες (“and they caught Odysseus pretending to be mad because he was reluctant to take part in the expedition with them, after Palamedes advised them to seize his son with the intention of harming him”).

21 See *Il. parva* fr. 29 PEG 1 = 6 EGF = 6 GEF.

22 *Cypr.* fr. 20 PEG 1. See also Procl. arg. *Cypr.* ll. 127–128 Severyns.

23 Procl. arg. *Cypr.* ll. 126–127 Severyns.

The Typology of the Motif

Amidst a wealth of mythological details, it is crucial (a) to locate the salient or primary features pertaining to the deep structure of the motif, (b) to determine what constitute secondary elements manifested as variations of the deep structure features, (c) to map the way both primary and secondary are interwoven with specific mythical figures in early hexameter poetry, and (d) to detect and pinpoint a number of truly peripheral elements that belong to the “epic staging” of this motif and have been developed when the motif and the mythical figures it had been attached to had become canonical during the process of shaping of epic traditions. This step-by-step process is indispensable for exploring the motif’s full potential as a dynamic mechanism for the production of meaning.

A. Deep Structure

The chief features of the motif ‘woman receives gifts to convince an unwilling hero to go to war’ belongs to the larger story pattern ‘unwilling hero is convinced to go to war’. In the latter women often play a key role, but mainly by being offered as a marriage gift by a third party, so that the hero can be persuaded to join up an expedition or the fighting. Another alternative is to have a woman close to the hero exercise all her persuasive force in order to make him change his mind. In the motif under examination the salient features comprising its deep structure are the following:

- A1. A hero is unwilling to go to war.
- A2. A third party is interested in making the hero take part in the war because he is an excellent warrior.
- A3. A female character, the wife or mother of the hero, is bribed by a third party, in order to convince her husband or son to join the war.
- A4. The hero goes to war.
- A5. The hero dies in the war.

B. Secondary Elements

The secondary features of this motif are in fact internal ramifications developed around the main elements presented above. They never occur all at one given version of the motif but are diffused at random in all its variants.

- B1. The hero's reluctance to join the war is due to the fact that he knows that he will die or because he is bound by an oath.
- B2. A third party offers to a female character associated to the hero a gift made by the gods.
- B3. A third party may or may not be related to the woman.
- B4. The hero may or may not find out about the bribery of his wife or mother.
- B5. The hero does not die in the war, but his ordeal has just begun.

C. Epic Staging: Phase I

In light of the aforementioned lists of primary and secondary features, let us now see how the various elements comprising the motif at hand are distributed within the stable skeleton of Theban and Trojan myth as manifested in early hexameter poetry. The focus will be the tales of Amphiaraus-Alcmaon and Eurypylus.

Amphiaraus was unwilling to join the war (A1) because he knew that the expedition was not supported by the gods (B1), but Polyneices (B3), who wanted him to take part in the expedition due to his excellent fighting skills (A2), bribed his wife (A3) Eriphyle with the golden necklace of Harmonia, a divine gift (B2), in order to convince Amphiaraus to take part in the expedition. Amphiaraus found out about the bribery (B4), but had to go to the war (A4) because he had accepted her as arbitrator between himself and Adrastus, who was supporting Polyneices' cause and was to lead the expedition. Amphiaraus died in the war (A5).

Alcmaon was unwilling to go to the war (A1) because he was angry at his mother Eriphyle, who had been bribed by Polyneices with the golden necklace of Harmonia, in order to persuade Alcmaon's father Amphiaraus to march against Thebes. Eriphyle was bribed again, this time by the son of Polyneices, Thersander (B3), who offered her the golden robe of Harmonia, a divine gift (B2), in order to convince Alcmaon to go to the war (A3), since he was indispensable for an Argive victory against the Thebans (A2). Alcmaon, who knew about the first bribery but did not want to oppose his mother, was convinced and joined the expedition (A4). After sacking Thebes, he returned home and upon discovering that his mother had been bribed a second time (B4), he killed her. Persecuted by the Erinyes, he fled and underwent various troubles until he was finally killed (B5).

Eurypylus was unwilling to go to war (A1) because he had been advised by his father Telephus (B1), who had given this promise to Achilles when he healed the wound he had inflicted to Telephus in the Teuthranian expedition. His mother,

Astyoche, who was the sister of Priam (B3), was bribed by her brother who gave her a golden vine made by Hephaestus (B2),²⁴ in order to convince Eurypylus to assist the Trojans against the Achaeans (A3). Priam had asked Eurypylus for help earlier, since Eurypylus was, like his father, a warrior of first rank (A2), but Eurypylus had refused. Astyoche was able to persuade Eurypylus to join up in the war (A4), where he was killed (A5).

At this first phase of “epic staging”, the primary features of the motif that belong to its core are fused with secondary features that accompany them without changing the motif’s structure.

C. Epic Staging: Phase II

While the blending of primary and secondary features produces variants of the same kernel, another process begins to make itself felt. As the Theban and Trojan War myths have attained a level of stability within the universe of early hexameter poetry, as far as the *Faktenkanon* of events and characters they comprise is concerned, the first phase of “epic staging” was followed by a second one, which amounts to the mere epic contextualization of the motif according to the set of rules and constraints pertaining to the ‘mythical data’ of the Theban and Trojan War traditions. As the motif begins to be tied to particular events and figures of the two great epic traditions, it becomes internally re-contextualized, i.e. it begins to acquire further features that are part and parcel of the epic texture it is incorporated in or it further develops in more detail existing features belonging to the standard mythical armature of certain figures or situations. This phase is characterized by a tendency to enhance the unity of primary and secondary features by creating new associations and analogies, by fully exploiting the ‘epic apparatus’ of traditional song so as to make each singer’s epic idiolect conform to the ‘epic register’ of features and phraseology pertinent to the specific motif.

²⁴ Fr. 29 PEG 1 = 6 EGF = 6 GEF. On Astyoche as Priam’s sister, see [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.146, Serv. on Verg. *Ecl.* 6.72, Quint. Smyrn. 6.135–136, Σ *Od.* 11.521 (Dindorf), Eust. *Od.* 1697.29 (Stallbaum). A different genealogy is given by Dict. Cret. 2.5 and Hyg. *Fab.* 101.5. Eustathius (*Od.* 1697.30–31 [Stallbaum]) leaves open the possibility that the expression γυναιῶν εἴνεκα δώρων may alternatively refer to Hermione, Menelaus’ daughter, offered to Neoptolemus as a future wife, if he would come to Troy. This explication is at odds with the story of the vine in the *Ilias parva* (fr. 29 PEG 1 = 6 EGF = 6 GEF). Moreover, it is not attested in other sources and seems to be Eustathius’ own explanation based on the assumption that γυναικεῖα δώρα (*sic*) may refer to the “female gifts” given to Neoptolemus, not the gifts given to Astyoche.

We can trace this ‘epic register’ with respect to the tales of Amphiaraus-Alcmaon-Eriphyle and Telephus-Eurypylus by locating common or analogous features in the versions of the tales offered by later poets, such as Stesichorus, Archilochus, and Pindar. These similarities and analogies cannot be explained by means of internal imitation between these poets. This is an unavoidable conclusion, since e.g. Archilochus (in the Telephus elegy) cannot have imitated Stesichorus (*Eriphyle*) due to a chronological *non sequitur* nor could Pindar (e.g. *Nem.* 9) have imitated Archilochus with respect to a *different story*. The pairing of these features must have happened earlier and oral epic traditions pertaining to the Theban and Trojan Wars must have been the place where this ‘nesting’ of elements had originated. Such a pairing was not a result of imitation but a much more complex process pertaining to “epic staging” as I had described it above.

In what follows, I will offer a list (with brief analysis) of each one of these features:

Children of the Gods

If taken at face value, the phrases παῖδες τ’ ἁθανάτων (Arch. *P.Oxy* 4708, fr. 1.14) and παῖδες θεῶν (Pind. *Nem.* 9.27–28) do not fit either context, since the former is awkwardly used for the Achaean army in Archilochus and the latter is clearly inappropriate for the fleeing Amphiaraus in Pindar.²⁵ Although there are a number of examples showing that men of the heroic age were collectively called ἡμίθεοι,²⁶ the addition of ἀδελφοί to παῖδες τ’ ἁθανάτων in the Archilochus elegy (fr. 1.14) is unexpected and hard to explain,²⁷ even if its meaning is rather clear having the sense ‘brothers in arms’. A crucial feature in determining whether this phraseology was not only used collectively for men of the heroic age but was particularly applied to some of them is the motif of flight. It is *only* in the Archilochus and Pindar passages that this phraseology is applied to heroes *fleeing from the enemy*. In this light and without rejecting the collective use of the phrase, we may

²⁵ The frustration about the function of these expressions is apparent in the commentaries of both Obbink (2005) and Braswell (1998) for Archilochus and Pindar respectively.

²⁶ *Il.* 12.23; Hes. *WD* 160; [Hes.] fr. 204.100 M-W; Simon. 523.1–2 and id. eleg. 11.18 *IEG*²), τέκνα θεῶν ([Hes.] fr. 204.101 M-W, and παῖδες ... τε φωτῶν καὶ θεῶν (Pind. *Pyth.* 4.13); see D’Alessio (2006) 21 with further examples from the classical period onwards.

²⁷ West (2006) 14 acknowledges that ἀδελφοί is “an unexpected addition” and tries to explain it by saying that “anyone fathered by Zeus would be the half-brother of several gods and goddesses”. Obbink (2005) 36 rightly calls it a “striking collocation” and adds that “the present expression may be an analogous expansion based on cases like Achilles”.

examine cases in which it would have been appropriately employed for *specific* heroes who are the children of gods and are persecuted by an enemy.

Scholars have pointed to Cycnus, son of Ares, who routs Heracles (Stesich. *PMGF* 207) and Aeneas who is persecuted by Achilles (*Il.* 20.89–98 and 188–194; *Cypr.* arg. ll. 160 Severyns and [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.32).²⁸ Let us explore them in detail.

In the Theban tradition, Heracles, son of Zeus, defeats Cycnus, son of Ares, in a chariot race by using his horse Arion, whereas in the Heracles saga it is Cycnus who routs Heracles who in the end defeats him.²⁹ The fact that Arion is a central feature of this episode is of particular interest to our inquiry because in the *Thebaid* he is fathered by Poseidon. Arion is the thematic link between this episode and that of the flight of Adrastus in the expedition of the Seven, since Adrastus is the only one of the Seven who was able to get away alive due to his divine horse.³⁰ The use of the epithet κυανοχαίτη ('sable-haired') for Arion in the *Thebaid* is an indication that his father was Poseidon.³¹ Given that the Heracles-Adrastus link is a strong one in the Theban tradition via Arion, it is no wonder that the "children of gods fleeing" feature was transferred together with Arion from Heracles to Adrastus. Why is it then applied to Amphiarus in Pindar's *Nemean* 9? In my view, it is no coincidence that the Pindaric *gnome* about the children of gods fleeing in the midst of panic is applied to Amphiarus *immediately* before Pindar refers to the imminent blow on the hero's back (i.e. while fleeing) by Periclymenus.³² Given that (a) Adrastus is a son of Talaos, who escapes with his divine horse Arion, fathered by Poseidon (*Theb.* fr. 11 *GEF*), (b) Parthenopaeus, one of the Seven, who is equally a son of Talaos in the *Thebaid* (fr. 10 *GEF*) and so Adrastus' brother, is slain by Periclymenus, and (c) Pindar applies his *gnome* to fleeing Amphiarus before being stabbed in the back by Periclymenus, it is possible that an expression like παῖδες θεῶν/ἀθανάτων καὶ ἀδελφοί 'children of gods/immortals and brothers' would have suited Adrastus and his brother Parthenopaeus fleeing from the enemy. Pindar's earlier reference to Ταλαοῦ παῖδες (*Nem.* 9.14) shows that he may have after all Adrastus and Parthenopaeus in mind. Since he is offering a positive presentation of Adrastus who is associated in the Ode with Chromius to whom

²⁸ See Braswell (1998) 97.

²⁹ Heracles defeats Cycnus in a chariot race: *Theb.* fr. 7–8 *PEG* 1 = fr. 6 *EGF* = fr. 11 *GEF*; Cycnus routs Heracles: Stesich. *PMGF* 207; Pind. *Ol.* 10.15–16; Σ Pind. *Ol.* 10.19a–b, 20, 21a (I 315.22–316.12, 316.18–19, 316.20–317.2 Drachmann).

³⁰ The association has been made by Σ (D) *Il.* 23.346 (van Thiel). See Severyns (1928) 220–221.

³¹ See Paus. 8.25.7–8: "εἴματα λυγρὰ φέρων σὺν Ἀρίονι κυανοχαίτη." αἰνίσσασθαι οὖν ἐθέλουσι τὰ ἔπη Ποσειδῶνα Ἀρίονι εἶναι πατέρα ("his clothes in sorry state, with Arion the sable-haired". So they want the verse to hint that Poseidon was father to Arion").

³² *Nem.* 9.22–27; see also [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.77: Ἀμφιαράω δὲ φεύγοντι παρὰ ποταμὸν Ἰσμηνὸν ... καὶ Ζεὺς ἀθάνατον αὐτὸν ἐποίησεν.

the epinician is dedicated, Pindar would have liked to downplay Adrastus' flight. This line of interpretation is further strengthened if we take into consideration that Pindar has followed the same practice in the case of the lack of propitious omens (Zeus' failure to lighten at the moment the Seven were ready to depart for Thebes).³³ Seen from this vantage point, the transfer of a form of the expression 'children of gods *fleeing*' to Amphiaraus seems a reasonable choice.

In the Trojan tradition this feature is interwoven with the role of Achilles, the more so since in the *Cypria* he routs both Telephus,³⁴ son of Heracles, and especially Cynus,³⁵ son of Poseidon, when the Achaeans land at Troy (inner doublet).³⁶ That this association was operative in antiquity is clearly seen in the poetry of Pindar, who stresses by means of a series of rhetorical questions in asyndeton that Cynus, Hector, Memnon, and Telephus were all killed by Achilles.³⁷

Is it a coincidence that the two heroes Achilles routs in the *Cypria* (Telephus and Cynus, the former trying to escape on his horse) are linked with the Heracles-Cynus episode in the Theban tradition, Telephus being Heracles' son and Cynus being the son of Poseidon whose horse Arion had made Heracles victorious over the other Cynus, son of Ares? In fact, the Achilles-Cynus encounter offers a strong parallel of how the phrase παῖδες θεῶν/ἀθανάτων may have been used for both collective and hero-specific routing pertaining to the same episode, since in the *Cypria* Achilles routs the Trojans immediately after killing Cynus: ἔπειτα Ἀχιλλεύς αὐτοὺς τρέπεται ἀνελῶν Κύκνον τὸν Ποσειδῶνος (*Cypr.* arg. ll. 149–150 Severyns). Although technically Telephus is the son of a demi-god (Heracles) and grandson of a god (Zeus), the inner doublet with Cynus (Telephus and Cynus being the main warriors³⁸ of the *Cypria* killed by Achilles) may have led to the transfer of this phraseology to him as well. Seen from this angle, Archilochus'

³³ See Braswell (1998) 81–82.

³⁴ Fr. 20 PEG 1 (= Σ Il. 1.59 [Erbse]): ... ὀρμήσαντος δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὸν (sc. τὸν Τηλεφον) Ἀχιλλέως οὐ μείνας ἐδιώκετο.

³⁵ See Janko (1986) 56, who rightly claims that "[t]he association [of Cynus] with Achilles, a Thessalian hero, accords with the usual [Thessalian] location of our [the one associated to the Heracles saga] Cynus; the Cyni were originally one and the same"; see also Robert (1924⁴) 81–82.

³⁶ *Cypr.* arg. ll. 149–150 Severyns. In addition, Achilles made Aeneas, son of Aphrodite, flee (*Cypr.* arg. l. 160 Severyns and [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.32).

³⁷ Pind. *Isth.* 5.39–42: λέγε, τίνες Κύκνον, τίνες Ἑκτορα πέφνον, / καὶ στράταρχον Αἰθίοπων ἄφοβον / Μέμνονα χαλκοῶραν· τίς ἄρ' ἐσλὸν Τηλεφον / τρώσεν ἐφ' ὁδοῖ Καῖκου παρ' ὄχθαις; ("say, who slew Cynus, who Hector and the fearless leader of the Ethiopians, Memnon of the bronze armor? Who wounded brave Telephus with his own spear by the banks of Caycos?"); see also: Σ Pind. *Isth.* 5.48a–b (III 246.3–17 Drachmann).

³⁸ Next to Troilus, another son of a god.

application of the expression to the fleeing Achaeans may be an adaptation of this phraseology from an epic featuring Achilles routing Telephus, Cycnus,³⁹ and the Trojans. But what about the use of ἀδελφοί after παῖδες ἀθανάτων in Archilochus' elegy? Is it possible that the Theban and Trojan traditions shared such a feature? This answer escapes us due to lack of information but some thoughts about a possible bridge between the two traditions are under way.

The historical reality lurking behind Cycnus, son of Poseidon, is instructive. If Kukunnis was Alaksandus' predecessor as king of Wilusa,⁴⁰ his equation in early Greek mythical tradition with Cycnus is telling. The aural similarity between Kukunnis and Cycnus explains only part of the story, since it leaves in the dark the question pertaining to his being identified with Cycnus the son of Poseidon, and not Cycnus the son of Ares. I think that the reason is straightforward. Although Heracles had sacked Troy for the first time,⁴¹ his entire mythical entourage (even that belonging to non-Trojan adventures like the defeat of Cycnus, son of Ares) could not be carried wholesale to the second expedition in which he had no role. The great hero of the new expedition against Troy was Achilles, who had somehow to show himself worthy of the great exploits of his predecessor. Being both children of gods, the analogy between them was enhanced even more. When the Aeolian settlers of the western part of Asia Minor next to Lesbos started hearing stories about a great king of Wilusa named Kukunnis, they had to make him confront their great hero, Achilles. The story of Heracles, who had sacked Troy first because of the divine horses promised but not given to him by Laomedon, gave them a nice example to compete with. Cycnus, son of Ares, defeated by Heracles who had a divine horse Arion, fathered by Poseidon, became Cycnus son of Poseidon whom Achilles, their own hero, would defeat, as he had defeated Telephus, Heracles' son. The change of father between the two 'Cycni' reflects an effort to make them fit to the mythical saga they belong: as Ares' role in Theban myth was well founded, since the first event of this saga was the marriage of his daughter Harmonia to Cadmus,⁴² so Poseidon loomed large in Trojan myth, given

³⁹ On Cycnus, see West (2011) 40–41.

⁴⁰ West (2011) 40.

⁴¹ On the "epic biography" (Homeric and Hesiodic) of Heracles, see Bernardini (2010) 387–391. On his presence in the "epos minore" of the archaic period, see Bernardini (2010) 392–400.

⁴² The Theban and Trojan traditions were also paired by means of Cadmus and Peleus, in whose weddings to the daughter of a god (Harmonia, daughter of Ares, and Nereus' daughter Thetis) lie their very beginnings. See Pind. *Ol.* 2.78–83: Πηλεὺς τε καὶ Κάδμος ἐν τοῖσιν ἀλέγονται / Ἀχιλλέα τ' ἔνεικ', ἐπεὶ Ζηνὸς ἦτορ / λιταῖς ἔπεισε, μάτηρ· / ὃς Ἑκτορα σφάλε, Τροίας / ἄμαχον ἀστραβὴ κίονα, Κύκνον τε θανάτῳ πόρεν, / Ἀοῦς τε παῖδ' Αἰθιοπα ("Both Peleus and Cadmus are numbered among them; and his mother, since she persuaded Zeus' heart with prayers, carried Achilles there, who felled Hector, the invincible, upright column of Troy, and gave death

that he had built (together with Apollo and Achilles' grandfather Aeacus)⁴³ the walls of the city that Heracles sacked, the very walls Achilles would fail to take. By having Achilles fight against Cynus, Poseidon's son, the Trojan War tradition recalled the god's role in the early mythical history of Troy.⁴⁴

In this light, it is not unthinkable that if Heracles' Arion became the vehicle for the transfer of phraseology and features to the myth of the Seven, then given Heracles' association to Achilles and the Trojan saga, some of these features could also be transferred to the Trojan myth as well. Telephus and Cynus were strong connecting points.

Flight

The motif of flight in the expedition of the Seven is associated with the successful flight of Adrastus who escapes because of his horse Arion (fr. 7–8 *PEG* 1 = fr. 6 *EGF* = fr. 11 *GEF*), the unsuccessful flight of Amphiaraus who is 'saved' from his opponent Periclymenus, his body disappearing under the earth⁴⁵

to Cynus, the Aethiopean son of Eos"); see also Σ Pind. *Ol.* 2.147a–e, 148 (I 96.19–97.5, 97.6–11 Drachmann). For the weddings of Cadmus and Peleus in Pindar, see *Pyth.* 3.88–95 and, for the marriage of Peleus, *Nem.* 4.66–68. See also Ov. *Met.* 12.86–94, where Cynus highlights the gap of power between his own father Poseidon *qui / Nereaque et natas et totum temperat aequor* (12.93–94: "who rules both Nereus and his daughters and the whole sea besides") and Achilles' "lower-level" divine ancestor, Nereus (with the analysis of Papaioannou (2007) 59–67).

43 See Pind. *Ol.* 8.30–44, where it is also stated that Troy would fall because part of the walls was built by the mortal Aeacus; see Σ Pind. *Ol.* 8.41a–b, 44a–d (I 247.6–24, 248.6–18 Drachmann).

44 It is perhaps not a matter of sheer chance that both Achilles' father Peleus and Amphiaraus' father Oecles took part with Heracles in the first expedition against Troy. Heracles, who had saved Troy (together with Telamon and Oecles) from a sea monster sent by Poseidon because Laomedon did not pay him back for building the walls of Troy (*Il.* 7.451–453; 20.145–148; 21.442–457), was also deceived by Laomedon who had agreed to give him the horses his ancestor Tros had received from Zeus as compensation for his abduction of Ganymedes. When Heracles came back later with a whole army, he sacked Troy and slew all of Laomedon's sons (who had earlier killed Oecles trying to protect the Greek ships) with the exception of Podarces who saved himself by giving Heracles Hesione's golden veil and was renamed Priam ([Apollod.] *Bibl.* 2.134–136).

45 For the topic of the vanishing body of a hero, see Coppola (2008), especially (for Adrastus and Melanippus in Sicily) 147–148; for the disappearance of Amphiaraus' body, see Bener (1945) 47–50; Currie (2005) 212. Within the larger framework of the Amphiaraus-Achilles analogy, it is interesting to note that in the Cyclic *Aethiopis* (arg. ll. 199–200 Severyns) Achilles' body is transferred to the White Island after his death by his mother Thetis.

and immortalized (Pind. *Nem.* 9.24–27),⁴⁶ and of course the defeat of the Seven.⁴⁷

In the abortive expedition to Teuthrania, the Achaeans flee under the attack of Telephus,⁴⁸ but when Achilles fights back, the Mysian king flees and is wounded in the thigh by Achilles' spear (*Cypr. arg.* ll. 125–128 Severyns; [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.17; cf. Σ (D) *Il.* 1.59 [van Thiel]). We now know that Archilochus had referred (*IEG* fr. 304) to Neoptolemus dancing the *pyrrhiche* after the defeat of Eurypylus and, as West has suggested, this reference may have occurred in the lost part of the Telephus elegy, by reminding his audience “how the Telephus saga ended: with the hero's son slain and his opponent performing a victory dance”.⁴⁹ If this suggestion holds true, then it is not unthinkable, given that Archilochus “will not have been the first to connect the *pyrrhiche* with Pyrrhos”,⁵⁰ that he may have taken both his version of the Telephus episode and the final victory of Neoptolemus/Pyrrhus over Eurypylus from a lost epic or pair of epics relating the entire Telephus myth from the arrival of the Achaeans in Mysia to the death of Eurypylus in Troy. Along these lines and given that Eurypylus' arrival at Troy is described in terms of an *aristeia* (*Il. parva* arg. ll. 219–221 Severyns: Εὐρύπυλος δὲ ὁ Τηλέφου ἐπικούρος τοῖς Τρωσὶ παραγίνεται, καὶ ἀριστεύοντα αὐτὸν ἀποκτείνει Νεοπτόλεμος), it is not unthinkable that in this lost epic Eurypylus may also have routed the Achaeans,⁵¹ before being killed by Neoptolemus, just as his father Telephus had routed them in Mysia, before being wounded by Neoptolemus' father Achilles.

Since these episodes belonged to the *Faktenkanon* of early epic, the use of analogous phraseology in Pindar (*Nem.* 9.26–27: ἐν γὰρ δαίμονιοισι φόβοις φεύγοντι καὶ παῖδες θεῶν) and Archilochus' elegy on Telephus (φεύγ[ειν δέ τις ὤρη] (3) – ἐφόβησε (6) – ἐφόβει (7) – φύζαν (24)) points to the sharing of the same feature *within the scope of the same motif* linking the stories of Amphiarus-Eriphyle-Alcmaon and Telephus-Astyoche-Eurypylus.

⁴⁶ See also Pind. *Ol.* 6.12–17; *Nem.* 10.8–9.

⁴⁷ The ‘flight’ feature is also used, in a different scope, earlier in the same Pindaric ode (*Nem.* 9.13: φεύγε γὰρ Ἀμφιάρην) with respect to Adrastus' fleeing from Amphiarus before the expedition to Thebes; see D'Alessio (2006) 20.

⁴⁸ See [Hes.] *GK.* fr. 165.14–15 M-W: αὐτὰρ Τηλέφος] ἔτραπ' Ἀχαιῶν χαλκοχιτών[ων and (perhaps) 165.20 M-W: πεφοβημένῳ].

⁴⁹ West (2006) 17.

⁵⁰ West (2006) 17.

⁵¹ See Fowler (2013) 542, who rightly notes that “the Odyssey passage and a depiction of Eurypylus slain by Neoptolemos on a late sixth-century hydria (*LIMC* Eurypylos no. 1) indicate the same conclusion”.

Μόνος

Although a hero's exceptional prowess in war is typically presented as a characteristic he alone possesses in contrast to the rest of the army, it seems to have been put into a specific use in the context of the Theban and Trojan myths. In the expedition of the Seven, Adrastus is the only one who survives (*Theb. PEG* 1 fr. 7–8 = fr. 6 *EGF* = fr. 11 *GEF*; [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.60). His good fortune is reversed in the expedition of the Epigonoι, since his son Aegialeus is the only one dying at the hands of Laodamas (Pind. *Pyth.* 8.51–53: Ἄδραστος ἥρωες· τὸ δὲ οἴκοθεν / ἀντία πράξει. μόνος γὰρ ἐκ Δαναῶν στρατοῦ / θανόντος ὅστέα λέξαις υἱοῦ; [Apollod.] 3.83: καὶ Λαοδάμας Αἰγιαλέα κτείνει). In the Telephus myth, the Archilochus elegy stresses the fact that Telephus *alone* was able to put the Achaeans into flight:

P.Oxy. 4708

fr. 1.5: καὶ ποτ[ε] μ]οῦνος ἐὼν Τήλεφος Ἀρκα[σίδης]

fr. 1.25: ἦ]βριδε[ν μο]ῦνος

The same feature is employed by Pindar (*Ol.* 9.70–73) with respect to Patroclus standing with Achilles against Telephus,⁵² at a point when the Mysian king has routed the rest of the Danaans to their ships:

τοῦ παῖς ἄμ' Ἀτρεΐδαις / Τεϋθραντος πεδῖον μολῶν ἔστα σὺν Ἀχιλλεΐ / μόνος, ὅτ' ἀλκ<άε>ντας
Δαναοὺς τρέψαις ἀλίσαισιν / πρύμναις Τήλεφος ἔμβαλεν.

whose son, brought with the Atreidae in the plain of Teuthras, stood by Achilles alone, when Telephus routing the mighty Danaans hurled them against their beached ships.

The multiple similarities between *Ol.* 9.70–73 and Archilochus' elegy on Telephus (fr. 1.7: ἄλκιμ[οι] – *Ol.* 9.72: ἀλκ<άε>ντας; 1.12: προ[τ]ροπάδην – *Ol.* 9.72: τρέψαις; 1.13: ἐς νέας ὡ[κ]υπόρ[ο]υς – *Ol.* 9.72–73: ἀλίσαισιν / πρύμναις) are indicative of the fact that both Archilochus and Pindar draw on an earlier epic on Telephus. The μόνος feature is also applied to Patroclus⁵³ (and Achilles) standing on their ground to fight Telephus. In this light, this earlier epic and the Theban epic tradition may have shared the analogy of the solitary fate of individual heroes, such as Adrastus, Aegialeus, Telephus, and Achilles when faced with great danger. Once more, the symmetrical development is more about *situations* than *individuals*.

⁵² See below under 'Healing'.

⁵³ On the role of Patroclus in this episode, see below under 'Healing'.

Horses

In the Theban tradition, Heracles with his horse Arion defeats Cycnus, son of Ares, and Adrastus escapes with the help of the same horse (*PEG* 1 fr. 7–8 = fr. 6 *EGF* = fr. 11 *GEF*), while Amphiaraus fails to flee with his chariot (Pind. *Ol.* 6.13–14; *Nem.* 9.24–27). In the Telephus episode in the Trojan tradition, Telephus fails to escape on horseback from Achilles (*PEG* fr. 20 (II) = Eust. ad *Il.* p. 46.36). Other authorities (Σ (D) *Il.* 1.59 [van Thiel] and [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.17) do not mention Telephus' horse but refer to his running away and pursuit by Achilles.

(a) Eust. ad *Il.* p. 46.36:

πέπονθε δὲ τραῦμα δεινὸν ὑπὸ Ἀχιλλέως ἀμπέλου ἔλικι συμποδισθέντος αὐτῷ τοῦ ἵππου κατὰ Διονύσου πρόνοιαν καὶ πεσόντος εἰς γῆν.

He suffered a terrible wound by Achilles, when his horse was entangled in the tendril of a vine, according to the forecast of Dionysus, and fell to the ground.

(b) Σ (D) *Il.* 1.59 (van Thiel):

ὀρμήσαντος δὲ ἐπ' αὐτὸν τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως οὐ μείνας ἐδιώκετο· ἐν δὲ τῷ τρέχειν ἐμπλακεῖς ἀμπέλου κλήματι τὸν μηρὸν τιτρώσκεται, νεμεσήσαντος αὐτῷ Διονύσου, ὅτι ἄρα ὑπὸ τούτου τιμῶν ἀφῆρητο.

After Achilles rushed on him, he did not hold his ground and was pursued; while running he was entangled in a vine and wounded on his thigh, Dionysus being angered at him, because he had deprived him from due honor.

(c) [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.17

ὀρμήσαντος δὲ Ἀχιλλέως ἐπ' αὐτὸν οὐ μείνας ἐδιώκετο· καὶ διωκόμενος ἐμπλακεῖς εἰς ἀμπέλου κλῆμα τὸν μηρὸν τιτρώσκεται δόρατι.

After Achilles rushed on him, he did not hold his ground and was pursued; while being pursued he was entangled in a vine and wounded on his thigh by a spear.

The phrasing in these two last sources is so similar that they must be drawing on a common source. Since [Apollodorus] has omitted the reference to Dionysus, which is attested in both Eustathius and the Σ (D) *Il.* 1.59 (van Thiel),⁵⁴ then it is probable that Eustathius' version is the most accurate. This line of thought is central to the role played by the horses in this episode, given the overall contextualization of this motif. In fact, if the son of Thetis was chasing Telephus with his own chariot, driven by the divine horses Balios and Xanthos, who were Posei-

⁵⁴ See above sources (a) and (b).

don's gifts in the wedding of his father Peleus,⁵⁵ the sequence Poseidon > Heracles > Adrastus (Arion) in the Theban tradition would correspond to the sequence Poseidon > Peleus > Achilles (Xanthos and Balios) in the Trojan tradition.⁵⁶ Poseidon's horse(s) would guarantee the success of their owner, whereas their lack would make even the son of Heracles (Telephus) fail to escape, very much unlike Adrastus. In this way, the entire epic contextualization of this feature would gain in depth. Furthermore, the substitution of the immortal horses of Tros (given to him by Zeus in compensation for the abduction of his son Ganymedes), a version followed by the *Iliad* (5.265–267), by a divine vine made by Hephaestus (and given to Zeus) in the *Ilias parva* (PEG 1 fr. 29) would be indicative of the effort of this cyclic poem not just to disagree with the Iliadic tradition, but also to remind audiences that Eurypylus would go to his death by means of a Dionysiac vine (ἄμπελος), exactly like his father Telephus. Like father, like son.⁵⁷

Seen from this vantage point, the stress put by both Archilochus and Pindar on the armies of the Achaeans and the Seven *going to their ruin, men and horses alike*, is far from accidental (Arch. *P.Oxy.* 4708, fr. 1.18–19: ... [μ]ένος πνείοντες ὁμῶς αὐτοῖ[τε καὶ ἵπποι / ἄφ[ραδι]ηι, μεγάλως θυμὸν ἀκηχέ[μενοι]⁵⁸ / Pind. *Nem.*

55 See *Cypr.* PEG 1 fr. 3 (= fr. 3 EGF = fr. 4 GEF).

56 In this light, I would like to draw attention to the fact that after Xanthos talks to Achilles in *Il.* 19.408–417, the narrator caps the horse's speech by referring to the Erinyes who put an end to his talking ability, given to him by Hera (*Il.* 19.407). Dietrich (1964, 9–24) has argued that the Erinyes are involved because they are associated with the Harpyiai (*Σ Il.* 23.347), one of whom (Podarge) had fathered to Zephyrus Achilles' horses Xanthos and Balios. In my view the analogy is telling. Let us not forget that Arion was born to Erinyes and Poseidon (*Theb.* fr. 7–8 PEG 1 = 6 EGF = 11 GEF). Edwards (1991, 285; see also Heubeck 1986, 154) argued that the Erinyes may have acted in this way “not to end the unnatural phenomenon of a talking horse [...] but to prevent the disclosure of some secret or prophecy which must not be revealed to mortals; this may have been their rôle in the obscure Melampous story (*Od.* 11.291–3, 15.234)”. Another potential explanation is that what we see here in *Il.* 19.408–417 is analogous to what may have happened in the Theban epic tradition with respect to Arion. Is it possible that Arion told Adrastus that the rest of the Seven would perish and that only he would survive? The tradition of the *Iliad* (that is aware of Arion's divine parentage [23.347]) may be reflecting such a story. This would explain why Hera is the one who makes Xanthos speak (*Il.* 19.407). In Theban epic, the pro-Argive and anti-Theban Hera may have done the same with Arion at the crucial moment of the fall of the Seven, so as to tell Adrastus that it is time for him to flee.

57 See Kelly (forthcoming): “the *Ilias parva* is also capable of open disagreement with its Homeric predecessor, e.g. substituting the immortal horses given by Zeus as compensation for Ganymedes' rape (*Il.* 5.265–7) with a golden vine made by Hephaestus (PEG 1 fr. 29)”.

58 “Breathing ferocity, they [and their horses] alike, in their [f]olly, greatly sore at heart” (transl. by West, 2006, 12).

9.21–22: φαινομένην δ' ἄρ' ἔς ἄταν σπεῦδεν ὄμιλος ἰκέσθαι / χαλκίοις ὅπλοισιν ἱππείοις τε σὺν ἔντεσιν).⁵⁹

Heroic Foreknowledge

Being a seer, Amphiaraus was aware that the expedition of the Seven was doomed to fail and that he would die in the war,⁶⁰ but he had to join up. Pindar probably knew by means of the cyclic *Thebaid* that Zeus' failure to lighten at the moment the Seven were ready to depart for Thebes was a sign known to the seer Amphiaraus.⁶¹ Although a similar feature marks the beginning of the Achaeans' abortive expedition to Teuthrania, since Calchas⁶² informed the army that this was a sign sent by Zeus,⁶³ just as with Amphiaraus before the departure of the Seven, and that it would take them ten years to sack Troy, the analogy is rather typological and not derivative or specific. On the other hand, Telephus seems to be the hypostasis of 'ein wissende Dämon' (a knowledgeable demon) with con-

59 "but this crowd hastened to its plainly-shown destruction with bronze armor and horses and weapons". Pindar's emphasis on horses in this Ode ties well with the fact that Chromius was victor in the chariot-race. On the other hand, ll. 80–81 reflect the typical motif of "all forms of combat" (see Sappho fr. 16.1–2 Voigt).

60 [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.60: Ἀμφιάραος δὲ ὁ Οἰκλέους, μάντις ὣν καὶ προειδῶς ὅτι δεῖ πάντας τοὺς στρατευσάμενους χωρὶς Ἀδράστου τελευτῆσαι, αὐτὸς τε ὤκνει στρατεῦσθαι καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἀπέτρεπε. It is also worth observing that what is said by Pindar (*Pyth.* 8.50: ὄρνιχος ἀγγελία; *Nem.* 9.18–19: αἰσιᾶν / οὐ κατ' ὀρνίχων ὁδόν) parallels what is said by Aeschylus (*Sept.* 597: τοῦ ξυναλλάσσοντος ὄρνιθος βροτοῖς) in reference to Amphiaraus and his prediction that the expedition was doomed to fail. Another striking parallel attested in exactly the same context in both Pindar's *Nem.* 9 and Aesch. *Sept.* is the expression πῖαναν καπνόν (*Nem.* 9.23) and τήνδε πῖανῶ χθόνα (*Sept.* 587), again in the context of Amphiaraus' involvement in the expedition. Since the *Septem* is dated to 467 BC, it seems that Aeschylus is imitating Pindar with respect to *Nem.* 9 (474? BC). But how are we then to explain that with respect to the other parallel between Pindar and Aeschylus concerning Amphiaraus (*Ol.* 6.17: ἀμφοτέρων μάντιν τ' ἀγαθὸν καὶ / δουρὶ μάρνασθαι – *Sept.* 569: ἀλκὴν ἄριστον μάντιν, Ἀμφιάρεω βίαν)? The time difference is extremely tight (*Ol.* 6.15: 468 BC – *Sept.* 467 BC) and, what is more significant, we know that (according to the Σ Pind. *Ol.* 6.15) Asclepiades of Mirlea said that this verse was taken from the Cyclic *Thebaid* (PEG 1 fr. 10 = 7 EGF = 6 GEF). Drawing material from different Pindaric epinician odes with respect to a single character (Amphiaraus) and piling them in the same passage of the same work (*Septem*) seems to me less likely for Aeschylus than adapting this material directly from the *Thebaid*.

61 See Braswell (1998) 81.

62 *Cypr.* arg. ll. 122–124 Severyns; [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.15.

63 κατὰ Διὸς βούλησιν γεγονέναι αὐτοῖς τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο.

nections to the Underworld through (mainly but not solely)⁶⁴ the adventures of his father Heracles with respect to cattle-rustling and the world of the dead.⁶⁵ His knowledge of the way the Achaeans should follow to reach Troy is telling in this respect.⁶⁶

According to the prophecy of Amphiaraus (Pind. *Pyth.* 8.44–55),⁶⁷ Alcmaon should lead the expedition of the Epigonoι in order to sack Thebes. Pindar's version is compatible with another piece of information relating that Amphiaraus advised his other son Amphilochus as well by means of the so-called 'norm of the polyp', according to which his son should be, octopus-like, adaptable 'to whatever people he comes along'.⁶⁸ Given that this prophecy cannot have been given to Alcmaon and Amphilochus when Amphiaraus was departing for the war, since Alcmaon was only a boy and Amphilochus a baby,⁶⁹ the most likely context for Amphiaraus' appearance from his underground oracle to both his sons, who were now grown up men and skilled warriors, would have been an oracular consultation before the sack of Thebes by the Epigonoι, an episode that must have featured in the *Alcmeonis*.⁷⁰

Likewise in the Trojan tradition, in which according to the prophecy of Helenus ([Apollod.] *Epit.* 5.9),⁷¹ Neoptolemus (like Alcmaon) should come to Troy (among other things), so that the city can be sacked. Amphiaraus' appearance to his son is equally paralleled by Achilles' to Neoptolemus⁷² just after the latter's arrival from Scyros to Troy and immediately before his military exploits, among

64 Davies (2000, 9 n. 16) notes that the name of Telephus' son Eurypylus can be traced back to associations with the Underworld. Interestingly enough, Telephus' father Heracles has, after the first sack of Troy, fought against the Coans and their king Eurypylus. The name may have been transferred to Heracles' grandson from that adventure.

65 Davies (2000) 9, n. 16.

66 Amphiaraus may be treated as a hypostasis of a chthonic Poseidon or a Hades who is confused with Dionysus. On his association to chthonic Erinyes, see Legras (1905) 12–13. Interestingly enough, in *Od.* 15.244 he is modified by the epithet λαοσσός ("rousing/stirring the nations"), which is regularly employed for war-deities (Ares: *Il.* 17.398; Eris: *Il.* 20.48; Athena: *Il.* 13.128, *Od.* 22.210; Apollo: *Il.* 20.79).

67 See also Pind. *Pyth.* 8.39–43.

68 "πουλύποδός μοι, τέκνον, ἔχων νόον, Ἀμφίλοχ' ἦρως, / τοῖσιν ἐφαρμόζειν, τῶν κεν κατὰ δῆμον ἵκηται, / ἄλλοτε δ' ἄλλοις τελέθειν καὶ χροῖνι ἐπεσθαι" (*Theb.* PEG 1 fr. 4 = "Hom." 3 EGF = *8 GEF). I am following Debiasi (2013, 195–207; also forthcoming), who attributes this fragment to the *Alcmeonis*.

69 See Gantz (1993) 507.

70 See Debiasi (2013) 195–207; (forthcoming).

71 See also the compressed version of this prophecy in *Il. parva* arg. ll. 211–213 Severyns.

72 *Il. parva* arg. ll. 217–218 Severyns: καὶ Νεοπτόλεμον ἐκ Σκύρου ἀγαγὼν τὰ ὅπλα δίδωσι τὰ τοῦ πατρός· καὶ Ἀχιλλεύς αὐτῷ φαντάζεται.

which the killing of Telephus' son Eurypylus is the most prominent one. It is to be noted that when Achilles appears to Neoptolemus, he has just received his father's armour, i.e. he will soon be a 'second Achilles'.⁷³

In both cases a prophecy makes it clear that the son of the greatest warrior who took part and died in the first expedition to Thebes (Amphiaraus)⁷⁴ and the second expedition to Troy (Achilles) respectively, is a prerequisite for the success of the attacking side. In this way, father and son are more closely connected to each of these stories, the more so since the two sons will play equivalent roles while being on the battlefield: Alcmaon will kill the chief Theban leader Laodamas (son of Eteocles), who has previously killed Aegialeus (son of Adrastus), and Neoptolemus will slay Eurypylus (son of Telephus), who has previously killed important Achaean warriors such as Machaon (son of Asclepius) and Peneleus. Moreover, in both cases the dead father appears and advises his son(s), who after the sack of Thebes and Troy respectively will wander.

Suffering at the River

In both Archilochus *P.Oxy.* 4708 and Pindar's *Nemean* 9, the central scene of the fight between the Achaeans and the Seven takes place next to a river, Caycos and Ismenos respectively:

Arch. *P.Oxy.* 4708, fr. 1.8–9:

... ἐὺρρείτης δὲ Κ[αῖκος
π]ιπτόγτων νεκύων στείνετο καὶ [πεδίον
Μύτιον

Pind. *Nem.* 9.22:

... Ἴσ-μηνοῦ δ' ἐπ' ὄχθαισι ...

Pindar's emphasis on fighting at a river is also seen from the comparison between Chromius (the *laudandus* of his Ode) and Hector, whose "fame is said to have grown ... near the streams / of Skamander, and by the steep banks of Heloros"

⁷³ The analogy between Amphiaraus' sons Alcmaon-Amphilochus and Achilles' son Neoptolemus can be also seen in their respective wanderings. On Alcmaon, see [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.87–90; on Amphilochus, see [Apollod.] *Epit.* 6.2; on Neoptolemus, see *Nost.* arg. ll. 296–300 Severyns. On Alcmaon's mythic geography that is mapped on the basis of his wanderings, see Olivieri (2010) 299–314.

⁷⁴ Both Amphiaraus ('Simonides' 6.3.4 *FGE*; Aesch. *Sept.* 587–589; Hdt. 7.221) and Achilles (Σ (D) *Il.* 19.326 [van Thiel]) knew that it was fated for them to die in Thebes and Troy respectively.

(39–40: Ἑκτορι μὲν κλέος ἀνθῆσαι Σκαμάνδρου χεύμασιν / ἀγχοῦ, βαθυκρήμιοι δ' ἄμφ' ἀκταῖς Ἐλώρου).⁷⁵

It should be made clear that in both Archilochus and Pindar, the feature under examination consists in the *suffering* and not just the fighting taking place by Caycos and Ismenos respectively. In both cases the attacking side (Achaeans and the army of the Seven) are defeated with great losses by the river-banks. This element is typical of the last phase of the process I have described as “epic staging” (phase II), during which rules and constraints pertaining to the “mythical data” of the Theban and Trojan War traditions are put into use. Caycos and Ismenos are typical features of the Teuthrania and Seven myths and they form integral part of their epic rendering.

The analogy between Ismenos and Caycos seems to go deeper than a mere parallelism. In the Hellenistic or post-Hellenistic hexameter poem (*P.Oxy.* 214 = *P. it.Lond.* 39 = Coll. Alex. 76–78) on the story of Telephus (and perhaps Eurypylus) there is, among other features, a clear reference to the *Argives turning red [because of their blood] the great stream of Caycos* (15–16):⁷⁶ (Ἀργεῖοι) ξανθοῦ φοινίξαντες ἐπεί] μέ[γα] χεῦμα Κάϊκου | Τηλέφου τό[σοι δάμεν οὐ]κέτι θωρηχθέντες.⁷⁷ According to an ingenuous suggestion by Weil,⁷⁸ we should read Ἐάνθου instead of ξανθοῦ, since the speaker of this entire passage may well be Astyoche, mother of Eurypylus, who is praying to the immortals (10: [κλ]ῦτέ μοι ἄθάνατοι) asking them *not* to duplicate the carnage inflicted upon the Argives by her husband Telephus but to strike an agreement between Trojans and Greeks (13: [σ]υνθεσῇ Τρώεσσι καὶ Ἀ[ργ]είοισι γε[ν]έσθω). She makes it clear that she is not praying that the Argives die after turning red (by their blood) Xanthos as it has happened in Caycos when they were slaughtered by Telephus. This typically Hellenistic approach to the Telephus and Eurypylus story is telling for many reasons. By reversing the archaic version of the story in which Astyoche was bribed by Priam, in order to send her son Eurypylus to the war, here she speaks with a clear intention of putting an end to the bloodshed. What is particularly relevant to our investigation is that (a) the Telephus and Eurypylus episodes are effectively linked in a *single* epyllium, and (b) that the encounter between the fathers (Tel-

⁷⁵ See D'Alessio (2006) 20–21. On Chromius and Hector, see Braswell (1998) 120–121.

⁷⁶ The presentation of river Caycos turning red because of the carnage taking place there during the fight between Telephus and the Achaeans is also attested in Accius' *Tel.* fr. 15 (D'Anto 633 = Klotz (619 W) = Non. p. 488, 10–11): *flucti cruores volverentur Mysii*. According to Stanley (1663) 712 (in Ribbeck 1875 *ad loc.*), Accius' model may have been Aeschylus' *Telephus*. Handley (1957) 25–27 and Jouan (1966) 224 rightly suggest caution, though they do not exclude this possibility.

⁷⁷ I owe this reference to West (2006) 13.

⁷⁸ See Weil (1900) 97–98; Pellin (2010) 533.

ephus and Achilles) at Caycos is paralleled by the encounter between the sons (Eurypylus and Neoptolemus) at Xanthos (Scamander). Is this last feature, i.e. the reference to a clash between Eurypylus and Neoptolemus at Xanthos, an innovation introduced by the poet of the *Telephi epyllium* or a much older feature that had been developed when the Eurypylus story was shaped as to double that of Telephus? And, if so, what does this tell us about the association between Ismenos, Caycos, and Xanthos/Scamander within the context of the link shared by the Theban and Trojan sagas?

In order to answer this question, we should bear in mind that Archilochus, who is our earliest source for the Telephus and Eurypylus tales, had dealt with both the episode of Telephus routing the Achaeans at Caycos and Eurypylus killing Neoptolemus. Although we do not know whether in his own poetry he had presented Eurypylus facing Neoptolemus at river Xanthos, his elegy on Telephus preserves an almost verbatim repetition of phraseology pertaining to the cramming of a river with corpses by Achilles in the *Iliad* (21.220: στεινόμενος νεκύεσσι – Arch. *P.Oxy.* 4708, fr. 1.9: νεκύν στείνετο).⁷⁹ This is the only time in archaic Greek poetry that the expression στείνεσθαι νεκύν is employed with reference to a river.⁸⁰ The imitation is unmistakable. But the μάχη παραποτάμιος in *Iliad* 21 is imitated not only by Archilochus but also by the poet of the *Telephi epyllium*. In this case, the imitation is wholesale:

Iliad 21

192–3: εἰ δύναται τι / χραισμεῖν
207: τὸν ἄριστον ἐνὶ κρατερῇ ὕμνῃ
208: ἴφι δαμέντα
209: ἔνθ' ἔλε Θερσίλοχόν τε Μύδωνά τε ...

211: καὶ νύ κ' ἔτι πλέονας κτάνε Παίονας ὡκὺς Ἀχιλεὺς
224–226: ἐναρίζων / πρὶν ἔλσαι κατὰ ἄστυ
καὶ Τρῶας πειρηθῆναι / ἀντιβίην
231: Τρώεσσι ... καὶ ἀμύνειν

Telephi epyllium

7: χραισμηῖσαι
4: τὸν ἄριστον ἐν Ἀργείοις [Ἀχιλῆα
16: ἴφι τῷ[σοι δάμεν
3: ἔνθα δέ κεν Μενέλαος ἐκέκλιτο,⁸¹
ἔγ[θ' Ἀγαμέμνων
2: [οὐ] κεν ἔτι ζῶοντες ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον
[Ἀχαιοί
5: ἐξενάριξε πρὶν Ἑκτορος ἀντίον
ἐλθεῖν
6: τ[ῶι] ἀμυνόμεν

In this light, why would both Archilochus and the poet of the *Telephi epyllium* imitate the Iliadic μάχη παραποτάμιος by the banks of Xanthos/Scamander fea-

⁷⁹ See also *Il.* 21.208 (χέρσ' ὑπο Πηλείδαο) and Arch. *P.Oxy.* 4708 fr. 1.11 (χέρσ' ὕπ' ἀμειλίκτου φωτὸς ἐναυρό[μενοι]).

⁸⁰ Pellin (2010, 534) offers a list of late authors using a relevant expression, among whom only Q. S. (7100) and Tryph. (543–544) employ the expression στείνεσθαι νεκύν.

⁸¹ See also Arch. *P.Oxy.* 4708 fr. 1.12: ἀπέκλινον ἐϋκνήμ[ιδες Ἀχαιοί].

turing a completely different episode? This would have made sense, only if the Hellenistic poet had imitated Archilochus, which is not the case. In my view, the answer lies both in the fact that Achilles features in the carnage at river Caycos as well as in the slaughter of the Trojans at Xanthos/Scamander in *Iliad* 21, and in the association between Xanthos/Scamander with the encounter between Eurypylus and Neoptolemus that must have featured in an archaic epic on the Telephus myth that both the *Iliad* and Archilochus were aware of. It can hardly be a coincidence that in the same context (*Il.* 21.146) Scamander is called with his divine name, i.e. Xanthos.

The sharing of this feature within the context of the story of Telephus-Eurypylus and the Seven must go back to relevant epic traditions of the archaic period followed by Archilochus and Pindar. This is highly probable, since Pindar refers to the river Caycos in Mysia and to the Mysian plain in the context of Telephus' wounding by Achilles (*Isth.* 5.41–42: ... τίς ἄρ' ἐσλὸν Τηλεφον | τρῶσεν ἐῷ δορὶ Καϊκού παρ' ὄχθαις; *Isth.* 8.48–50: ἀρετὰν Ἀχιλῆος / ὃ καὶ Μύσιον ἀμπελόεν / αἵμαξε Τηλέφου μέλα-νι ῥαίνων φόνωι πεδίον). In fact, Amphiarus' fleeing by the river Ismenos before being hit at the back by Periclymenus is also mentioned by [Apollodorus] (*Bibl.* 3.77: Ἀμφιαρᾶω δὲ φεύγοντι παρὰ ποταμὸν Ἰσμηνόν, πρὶν ὑπὸ Περικλυμένου τὰ νῶτα τρωθῆναι, Ζεὺς κεραυνὸν βαλὼν τὴν γῆν διέστησεν), in a passage whose phrasing points to Pindar as [Apollodorus'] source. Ismenos as the area where the battle took place (more precisely at the Ismenion “past which the river Ismenos flows”)⁸² is also mentioned by Pausanias (9.10.2), who also seems to be drawing on a standard feature of the expedition of the Seven. Under the scope of the analysis presented above, Ismenos, Caycos, and Xanthos/Scamander may have formed a nexus of geographical references whose association with the myths of the Seven and Telephus-Eurypylus must have been shaped as early as the archaic period in the context of the interaction between the Theban and Trojan epic traditions.

Fighting Spirit

D'Alessio⁸³ has drawn attention to the correspondence between ἄλκιμοι – αἰχμηταί (*P.Oxy.* 4708 fr. 1.7–8) and μαχατάν | θυμόν and θυμόν αἰχματάν used for Amphiarus and the *laudandus* Chromius respectively (Pind. *Nem.* 9.26–27 and 37). ἄλκιμος is also used in Arch. *IEG* fr. 95 (ἀλκίμωι) and 148 (ἱρὸς ἀλκίμους),

⁸² Braswell (1998) 87.

⁸³ D'Alessio (2006) 20.

as well as *IEG* adesp. iamb. 38.10 (ἄλκιμωτέρους). The combination θυμός with ἄλκιμος is attested in Callin. *IEG* fr. 1.1 (ἄλκιμον ἔξετε θυμόν) and Tyrt. *IEG* fr. 10.17, 24 (ἄλκιμον ... θυμόν). αἰχμητής is common in Arch. *IEG* (fr. 24.13: χερσὶν αἰχμητέων ὕπο; 91.5: αἰχμητῆς ἑών; see also fr. spur. 324.3: αἰχμητὰ δὺω of Heracles and Iolaus).⁸⁴ The combination of θυμός with μαχατάς/αἰχμητάς is unique in Pindar who prefers θυμός “with a proper name or a general term such as ἀνὴρ, γυνή, φώς”).⁸⁵ The verbal echo in Pindar’s Ode shares with Archilochus’ elegy the same context, namely the fleeing of Amphiaraus and the Achaeans respectively.

Fighting spirit seems to have been used as an associative mechanism of fathers and sons in the Theban and Trojan tradition along the axis of the Seven and Telephus stories. Thersander’s fighting spirit in the *Cypria* (arg. ll. 126–127 Severyns; Paus. 9.5.14) may be reflecting his equivalent fighting spirit in the *Epigoni*.⁸⁶ It is perhaps no coincidence that Thersander and Peneleus (a skilled warrior and next king of Thebes, since Thersander’s son Tisamenus was not yet of age), were killed by Telephus (who excelled against the Achaeans) and Eurypylus (ἀριστεύοντα) respectively (the last two being equally wounded/killed by a father and a son, Achilles and Neoptolemus also excelling in the battlefield).

The general feature of “fighting spirit” appears to have acquired some specific function in the last phase of the epic staging of the motif under examination.

Healing

Healing skills are equally a feature that must have been associated with the *particular role* certain persons played in Theban and Trojan saga. Amphiaraus was considered to possess healing abilities, like his ancestor Melampus.⁸⁷ These abilities may well be attributed to him at a much earlier date than it is generally thought. According to Herodotus (8.134), a certain Mys was sent by Mardonius, who was waiting with his army in Thessaly for the winter to pass, to consult the oracle of Amphiaraus. The fact that this consultation involved incubation makes it clear that next to the oracular there was also a medical side in Amphiaraus’ sanctuary.⁸⁸ Herodotus is no doubt drawing on some earlier source that goes back

⁸⁴ I owe parallels to Obbink (2005) 34 on 7 and 8.

⁸⁵ Braswell (1998) 96 on *Nem.* 9.26–27; see also 117 on *Nem.* 9.37.

⁸⁶ On this point, see Cingano (forthcoming b).

⁸⁷ See Löffler (1963) 14–16.

⁸⁸ See Schachter (1981) 23.

to at least the sixth century BC.⁸⁹ In this respect, Amphiaraus' connection to Asclepius is also telling. As early as Stesichorus (*Eriphyle*, fr. 92a-e Finglass-Davies) Asclepius is hit by Zeus' thunderbolt because he had risen Capaneus and Lycurgus (the latter a floating member of the Seven) from the dead,⁹⁰ an episode that brings in mind Amphiaraus' "death" by Zeus' thunderbolt in the Theban tradition, as well as Amphiaraus' fight with Lycurgus in the context of the Nemea incident. It should not escape our attention that this version of the death of Asclepius is related by Stesichorus in his *Eriphyle*, a play dealing with the core of Theban epic saga. Moreover, in the Amyclaeon throne and a shieldband from Olympia dated to 575–570 BC, Amphiaraus is involved in a quarrel with Lycurgus that Adrastus and Tydeus try to stop.⁹¹ Given the fact that Asclepius' healing abilities are as old as the *Iliad* (2.731; 4.194; 11.518), we wonder whether he did not share this feature with Amphiaraus. The fact that they both had a daughter called Iaso is no doubt a later feature that underlines their medical role, but it seems to be an extension of an older association with respect to their healing abilities.⁹² In Pindar (*Pyth.* 3.5–8) Cheiron is referred to as the one who taught Asclepius how to cure every kind of disease.⁹³ Likewise, in the *Cypria* Achilles heals Telephus after wounding him.⁹⁴ Since Telephus does not die from the wound and Achilles' healing spear is a gift of Cheiron to Peleus in his wedding according to the *Cypria*,⁹⁵ it must go back to an early phase of the story that antedates the *Cypria* and must come from the source on which Archilochus drew for his elegy on Telephus. Achilles' healing abilities in this episode can be also seen on a red-figure drinking bowl from Vulci by the painter Sosias (around 500 BC)⁹⁶ depicting Achilles placing a bandage on Patroclus' wounds. If this piece of information is combined with Pindar's reference

⁸⁹ See Terranova (2013) 19, who draws attention to the fact that Amphiaraus was recognized as a θεός by the Megarians (as early as the archaic period?, see Dion. Byz. *Anaplous Bosphori* 227 Gilles) and by the Oropians (end of fifth century BC, see relief in the National Museum at Athens [NM 1397]). She rightly, in my view, speaks of an intermediate phase in the evolution of Amphiaraus from hero to healing divinity associated with Asclepius. See also Petsalis-Diomidis (2006) 212, who draws attention to the fact that in the Amphiareion at Oropus Amphiaraus is sometimes presented on a chariot, a tendency reflecting the belief that his shift from heroic to divine status was closely associated with the episode of his disappearance on his chariot.

⁹⁰ See Torres (2012) 523.

⁹¹ Amyclaeon throne; shieldband, Olympia, c. 575–550.

⁹² See Σ in Aristoph. *Pl.* 701e (Chantry).

⁹³ See also [Apollod.] 3.10.3.

⁹⁴ See *Cypr.* arg. II. 132–134 Severyns: ἔπειτα Τηλεφὸν κατὰ μαντεῖαν παραγενόμενον εἰς Ἄργος ἰᾶται Ἀχιλλεὺς ὡς ἡγεμόνα γενησόμενον τοῦ ἐπ' Ἴλιον πλοῦ.

⁹⁵ *PEG* fr. 3 = 3 *EGF* = 4 *GEF*; see also [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.170.

⁹⁶ Berlin, Antikenmuseum, F 2278. See *LIMC* 1.1 (1981) 114–115, s.v. 'Achilleus' [Kossatz-Deissmann]; for the attribution of this scene to the *Cypria*, see Kullmann (1960) 193–194.

to Patroclus standing together with Achilles to face Telephus who is routing the Achaean army in Mysia (*Ol.* 9.70–73), then it is plausible that this scene must have featured at least in the *Cypria*, if not in an earlier epic poem on Telephus (given the similarities between *Ol.* 9.70–73 and the Archilochus elegy on Telephus that precedes the written *Cypria*). In fact, the wounding of Patroclus would have functioned as a neat explanation of Achilles' routing and wounding of Telephus.⁹⁷ The existence of a [Hesiodic] epic on the 'Precepts of Cheiron' (Χείρωνος Ὑποθήκαι) in the archaic period shows that Achilles' healing abilities were widely known and explained as the result of his education by the Centaur Cheiron.⁹⁸ This is confirmed *inter alia* by the fact that the *Iliad* (11.830–832)⁹⁹ refers to Achilles' possession of ἥπια φάρμακα and knowledge of healing techniques by Cheiron,¹⁰⁰ despite the fact that it deviates from its standard presentation of Achilles as having grown up in his parents' palace in Phthia. This "healing" feature continues to be linked with the Telephus story, since one of the eminent Achaeans killed by his son Eurypylos was no other than Asclepius' son Machaon,¹⁰¹ whose healing abilities had been put into good use just before, when he cured Philoctetes' wound.¹⁰²

⁹⁷ Preiser (2000) 50.

⁹⁸ Such pairing of activities is also shared by Heracles and Achilles whose "chiastic" relation is also worth mentioning: both wound and try to heal or save from unending pain individuals closely associated to the other member of the pair (Heracles wounds and tries to put an end to Cheiron's (Achilles' tutor) endless suffering; likewise, Achilles wounds and heals Telephus (Heracles' son).

⁹⁹ ἐπὶ δ' ἥπια φάρμακα πάσσε / ἐσθλά, τὰ σε προτί φασιν Ἀχιλλῆος δεδιδάχθαι (δεδάσθαι: Zenodotus), / ὃν Χείρων ἐδίδαξε δικαιοτάτος Κενταύρων; contrast *Il.* 9.438–443; see also, Σ (A) *Il.* 11.832a (Erbse): <ὃν Χείρων ἐδίδαξε>: ὅτι Ὅμηρος δεδιδάχθαι μὲν φησιν ἐνταῦθα τὴν ἰατρικὴν ὑπὸ Χείρωνος τὸν Ἀχιλλέα, περὶ μέντοι τῆς παρ' αὐτῷ τροφῆς οὐδὲν συνέστακεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῦναντίον διὰ τῶν πραγμάτων ἐπιμαρτυρεῖ, τροφέα τὸν Φοῖνικα συνεστακῶς τούτου; see Preiser (2000) 47 with further bibliography; West (2011) 262 on *Il.* 11.830–832.

¹⁰⁰ See Eust. on *Il.* 1.54–55 (van der Valk): τὴν δὲ κατὰ τὸν Ἀχιλλέα ἰατρικὴν δηλοῖ; Σ (A) on Dio's *Or.* 18.72 (Dilts): ἐπεπαιδευτο γὰρ καὶ τὴν ἰατρικὴν Ἀχιλλεὺς ὡς παρὰ Χείρωνι τραφεῖς and Σ (Pr) on Dio's *Or.* 18.72 (Dilts): (Τήλεφος) ... ἀπῆλθε παρ' Ἀχιλλεῖ ἰάσεως εἵνεκα, ὑπὸ Χείρωνος πάλαι πεπαιδευμένῳ καὶ ταύτην τὴν ἐπιστήμην μετὰ τῶν τακτικῶν.

¹⁰¹ *Il. parva* PEG 1 fr. 30 = 7 EGF = 7 GEF (= Paus. 3.26.9): Μαχάονα δὲ ὑπὸ Εὐρυπύλου τοῦ Τηλέφου τελευτήσai φησιν ὃ τὰ ἔπη ποιήσας τὴν μικρὰν Ἰλιάδα. See Fowler (2013) 542 n. 63, who draws attention to the fact that since "Eurypylos is also the name of the king of Kos defeated by Herakles (Pher. fr. 78; § 8.5.3), and the Asklepiad Machaon is Eurypylos' main victim at Troy[,] scholars have sometimes thought of a transferral from Kos to Mysia, or perhaps of a doubling".

¹⁰² *Il. parva* arg. 1. 213 Severyns: ἰαθεῖς δὲ οὗτος [sc. Φιλοκτήτης] ὑπὸ Μαχάονος. See also *Il.* 4.218–219, in which Machaon heals Menelaus' wound by sucking the blood and spreading ἥπια φάρμακα which he had acquired through his father Asclepius, who had received them from Cheiron (see Pind. *Pyth.* 3.5–7). The fact that Machaon cures Philoctetes' wound that had been caused by a snake points to his father's (Asclepius') early association with snakes.

Second Gathering of the Army

One of the most notorious *cruces* of the *Cypria* pertains to the arrival of the wounded Telephus at Argos, where he would be healed by Achilles. This piece of information is offered by [Apollodorus], a Homeric scholium on the *Iliad*, and Proclus. Let us look carefully at all these passages:

[Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.18–21:

[18] ... τοὺς Ἕλληνας παρασκευασμένους στρατεύεσθαι, ἀναχωρήσαντας δὲ ἀπὸ Μυσίας εἰς Ἑλλάδα μετὰ ἔτη ὀκτὼ πάλιν εἰς Ἄργος μεταστραφέντας ἐλθεῖν εἰς Αὐλίδα. [19] συνελθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν Ἄργει αὐθις μετὰ τὴν ῥηθεῖσαν ὀκταετία, ἐν ἀπορία τοῦ πλοῦ πολλῇ καθεστήκεσαν, κατηγεμόνα μὴ ἔχοντες, ὃς ἦν δυνατὸς δεῖξαι τὴν εἰς Τροίαν. [20] Τηλέφος δὲ ἐκ τῆς Μυσίας, ἀνίατον τὸ τραῦμα ἔχων, εἰπόντος αὐτῷ τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος τότε τεύξεσθαι θεραπείας, ὅταν ὁ τρώσας ἰατρὸς γένηται, τρύχεσιν ἡμφιεσμένος εἰς Ἄργος ἀφίκετο, καὶ δεηθεὶς Ἀχιλλέως καὶ ὑπεσχημένος τὸν εἰς Τροίαν πλοῦν δεῖξαι θεραπεύεται ἀποξύναντος Ἀχιλλέως τῆς Πηλιάδος μελίας τὸν ἰόν. θεραπευθεὶς οὖν ἔδειξε τὸν πλοῦν, τὸ τῆς δεῖξεως ἀσφαλὲς πιστουμένου τοῦ Κάλχαντος διὰ τῆς ἑαυτοῦ μαντικῆς. [21] ἀναχθέντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἀπ' Ἀργους καὶ παραγενομένων τὸ δεύτερον εἰς Αὐλίδα, τὸν στόλον ἅπλοια κατεῖχε.

Σ (D) Hom. *Il.* 1.59 (van Thiel):

A 59/Y* ... οἱ δὲ Ἕλληνες ὑπέστρεψαν εἰς τὸ Ἄργος. Τηλέφον δὲ ἀνίατον ἔχοντα τραῦμα ὁ Ἀχιλλεὺς ἐθεράπευσε κατὰ πεῦσιν τινὸς τῶν θεῶν (YAR).

Procl. *Cypr. arg.* Il. 132–134 (Severyns):

ἔπειτα Τηλέφον κατὰ μαντεῖαν παραγεγόμενον εἰς Ἄργος ἰᾶται Ἀχιλλεὺς ὡς ἡγεμόνα γενησόμενον τοῦ ἐπ' Ἴλιον πλοῦ.

Coming from three different sources these passages make it clear that the healing of Telephus took place in Argos, where Achilles and the Achaeans had gathered after the aborted expedition to Teuthrania. It was from Argos that they went to Aulis and from there to Troy, following the advice of Telephus about the route they should take. Here is then a crucial *non sequitur* according to Proclus' summary, since the episode between Telephus and Achilles at Argos is flanked by contradictory information; we have been just told that Achilles was driven to Scyros by a storm on his way back from Teuthrania, and we will be informed that the second gathering of the Achaean army took place, like the first one, in Aulis.¹⁰³

103 There is a striking parallel between the Teuthranian expedition and that of the Seven with respect to their function as a time-frame for the ensuing Trojan and Epigonoι expeditions respectively. In each case the second expedition occurred ten years after the first (for the Teuthranian expedition, see [Apollod.] *Epit.* 3.17–19; for the Epigonoι, see [Apollod.] *Bibl.* 3.72). On this topic, see Terranova (2013) 16; on time-reckoning with respect to Calchas' prophecy about the duration of the Trojan War, see West (2013) 104–105.

What was doing Achilles in Argos? This is undoubtedly the city in the Argolid and not the whole of the Peloponnese or Greece. Things become even more complicated, if we take into account that the phrasing of part of [Apollodorus'] passage indicates that this is the second time the Achaeans are gathering in Argos (*Epit.* 3.18: ... τοὺς Ἕλληνας παρασκευασμένους στρατεύεσθαι, ἀναχωρήσαντας δὲ ἀπὸ Μυσίας εἰς Ἑλλάδα μετὰ ἔτη ὅκτῳ *πάλιν* εἰς Ἄργος μεταστραφέντας ἐλθεῖν εἰς Αὐλίδα. 3.19: συνελθόντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐν Ἀργεὶ *αὐθις*). So, when did they Achaean army or leaders reassemble before in the Argolid?

As early as 1929, Bethe¹⁰⁴ tried to explain this paradox by arguing that in the *Cypria* Telephus had been healed by Achilles in Aulis and that all our sources ([Apollodorus], the Homeric scholia, and Proclus) had been contaminated by the influence of Euripides' *Telephus*, in which the healing takes place in Argos. This line of interpretation is misleading. Cingano has shown that even if we admit the influence of Euripides on ([Apollodorus], this is unlikely for Proclus' summary. Moreover, I would add, it is hard to believe that the Euripidean play had such a powerful impact on all these three sources. In an attempt to find a way out of this impasse, Severyns¹⁰⁵ suggested, on the basis of an Aristarchean scholium, that Agamemnon's kingdom was placed in Argos according to the *Cypria* and not to Mycenae, as it is the case in the *Iliad*,¹⁰⁶ and that (on the basis of a scholium in Eur. *Phoen.* 125) Mycenae and Argos were treated by the *neoteroi* as identical.¹⁰⁷ Severyns' hypothesis is bound to fail for two reasons, as Cingano has convincingly argued:¹⁰⁸ first, it does not explain why after the abortive expedition to Teuthrania the Achaeans gathered first in Argos and not immediately in Aulis, and second, it stems from a scholium that cannot have been known to ([Apollodorus] or Proclus. We are in no position to know whether the entire corpus of cyclic poetry relocated Agamemnon's kingdom at Argos, as it is the case with early lyric that places his palace either in Sparta (Stesichorus and Simonides)¹⁰⁹ or at Amyclae (Pindar).¹¹⁰

My take on this issue follows the suggestion of Cingano with a slight modification. The surfacing of Argos as the place of the assembling of the Achaean army both before the Teuthranian and the Trojan expeditions belongs to the general

104 (1929²) 239–241; see also Jouan (1966) 226, 245, 250.

105 (1928) 294.

106 *Il.* 2.569, 4.376, 8.180, 9.44. When Argos is designated as the place of Agamemnon's kingdom in Homer, it stands for the Argolid than the city of Argos itself (*Il.* 1.30, 2.108, 4.171, 9.141 = 283).

107 See *Σ Il.* 11.46 (Erbse): ἐν Μυκίῃναις τὰ Ἀγαμέμνονος βασιλεία, οὐκ ἐν Ἀργεὶ, ὡς οἱ νεώτεροι.

108 (2004) 74.

109 Stes. fr. 177 Finglass-Davies; Sem. fr. 549 *PMG*; see *Σ Eur. Or.* 46 (I 102.21–24 Schwartz).

110 *Pyth.* 11.16, 11.32, *Nem.* 8.12, 11.34.

pattern of doubling certain episodes or features pertaining to the Theban and Trojan epic traditions. Argos was the natural place of gathering for the Argive armies of the Seven and the Epigonoï in the first and second Theban wars respectively. As such it may have influenced the cyclic tradition of the *Cypria*, which tried to accommodate both the “Theban” gathering at Argos and the “Trojan” gathering at Aulis. Given the technical difficulties of gathering twice each time, first in Argos and then in Aulis, the Achaean fleet (not to mention the absurdity of gathering the fleet at an inland location such as Argos), the *Cypria* may have featured gatherings only of the Achaean leaders at Argos before and after the Teuthranian expedition, leaving Aulis for the assembling of the entire fleet. Conversely, the Homeric *Iliad* opted for Mycenae as Agamemnon’s kingdom, leaving Argos to Diomedes, thus referring only to the gathering of the fleet in Aulis before the Teuthranian and Trojan expeditions.¹¹¹

Dionysus

When Thersander was killed by Telephus, his son Tisamenus was to succeed him in the throne of Thebes, but due to his young age Peneleus became king. At that point, the gods (Dionysus: Paus. 9.19.1) send the Teumesian fox against the city. After this event and as the Achaeans were mustering their fleet for the second time at Aulis, Peneleus joined the expedition. He was a skilled warrior (see *Iliad*, in which he is mentioned a number of times and he is one of the leaders of the Boeotian contingent), but he was killed by Eurypylus, son of Telephus (Paus. 9.5.15; Q. S. 7.105; Dict. Cret. 4.17).¹¹² Pausanias’ version that Dionysus sent the Teumesian fox against Thebes as a punishment because the Thebans made Peneleus their king, although he was not a descendant of Cadmus, is analogous

111 For the gathering of the Achaean first in Argos and then Aulis, see also Ibyc. S151.27–30 *PMGF* and (perhaps) ll. 36–37 too (with respect to Cyanippus, provided that Barron’s supplement Κῶάνυ] π[ο]ς in l. 37 is correct). According to [Apollod.] (*Bibl.* 1.9.13), Cyanippus was the grandson of Adrastus and son of Aegialeus who was the only Argive leader to die in the successful expedition of the Epigonoï against Thebes. Ibycus is the sole source for the participation of Cyanippus in the Trojan war. As Cingano (2004, 75) has put it “Il distacco di Ibyco dalla tradizione omerica evidenzia in filigrana il permanere in ambito argivo di tradizioni legate al ciclo tebano, che integravano il silenzio della tradizione epica. Grazie a queste riorganizzazioni genealogiche i Biantidi Egialeo e Cianippo, entrambi figli di Adrasto, erano iscritti nelle due diverse scansioni temporali e narrative dell’epica: Egialeo nel ciclo tebano, dove è l’unico di cadere in battaglia; Cianippo è invece assente a Tebe e approba – seppur tardivamente – a Troia nel ciclo troiano”.

112 See Kullmann (1960) 69.

to Dionysus' role in the Telephus and Eurypylus story: he causes the former's wounding and uses the latter as the means for the killing of Peneleus, who had succeeded Thersander in Thebes against Dionysus' will.

In this light, it is clear that Dionysus featured in both the Theban and the Trojan¹¹³ part of this story, since the old king (Thersander) and the new king (Peneleus) of Thebes participated in the Teuthranian and Trojan expeditions and were killed by father (Telephus) and son (Eurypylus) respectively. What is also important is that if the Teumesian fox featured in the *Epigoni* (PEG 1 fr. 5 = incerti loci 1 p. 74 EGF = *3 GEF), then it is very likely that in this poem there may have been a reference to the future killing of Thersander by Telephus, since the Teumesian fox pertains to a stage when Peneleus, successor of Thersander, is the king of Thebes. If that line of thought holds true, then we have ample evidence that the reduplication of the doublet between the two Theban expeditions and the Teuthranian and Trojan expeditions was operative at an early stage and independently from the Homeric epics.

Admonition To Abstain From the War

According to Σ Juv. 6.655¹¹⁴ (see Kullmann 1960, 213),¹¹⁵ Telephus had advised his son Eurypylus not to take part in the war. In this version, which must be quite old, Eurypylus is bribed by his wife whose name is Eriphyle. Since this name is used twice in the same scholium, it cannot be a scribal error. But why would the scholiast have made such a reference on commenting Juvenal's 'Eriphylae' (6.655)? Why didn't he refer to the widely known Eriphyle, wife of Amphiaras and mother of Alcmaon, as he got right Clytemestra and the other figures from Greek mythology

113 See Preiser (2000) 49, who draws attention to a krater by the painter Phintias (around 500 BC), on the left of which is depicted Patroclus in retreat looking at Diomedes who is bending forward because he is dragging something, perhaps the corpse of Thersander. On the right, a seated Dionysus is depicted, whose hand as well as his name are partly preserved. See Preiser (2000) 49 with further bibliography.

114 'atque Eriphyle': Eriphyle, uxor Eurypili, filii Telephi. Qui Telephus cum venisset ad auxilium Priamo, plagatus est ab Achille, et cum non posset curari, sortitus est, ab Achille se solo posse curare. Venit supplex, petit se curari, promisso hoc, ut nunquam iam auxilio ferat Troianis, nec ipse, nec de suis aliquis. Curatus est; recessit. Post mortem huius, filius Eurypilus [sic] vir fortis fuit. Hunc saepius ad auxilium petit Priamus. Ille negavit, monitus scilicet a patre suo. Ergo cum non posset aliter Priamus eum sollicitare, fecit vitem ex auro, et misit ad uxorem eius Eriphylem. Haec, accepto munere tanto, marito persuasit. Venit in Troiam auxilium ferens. Hunc occidit Pyrrhus filius Achillis.

115 See also Fowler (2013) 542–543.

mentioned by Juvenal in this context? West¹¹⁶ says that the scholiast confused the two versions, but his confusion seems rather awkward, since he did get right all the other details. For example, why did he confuse only a name and not the rest of the narrative? And if he had drawn material from the famous Theban tale of Eriphyle, which Juvenal seems to refer to in the verse the scholiast is commenting on, why did he present Telephus as advising his son not to take part in the war on the Trojan side, in contrast to Amphiaraus who explicitly (Pind. *Pyth.* 8.44–6) said that the expedition of the Epigonoι would be successful only if Alcmaon was their leader? How is it possible that the scholiast was confused with respect to the most famous heroine of this tale, namely Eriphyle? In fact, it seems unlikely that the scholiast commenting on the name Eriphyle, who is mentioned by Juvenal together with the Danaids and Clytemestra as negative examples of women who had killed their husbands, transferred the right name to the wrong story, which he quoted in detail, *although it did not involve the murder of any husband*. The only reasonable explanation is that he had found this name used in the same version in which he had found the information about Telephus' admonition to Eurypylus not to fight at the side of the Trojans. After all, this would effectively explain why he designated Eriphyle as *wife* of Eurypylus and not as his mother. Being influenced by her designation as wife of Amphiaraus, he made her also wife of Eurypylus.

According to *PEG* fr. 22 (I) / Σ (D) II. 1.59 (van Thiel), Telephus had sworn an oath that he would not help the Trojans in the future, if Achilles healed his wound. In addition, he would also need to show the Achaeans the route to Troy:

Τήλεφος δὲ ἀνίατον ἔχων τὸ τραῦμα, εἰπόντος θεοῦ μηδένα δύνασθαι αὐτὸν θεραπεῦσαι ἢ τὸν τρώσαντα, ἦλθεν εἰς Ἄργος, καὶ πίστιν δούς μὴ ἐπικουρήσειν Τρωσὶν ἐθεραπεύθη ὑπὸ Ἀχιλλέως καὶ αὐτὸς ἔδειξε τὸν ἐπὶ Τροίαν πλοῦν. ταῦτα μὲν οἱ νεώτεροι· ὁ δὲ ποιητὴς λέγει Κάλχαντα ἀφηγήσασθαι τοῦ ἐπὶ Ἴλιον πλοῦ.

The phrase καὶ πίστιν δούς μὴ ἐπικουρήσειν Τρωσὶν may well be, given the highly compressed and abbreviated style of the scholia, an indication that Telephus' oath extended not only to the immediate but also to the distant future, i.e. that neither himself nor anyone among his descendants would help the Trojans.

116 (2013) 191.

To this piece of evidence, we should also connect the following information given by the Σ *Od.* 11.520 [Dindorf]):¹¹⁷

Εὐρύπυλος ὁ Ἀστυόχης καὶ Τηλέφου τοῦ Ἡρακλέους παῖς λαχὼν τὴν πατρίαν ἀρχὴν τῆς Μυσίας προΐστατο. πυθόμενος δὲ Πρίαμος περὶ τῆς τούτου δυνάμεως ἔπεμψεν ὥς αὐτὸν ἵνα παραγένηται σύμμαχος. εἰπόντος δὲ αὐτοῦ ὡς οὐκ ἐξῆν αὐτῷ διὰ τὴν μητέρα, ἔπεμψεν ὁ Πρίαμος τῇ αὐτοῦ μητρὶ δῶρον {Ἀστυόχη} (secl. Jac.) χρυσὴν ἄμπελον. ἡ δὲ λαβοῦσα τὴν ἄμπελον τὸν υἱὸν ἔπεμψεν ἐπὶ στρατείαν (στρατὸν Q: ἐπιστρατεύειν dub. Jac. in ap. cr.) ὃν Νεοπτόλεμος ὁ τοῦ Ἀχιλλέως υἱὸς ἀναιρεῖ. ἡ δὲ ἱστορία παρὰ Ἀκουσιλάῳ (fr. 40c *EGM*).

What does the phrase διὰ τὴν μητέρα refer to? That Eurypylus would not participate in the war because his mother did not allow him to go to Troy? Why was she unwilling to help her brother Priam trying to save his city against the Achaeans host? Was she afraid that her son would die, if he went to Troy or did she remind her son of Telephus' promise to Achilles when he healed his wound that neither he nor anyone of his descendants would help the Trojans against the Achaeans? I think both, but the latter alternative, given the evidence of the scholia to Homer and Juvenal presented above, is the stronger one.¹¹⁸

Setting Foot on Foreign Land

Both Archilochus¹¹⁹ and Euripides¹²⁰ lay stress on the first landing of the Achaeans in Mysia. Although this is a typical motif,¹²¹ the transfer of phraseology is unmistakable:

P.Oxy. 4708, fr. 1.9–10: [πεδῖον] Μῦσιον

P.Oxy. 4708, fr. 1.21: ἐπάτευν Μυσίδα

Tel. fr. 696.1: στρατὸς τὰ Μυσῶν πεδί' ἐπ[ι]στρωφῶν πατεῖ

Since it is unlikely that Euripides had used as his model Archilochus where this form is attested only once, he must be drawing on Aeschylus' *Telephus*,¹²²

¹¹⁷ See Σ *Eur. Or.* 1391 (Schwartz); *Od.* 11.520–522; also *Acus.* fr. 40c *EGM*.

¹¹⁸ See Fowler (2013) 542–543.

¹¹⁹ *P.Oxy.* 4708, fr. 1.9–10 and 1.21.

¹²⁰ *Tel.* fr. 696.16 *TrGF* Kannicht 5.2; see Obbink (2006) 9.

¹²¹ See Tsagalis (2012a) 337.

¹²² That certain features of Euripides' prologues may be working as a *Zitat* to earlier plays on the same topic, see Danek (1992) 19–37. On Aristophanes' use of Aeschylus' *Telephus* in *Ach.* 332 (and discussion of the relevant scholium designating Aeschylus as Aristophanes' model), see Platter (2007) 149 and n. 27 with further bibliography.

since Euripides uses it only in this case in the entire corpus of his plays, whereas Aeschylus employs it 8 times (without counting compound forms like ἔμπατεῖν), of which 2 together with the root πεδ-:

Ag. 1356–1357: τῆς μελλοῦς κλέος / πέδοι (Hermann: πέδον codd.) πατοῦντες
Ch. 643: λὰξ πέδοι (Hermann: πέδον M) πατουμένας

If this is the case and given that (a) its use in Archilochus occurs in the same context with Aeschylus' play, and (b) that Aeschylus is less likely to be drawing πατεῖν from Archilochus (since the verb is very common in tragedy),¹²³ it is plausible that the expression “tread under foot” (the Mysian plain) goes back to a lost archaic epic on Telephus. After all common diction about the Teuthranian expedition could only have originated in an epic tradition dealing with it.

Doubling a Doublet

The deep interaction between these two traditions based on similarity pertaining to both situations and characters is possible only if the Theban and the Trojan War sagas had acquired a stable skeleton of myth through their shaping by means of various oral versions of epic song. In this light, it is not unthinkable that Hesiod's designation of the Theban and Trojan sagas as emblematic for the race of heroes (*WD* 161–165) is equally true on the level of epic traditions.¹²⁴ It seems that certain situations and characters functioned as a bridge between the two sagas and, what is more telling, that such resonances were conscious and meaningful, as the *Odyssey* examples show.

As the Teuthranian expedition is a doublet of the successful expedition to Troy in the Trojan War epic tradition, so the expedition of the Epigonoι is a doublet of the expedition of the Seven. There are various features that corroborate these two analogies. Given this observation, the pairing of a motif inherent in the phrase γυναιῶν εἵνεκα δώρων by the *Odyssey* brings to the fore a thorny but fascinating question: are we entitled to speak of “doubling” a doublet between the Theban and the Trojan War epic traditions? Is it possible that the Trojan War tradition has developed the idea of a first, unsuccessful assault at Mysia in the light of the first failed expedition of the Seven against Thebes? If a whole nexus

¹²³ Only in *Il.* 4.157. I owe this observation to Obbink (2006) 9, who fails to note that πατεῖν accompanied by the root πεδ- is attested only in Aeschylus.

¹²⁴ See Krafft (1963) 118–119.

of associations between the Theban and the Trojan myth shows that the Trojan War tradition has used elements organically pertaining to the Theban one (e.g. the transfer of heroes like Diomedes, Sthenelus, and Euryalus “belonging” to the expedition of the Epigonoι to the Troy War saga), is it not fair to argue that it has also aimed at duplicating the entire doublet “first unsuccessful expedition” – “second successful expedition”?

As Bethe has argued, Amphiarus lies at the center of interest for the Theban expedition, more or less as Achilles for the Trojan one. The former’s departure for the war was a crucial point in the entire Theban saga. His anger against Eriphyle must have been of paramount importance, as was Achilles’ wrath in the *Iliad*. I am not sure that the so-called Ἀμφιαράου ἐξέλασις was an independent poem, but what is very plausible is that it reflects an earlier oral tradition or traditions that emphasized the seer’s role in the Theban expedition. Such a lay must have been very deeply embedded in the Theban saga, in fact so well built-in that it may have triggered a whole range of resonances with Achilles and his connection to the Trojan War, the more so since the hero initially came from a different mythical environment and had his own sweep of activities in “an area reflecting the interests of Aeolic Greeks based on Lesbos”.¹²⁵ It is exactly his gradual association with “a confederation of heroes from central and southern Greece whose one target was Troy”¹²⁶ that necessitated a series of adjustments so that he could be presented as the principal hero taking part in the expedition. The resonances between Theban and Trojan epic myth discussed above show how deep and early is the interaction between the Theban and Trojan epic traditions.

We are now in a position to assert that Archilochus treated both the Telephus and the Eurypylus story (*IEG* fr. 304). West (2006) 16–17 has suggested that he may have heard an epic poem or a pair of epic poems in which father and son featured in a single story as protagonists. The focus of this epic or epics would have been the whole mythical scope from the arrival of the Achaeans in Mysia to the death of Eurypylus at the hands of Neoptolemus. Such a suggestion caters well for the cross-generational dimension that is so characteristic of the Theban Cycle, as West himself (2006, 17) observes. Extending this line of thought further, the Telephus-Eurypylus story as treated in Archilochus and the Epic Cycle makes it likely, given the wealth of similarities and analogies presented above, that it reproduced to a considerable extent and, of course, with the necessary modifications a story pattern that had been linked at an early stage with Amphiarus and Alcmaon. Is it accidental that these were the only char-

¹²⁵ West (2011) 43.

¹²⁶ West (2011) 43.

acters of Theban myth associated with “independent” poems, the Ἀμφιαράου ἐξέλασις and the Ἀλκμαιωνίς respectively? Is it mere chance that the Ἀλκμαιωνίς may have contained apart from the story of Alcmaon that of his father Amphiaraus as well?¹²⁷ Isn’t this, among other things, a reflection of their belonging to a common mythical thread? Seen from this angle, the interconnection between the Theban and the Trojan Cycle with respect to this motif and the characters associated with it becomes a reasonable possibility. Perhaps, oral epics antedating the Homeric *Odyssey* had already stroke that chord, which is indicative of the existence of a notional Theban and Trojan Cycle long before their actual combination into a rigid canon, and is also representative of the powerful way these traditions resonated during the shaping of early hexameter poetry in the archaic period.

Interformularity and Intertraditionality

I hope that the preceding analysis has shown that even a typical motif (such as that of a “woman receiving gifts to convince an unwilling hero to go to war”) has been gradually attached (within the framework of the larger story-pattern “unwilling hero is convinced to go to war”) to specific individuals in the Theban and Trojan epic traditions. In this light, we can now make a step back, return to our departure point recalling that our entire investigation started by means of a formulaic repetition of the expression γυναιῶν εἴνεκα δώρων in the *Odyssey*, and ask ourselves on a rather theoretical level about the implications for our larger picture of archaic epic of the evocative power of thematical resonances woven in the fabric of formulaic expressions.

In a recent study on the *Odyssey*, Bakker devoted his Epilogue to the re-examination of the time-old question “can deliberate repetition be formulaic” or “can formulas be quotes”? Bakker opts for the term *interformularity*,¹²⁸ a new coin in the already rich storehouse of terminology developed around formulas in Homeric diction, and argues that the evocative power of formulaic phrases is determined by their specificity, which is measured on the basis of their position on what he calls “the interformularity scale”.¹²⁹ In his own words,

¹²⁷ See Debiassi (forthcoming).

¹²⁸ (2013) 158.

¹²⁹ Bakker (2013) 159.

[T]he more restricted an expression, the more specific the context in which it is uttered, and the higher the point at which it can be placed on the scale. (On the other hand, a high frequency of a context to which a given phrase is restricted will lower its position on the scale, since frequency diminishes specificity). It is also important to observe that the continuum of increasing specificity is quintessentially cognitive: it is based on the judgment of the performer/poet and the audience as to the degree of similarity between two contexts: *the more specific a formula and/or the more restricted its distribution, the greater the possible awareness of its recurrence and of its potential for signaling meaningful repetition.*¹³⁰

Bakker reminds us of two key examples of meaningful repetition of formulas: the first one observed by Austin in 1975 pertains to the fact that 62 out of 66 occurrences of the formulaic phrase πολὺμητις Ὀδυσσεύς are preceded by the speech-introductory formula τὸν δ' ἀπαμειβόμενος προσέφη.¹³¹ This is a telling example of what Bakker calls a “staging-formula”,¹³² i.e. a standard phrase employed for the “epiphany” of an epic figure “whose formula it precedes in the verse”.¹³³ Apart from the metrical constraints pertaining to the use of this noun-epithet formula, there is no doubt that there is a specific context that is hereby evoked, since every time Odysseus will speak he is staged as a man of *mētis*. This is an example that belongs to the low end of Bakker’s scale of interformularity. At the middle of this scale are placed expressions specific to a given episode, like the line ἤμεθα δαινύμενοι κρέα τ' ἄσπετα καὶ μέθυ ἡδύ occurring no less than six times in the *Odyssey* (9.161–162; 9.556–557; 10.184–185; 10.467–468; 10.476–477; 12.29–30). The first-person plural imposes a first-level restriction to the use of this expression, since it has to belong to a character’s speech. The thematic resonances of the essential idea “and then we had a lavish meat” leads to a further restriction and, subsequently, specification, as the phrase is used only in Odysseus’ *Apologoi*.¹³⁴ Next, we can posit a third-level restriction, since the theme of “pre-cultural plenitude as opposed to Ithacan limitations” brings to the limelight the antithesis between the world of the Wanderings and the real world of Ithaca to which Odysseus strives to return. At the highest end of the scale are placed expressions that either “extend across the boundary of the work”¹³⁵ or have minimal distribution. By drawing attention to *Il.* 2.484 and *Od.* 11.328 featuring the lines πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω and πάσας δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω respectively, Bakker makes the important step that crosses over to

¹³⁰ The italics are mine.

¹³¹ Austin (1975) 28–29; Bakker (2013) 162.

¹³² (1997) 162–165; (2013) 163.

¹³³ Bakker (2013) 163.

¹³⁴ Bakker (2013) 164.

¹³⁵ Bakker (2013) 168.

another epic tradition, even if he avoids the word “text” or “poem” with its strong literate connotations. There are multiple examples of this last kind, which have been thoroughly discussed in the past in the context of an interaction of a sort between the Iliadic and Odyssean traditions.¹³⁶ The crucial step is here that interformularity or oral intertextuality, as others have named it, can reach even the level of intertraditionality, i.e. it can refer to the performances of different epic traditions that become gradually crystallized in the course of time and share a considerable degree of symbiotic relationship.

Internal interformularity within a given epic tradition or external interformularity between different epic traditions that amounts to intertraditionality has been systematically treated in two studies that have not attracted the attention they deserve in the English-speaking world. In a detailed study of a number of *iterata*¹³⁷ in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* Usener has shown that repeated phraseology extending to more than one verse in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is regularly characterized by what one may call, following Mueller, a “high contextual surplus”, i.e. the sharing of a number of features between the two formulaic expressions “*that are not required by the meaning of the line(s) in question*”.¹³⁸ For example, *Il.* 1.245–246 and *Od.* 2.80–81 that reiterate similar phraseology share a high contextual surplus for they both pertain to situations that seem to be paralleled: Achilles in a state of distress and anger against the injustice of Agamemnon has just expressed his decision to withdraw from the fighting. He swears an oath and makes a powerful symbolic gesture: he dashes to the ground the scepter, studded with golden nails, and sits down. In a while, when the assembly will be over, he alone will walk along the sea-shore and pray to this mother Thetis, in order to persuade Zeus to give victory to the Trojans. Likewise, in *Od.* 2.80–81 Telemachus in a state of distress and anger against the suitors who are consuming his father’s fortune dashes to the ground the scepter in tears. Later on when the assembly is over, he alone, like Achilles in *Iliad* 1, walks along the sea-shore and asks for the help of Athene. This is a typical case where the “high contextual surplus” of these two scenes is not required by the reiterated phraseology. Telemachus did not “need”, so to speak do what Achilles did after the end of the assembly in *another* epic tradition nor is the dashing of the scepter to the ground something that heroes regularly do when they are angered and in a state of distress. The two scenes belonging to two different epic traditions are, then, closely linked between them. The restriction of this *iteratum* or doublet to a set of characters is

¹³⁶ See e.g. Pucci (1987); Usener (1990); Tsagalis (2008).

¹³⁷ On a useful collection of *iterata* in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, see Strasser (1984).

¹³⁸ Mueller (1984) 151. The italics are mine.

essential for understanding the function of what Mueller has coined “high contextual surplus”. And this is the case with the example at hand. Conversely, a weak form of contextual surplus is at work when doublets are restricted to the same or neighboring books of the same epic.¹³⁹

In a similar vein, Reichel has studied what he calls *Fernbeziehungen* (“cross-references”) in the *Iliad*. Treading on the path opened by the work of Basset and Schadewaldt,¹⁴⁰ Reichel meticulously mapped a dense network of cross-references in the *Iliad* that amounts to a massive mechanism associating persons, scenes, and situations. Leaving aside the sophisticated manipulation of time through an entire system of advance mentions, flashbacks, and para-narratives that stand beyond the scope of my study, I would like to draw attention to Reichel’s methodological treatment of the Iliadic *iterata* that makes a strong case in favor of *planned and meaningful repetition* and not just mechanical reiteration of phrase units. Although my final take on the explanation of this phenomenon is not the same with that advocated by Reichel who thinks that this can only be the result of written composition, his list of criteria for the establishment of *intentional* cross-referencing is extremely valid.¹⁴¹

1. repetition occurs (no matter whether it is required by the wording) inside a given plotline or a specific context;
2. repetition is supported by an implicit cross-reference through an explicit cross-reference in the same context;
3. within the environment of two or more passages, in which the repetition occurs, there are other repetitions too;
4. the repeated element occurs only very rarely or at minimum twice;
5. the repetition involves a longer passage;
6. the repetition is very specific with respect to its phraseology and hence applicable only to a very limited number of situations.

The more criteria are met the more probable is that we are dealing with meaningful and intended repetition. Reichel was able to reveal the existence of a remarkable internal system of references, a real *Vernetzung* (“web of associations”), integral part of which are the so-called *iterata* (next to the repetition of longer passages, the structural and thematical parallel shaping of speeches and speech-based scenes separated by long chunks of text, and the sophisticated manipulation of time).¹⁴²

¹³⁹ See Mueller (1984) 158.

¹⁴⁰ Basset (1938), Schadewaldt (1966³).

¹⁴¹ Reichel (1994) 42.

¹⁴² Reichel (1994) 370.

In light of all the above observations, it is clear that the expression γυνάων εἵνεκα δώρων meeting most of the criteria listed above is not a mechanical reiteration of wording but a meaningful repetition amounting to an *intertraditional cross-reference* or an *oral intertextual citation*.

Justin Arft

Immanent Thebes: Traditional Resonance and Narrative Trajectory in the *Odyssey*

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0020

Theban Resonance: Problem and Method¹

The central interpretive problem posed by Thebes in archaic Greek literature is one of sources. Extant written sources are fragmentary, and the repository of traditional multiforms once immanent to them is lost as well. In the absence of a cohesive whole, however, we may seek resonance² as an indicator of lost “sources”, or rather, traditional interactions. Inherent to the term resonance is the metaphor of a source interacting with its surroundings, a useful framework for viewing Thebes in the *Odyssey*. The primary aim of this essay, then, is to explore the mechanics of interaction between Theban “sources” and the *Odyssey*’s poetic framework, or “surroundings”. In particular, Epicaste and Eriphyle as presented in the *Nekyia* summon extratextual Theban connotations that resonate against intratextual elements of the *Odyssey*’s own poetic construction and audience – in this case, the Catalogue of Heroines and its primary recipient, Arete, queen of the Phaeacians.

¹ Greek text of the *Odyssey* is from von der Mühl (1962). Translations for *Od.* 11.271–276 and *Od.* 11.336–340 are from Lattimore (1965/2007). All other translations are my own. Special thanks to Jonathan Burgess, Sean Gurd, Benjamin Sammons, and David Schenker for valuable comments and critiques, especially on interpreting the scholia, and Matthew Farmer, Scott Garner, Eric Thienes, and Christopher Dobbs for their helpful suggestions. All remaining errors, inaccuracies, or otherwise blameworthy assertions are my own.

² The term “resonance” is more suggestive than descriptive, used broadly in studies on traditional poetry. Graziosi and Haubold (2005) 9 treat the term more specifically, and Barker and Christensen (2008) 8, n. 35 call attention to their understanding of the term (see also Barker [2009] 1, n. 1). Their application of the term is useful, but I prefer Foley’s traditional referentiality to elucidate the traditional phenomenon at hand. See below for further explication, and see Foley (1990, 1991, 1995a, and 1999) for the projects that develop this model more completely.

Justin Arft: E-Mail: justin.arft@gmail.com.

Before proceeding, a word on Homer and Thebes *in toto*. At the broadest level, Homeric tradition can encompass both Theban and Trojan War traditions, blurring boundaries between them.³ Written texts – the artifacts of these traditions – confine us to sharper delineation. Although we possess only fragments⁴ of what may have been coherent Theban epics similar to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, the textualized form of the *Odyssey* is actually similar to such epics in its status as *pars pro toto* – that is, the *Odyssey* represents a single manifestation drawn from a larger tradition. While the *Odyssey* presents its own challenge of sources, the chronological and generic disparities among the sources for Theban myth pose an even greater problem of coherence.⁵ Therefore, the *Odyssey*'s intratextual frame, because of its larger and more intact poetic sample size, becomes a necessary interpretive point of departure for an examination of extratextual⁶ Theban resonance in the *Odyssey*. I proceed with approximations of what we may consider “traditional” aspects of Theban myth and weigh them against the more discernible structures of the *Odyssey* itself.

Studies of allusion, reference, and intertextuality are thriving in Homeric scholarship, especially in the areas of oral poetics and neoanalysis.⁷ While I do not declare exclusive allegiance to one approach, I adopt John Miles Foley's traditional referentiality⁸ as a working model in this analysis, employing the ter-

³ On this “mythological superstructure”, see Burgess (2001), 3, 173. On the attribution of cyclic poetry as Homeric, see Burgess (2001) 129–131; Nagy (1990) 77–79 = §§ 2.48–49. On the possibility of a “Homeric *Thebaid*”, see Torres (2012). On Theban myth in the Homeric tradition, see Barker and Christensen (2008, 2011) and Nagy (1990) 414–416 = §§ 14.1–5. See also Ebbott (2010) 240–242.

⁴ For the fragments themselves, see West (2003). Regarding evidence for the cyclic *Thebaid* see Ebbott (2010) 242 and Fitch (1922). On reconstructing Theban epic, see Barker and Christensen (2011) 10 and Berman (2013). Regarding the myths and epics surrounding Oedipus, see Cingano (1992) and Edmunds (1981a).

⁵ The following resources direct the reader to a more exhaustive handling of Thebes in Greek literature. On the general problem of Theban reconstruction, see Ebbott (2010) 254–258. On the sources and their reconstructions, see Berman (2013) 37, who includes the important works of Gantz (1993) and Bethe (1891). On Theban archaeology, see Berman (2004) and Kelly (2006). On Thebes' foundation, see Berman (2004, 2013) and Kühr (2006) 369. On interactions between epic, drama, and lyric relating to Thebes, see Nagy (2000). On Pindar and Thebes, see Braswell (1998), Floyd (1968) and Foster (2013). For a view of Stesichorus and Theban epic, see Gostoli (1978). See also Burnett (1988) 121–129 for a careful handling of a variety of lyric, cyclic, and dramatic sources as they relate to Theban myth.

⁶ Cf. Foley (1991) 7–8 on the “extratextual” nature of tradition.

⁷ See Tsagalis (2011a) for an excellent overview of these developments. See also Burgess (2006), Danek (2002), and Montanari et al. (2012).

⁸ See Foley (1991) xiv–xv, 10 on connotation. On traditional referentiality see (1991) 2–11 and (1999) 278, n. 2. See Danek (2002) 13–19 for an appraisal of the method.

minologies of “inherent” and “connotative” to represent how traditional poetry signifies meaning. Thus, the term “immanence” becomes useful for describing the metonymic mechanism of Homeric referentiality. As Foley describes, (1991) 9:

When we “read” any traditional performance or text with attention to the inherent meaning it necessarily summons, we are, in effect, recontextualizing that work, reaffirming contiguity with other performances or texts, or, better, with the ever-immanent tradition itself.

What follows, then, is a consideration of what Thebes immanently connotes and how those connotations resonate once positioned within the thematic structures and trajectory of the *Odyssey*’s intratextual frame.

Intratextual Surroundings

The Catalogue of Heroines represents one of the more densely Theban-referential⁹ episodes in the *Odyssey* and provides the most immediate resonating chamber for Eriphyle and Epicaste. While much can be said about the Catalogue’s overall structure and function in the epic,¹⁰ I focus on these two particular women for their roles in major episodes of Theban myth and their resonance with Arete, the primary internal audience of the Catalogue.¹¹

Catalogues employ a distinct referential mechanic in their ability to create particularized arrangement, invoking a kind of “mythic discourse”¹² where tradition can be focused and encoded. In Tsagalis’ terms, this encoding can be thought of as “vertical” and “horizontal” – reaching outward (horizontally) to extratextual tradition and within (vertically) to intratextual figures and features.¹³ Regarding the Catalogue of Heroines’ relationship to Theban myth, Tsagalis’ remarks are incisive (2010) 328:

⁹ See Larson (2000) for an outline of Theban/Boeotian ties to women in the Catalogue of Heroines, especially in terms of the external audience.

¹⁰ Cf. Fenik (1974) 145–46; Frame (2009) 225–254 = §§ 2.100–116; Doherty (1995) 66–68, 87–126; Sammons (2010) 74–102; Larson (2000); Gera (1997) 48–50.

¹¹ On Arete as audience to the Catalogue, see Doherty (1995) 65–86, 90, 96–99; Slatkin (1996) 228–230; Wyatt (1989) 239; Tsagarakis (2000) 83; Sammons (2010) 83–84; Skempis and Ziogas (2009) 239; Barker and Christensen (2008) 10, n. 43.

¹² See Aronen (2002) 93–96 for a deeper discussion.

¹³ See Tsagalis (2010) 328 on this terminology and 324–330 for more on Catalogues as “hypertextual” tools. See also Sammons (2010) 74–102 regarding the poetics of the Catalogue of Heroines.

When the audience listens to this material, it would at once activate in its mind myths pertaining to the Theban tradition, with the result that this fragmented text would be disseminated, almost “spilled over” into the Theban material.... What seems at first glance static, unchanging and rigid thus becomes kinetic and open-ended, coming alive every time an audience hears it performed.

Further, the Catalogue’s generic relationship to *ehoie*-poetry shapes how its figures are presented to Arete,¹⁴ a contrast to the martial, androcentric elements of the *Nekyia*’s latter half directed toward Alcinoos.¹⁵ Conventions of *xenia* or decorum alone might demand compliment for the queen, so a pleasant account of powerful women might likewise appeal to her.¹⁶ Beyond protocol, however, the composition of the Catalogue of Heroines is more targeted, not least because Arete represents a significant milestone in Odysseus’ *nostos*. The queen is introduced to Odysseus on two occasions, once by Nausicaa, and once by Athena, and in both cases her centrality to Odysseus’ homecoming is forecast.¹⁷ Moreover, Athena introduces Arete by means of a genealogical catalogue – a vertical reference within the poem anticipating the more complex Catalogue of Heroines later. Athena informs Odysseus that Arete “lacks no good intelligence” (*Od.* 7.73, οὐ μὲν γάρ τι νόου γε καὶ αὐτὴ δεύεται ἐσθλοῦ) and Arete’s favorable impression (*Od.* 7.75, φίλα φρονέησ’ ἐνὶ θυμῷ) could result in Odysseus’ successful return (*Od.* 7.76–77). I contend that here and elsewhere, Odysseus is listening carefully and adapts the Catalogue of Heroines to his audience in kind.

Two additional characteristics of the queen should be noted for further analysis of Epicaste and Eriphyle. From the outset, Arete bears semiotic similarity to Penelope, inviting association with her role in Odysseus’ *nostos*, especially as a determinant in the return tale.¹⁸ Further, from Odysseus’ arrival on Scheria to the close of the Phaeacian episode, the curse of Poseidon as foretold in Nausithoos’

¹⁴ On the Hesiodic Catalogue’s relationship to the *Odyssey*’s Catalogue of Heroines, see West (1985) 32 n. 7; Barker and Christensen (2008) 10, n. 42; Doherty (1995) 66, n. 4; Osborne (2005) 17; Irwin (2005) 49; Tsagarakis (2000) 11–12. See Tsagalis (2010) 326–328 on the structure of the Catalogue of Heroines as it relates to the Hesiodic Catalogue.

¹⁵ See Sammons (2010) 82–85 for more on this contrast.

¹⁶ See Doherty (1995) 90, 96–99, 103 on this level of appeal.

¹⁷ Cf. *Od.* 6.303–315 and 7.73–77. On Arete as a problematic figure in the *Odyssey*, see Fenik (1974) 7–17, 105–130; Hainsworth (1988) 316–319; Austin (1975) 196–197; Garvie (1994) 2, 22–23; Reece (1993) 108–107. For diverse views on Arete’s significance, see Doherty (1995) 76–126; Loudon (1999) 1–14, 119, n. 39, 140, n. 35; Skempis and Ziogas (2009); Whittaker (1999); Minchin (2007a) 87, 112, 128; Frame (2009) 2–3, 338–393 = §§ 3.1–38.

¹⁸ On Penelope and Arete’s similarity, see Loudon (1999) 7, 59; Lang (1969); Doherty (1995) 80–90. See Foley (1999) 115–168 on Penelope’s indeterminacy as conventional to the Indo-European return tale.

prophecy looms heavy over the Phaeacians, whereby Arete's assistance to Odysseus could result in their demise.¹⁹ For the moment, an outline emerges: Odysseus has been informed he is speaking to a powerful queen who may determine his day of return, a queen who may be complicit in her people's destruction by means of an ancestral curse. It is from this intratextual frame that Odysseus carefully renders his handling of Epicaste and Eriphyle.

Fair Epicaste

μητέρα τ' Οἰδιπόδαο ἴδον, καλὴν Ἐπικάστην,
ἧ μέγα ἔργον ἔρεξεν αἰδρεῖται νόοιο
γῆμαμένη ὧ νῦν· ὁ δ' ὃν πατέρ' ἐξεναρίξας
γῆμεν· ἄφαρ δ' ἀνάπυστα θεοὶ θέσαν ἀνθρώποισιν.
ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν Θήβῃ πολυηράτῳ ἄλγεα πάσχων
Καδμείων ἦνασσε θεῶν ὀλοὰς διὰ βουλὰς·

I saw the beautiful Epicaste, Oedipodes' mother,
who in the ignorance of her mind had done a monstrous
thing when she married her own son. He killed his father
and married her, but the gods soon made it all known to mortals.
But he, for all his sorrows, in beloved Thebes continued
to be lord over the Cadmeans, all through the bitter designing of the gods;

Od. 11.271–276

Consistent with *ehoie*-poetry, Epicaste is introduced as *καλὴν*, a straightforward compliment with wide semantic range. As her entry continues, Odysseus offers more subtle praise²⁰ without being entirely revisionist of Theban myth. This rendition of the Oedipus story is our earliest textualized version and lacks the more dramatic aspects of the story. Despite its compressed form, however, the subtleties of Odysseus' handling of the more well-known or variable aspects of Theban myth demonstrate a clever interplay between intratext and extratext.

¹⁹ See *Od.* 8.564–571 for Alcinoos' first mention of the prophecy. *Od.* 8.570–71 indicates uncertainty as to the fulfillment of the prophecy, but the curse is initiated by Poseidon in *Od.* 13.146–152, although he only lithifies the ship before exiting the narrative, allowing the threat of Phaeacian destruction to linger. On the problems of indeterminacy this raises, see Peradotto (1990) 80–82, Doherty (1995) 126, and Nagy (2002) 86–88.

²⁰ See Barker and Christensen's examination (2008) 19–22 of the phraseological undertones of Epicaste's "great deed" (μέγα ἔργον) and portrayal as unknowing (αἰδρεῖται νόοιο).

Odysseus' use of the epithet πολυηράτω is particularly charged. In describing Thebes as πολυηράτω (literally, “much-loved” or “very lovely”) he is, at face value, confusing what is conventionally known of Thebes. This diction even gave the scholiast enough trouble to clarify the sense of the word (Σ *Od.* 11.275 [Dindorf]):

πολυηράτω] πολλὰς ἄρας καὶ βλάβας ὑπομεινάσῃ παρὰ θεῶν. Β. (5)
Q. V. οὐ γὰρ ἐρασμίω· ὅπως ἂν ἢ τῷ ὑποκειμένῳ ἀκόλουθον. V.

much-cursed] in that Thebes experienced many injuries and curses from the gods. In whatever way it is consistent with its subject [Thebes], it does not mean “lovely”.

While ὑποκειμένῳ likely means “subject” here, it can also indicate a subject's underlying element²¹ – suggesting, perhaps, the traditional force of the myth. For the scholiast, at the very least, loveliness is not immanent to Thebes.

This apparent contradiction in terms alerts us to a clever, layered association exploited by Odysseus. The adjective πολυηράτω is morphologically ambiguous enough to suggest forms of ἀράομαι and ἐράω, and Barker and Christensen (2008) 24–25 note this dual undertone, suggesting associations of both *eros*-heavy and cursed.²² The more immediate meaning of “lovely”, then, is hardly misplaced but a veneer of praise consistent with the Catalogue's genre and audience. Odysseus poetically employs, retains, and leverages extratextual resonance for the internal and external audiences simultaneously.

The adjective πολυηράτω also aligns with an intratextual network of curse-associations, including Arete's relationship to her own cursed city along with the etymology of her name. Arete's etymology,²³ associated with beseeching, praying, or even silence,²⁴ also implies “cursed”. Odysseus, too, occupies this ambiguity as one who is πολυάρητος (“much prayed for”) by Nausikaa (*Od.* 6.280) and Autolycus (*Od.* 19.404), but as his name given by Autolycus suggests (*Od.* 19.407–409), he is also “much cursed”.²⁵ The referential network of curses involving Thebes, Odysseus, and Arete convene at this moment in the *Odyssey*: if Odysseus is conveyed by the Phaeacians, Arete and Odysseus have a great deal to lose and gain, respectively. Therefore, Odysseus' presentation of Epicaste to Arete must be deli-

²¹ Cf. Ketel (1991) 197.

²² While the situation is not identical, Arete's own cursed household bears the marks of intra-familial relations and endogamous complications (*Od.* 7.54–77). For more, see Garvie (1994) 173–174.

²³ Cf. *Od.* 7.54: Ἀρήτη δ' ὄνομ' ἐστὶν ἐπώνυμον....

²⁴ On Arete's etymology, see Skempis and Ziogas (2009); Frame (2009) 351–352 = § 3.11; Garvie (1994) 172; Peradotto (1990) 108, 138–142.

²⁵ Cf. Peradotto (1990) 139.

cate and well-received, at least from his point of view in the narrative. For now, transforming an inherently cursed city into a lovely place is a good start.

Odysseus continues his praise by presenting Epicaste as “unknowing” (ἄδρῆϊσι νόοιο) and places her suicide soon (ἄρα) after the discovery of the deed. While an unknowing Epicaste is less culpable, a quick death²⁶ may also point to a strategic rendering of Epicaste’s fate amid traditional variations.²⁷ The myths concerning Epicaste and Oedipus are fragmentary and multiform²⁸ with at least two possible outcomes: one in which she dies immediately, eliminating her role in the later Theban conflict, or one where she lives, implicating her in the Oedipal curse represented in the *Thebaid*.²⁹

In Epicaste’s wake, Euryganeia becomes the mother of Eteocles and Polyneices, precluding the matrilineal curse sustained upon Thebes.³⁰ However, as evidenced in the Euripidean tradition and suggested in the Lille Stesichorus,³¹ a scenario exists wherein Epicaste remains alive and active in the household of Oedipus. Burnett³² places Homer’s Epicaste in the quick-death category, an outcome that elevates Oedipus’ heroism and implies Epicaste’s exoneration and preservation of the hero, a treatment Burnett calls “Homeric bowdlerizing”,³³ not unlike Hesiod’s account or the *Oedipodeia*’s possible treatment.³⁴ While I do not suggest such neat divisions within these myths, the variations themselves are consistent with traditional multiformity, making the Odyssean presentation targeted and meaningful.

Epicaste’s presentation in the Catalogue of Heroines, then, makes the following connotations immanent: she is a fair, even upright queen of a lovely yet cursed city, nor is she entirely responsible for its troubles – an outline that resonates with Arete, also at the center of a household threatened by divine, prophetic wrath. By means of her genealogical introduction in *Odyssey* 7, Arete is “tagged” with both Nausithoos and Poseidon as ancestors (*Od.* 7.54–62), and as

²⁶ On Epicaste’s suicide, see Gostoli (1978).

²⁷ See Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (1989) 60–63 for issues and sources regarding variant Oedipal wives, including Epicaste/Iocaste, Euryganeia, and Astymedousa.

²⁸ Cf. Cingano (1992), Edmunds (1981a), and Gantz (1993) 490–506.

²⁹ Cf. West (2003) 5–6, *Thebaid* frs. 2 and 3 (West). See Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (1989) 65–67 for a variety of approaches on Epicaste’s death and survival.

³⁰ Cf. West (2003) 38–41, *Oedipodeia* fr. 1 (= Pausanias 9.5.10–11).

³¹ On the variation in these sources, see Gostoli (1978) 24–26 and Burnett (1988) 120–129. On the Lille Stesichorus and Stesichorus’ approach to Theban epic, see Burnett (1988) and MacInnes (2007).

³² (1988) 120–123.

³³ (1988) 122.

³⁴ See Tsitsibakou-Vasalos (1989) 65, n. 17 for more on the *Oedipodeia*’s role in this version.

Odysseus learns in *Od.* 7.30–36, his means of Phaeacian conveyance is a gift from Poseidon, who most certainly is not in favor of his easy return. In fact, as Alcinoos expresses, the curse itself will be enacted for giving painless conveyance (*Od.* 8.566, πομποὶ ἀπήμονες), and it has been announced to Odysseus that Arete will be instrumental in gaining said conveyance. The equation adds up, and Arete's efficacy in Odysseus' *nostos* results in destruction.

Odysseus has certainly picked up relevant bits of information from Athena, Nausicaa, and Alcinoos concerning Arete's role in the household. Epicaste's fate here in the *Odyssey*, then, is a poetic creation in the hands of Odysseus, who uses narrative cues, not unlike a performer, to create an Epicaste who will resonate with the queen of the Phaeacians. The message seems to be clear: regardless of the Phaeacians' fate, Arete's actions could preserve the hero,³⁵ and her memory will be preserved by a capable poet who can exonerate the guilty, rehabilitate miasma, and render Arete a praiseworthy queen.

Baneful Eriphyle

Eriphyle's status as baneful sustains more traditional inertia than Epicaste's more "flexible" outcome. Eriphyle's epithet στυγερινή τ' Ἐριφύλην (*Od.* 11.326) serves as an immediate contrast to Ariadne in the previous entry (καλήν τ' Ἀριάδνην, *Od.* 11.321), and is also the only negative epithet in the Catalogue of Heroines, a feature that differentiates this Catalogue from a more universally positive Hesiodic Catalogue.³⁶ The poet does not attempt to transform the traditionally negative association; rather, it is leveraged into a series of intratextual associations resonating with Clytemnestra and her determinant role in the return-tale.

The extant myths surrounding Eriphyle generally fall into two categories: her betrayal of Amphiaraus and her matricide at the hands of Alcmaon.³⁷ Her

³⁵ See Doherty (1995) 125–126 for a discussion of the "opening" created by the Phaeacian episode's indeterminate conclusion.

³⁶ Cf. Osborne (2005) 17.

³⁷ For an overview of sources see Gantz (1993) 506–510, 523–528. In the *Odyssey*, Eriphyle appears here at *Od.* 11.326–327 and by allusion at *Od.* 15.247. Σ *Od.* 11.326 (Dindorf) retells the basic outline of her tale citing Asclepiades. Her legacy looms in the fragments of Stesichorus' *Eriphyle* (Cf. *PMGF* S148–S149), a poem familiar to [Apollodorus] (*Bibl.* 3.10.3), and she appears in Pindar's *Nemean* 9, adjunct to his handling of the Amphiaraus episode (see Braswell 1998, 27–41 for a detailed treatment of the Amphiaraus myth). See also [Apollodorus] *Bibl.* 3.6.2, 3.7.2, 3.7.5 and *Hyg. Fab.* 71, 73, as well as Paus. 1.34.3, 2.32.3, 5.17.7, and 9.41.2–5 who is especially concerned with her necklace (see Duffy 2013).

portrayal in Pindar's *Nemean* 9.16 as ἀνδροδάμαντ' Ἐριφύλαν ("man/husband taming Eriphyle") is consistent with consensus: Eriphyle ends heroes' careers, and her brief appearance in the Catalogue of Heroines accords with this tradition. While Eriphyle's status as treacherous and husband-taming alone resonates superficially with Clytemnestra, her descriptor *στυγερινή* phraseologically aligns her more specifically with Clytemnestra's "baneful song" (*Od.* 24.200, *στυγερὴ δέ τ' ἄοιδή*) and reminds the audience of Clytemnestra as "baneful mother" at *Od.* 3.310 (*μητρός τε στυγερῆς*) where Orestes is presented as killer of Aegisthus, but not explicitly of Clytemnestra.

The Σ *Od.* 3.309–310 and 3.310, commenting on this unusual omission, draw an even more direct, extratextual connection between Eriphyle and Clytemnestra (Dindorf 1855):

(309–310) ἦτοι ὁ τὸν κτείνας] ἔν τισι τῶν ἐκδόσεων οὐκ ἦσαν. ὁ δὲ Ἀρίσταρχος φησιν ὅτι διὰ τούτων παρποφαίνεται ὅτι συναπώλετο Αἰγίσθω ἢ Κλυταμνήστρᾳ. τὸ δὲ εἰ καὶ ὑπὸ Ὀρέστου, ἄδηλον εἶναι· οὐδὲ γὰρ τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἐριφύλην φησὶν εἶδέναι αὐτόν. M. Q.R. T. (5)

"In fact he who killed him"] These lines were not in some editions. Aristarchus claims that, by means of them, it is suggested that Clytemnestra was killed together with Aegisthus. But if this [matricide] was done by Orestes, [Aristarchus] says it is unclear. For he [Aristarchus] denies that he [Homer] knows the stories of Eriphyle.

(310) *μητρός τε στυγερῆς*] φεῖδεται διὰ τούτων τοῦ Ὀρέστου. τὸ μὲν γὰρ εὐφημότερον εἶπεν ὅτι ἔθαψε τὴν μητέρα, τὸν δὲ θάνατον παρεσιώπησεν. E. Q.V.

"baneful mother"] this is preserved because of the affairs of Orestes. He said the more euphemic thing, that he buried his mother, and omitted the matricide.

The scholiast above (Σ *Od.* 3.309–310 [Dindorf]) implies Aristarchus doubts these lines' authenticity based on their tacit acknowledgement of matricide, and if the γάρ is taken as explanatory, it also implies Aristarchus knew the stories of Eriphyle and believed them to be post-Homeric – if they were not, an allusion to their matricidal content (τὰ περὶ τὴν Ἐριφύλην) could have been possible for Homer, which Aristarchus denies. While it is unlikely that Eriphyle's tales or Orestes' matricide of Clytemnestra are post-Homeric,³⁸ this all suggests that Eriphyle and Clytemnestra are something of a multiform at least by the time of the scholiast.

Aristotle's *Poetics* brings this pairing down to at least the 4th century BC and even suggests the myths are traditionally stable units subject to poetic arrange-

³⁸ See Heubeck et al. (1988) 180–181.

ment and expansion. In a discussion concerning fear and pity in drama (*Poet.* 1453b), Aristotle speaks of how a dramatist should present material from myth, preferring compositional artistry (σύστασις) over visual spectacle (ὄψις). In doing so, he refers to the stories of Eriphyle and Clytemnestra in tandem (*Poet.* 1453b, 22–25):

τοὺς μὲν οὖν παρειλημμένους μύθους λύειν οὐκ ἔστιν, λέγω δὲ οἷον τὴν Κλυταιμίστραν ἀποθανοῦσαν ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀρέστου καὶ τὴν Ἐριφύλην ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀλκμέωνος, ...

[The poet] should not break up traditional tales; for example, the story where Clytemnestra is killed by Orestes and Eriphyle by Alcmaon, ...

Aristotle not only pairs Eriphyle and Clytemnestra, but also suggests that each mother-son unit represents a similar, coherent story pattern consisting of “traditional” elements (παρειλημμένους) that deserved preservation and were subject to artistic variation.

Vase iconography also supports thematic extratextual links between Clytemnestra and Eriphyle. In at least two ambiguous images of failed supplication, the images could interchangeably represent Clytemnestra or Eriphyle.³⁹ Additionally, a variety of images attributed to both Clytemnestra and Eriphyle depict a young male figure killing a woman.⁴⁰ Gantz, too, notes the inherent similarity between Clytemnestra and Eriphyle in vase images and fragmentary plays of Euripides and Sophocles dealing with the Theban cycle.⁴¹ Gantz singles

³⁹ *LIMC* 6.1, ‘Klytaimestra’ 31, 36; See further Naiden (2006) 79–81 on this supplication. Additionally, Lyons (2003, 101) sees the seductive nature of Eriphyle’s representations analogous to adultery, thereby linking Eriphyle to Clytemnestra on a level beyond matricide as well.

⁴⁰ Examples of vase images that attest to ambiguity in representations of Eriphyle and Clytemnestra are as follows:

(1) Gotha, Schlossmuseum: 55 = *ARV*² 804.69 = Addenda² 291 = *LIMC* 1.1, ‘Alkmaion’ 11 = *BAD* 209950; (2) Nauplia, Archaeological Museum: *PGU* 180 = *ARV*² 1061.154 = Addenda² 323 = *BAD* 213785. (Cf. *LIMC* 1.1, ‘Alkmaion’ 12.) Cf. *LIMC* 6.1, ‘Klytaimestra’ 36; as for the subject of the image, Vermeule (1966, 19) favors Clytemnestra over Beazley’s Eriphyle; (3) London, British Museum: E120 = *ARV*² 1280.61 = *Paralipomena* 472 = Addenda² 35 = *LIMC* 1.2, ‘Alkmaion’ 13 = *BAD* 216249; (4) Berlin, Schloss Charlottenburg: F1937 = Berlin, Antikensammlung: F1937 = *ABV* 525.5, 704 = Addenda² 131 = *LIMC* 1.2, ‘Alkmaion’ 9 (BD) = *BAD* 330772; (5) Sevres, Musée Céramique: 2035 = *ABV* 525.6, 704 = Addenda² 131 = *LIMC* 1.1, ‘Alkmaion’ 10 = *BAD* 330773; (6) as referenced in Vermeule (1966) 18: *ARV*² 587.55; (7) as referenced in Naiden (2006) 80, n. 301: *LIMC* 6.2, ‘Klytaimestra’ 31. *LIMC* 6.1, ‘Klytaimestra’ 31–46 is classified as “meurtre de Clytemnestre seule” and serves as helpful comparandum to images of Eriphyle and Alcmaon. See also Vermeule (1966) 18–19 for analysis on Clytemnestra and Eriphyle’s matricides in iconography.

⁴¹ Cf. Gantz (1993) 525–527 and Sommerstein (2012) 195, 198–99.

out one image in particular of Eriphyle's matricide (Berlin PM VI 4841,⁴² dated 575–525 BC), which depicts a snake, possibly Erinyes or other “malignant nether powers”,⁴³ exhibiting congruence between Orestes and Alcmaon and the aftermath of matricide.⁴⁴ Further, the architectural sculpture on the east pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia also bears a similar resonance between traditions.⁴⁵ In sum, these parallel associations between Orestes/Alcmaon⁴⁶ and Clytemnestra/Eriphyle suggest at least deepened linkage between bodies of Theban and Trojan War myths but also increase the likelihood that the traditional multiformities surrounding these characters are immanent to their instances.

The suppression of Clytemnestra's matricide at *Od.* 3.309–310, then, represents an important intratextual calibration for both Clytemnestra and Eriphyle's extratextual identities. Not only is Orestes made to be a more suitable parallel for Telemachus, Clytemnestra as husband-destroyer is emphasized, an identity more suitable to the themes of *nostos* and *xenia* than her being a victim of matricide. The poet raises and suppresses traditionally available options as suited to the larger themes and structures of the poem at hand – a primary goal of which is to sing a particular version of Odysseus' return. Within the bounds of the return tale, husband-destroyer becomes *nostos*-destroyer, an identity assigned to Clytemnestra and likewise resonant with Eriphyle.

Arete's Reception and Narrative Trajectory

Odysseus' reason for not simply presenting the shade of Clytemnestra to Arete is partly an issue of subtlety and diplomacy. Clytemnestra's tale is narrated later, and in much less subtle terms (*Od.* 11.387–464), being focalized through a spurned male hero, Agamemnon. Subtle praise is replaced with more grandiose, misogynist, and admonitory rhetoric. The Catalogue of Heroines, rather, is tempered by Odysseus' knowledge of Arete's good intelligence and potential role in assisting him. More specifically, however, Arete's linkage to the looming destruction of the

⁴² Cf. Gantz (1993) 760 (same as *LIMC* 1.1, 'Alkmaion' 3).

⁴³ Cf. Gantz (1993) 526. See Berlin, Schloss Charlottenburg: F1937 and Sevres, Musée Céramique: 2035 above for similar iconography.

⁴⁴ Σ *Od.* 11.326 (Dindorf) refers to the madness of Alcmaon after killing Eriphyle.

⁴⁵ See Hurwit (1987) 13–14 for a collocation of the matricides of Clytemnestra and Eriphyle, particularly how the viewing audience would recall both sets of stories.

⁴⁶ Cf. Gantz (1993) 507–08, 522–27; see also West (2003) 10–11 for a general background on a possible *Alcmeonis*.

city and her eventual giving of gifts⁴⁷ aligns her with elements of Eriphyle's tale, reinforcing the danger both Odysseus⁴⁸ and Arete represent for the Phaeacians.

The Catalogue of Heroines closes immediately following Eriphyle's entry, where the poet-narrator punctuates the episode with a traditional phrase: ὥς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα πάντες ἀκήν ἐγένοντο σιωπῇ ("So he spoke, and they all became silent, without words"). This phraseology has been analyzed by Foley (1995b), Andrew Porter (2011), and David Elmer (2013) 28–29, all of whom note the traditional mechanism enacted by the formula. As Foley explains (1995b) 14:

Implied uncertainty gives way to stunned silence, and then, by traditional convention, to an absolutely predictable – because traditionally sanctioned – response. In short, the radical, unexpected action never materializes without an immediate or an eventual qualification, that is without a substantial attendant drawback that may be crippling to or dismissive of the proposal but at the very minimum constitutes a change of narrative direction from that suggested by the initial speaker.

The immediate qualification, then, is offered by Arete in the intermezzo. Breaking the silence, she says:

“Φαίηκες, πῶς ὕμιν ἀνὴρ ὅδε φαίνεται εἶναι
εἰδός τε μέγεθός τε ἰδὲ φρένας ἔνδον ἔϊσας;
ξεῖνος δ' αὐτ' ἐμός ἐστιν, ἕκαστος δ' ἔμμορε τιμῆς.
τῷ μὴ ἐπειγόμενοι ἀποπέμπετε μηδὲ τὰ δῶρα
οὕτω χρηῖζοντι κολούετε· ...

“Phaeacians, what do you think now of this man before you
for beauty and stature, and for the mind well balanced within him?
And again he is my own guest, but each one of you has some part
in honoring him. Do not hurry to send him off, nor cut short
his gifts, when he is in such need, ...

Od. 11.336–340

⁴⁷ See Lyons (2012) 30, 65–72 on the dynamic of women's gift exchange in the *Odyssey*, especially in relation to Arete. Lyons (2012) 66 notes the danger associated with women's gifts in Greek tradition, but interprets Arete's gift giving as benign. I contend that her gifts, representing her assistance in Odysseus' return, are quite dangerous to the Phaeacians.

⁴⁸ Poseidon's curse and Odysseus' conveyance represent threats to the Phaeacians, but also, Odysseus is entangled in the very language of the curse. Upon his arrival to Scheria he, likened to a fire-brand (δαλόν, *Od.* 5.488), buries himself (καλύψατο, *Od.* 5.491) on the isle, and his eyes are covered (ἀμφικαλύψας, *Od.* 5.493). Both expressions use the same diction as the prophesied destruction of the isle (μέγα δ' ἡμῖν ὅρος πόλει ἀμφικαλύψειν, *Od.* 8.571). After being prompted by Odysseus and just prior to the Apologue, Demodocus introduces Odysseus by way of the Trojan horse episode, wherein the city was fated to be destroyed “whenever it concealed” the horse (αἶσα γὰρ ἦν ἀπολέσθαι, ἐπὶν πόλις ἀμφικαλύψει δουράτεον μέγαν ἵππον..., *Od.* 8.510–511).

Odysseus' closure of the Catalogue is an encoded proposal that his tale end at the hands of a baneful woman, a moment of feigned determinacy in the epic that is opened up by Arete through her response. Not only does Arete's response ratify the continuance of Odysseus' tale, it sets the terms of the continuation: by speaking authoritatively in assembly she rebukes the possibility of a bad *nostos* raised by Odysseus through Eriphyle, and redefines him as a *xeinos*, a status critical to his return.⁴⁹ If this exchange has aided in the continuance of Odysseus' *nostos*,⁵⁰ even subtly, the ramifications of assisting Odysseus initiates Poseidon's curse and Arete's demise. Just as Epicaste ended her life quickly but survived as praiseworthy within Odysseus' poetic abilities, Arete too, upon his heroic success, will be remembered in similar terms, despite her city's foregone destruction. Just as Penelope will not become Clytemnestra, Arete will not become Eriphyle.

In the end, Odysseus' performance and Arete's reception of Eriphyle and Epicaste in the *Odyssey* are emblematic of traditional referentiality throughout Homeric poetry. Variation among extant extratextual sources, more than presenting a conundrum of reconstruction, indicates traditional multiforms available for the poet's use. In this case, the catalogue structure of Odysseus' performance indicates a partial, yet encoded and compressed rendition of a larger mythic tradition. Within this performance arena, the individual words are "explosively connotative"⁵¹ with traditional associations, retaining aspects of their history, but shaped anew in each recurrence. Even if we lack the full corpus of Theban myth, we can be assured of its traditional nature, its ability to retain association. The challenge for us, then, is to carefully discern or reconstruct what is retained – an operation achieved in part through the consensus of relatively mute artifacts, but especially within the context of the *Odyssey*'s mostly complete performance, an artifact in its own right, but monumental enough to sustain resonance.

⁴⁹ Cf. Murnaghan (2011) 69–85 on the idea that Odysseus must be a proper guest to become a suitable husband to Penelope. Further, Poseidon's wrath is specifically targeted against Odysseus "sacker of cities", (*Od.* 9.530) an identity reconfigured by his status as ξείνος. Cf. Peradotto (1990) 141–142 for a similar view on Odysseus' shifting identity.

⁵⁰ Cf. Skempis and Ziogas (2009) 227, n. 39 for views against and n. 40 for views in favor. On a metapoetic level, the continuance of the *Nekyia* allows the *Odyssey* itself to continue, but in terms of the traditional narrative, Arete is also sensitive to the order of hospitality rituals (including supplication, meals, interrogation, gifts, and conveyance) that Alcinoos threatens to violate throughout the Phaeacian episode; see further Rose (1969) 390–391, 396, 402–403; Reece (1993) 104–106.

⁵¹ Cf. Foley (1999) xii, 305.

Stephanie Larson

Boeotia, Athens, the Peisistratids, and the *Odyssey's* Catalogue of Heroines¹

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0021

Archaic Greeks seem to have been particularly fond of catalogues, especially those recounting heroic genealogies, such as the Hesiodic *Gynaikon Katalogos*, an early example of a specifically female-oriented catalogue.² In *Odyssey* 11, Odysseus presents an analogous list of fourteen female mythological figures whom he encounters in the Underworld. Brief mention of heroines in catalogues served to recall myths of their husbands or famous male children.³ A similar privileging of male over female is also evident spatially in Greek cult where females are commonly celebrated as secondary figures to their male partners or sons.⁴

Traditionally the Hesiodic *Gynaikon Katalogos* has been read as a model for the *Odyssey's* catalogue, although this assumption has been challenged.⁵ While many heroines of the catalogue seem to form a unified group and were based on an existing and well-known mythic tradition, and while a number of lines in both catalogues correspond, particularly in the case of the Aeolids, it does not follow that the *Odyssey's* catalogue relied exclusively on the first book of the *Gynaikon Katalogos*.⁶ Heubeck attributes the similarity between the catalogues to a common mythic source, a view which seems most likely given the tradition of catalog poems stipulated by Rutherford.⁷ Catalogues comprise a structural

¹ An earlier version of this article appeared in *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 41 (2000) 193–222, and I am grateful for the journal's permission to present a reworked version of the article for this volume.

² Dated ca. 580 by West (1985) 130–137, 164; see 137–164 for the different chronological layers of the poem); see also Fowler (1998) 1 and n. 4.

³ Doherty (1995) 94 and 108; West (1985) 2 (on the *Gynaikon Katalogos*). Doherty has even called the *Gynaikon Katalogos* (rightly, in my view) a “men's genre” (Doherty 2008, 64).

⁴ J. Larson (1995) 79–80 (the most notable exception being the cult of Helen at Therapne).

⁵ West (1985) 6, 32; for a list of others, see Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989) 91; Doherty (1995) 66 n. 4.

⁶ As first noted by Zutt (1894); see West (1985) 32.

⁷ Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989) 91; Rutherford (2000) 89–92; Skempis and Ziogas (2009) 231 and n. 49.

Stephanie Larson: Bucknell University, E-Mail: slarson@bucknell.edu.

element of epic extremely susceptible to alteration and amalgamation.⁸ It seems most likely that the *Odyssey's* catalogue rather juxtaposes traditional tales of relevance to a particular time and place, thereby capturing of a specific point in the development of the *ehoie*-genre.⁹ In terms of function and reception, such alterations conformed to the needs and expectations of the audience at the time of performance and were used “to provide proof or explanation for the present.”¹⁰

In what follows I first set the final composition of the *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines into a context by analyzing the mythical significance behind the figures included. The figures clearly and predominantly center upon Theban and Boeotian mythic tradition. In the second section, I turn to material evidence from Boeotia for positive relations between Athens and Thebes during the sixth-century BC and ultimately conclude that the period of textualization for the *Odyssey's* catalogue can be set in Peisistratid Athens.

In attempting to locate this period, it is first instructive to consider Odysseus' own strategy within the poem for incorporating the catalogue of heroines as entertainment for his Phaeacian audience. His method can be understood to mirror that used for the catalogue itself at the time of the poem's final textualization. As we will see, one of Odysseus' main concerns in telling his genealogical tales is to compliment his audience and to acquire its continued goodwill.

As Athena leads the shipwrecked Odysseus to the palace of king Alcinoos, she informs him about the Phaeacians, his future audience (*Od.* 7.75). He learns of their descent from Poseidon through Poseidon's son, the great-hearted Nausithoos (*Od.* 7.62), the original king of the Phaeacian community and *oikist* of Scherie (*Od.* 7.56–57, 6.4–8). Alcinoos, the present king and Odysseus' host, is Nausithoos' son and thus Poseidon's grandson. Recall that Odysseus has landed on Scherie bereft of everything, even his name. In order to accomplish his *nostos*, Odysseus desperately needs the Phaeacians. The genealogical information that Athena provides is thus vital. Odysseus must devise a means to compliment these descendants of Poseidon, even though it is this very deity who would destroy him.¹¹ Πολύτροπος Odysseus thus devotes over half his catalogue to tales of women linked to the god; as we will see below, eight of the fourteen are somehow related to Poseidon, as mothers of his sons, as descendants, through cult relationships, or by marriage. Odysseus' list thus creates a bond of good will between himself and his audience based on shared knowledge of an inherited tradition of local stories.

⁸ Sherrat (1990) 813; see also Raaflaub (1998) 169–194.

⁹ Rutherford (2000) 94–96.

¹⁰ Thomas (1989) 173; see also West (1985) 11 and Irwin (2005) 60 and 65–83.

¹¹ This approach complements Most's reading of the *apologoi* in general (Most 1989, 29–30).

Immediately upon the catalogue's completion, queen Arete praises Odysseus' heart (*Od.* 11.337) and urges his audience not to begrudge him any gifts (*Od.* 11.339–40). Alcinoos also applauds Odysseus for his minstrel-like skill in truth and storytelling (*Od.* 11.363–367) and even requests a second catalogue of the heroes Odysseus encountered in the *katabasis*.¹² The positive reception indicates the internal audience's acceptance of Odysseus' tales and character; his return seems more assured. The causal relationship between the genealogies in the catalogue of heroines and Odysseus' successful journey has often gone unnoticed by commentators; some have even interpreted the catalogue as a "flaw in composition", although recent work by Doherty and Minchin has gone far in explaining Arete's and ultimately the Phaeacians' positive reception of the *Nekyia*.¹³

Interpreting the catalogue of heroines as an appeal to the internal audience of Odysseus' poem raises the possibility of approaching the catalogue similarly in terms of the real external audience for the poem. It is quite possible that these same genealogies operated analogously at the specific time of the poem's textualization: to engage and perhaps even to compliment implied members of the external audience. We may come closer to identifying this period by examining the regions and mythic families with which the catalogue's genealogies are primarily associated. In what follows I demonstrate the catalogue's focus on Thessaly, Boeotia, and Attica. Within these regions, Thebes, Athens, and south-central Thessaly are particularly well represented, the last insofar as the Thessalian heroines of the catalogue are all related, usually by blood, to the Aeolids of south-central Thessaly. I have tried to follow Odysseus' own classification of these figures as wives and daughters by categorizing them according to marriage, famous children, other immediate blood relationships, and locations of their primary cults. I have limited my sources to the archaic and early classical periods so as to remain as close as possible to the moment of the *Odyssey*'s final textualization. The catalogue consists of fourteen heroines.

¹² For a fascinating reading of this interchange as a ratification of masculine authority over Arete's initial acceptance of Odysseus' entertainment, see Doherty (2008) 66.

¹³ E.g. Heubeck and Hoekstra (1989) 91, where the catalogue's function is explained as a demonstration of Odysseus' experience in the heroic world. Stanford (1959, 394) noted Arete's positive response but did not link it to the catalogue. Minchin and Doherty concentrate primarily on the pleasant effect of the list on Arete as a female member of Odysseus' audience; see Doherty (1995) 22, 65–69, 82–83, 92–121 and 76–86 for similarities between Arete and Penelope as ideal female members of Odysseus' internal audience; Minchin (2007b) 20–11; Skempis and Ziogas (2009) 227–228, 240.

Odysseus opens with Tyro, daughter to king Salmoneus, son of Aeolus,¹⁴ and lover to Poseidon but wife to Thessalian Cretheus, her father's brother.¹⁵ Tyro is thus an Aeolid by both blood and marriage. In archaic myth the Aeolids and many of their offspring were linked to central Greece, especially south-central Thessaly and the Iolcos region.¹⁶ That Poseidon visits Tyro in the form of her beloved Enipeus also links Tyro to the region, as the Enipeus river flows through southern Thessaly to the Peneios.¹⁷ This geography is also particularly evident in the cities to which Tyro's sons are connected. Pelias becomes king of Thessalian Iolcos (*Od.* 11.256),¹⁸ and Aeson founds Thessalian Aeson and fathers of the hero Jason;¹⁹ Tyro also bears Pheres, eponym of Thessalian Pherae and father of Admetus.²⁰ Through blood, marriage, and children, Tyro is thus firmly connected to south-central Thessaly.

Antiope, the second woman in the catalogue, figures prominently in Boeotian tradition. According to Asius, a late sixth-century poet who often treated Boeotian legends, Antiope is daughter to Asopos, the main river in south-central Boeotia.²¹ In the *Gynaikon Katalogos* Antiope was born in Hyria, a southern Boeotian community.²² She bore the famous twin *oikistai* of Thebes, Amphion and Zethos.²³ Early Ionian historians center the mythology of Amphion and Zethos in southern Boeotia, especially Thebes, where the two heroes may have been worshipped at a tumulus north of the Acropolis, as is still commonly believed in modern Thebes.²⁴

14 [Hes.] *GK* fr. 30 M-W; West (1985) 64. For Tyro's story see West (1985) 142; for the association with Thessaly, see also Gantz (1993) 171 and n. 7.

15 [Hes.] *GK* fr. 30.26–34. For the Tyro story as a positive example for Arete, see the excellent commentary by Skempis and Ziogas (2009) 236.

16 West (1985) 142. See West's map of Aeolus' offspring in the *Gynaikon Katalogos*, where three of Aeolus' five daughters are linked geographically to southern Thessaly (61).

17 On Tyro as a subject of desire in her own idyll within the catalogue, see Doherty (2008) 69, 72.

18 For Pelias as Poseidon's son, see [Hes.] *GK* fr. 38 M-W.

19 [Hes.] *GK* fr. 38–42 M-W; West (1985) 65.

20 West (1985) 65.

21 Asius fr. 1 *GEF*. That the south-central Boeotian river is meant in the *Odyssey* must be inferred from its existence at *Il.* 4.382–384 and 10.285–288 (Gantz 1993, 219). Antiope's importance for nearby Thebes also implies that the Boeotian Asopos is the river named here. For Asius' sixth-century date, see Huxley (1969) 95. The alternative late-fifth-century date seems less probable, since it is based on the style and tone of one of the less securely ascribed fragments; see Forrester (1956) 43 n. 3; Bowra (1957) 391–401, esp. 400; Schachter (1981–1994) I 59.

22 [Hes.] *GK* fr. 181 M-W.

23 [Hes.] *GK* fr. 182 M-W; Pindar characterizes his Thebes as the city of Zethus (fr. 52k.44 S-M).

24 For differences between the Pherecydean, Hecatean, and Hellenian traditions, see Buck (1979a) 21, 23. For prehistoric tombs north of the Cadmeia, see Spyropoulos (1981) and Schachter (1981–1994) I 28 and n. 2.

Antiope is thus strongly linked to south-central Boeotian topography and cult.

The following three heroines also have significant associations with Thebes about which little need be said. Alcmene's links to the city, as wife of Amphitryon and mother of Heracles, are obvious. The *Iliad*, the *Gynaikon Katalogos*, and the [Hesiodic] *Aspis* all tie her to Thebes, and the *Odyssey* and Pindar to Heracles.²⁵ In Thebes Alcmene had her own sacred ἄλσος.²⁶ Odysseus next includes Megara, daughter of Creon, wife of Heracles, and mother to the Alcidae.²⁷ Following Megara comes Epicaste, a variant of the more familiar name Jocasta. She was the daughter of Menoeceus, a Theban descended from Echion, one of the original Spartoi. Her sorry fate is well known. Epicaste is thought to have been worshipped alongside the buried Oedipus in Thebes (*Il.* 23.679).²⁸

Chloris, the catalogue's sixth heroine, is tied to Boeotia through her father, Amphion, king of Boeotian (Minyan) Orchomenos. Hesiod and Pherecydes accordingly place Chloris in the Minyan genealogy of the city.²⁹ Chloris also reestablishes the catalogue's ties with Thessaly through marriage to Neleus, one of Tyro's sons and thus a descendant of the Thessalian Aeolids. Although Neleus and Chloris ruled Pylos, by descent they are both firmly linked to central Greece; their marriage was considered of great regional importance, as Pausanias later indicates.³⁰ Thus, Chloris brings to the catalogue a mixture of Boeotian and southwest-Thessalian ties.³¹

²⁵ *Il.* 14.323–324; [Hes.] *GK.* fr. 193 M-W; [Hes.] *Asp.* 50–53; *Od.* 11.266–268; Pind. *Nem.* 10.13–18.

²⁶ Pherec. fr. 84 *EGM*; also Paus. 9.11.1, on which see J. Larson (1995) 91–92; Schachter (1981–1994) I 15–16. For Alcmene's later connections to Athens, see Paus. 1.19.3; Kearns (1989) 145; J. Larson (1995) 93.

²⁷ On the Alcidae, see Pind. *Isthm.* 4.61–64, Stesich. 230 *PMGF*, Panyassis fr. 1 *GEF*, and Paus. 9.11.1–2.

²⁸ See also Kearns (1989) 50–52. For Odysseus' (and the epic's) manipulation of the Oedipus tale, see Barker and Christensen (2008) 22–25.

²⁹ [Hes.] *GK.* fr. 33a M-W; in Pherecydes Persephone, daughter of Minyas, was Chloris' mother (fr. 117 *EGM*).

³⁰ Paus. 9.36.4–9.37.1. Although in many early accounts Neleus and the Neleids are pursued by Heracles, this antagonism may reflect intra-Boeotian rivalry (Thebes versus Orchomenos) rather than casting into doubt Chloris' and Neleus' central Greek pedigree. Heracles kills all Neleids except Nestor at *Il.* 11.692–693; the *Gynaikon Katalogos* tells of Heracles' capture of Pylos (fr. 33a, 35 M-W, see Gantz 1993, 184–185). That Neleus' family remained linked to Thessaly, however, is clear from the story of Neleus' trial for the wooing of his daughter Pero, partially told in the catalogue. The trial consisted in driving the stolen cattle of Neleus' mother Tyro back from Iphiclus in Thessalian Phylace (*Od.* 11.281–297; cf. 15.225–226 and Pherecydes' account, fr. 33 *EGM*).

³¹ Cult evidence is of little worth, as references to cults involving Chloris and her family are late, although some concern Thebes (Paus. 9.1.6.4; Hyg. *Fab.* 69).

After this patently Thessalian and Boeotian section, the catalogue briefly includes Leda, a figure with primary ties to Sparta, but also to central Greece and Athens. Leda's father, Thestius, descends from the Aeolid Calyce and becomes patriarch of the famous Thessalian family already involved in the catalogue via Tyro.³² If Shapiro is right in accepting the existence of a mid-sixth-century Athenian cult and sanctuary of the Dioscouroi (the Anaceion), Leda's relations also may be linked to Athens. Although the Anaceion cannot be securely connected to Peisistratus or his sons, the Dioscouroi do not appear in Attic art for at least fifty years after the end of Peisistratid rule;³³ their absence raises the possibility of their cultic association with the Peisistratids in Athens in the mid sixth century BC. Leda's presence in the catalogue of heroines may thus serve to link Sparta, central Greece, and Athens, much as Chloris linked Pylos to central Greece.

Iphimedeia brings the audience back directly to southern Thessaly and central-Greek tradition through her father Triops, a descendant through Canace from Thessalian Aeolus;³⁴ in Hesiod Iphimedeia is also wife of Aloeus, a second relation via Canace to Aeolus ([Hes.] *GK* fr. 19 M-W), a relationship which makes Iphimedeia related to the Aeolids through both descent and marriage.³⁵ Iphimedeia is also celebrated for her famous central-Greek sons, Otus and Ephialtes (the Aloadae).³⁶ All figures in the catalogue who have Thessalian connections up to this point are thus somehow related to or descended from the Thessalian Aeolids. I return to this issue below.

With Phaedra begins the catalogue's brief focus on Athenian families and places. The *Odyssey* provides our sole attestation of Phaedra before Sophocles;³⁷ the most prominent feature of her story at that time seems to have been her marriage to Theseus.³⁸ Procris, daughter of Erechtheus and wife of the Attic deme hero

³² Thestius is Leda's father in Asius, as quoted by Pausanias (3.13.8: fr. 6 *GEF*). The genealogy, which seems of central-Greek importance, runs: Calyce > Endymion > Aetolus > Pleuron > Agenor > Thestius; see Huxley (1969) 94. On the basis of [Apollodorus'] testimony Gantz argues that Calyce be restored to the *GK* to fill a gap in the family ([Hes.] *GK* fr. 10a.100, 34, 96 M-W; Gantz 1993, 168).

³³ Shapiro (1989) 151–154.

³⁴ Gantz (1993) 168. For Triops as Iphimedeia's father (restored in the *GK* from [Apollodorus] *Bibl.* 1.74), see Gantz (1993) 169.

³⁵ West (1985, 61) also links Aloeus to the Thessalian town Alos (*Il.* 2.682).

³⁶ In some versions Otus and Ephialtes are the children of Aloeus (*Il.* 5.385–391); in others, as here, Iphimedeia bears them to Poseidon ([Hes.] *GK* fr. 19 M-W, Pind. fr. 162 S-M).

³⁷ Gantz (1993) 285–286.

³⁸ The location of Phaedra's cult on the south slope of the Acropolis, reportedly near Hippolytus' tomb, is uncertain (Eur. *Hipp.* 31–32; Kearns 1989, 173).

Cephalus, needs little explanation in terms of her Athenian significance.³⁹ Cephalus' pedigree also ties Procris to central Greece, however, for he was son to the Phocian king Deion, himself a son to Aeolus.⁴⁰ Cephalus was thus uncle to Tyro, the first Aeolid heroine of the catalogue. After Procris, the catalogue includes Ariadne. Associations with Athens through Theseus are primary, as noted in the catalogue itself. In this predominantly Attic section, the poem lists Phaedra and Procris only by name, giving no details about their traditions. Ariadne is more fully described, although her story is relatively short in comparison with the catalogue's earlier heroines. In fact, when taken together, the Athenian stories are noticeably brief.⁴¹ This economy may suggest that the audience was extremely familiar with these mythologies and even that large numbers of Athenians comprised the intended audience. Such inclusion of these figures highlights their relevance at the time and place of textualization.

Maera, the catalogue's twelfth heroine, is otherwise unknown. The thirteenth, Clymene, again brings the audience to central Greece and Athens. This Clymene is almost certainly the Minyan heroine who married Cephalus.⁴² According to Pausanias, Polygnotus depicted this Clymene in his painting of Odysseus' *katabasis* in the Delphian Lesche.⁴³ There she was pictured with seven other heroines from the catalogue, thus nearly securing her precise identification here. In some versions, Clymene bore to Cephalus Iphiclus, a figure associated in the catalogue with the Thessalian town Phylace.⁴⁴ Thus, through her own Minyan associations, marriage, and child, Clymene further emphasizes the regions that the catalogue concerns. The final heroine, Eriphyle, most obviously concerns Boeotia and specifically Thebes through her husband, Amphiaras, who, while also an Argive hero, was worshipped primarily in Thebes and at his nearby oracular sanctuary at Oropos.⁴⁵

³⁹ Pherec. fr. 34a *EGM*; Hellan. fr. 169 *EGM*; Istrus *FGrHist* 334 F 14; Kearns (1989) 177; J. Larson (1995) 29–34.

⁴⁰ Gantz (1993) 173, 181–182; Camp (1994) 7–12, at 7.

⁴¹ As noted also by Doherty, although not in geographic terms (1995, 94, 112). Doherty attributes the brevity to the narrator's desire to suppress unsavory stories about women. This view is attractive although in my view somewhat contrary to the canonical and purposeful function of catalogue poetry in which even brief mention of a mythological character would have called to mind vast networks of associated tradition.

⁴² *Nost.* fr. 4 *GEF* (*apud* Paus. 10.29.6).

⁴³ Paus. 10.29.4–7.

⁴⁴ *Nostoi* fr. 6 *GEF*; cf. Gantz (1993) 182, who suggests that Pausanias may have inaccurately quoted this fragment from the *Nostoi*.

⁴⁵ The exact site of the Theban Amphiaras is unknown, although Pausanias locates it between Thebes and Potniae on the spot where the earth swallowed the hero (9.8.3); cf. Pind. *Nem.* 9.24–27, 10.8–9, *Ol.* 6.12–17; for discussion, see Schachter (1981–1994) I 21–23; Hubbard (1992) 102–107.

Outside marriage, Eriphyle is also one of the ill-fated owners of the necklace of Harmonia, wife of Cadmus, founder of Thebes.

In sum, the catalogue includes thirteen heroines tied to south-central Thessaly and the Aeolids (Tyro, Iphimedeia); Sparta, the Aeolids, and Athens (Leda); southern Thessaly, Boeotia, and the Aeolids (Chloris); Thebes and Boeotia (Antiope, Alcmena, Megara, Epicaste, Eriphyle); Boeotia, Thessaly, and Athens (Clymene); and Athens (Phaedra, Procris, Ariadne).⁴⁶

As I have discussed elsewhere, Thessaly, the Aeolids, and those who would have been considered descended from them were significant in late archaic Boeotia. Of primary importance is the tradition of Boeotian migration, most fully related at Thucydides 1.12.2–3, where he acknowledges the importance of the Thessalian community Arne in the tradition of Boeotian migration. Thucydides' account complements earlier sources which mention the related town of Boeotian Arne ([Hes.] *GK* fr. 218 M-W; *Il.* 2.507). Thessalian Arne is thought to have been located in south-central Thessaly, the exact area in which the Aeolids were prominent in myth.⁴⁷ The Boeotians also claimed connections to Thessaly through collective worship of the Thessalian Athena Itonia whose sanctuary lay near Coroneia, on the western border of lake Copais.⁴⁸ Boeotian concern with Thessaly is perhaps most apparent, however, in the genealogy of the eponymous hero Boeotus, a figure linked to the story of Boeotian migration from Thessaly whose sources consistently link him by descent to an Aeolid.⁴⁹ In light of these Boeotian connections to Thessaly and the Aeolids through traditions of migration, collective cult, and the genealogy of Boeotus, the *Odyssey's* emphasis on Thessalian tradition takes on new meaning and can be read as a reflection of sixth-century Boeotian concerns.

Given the concentration on Thessaly prominent in Boeotian archaic tradition, the specific areas targeted by the *Odyssey's* catalogue can easily be narrowed to Boeotia and Athens, although this reading does not exclude the continued importance of these figures for Thessaly. In itself this conclusion is important in interpreting the catalogue, for while commentators have noted its general central-Greek tone, the importance of the characters for specific central-Greek popu-

⁴⁶ I omit Maera as her status is unclear.

⁴⁷ As the site of Thessalian Arne some accept Cierion, a site whose remains date to the end of the seventh century; see Helly (1991) 36. Others suggest Thessalian Philia (e.g. Morgan 1997, 171, 173, 194 n. 31). Both candidates lie in southern Thessaly.

⁴⁸ See also Larson (2007a) 133–136.

⁴⁹ [Hes.] *GK* fr. 218 M-W; Asius fr. 2 *GEF*; Hellan. fr. 51a *EGM*; Eur. *Melanippe Desmotis*, fr. 489 *TrGF*; *Sophe*, test. i.12–14 and test. iia.3 *TrGF* [Kannicht] (cf. Webster 1967, 147–157; cf. Larson (2007a) 31–66.

lations, especially the Thessalian figures, has not been pursued, nor has their relevance within a specific historical and performative context in central Greece.

Patterns in catalogue poetry noted in scholarship on the *Gynaikon Katalogos* help in answering such questions. Catalogue poetry was particularly magnetic to audience members claiming descent from or cultically affiliated with an included figure, particularly eponymous or founding figures.⁵⁰ West argues that during Greek poetry's crystallization, myths from concurrent traditions were juxtaposed in catalogues, often highlighting political and cultural situations of the period of composition.⁵¹ He bases dates for different layers of the *Gynaikon Katalogos* on various genealogies and their combinations constructed from the eighth to the sixth century; he places the Athenian genealogies no earlier than the late seventh century.⁵² In the end, he sees the entire *Gynaikon Katalogos* as a mid-to late-sixth-century cobbling together of earlier and contemporaneous material by an Athenian.⁵³ The *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines can be read similarly as earlier Boeotian and Thessalian material juxtaposed with bits of traditional Athenian genealogies to comprise a combined list relevant for a certain point in time.

The geographical associations of the *Odyssey's* catalogue thus suggest that a positive political and cultural relationship between Boeotia, especially Thebes, Thessaly, and Athens, marked the period of the catalogue's final composition. Scattered evidence points toward the second half of the sixth century, when the Peisistratids seem to have been active in Boeotia and Thessaly. In what follows, I review these sources. Although each detail on its own fails to confirm Athenian operations in Boeotia, the sources *in toto* are suggestive and may reasonably constitute a cultural context into which we can place the *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines.

Material evidence for Athenian and Peisistratid activity at the oracular sanctuary of Apollo Ptoos during the second half of the sixth century attests to a relationship between Boeotia, Thebes, and Athens. The sanctuary, perched atop a steep slope in the eastern χώρα of the Boeotian πόλις Acraiphia, was particularly popular as a regional sanctuary in the last half of the sixth century. The Ptoion is perhaps best known for the series of fine *kouroi* and *korai* which begin in the late seventh century, many of which were produced locally, but some of which are significant Naxian, Parian, and Athenian works.⁵⁴

⁵⁰ West (1985) 9.

⁵¹ E.g. West (1985) 150–153.

⁵² For the Geometric layers of the poem, see West (1985) 143–144, 150–153, 155–161, 164–166; for the sixth century, 130–137, 143, 154, 156, 164 (Attic genealogies); for a synopsis, see 165.

⁵³ West (1985) 136–137, 164, 169–171, and (1999) 380.

⁵⁴ Ducat (1971); Schachter (1981–1994) I 52–73.

The site appears to have been a regional sanctuary with attraction for individual visitors from various archaic Boeotian *poleis*.⁵⁵ Moreover, the Ptoion is one of only two Boeotian sanctuaries at which the Boeotians as a collective are known to have erected dedications to Athena in the sixth century.⁵⁶ The other sanctuary where the Boeotians dedicated collectively is the nearby and related sanctuary of the Acraiphian civic hero Ptoos.⁵⁷ Although it is unclear from the sources whether Thebes or nearby Akraiphia ultimately controlled the sanctuary,⁵⁸ given the state of our knowledge, the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoos and the related site of the hero seem to have been central to Boeotian identity during the last half of the sixth century.

But what of Peisistratid activity at the site or in other central Greek cult? As is well known, the Peisistratids were well aware of the political potential of religion.⁵⁹ They expressed particular interest in Apolline cult and even maintained a collection of oracles on the Acropolis, as Herodotus reports.⁶⁰ The historians also record Peisistratid involvement in Apolline cult on Delos (Hdt. 1.64.2; Thuc. 3.104.1). Following the French School's excavation reports there, Shapiro and Parker attribute to the Peisistratids a small temple of purely "Attic materials and construction".⁶¹ The Peisistratids were of course also active in Apolline cult in Athens, founding the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios, started by Peisistratus himself and continued by his grandson.⁶²

We have no record of any Peisistratid activity from Delphi.⁶³ This somewhat surprising fact, given their interest in Apolline cult, might be attributed to Alcmaeonid involvement in Delphi and to the famous antipathy of these two families in

⁵⁵ A number of personal dedications emerged at the sanctuary: from Thebans: Ducat (1971) 201 no. 124; 379 nos. 232–233; from Acraiphians: 355 no. 202; 411 no. 260; from Alcmaeon, son of Alcmaeonides: 242 no. 141; from Hipparchus, son of Peisistratus: 251 no. 142. On the Attic inscriptions see below. Ducat suggests that many inscriptions without a city ethnic were Acraiphian dedications (1971, 202).

⁵⁶ See Ducat (1971) 409 no. 257 and plate CXLI; Ducat (1971) 419 no. 269a (no photograph); Larson (2007b).

⁵⁷ Ducat (1971) 448 n. 5 (analogous to Ducat 409 no. 257).

⁵⁸ For discussion see Hdt. 8.135.1; Schachter (1981–1994) I 67–69; Guillon (1943) II 117–25, at 118; Ducat (1971) 448–450.

⁵⁹ Shapiro (1989) 12–166.

⁶⁰ Hdt. 5.96.2, 5.93.2; cf. Parker (1996) 87; Aloni (2000) 1–94, at 86–87.

⁶¹ See Shapiro (1989) 48, who also mentions Peisistratus' institution of the Delia; Parker (1996) 87.

⁶² The Peisistratids may also have been involved in two other Apolline cults in Athens: Apollo Patroos (west side of the Agora), and Apollo Pythios (near the Ilissos). For discussion, see Hedrick (1988) 185–210, esp. 207, 209; Shapiro (1989) 51 and 59–60; Thompson (1937) 79–84.

⁶³ Shapiro (1989) 49–50; Parker (1996) 87.

Athens. It is well known that when the Alcmeonids were not welcome in Athens, they likely settled in Phocis. Alcmeonid ties to Delphi and Phocis were strong in the sixth century, and likely included Megacles' involvement in the First Sacred War against Crisa and Alcmeon's service to Croesus as a Delphic envoy. The Alcmeonids also famously and lavishly rebuilt the temple by facing it in marble.⁶⁴ Viewed in this context, Peisistratid involvement in Apolline cult elsewhere in central Greece takes on added significance, as does their inactivity at Delphi. Scholars have suggested that the Peisistratids not only avoided (or were excluded from) Delphi, but that certain actions, notably founding the sanctuary of Apollo Pythios in Athens, indicate defiance toward Delphi.⁶⁵ Even skeptics concede that Peisistratid involvement at non-Delphic sanctuaries might be understood in part as an attempt "to mitigate the influence of the Alcmeonids in Delphi".⁶⁶

And so let us take a closer look at Peisistratid activity at the Boeotian Ptoion. As a first bit of evidence, we have a dedication by Hipparchus, Peisistratus' son, likely erected on site before 519.⁶⁷ The inscription marks a simple base in local Boeotian stone, possibly for a tripod: ΗΙΠΠΙΑΡΧΟΣ ΑΝΕΘΕ[ΚΕΝ ΗΟ ΠΙΕΙΣΙΣ] ΤΡΑΤΟ.⁶⁸ What motivated Hipparchus to make this offering here in particular? An earlier dedication from the Ptoion, a column capital dedicated by Alcmeonides, son of Alcmeon, brother to Megacles and one of the most famous Alcmeonids from this period, provides a clue. Lewis places both these inscriptions in the context of Peisistratid interest in Apolline cult and antipathy toward Alcmeonid-controlled Delphi. Shapiro even calls Hipparchus' dedication "a kind of substitute" for involvement at Delphi.⁶⁹

Detailed examination of Hipparchus' dedication reveals more evidence about Peisistratid activity at the Ptoion. The hand of the Hipparchan inscription is linked to that of the Peisistratid altar of Apollo Pythios in Athens. Bizard, the stone's first editor, noticed the similarity; Meritt, Raubitschek, and others followed suit, with only Immerwahr's dissent.⁷⁰ Viviers tentatively suggests that the two stones,

⁶⁴ Hdt. 5.62; Camp (1994) 7; Athanassaki (2011) 246–249; see also Plut. *Sol.* 2.2 and Hdt. 6.125.

⁶⁵ See Forrest (1956) 37; Boardman (1978) 234; Watrous (1982) 167; Williams (1983) 136–137.

⁶⁶ E.g. Shapiro (1984a) 274, (1989) 52.

⁶⁷ Thebes museum no. 634: *IG* 13 1470; Ducat (1971) 251–258 no. 142; Buck (1979b) 118; Jeffery (1990) 78 no. 38; Schachter (1994) 304.

⁶⁸ See Meritt (1939) 65; Ducat (1971) 257–258; Jeffery, *LSAG* 75 and no. 38; Aloni (2000) 85.

⁶⁹ Lewis (1988) 292–294; Schachter (1981–1994) I 304; Shapiro (1989) 50.

⁷⁰ EM 6787: Meiggs/Lewis 11, *IG* I 3 948; on the Pythion see Thuc. 6.54.6. For views on the piece, see Aloni (2000) 84–86 (on the disputed date); Bizard (1920) 239; Meritt (1939) 65; Jeffery, *LSAG* 75; Lewis (1988) 292; Viviers (1992) 108–109. Immerwahr's objections rested on small differences in letter spacing between the two inscriptions that are easily explained: first, by the differences in stone, Hipparchus' dedication being local Boeotian stone (Schachter 1981–1994, I 292) and

along with two funerary bases from the last quarter of the sixth century, may have come from Endoeus' Athenian workshop, favored by the tyrants.⁷¹ If we entertain that the same hand or at least the same workshop was responsible for both inscriptions, then we could have evidence for Peisistratid use of preferred stone-cutters of enough importance and recognition to be commissioned to travel from Athens to Boeotia to inscribe Hipparchus' dedication in local Boeotian stone.

Around the date proposed for his dedication at the Ptoion, Hipparchus was busy marking Attic roads with herms which served to measure distances between the altar of the Twelve Gods and outlying demes. Each herm was inscribed with a phrase noting its location and a maxim attributed by name to Hipparchus. *Hermai* were even depicted in black-figure vase painting, as one example shows, inscribed *Hipparchos kalos*.⁷² One sixth-century herm found near modern Coropi reads: [ἐ]ν μέσοι κεφαλῆς τε καὶ ἄστεος ἀγλαὸς ἡρμῆς, "a glorious herm in the middle of Kephale and the city ..." ⁷³ Scholars generally agree that a now lost additional line would have identified the stele as Hipparchus' and would have added a moral maxim. Most significantly, the lettering of this herm resembles that of the Peisistratid altar and Hipparchus' inscription from the Ptoion. Jeffery links the Coropi herm to the mason/workshop responsible for these dedications.⁷⁴ It seems significant that at the time when Hipparchus was concerned to demarcate Athenian territory and publicize the Peisistratid name throughout Attica, he may also have erected a dedication at the Ptoion inscribed by the same preferred workshop.

It is also possible that Peisistratus himself was active at the Ptoion, for evidence suggests that he may have had a building constructed there. While identifying and distinguishing buildings at the Ptoion has been problematic since the earliest excavations, particularly in the middle terrace, Gustave Mendel found a fascinating clue in 1903: a terracotta *gorgoneion* antefix "sur le flank de la colline". This piece, dated before the late sixth century by Ducat,⁷⁵ comes from

second, by the ultimate location for each dedication and the different requirements in spacing for each text (see Arnush 1995, 149 and Aloni 2000, 86). Moreover, Immerwahr did not examine the stones firsthand; even the photographs do not support his arguments about letter forms and spacing (Immerwahr 1990, no. 455, pp. 17–18, 76 and n. 2).

⁷¹ EM 10643 (ca. 525): Viviers also suggests Ionian influence on the lettering (1992, 84–9, 222); EM 662 (ca. 525–500: Viviers 1992, 103–10, 222–223).

⁷² Osborne (1985) 48; Shapiro (1989) 126.

⁷³ IG I3 1023; Jeffery, *LSAG* 78 no. 35; Lazzarini (1976) 302 no. 872; called "Fourmont's herm" after its discoverer; cf. Lavelle (1985) 412; Osborne (1985) 51; Parker (1996) 73 n.23; Aloni (2000) 83; Pritchett (1969) 162; Crome (1935–1936) 305.

⁷⁴ See also Aloni (2000) 85–86.

⁷⁵ NM 16341: Mendel (1907) 203 n. 3; Ducat (1971) 425.

an identical mold as two *gorgoneion* antefixes from the Athenian Agora, dated 550–540.⁷⁶ The two Athenian pieces were found in the same context, a well associated with Building F (well H 12:15), constructed in the decade following 550.⁷⁷ This large building, connected to changes in the Agora including the closing of nearby wells, seems domestic in character with a kitchen, drainage system, two of its own wells, and space for large-scale bronzecasting. Both Shear and Camp identify Building F as either the residence of the Peisistratids or more broadly as Peisistratid “headquarters”.⁷⁸ Such identification must remain speculative, of course, since certain aspects of the building, particularly the space for metalwork, may prohibit identifying the structure as a residence. It would also be unusual to adorn a domestic building with a decorated roof system, as antefixes did not normally decorate private or even civic buildings.⁷⁹

Whether one accepts building F as a tyrant’s residence or not, the building’s date, 550–540, coincides with the generally accepted date for the final return of Peisistratus: 546.⁸⁰ It is also significant that the Agora as we know it, in size and architectural construction, seems to have been largely a work of Peisistratus and his sons, including the southwest corner where Building F stands.⁸¹

As Winter argues, the Ptoion’s antefix is likely Athenian in origin. Given its identification with the antefixes associated with building F, the Ptoion piece was likely also produced during Peisistratus’ tyranny. The identical antefixes from the two sites suggest that the Peisistratids did more than dedicate at the Ptoion but may also have built a temple or treasury there,⁸² these being the only types of buildings associated with decorated terracotta roofs in archaic Greece, with the possible exception of building F in the Athenian Agora.⁸³ In fact, the original French excavators tentatively associated the Ptoion antefix with a sixth-century

⁷⁶ Winter (1993a) 223–224, where she describes the two Athenian pieces (Agora A 2296 [missing since 1956], A 2345). For additional description, see Nicholls (1970) 138.

⁷⁷ The well’s fill dates ca. 480: Nicholls (1970) 131; see also Miller (1978) 63.

⁷⁸ Shear (1978) 6–7 and (1994) 225–248, at 231; Camp (1994) 10. This building was once considered a candidate for the archaic *prytaneion* on the basis of its position below the later tholos (Nicholls 1970, 131; Thompson 1937, 40–4). Miller rightly finds it difficult to accept the building as a *prytaneion* and suggests that Building F may have been later used by the new democracy as a *prytaneion* annex, but there is no evidence that its original purpose involved civic government (Miller 1978, 64–65 and n. 77). For the building’s domestic nature, see Thompson (1940) 15–33.

⁷⁹ Winter (1993a) 223–224.

⁸⁰ Shapiro (1989) 2, who relies on Andrewes in *CAH* 2 III.3 (1982) 400.

⁸¹ Camp (1994) 9–11.

⁸² Winter (1993a) 223.

⁸³ See Winter (1993a).

predecessor to the main fifth-century temple of Apollo Ptoos. Association with a “small or medium” sized temple on the middle terrace is also possible.⁸⁴

Similarity in ancient Greek roof decoration has long been considered a means of expressing various kinds of affinity, including the evocation of one place in another. Similarity in roofing systems may also indicate other past relationships between two locations, such as gift-exchange. A good example of the former are the consciously western-style roof systems on some of the western Greek treasuries at Olympia.⁸⁵ The latter category includes a sixth-century roof from Didyma linked to a specific roof at Delphi, both of which systems may have been dedicated and/or paid for by Croesus. Relevant too are the similar disc acroteria at Sardis and Sparta, also connected to diplomatic efforts on the part of Croesus during this period.⁸⁶ Such shared roofs reflect diplomatic gift-exchange and thank offerings but also political display contemporaneous with the Peisistratids.

With all of this context as background, I suggest that the gorgon antefix from the Ptoion may have evoked a structure in the southwest corner of the Athenian Agora built during the Peisistratid years. The antefix may even have decorated the main sixth-century building at the Ptoion. Within sixth-century activity of aristocratic Athenian families in central Greece, Peisistratid construction at the Ptoion could very well have marked Peisistratid rivalry with Alcmeonid Delphi, rather than simply attesting unrelated personal elite display.

To summarize: the *gorgoneion* antefix from the sanctuary of Apollo Ptoos offers evidence of some sort of Peisistratid construction, possibly of the main temple, although perhaps also of a smaller temple or treasury. The Peisistratids are suspected of other small building projects at Apolline sites like Delos. From the Ptoion we also have a dedication by Hipparchus from the same period in which he undertook a personal program to mark the distances connecting demes to the center of Athens. This dedication seems to have been in the same hand as the famous Peisistratid altar to Pythian Apollo and the Hipparchan herm from Coropi. The Peisistratids thus seem to have shown a high level of interest in the Ptoion, a site important to individual Boeotian πόλεις and also to the larger regional group of Βοιωτοί. As a prominent international Apolline site in central Greece from which one can see Mount Parnassos, the Ptoion provided a useful venue for Peisistratid competition with the Alcmeonids. While not decisive, the

⁸⁴ Ducat (1971) 425, who notes that the only surviving evidence for an archaic temple at the nearby sanctuary of the hero Ptoos also consists in bits of surviving architectural terracottas.

⁸⁵ E.g. the treasury of Gela (Winter 1993a, 313); Larisa on the Hermos and Sardis share not only similarities in roofing systems but even paint (Winter 1993a, 240–244 and 251).

⁸⁶ Winter (1993b) 29–33.

evidence I have presented *in toto* is suggestive of a relationship between Peisistratid Athens and Boeotia.

A Peisistratid nexus of Athenian-Boeotian interests in the last half of the sixth century provides the perfect context for performing the *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines, with its focus on Boeotia, Thessaly, and Athens. Various well-known historical tidbits corroborate the close relations between the regions and the Peisistratid family, such as the name Thessalus (one of Peisistratos' sons) and Thessalian military and geographic support of the Peisistratids.⁸⁷ Thebes' financial support of Peisistratus' final takeover is familiar from Herodotus, and Aristotle later identifies the Thebans as primary players in Peisistratus' rise to power.⁸⁸ In light of the material evidence for Peisistratid activity in Boeotia that I have adduced, the catalogue's Boeotian, Theban, Thessalian, and Athenian focus seems quite apposite.

For the sake of argument, then, let us assume a mid-sixth-century date for the final textualization of the *Odyssey*, a culmination of the poem after the formative late eighth and seventh centuries. While downrating the poem remains contested, many prominent philologists, cultural historians, and archaeologists support the position, as do studies of oral transmission, many of which demonstrate the near impossibility of transmission of extended oral poems over centuries without change.⁸⁹ Artistic representations of epic scenes before the sixth century do not require the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as we have them,⁹⁰ and it is not until as late as 520 that vase painters begin depicting scenes from the entire *Iliad*, as opposed to a few scenes from its last third.⁹¹ In the end, however, I am not promoting this date as much as I am interested in exploring the consequences of doing so for our understanding of the *Odyssey's* catalogue.

I'd like then to entertain the possibility that the historical and political context of Peisistratid Athens had a formative effect on the *Odyssey's* catalogue of heroines. During the recension traditional Boeotian and Thessalian figures were juxtaposed with shorter Athenian stories, all of which were familiar from oral tradition. Stephanie West convincingly argues for a final standardization of the *Odyssey* in Peisistratean Athens. Her interpretation accounts for the lack of regional variants for the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as well as the attribution of

⁸⁷ See Thuc. 6.55.1 (Thessalus); Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 17.3, 18.2; Hdt. 5.63–64 (Thessalian military aid); Hdt. 5.94 (Hippias and Iolcos); cf. Camp (1994) 8.

⁸⁸ Hdt. 1.61; Arist. *Ath. Pol.* 15.2.

⁸⁹ On the seventh century for the *Iliad's* formulation and the following crystallization in the mid-sixth century, see e.g., Cook (1995) esp. 3–5; St. West (1989) 33–48 (in Heubeck), at 36; and the bibliography collected at Larson (2000) 219–220 n. 113.

⁹⁰ Seaford (1994) 146; Snodgrass (1998).

⁹¹ Johansen (1967) 223–240; St. West (1989) 382 (in Heubeck).

their standardization to Hipparchus, not Peisistratus. During this final stage of the text's revision, West argues that certain passages, some Athenocentric, were added or altered.⁹² The catalogue clearly fits well into this interpretation.

Similar arguments have been adduced for other portions of catalogue poetry embedded in epic. Wickersham argues that the *Iliad*'s brief mention of Ajax in the Catalogue of Ships depends on sixth-century Athenian and Megarian disputes over Salamis. After Athens held Salamis, the passage retained its Athenian perspective during its final crystallization.⁹³ This Athenocentric entry in the Catalogue of Ships even caught Zenodotus' attention in Alexandria.⁹⁴ Stephanie West and others have similarly discerned Attic and Peisistratid influence on the entire *Odyssey*, most notably in the poem's concern with the Neleids of Pylos from whom Peisistratus' family claimed descent.⁹⁵

In this paper I have explored further evidence for a mid sixth-century Peisistratid *Odyssey*, a poem which reached final fixity in this last stage of living epic and whose codification was likely influenced by this historical period. Like Odysseus' use of genealogy to compliment his Phaeacian audience, the *Odyssey*, performed in Athens in the sixth century, perhaps at the Panathenaic festival expanded by the Peisistratids, incorporated traditions of well-known heroines of particular relevance to Thessaly, Boeotia, and Thebes, communities with whom the Peisistratids were involved in politics and cult.

⁹² St. West (1989), 36–38 (in Heubeck); for attributing the recension to Hipparchus, see [Pl.] *Hipp.* 228B. On the sources for recension and their modern interpretations, see Jensen (1980) 128 and 207–226.

⁹³ Wickersham (1991) 16–31; see also West (1985) 10 and n. 34.

⁹⁴ West (1985) 38.

⁹⁵ Hdt. 5.65; cf. Strab. 14.1.3. St. West (1989, 38 and n. 15 in Heubeck) also pinpoints the episode of Athena's visit to Athens as a candidate for possible Athenian influence (*Od.* 8.80–81).

PART III: Theban and Trojan Epic Across the Lines

Malcolm Davies

Oedipus and the Riddle of the Sphinx

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0022

Even if we do not now possess the riddle of the Sphinx *verbatim* as it was formulated in the Epic Cycle's Theban epics, in particular the *Oedipodeia*,¹ a riddle must always have loomed large in the narrative of Oedipus' accession to the Theban throne. As an ἀρχὴ κακῶν it might be compared to the importance of the Judgement of Paris within the Trojan Cycle. The comparison is no idle one. The careers of Paris and Oedipus have much in common: both were exposed as children in response to an oracle or prophecy portending disaster should they grow up.² Both are brought up away from their original community, into which they are later reintegrated after victory in a contest (involving riddles in Oedipus' case, an athletic contest in Paris').³ Both are ambivalent in a particular sense. Oedipus saves Thebes by solving the sphinx's riddle, but brings it to ruin, first by ruling with his responsibility for pollution undiscovered; then by dooming his sons to mutual slaughter. Paris' ambivalence lies in contradictory folk-tale features: he is the hero who, after his "preliminary adventure" with the three goddesses, successfully wins the princess with the aid of a helper figure and agent.⁴ But he is also the 'wicked' half of a pair of siblings, contrasting with Hector, the "good" brother.⁵

One could go further. Both take as partners a woman they should not have so taken: Helen, who is already married to Menelaus; Jocasta, whose husband is certainly dead, but was Oedipus' father by her. And both women were won as a result of a bridal contest: Helen by Menelaus, not Paris; Jocasta by Oedipus himself. If we contemplate further this latter particular shared aspect of their

1 See my remarks in Davies (2014). Cf. also Cingano (forthcoming a).

2 See Binder (1964) 144–146 (Paris) and 142–144 and 172–177 (Oedipus). The oracle or prophecy, which inspires "an act of villainy", especially the exposure of an infant, is a frequent folk-tale motif: see my discussion in Davies (2007) 70–71.

3 For sources and discussion of the tradition that Paris was recognised and restored to his family after victory in an athletic contest, see Hyg. *Fab.* 91 and e.g. Pearson (1917) 1.57–58; Eur. fr. 178 *TrGF* 5.1 (Kannicht).

4 See my remarks in Davies (2002) 6.

5 See my article in Davies (2003) 33 and 35.

Malcolm Davies: St John's College, E-Mail: malcolm.davies@sjc.ox.ac.uk.

careers, significant narrative parallels between these two key episodes of Theban and Trojan Cycle emerge.

Riddles play an important role in folk-tales, and solving them is often followed, as reward, by marriage to a princess and accession to a throne.⁶ In other words, “solving the riddle is the precondition for marriage”.⁷ The same could be said of the riddle in the narrative featuring Oedipus. The connection between the two stages is rather different, of course. But it should be noted that the quintessential folk-tale number three plays a part in many riddles, including that of Oedipus. In the story of Turandot,⁸ for instance, there are three separate riddles which must be solved before the princess’ hand can be won. In the case of Portia, most famously presented in Shakespeare’s *Merchant of Venice*, the riddle takes the form of choice between three caskets of differing metallic value. In the case of the riddle solved by Oedipus, the riddle itself requires identification of a being that undergoes locomotion in three different ways at three different stages of day or life.

The riddle contest with Portia as prize has been compared⁹ to the Judgement of Paris, and there are ways in which the latter narrative can be said to resemble the solving of a riddle. Paris has to deal with the question ‘What/ who is best?’ as applied to three different types of life embodied by the three different goddesses: success in war, regal power, or a rich sex life. His reward for “solving” the riddle is again highly ambivalent: even in the *Iliad*’s one enigmatic reference to the tale (24.25–30), Helen of Troy, whom we might expect to find termed τὴν καλλίστην is in fact a personification of μαχλοσύνη (for a different embodiment of the ambivalence compare the lion parable in Aeschylus’ *Agamemnon*). She brings Paris immediate gratification but ultimately leads him (and not only him) to disaster, ruin and death. Such ambivalence is actually idiomatic in such tales, although usually in the reverse direction. That is, Heracles at the Crossroads chooses in the short run a life of toil and sorrow but in the longer run immortality and glory, and much the same could be said of the choice made by Jesus Christ when confronted

⁶ See in general C. Goldberg s.v. ‘Rätselprinzessin’ in *EM* 11.286–294.

⁷ The quotation is from Lutz Röhrich’s *Märchen und Wirklichkeit* (English translation *Folktale and Reality* p. 99), which cites other examples of riddle-contests for brides, including one folk-tale where the relationship is reversed, as it were, and the task for the suitors is to devise a riddle that the princess cannot solve. Failure results in the decapitation of the suitors, as in the tale of Turandot (see n. 8 below) or the narrative by Apollonius of Tyre (see the article s. v. by L. Denecke in *EM* 1.667–674).

⁸ See Goldberg as in n. 6 *EM* 289–290. For further instances of the sequence of three riddles, see Edmunds (1981b) 9–10. For three as a significant number in folk-tales see, for instance, Müller (1976) 196–198 = (1999) 551–553.

⁹ By Stinton (1965) 7 = (1990) 21.

by the three temptations of Satan in the wilderness.¹⁰ And if one believes, as I do, that the narrative of Hector's visit to Troy in *Iliad* 6 derives from the Judgement of his brother,¹¹ a similar ambivalence is apparent: his "reward" for making the right choice in deciding to return to the battlefield rather than be enticed by any or all of the three most important women in his life is a heroic death. Furthermore, "the dilemma of Intaphrenes' wife" in Hdt. 3.119, obliged by Darius to choose between husband and brother,¹² has been described as "similar to that of Paris ... Paris, choosing Aphrodite, is gifted in love, but is forever without talent in the civic and military spheres of life".¹³ This thought-provoking comparison will guide us to the next stage of the argument.

The ambivalence of Jocasta as Oedipus' reward for solving his riddle, a woman initially gratifying because of the power and prestige she brings as wife but, as his mother, ultimately involving death and disaster (and not only for him), is not, in the light of what has just been said, without parallel. And if one returns to Hector's dilemma in *Iliad* 6, and examines it more closely, further parallels emerge. This episode has been interpreted in effect as a solving of the riddle pertaining to "the ascending scale of affection",¹⁴ whereby the hero has to decide whether e.g. mother, sister (in law), or wife is most valued by him. We have just seen one Herodotean instance of this pattern, with wife and sister as heroine replacing husband and brother as hero in the dilemma, but the closest parallel in Greek literature happens to come from the Theban Cycle and is, of course, the issue articulated by Antigone at vv. 905–928 of her play, where, like Intaphrenes' wife, she paradoxically proposes preference for brother over husband and children. And the climactic positioning of the Iliadic Hector's encounter with Andromache suggests a definitive decision in favour of the wife. But in fact, by his decision to reject even her entreaties and return to the battle (and to death), Hector is essentially rejecting the terms of the riddle and declining to make any choice. A modern Greek folk-tale¹⁵ does actually present "the inability of the arbitrator to decide" the most beautiful among three nymphs, with tragic outcome – he is vengefully torn apart by them. For a comic equivalent of this declined decision see Ovid *Amores* 3.1,¹⁶ where, in a narrative clearly deriving from both the Judgement of Paris and Heracles at the Crossroads, the poet urbanely sidesteps any

¹⁰ See Davies (2003) 33.

¹¹ See Davies (2003) 33.

¹² See Masing s.v. 'Bruder eher als Gatten oder Sohn gerettet' in *EM* 2.861–864.

¹³ Hansen (2002) 65.

¹⁴ Kakridis (1949) 43–49.

¹⁵ Stinton (1965) 7 = (1990) 21 n. 23.

¹⁶ See Davies (2013b) 165–176.

choice as between the female personifications of Elegy and Tragedy and opts for both.

If one applies this pattern of preferred female of the family to the twin issues of Oedipus' riddle and Jocasta as reward for its solution, Oedipus too emerges as a hero who declines to make a choice or, rather, opts for both. In contrast, as it were, to Antigone's paradoxical preference of brother over husband and children, Oedipus does not prefer mother to wife but sidesteps the issue by combining both in one and the same individual. In terms of the riddle, it is as if Oedipus were obliterating the distinctions between the three stages of human life that enabled him to solve the riddle in the first place. By making his own mother his wife, he conflates the relevant female figures of the initial two stages of human existence; and, as punishment, he is himself prematurely reduced to the third stage (often occupied by a widower), blindly groping his way along with a stick.

It may be objected that the solving of the riddle and the marrying of the princess are two separate and consecutive events,¹⁷ not simultaneous and the same, as in the choice embodied in the Judgement of Paris. But one scholar¹⁸ has plausibly argued that "the *result* of the riddle-solving in the ancient Oedipus legend is really its *purpose*: to win the bride" (my italics). In other words, the story as it now stands has transferred the riddle-posing from the princess herself to the monstrous sphinx. This transference would be facilitated by the more general folk-tale pattern of the bridal contest,¹⁹ where the bride to be won is notably hostile to the prospect. So with Turandot and other heroines from folk-tale, the bride (or her father) does not wish the marriage, and failure to win the relevant athletic or other contest is punished by the deaths of the unsuccessful suitors, just as failure to solve the sphinx's riddle has the same consequence. One thinks of the stories of Oenomaus and Hippodameia,²⁰ or of Atalanta. In pondering the potential equivalence of Jocasta and the sphinx, we may further note that both commit suicide when a riddle relating to her has been solved: the former in connection with the riddle she herself has posed, the latter when the riddle of Oedipus' true identity is brought into the open.

¹⁷ For the separating of a narrative's process into two consecutive parts, compare the Old Testament's Judgement of Solomon (see my article as cited in n. 5), where the king first chooses wisdom as the best of things and then exemplifies his possession of it by his decision between the two women each claiming a child as her own.

¹⁸ Edmunds (1981b) 11 n. 8.

¹⁹ For which, see e.g. Maser-Rath s.v. 'Brautproben' in *EM* 2.745–753; Grant (1967) 43–47; Hansen (2002) 36–40.

²⁰ See Hansen (2002) 35.

Further to the subject of motif- transference, one may wonder whether the key feature of incest in the Oedipus narrative originated in the same way. The above-mentioned paternal reluctance for a daughter to marry is sometimes explainable in terms of an existing incestuous relationship between father and child: consider Oenomaus, or, an even closer parallel, the story preserved in Apollonius of Tyre²¹ (ultimate source of Shakespeare's play *Pericles*), where the riddle to be solved contains a covert allusion to the incestuous relationship itself.

As for the act of patricide, one may advance the tentative suggestion that Oedipus' encounter with his father at the place where three roads meet,²² a locale with often profound significance in folktale, represents the first of three successive and significant meetings (the folk-tale phenomenon of "trebling")²³ as Oedipus journeys to what he hopes will be a new life. "Epic", it has been claimed,²⁴ "defines a man not as *homo sapiens* or as *homo ludens* but as *homo viator*". The other two encounters are with the sphinx and Jocasta. We have already seen an instance of this common narrative sequence with Hector's visit to Troy and his successive encountering of mother, sister (in law), and wife and child. The third and final element here is both climactic and a source of paradox: the wife and harmless baby son embody the last and most formidable of the temptations that assail the hero and seek to lure him from his duty. The same pattern is to be found on a more general level in the *Odyssey*, where, after surviving the variously sinister temptations offered by Calypso and Circe, the hero must finally face the most alluring temptation of all, in the person of the innocent young princess Nausicaa. She, who is young enough to be his daughter, might conceivably become his wife, a vestigial, weaker version of Oedipus' dilemma.

So Oedipus first encounters his father, the man who tried to end his existence at birth. The questing hero often encounters at an early stage of his adventure an ambivalent helper figure who frequently helps against his will and can occasionally be the reverse of helpful. Sometimes he takes the form of a wise

²¹ See Denecke in *EM* 1.667–674.

²² On significant convergences of three roads in folk-tale, see e.g. Davies (2013a) 5.

²³ On "trebling" see e.g. Davies (2008) 27–32. The deep-rootedness of this pattern in the human mind is suggested by its reappearance in Alfred Hitchcock's famous film *Psycho*, in which the heroine, fleeing from the scene of her crime, successively encounters three obstructive males: a policeman, a car salesman and Norman Bates. The third and climactic encounter proves her undoing, with Bates murdering her in a motel, which should have represented calm and safety from the threats of the outside world. Norman Bates, I cannot refrain from observing, transgressively combines the roles of mother and son.

²⁴ Owen Lee (1997) 3.

old man “who is in many myths the hero’s father”.²⁵ By provoking Oedipus into killing him, Laius does, very much against his will, further his son’s career and help him to a throne. Next comes the monstrous sphinx, whose role reminds us of the generalisation that “often in myth the feminine anima attempts to arrest the hero on his quest, often she attempts to destroy him”.²⁶ After not merely surviving but actually eliminating these two murderous threats, Oedipus climactically meets his wife and mother. Unlike Hector and Odysseus, Oedipus does not resist this last, alluring temptation, and she, who in either capacity should represent nurture and support for the hero, paradoxically transpires to be his most formidable threat, the source of his utter ruin. Oedipus might almost have said, as the Sophoclean Heracles does say, at vv. 1062–1063 of the *Trachiniae*, “I, who have mastered so many monsters, am now undone – by a woman”.

²⁵ Owen Lee (1997) 9. On ambivalent helpers, see Davies (1988b) 278–279. Note Owen Lee’s (1997, 10) further observation that “knight errant means not only wandering knight but erring knight ... The grave mistakes the hero makes are essential to his questing”.

²⁶ Owen Lee (1997) 27.

Athanassios Vergados

Form and Function of Some Theban Resonances in Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0023

The aim of this paper is to explore the different ways in which the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* incorporate material from the Theban traditions into their own narrative fabric.¹ First, I examine the references to Tydeus in the *Iliad*, addressing the function these references acquire each time they appear in a character's speech. In a second step I turn my attention to the allusions to Theban stories in the *Odyssey*, and in the *Nekyia* in particular. In this case too I will be zeroing in on the function of the Theban reminiscences. It will be shown that whereas the Theban reflections in the *Iliad* occur in a linear manner, the *Odyssey* incorporates the Theban material in a more intricate way. Finally, I will offer an explanation for the two poems' difference in their interaction with the corpus of Theban stories: the *Iliad* in general chooses material that conforms to the poem's preoccupation with the heroes' relative worth compared to earlier generations. In the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, the Theban material is combined with allusions to other local sagas, all of which it incorporates in order to supersede them and present itself as the "newest song."

Tydeus in the *Iliad*

The first reference to Tydeus comes in *Il.* 4.370–410. Agamemnon inspects the Achaean troops, encouraging those who are rushing to battle and reprimanding those lagging behind. Among the troops he inspects are also those of Diomedes, whom Agamemnon scolds by reminding him of his father Tydeus: Diomedes is evidently not as brave as his father who never cowered for fear but always fought

¹ For reflexes of the Theban epic tradition in Homer and Hesiod, see Cingano (2003); and for Thebes in early epic and lyric poetry, Cingano (2000).

Athanassios Vergados: Heidelberg University, E-Mail: vergados@skph.uni-heidelberg.de

against the enemy, even when he was outnumbered (*Il.* 4.372–373).² Interestingly, Agamemnon does not know this through personal experience, for he had never witnessed Tydeus in action. Rather, he learned of Tydeus' exploits through other men who saw him fight (*Il.* 4.374–375). From their eyewitness accounts Agamemnon learned that Tydeus had come to Mycenae with Polyneices to raise an army against Thebes. Even though Tydeus did not receive any allies from Mycenae because of negative omens, he marched against Thebes nevertheless. One against many, Tydeus fearlessly challenged the Thebans in athletic contests in which he easily defeated them. Then the angered Thebans laid an ambush on him, which was also doomed: all but one were killed. Diomedes, however, is not like his father: he is worse in fighting but better in speaking, says Agamemnon.³

Several points are worthy of comment here. The first extensive reference to the Theban war in the *Iliad* is introduced by a general reference to the source of the narrative: Agamemnon's account is based on eyewitness reports. This has been taken to imply the existence of a poetic tradition regarding Tydeus and his participation in the campaign against Thebes (cf. φασί at 375).⁴ While lines 374–375 clearly suggest the existence of storytelling regarding Tydeus and while there certainly existed a poetic tradition regarding the expedition of the Seven, an offshoot of which is the cyclic *Thebaid*,⁵ we may nevertheless doubt whether Agamemnon's words here imply that his sources were *aoidoi*. We need to draw a distinction between the *aoidos* on the one hand, who, if we follow the poet's words at *Il.* 2.485–486, receives knowledge from the Muses who *are* eyewitnesses to the accounts they inspire him to sing,⁶ and Agamemnon's source on the other hand, probably men of an older generation who saw Tydeus fight. This is also the point of Odysseus' praise of Demodocus in *Odyssey* 8: he sings the woes of the Achaeans λίην κατὰ κόσμον, as if he had witnessed them himself or heard from someone who had been at Troy (*Od.* 8.488–491). While Agamemnon's words imply the existence of storytelling regarding Tydeus' exploits, to which the poet

² For the general presentation of Diomedes in the *Iliad*, see Andersen (1978); Classen (2008) 39–42. On the first exchange between Agamemnon and Diomedes, see Alden (2000) 112–120. For the *Iliad*'s treatment of the story of Tydeus, see Barker and Christensen (2011) with abundant bibliography on the subject.

³ See Beck (2005) 160–164 who points out that Agamemnon's use of the patronymic Τυδείδῃ at *Il.* 4.161 is to be understood as adding to the abuse of Diomedes rather than being a sign of respect.

⁴ See Torres-Guerra (1995) 33. Note that Agamemnon does not mention authoritative witnesses for his account.

⁵ It is important to note in this context that Homer refers to Theban stories in a way that presupposes the audience's knowledge of their details, which implies the existence of a storytelling tradition on Theban matters; see Torres-Guerra (1995) 75.

⁶ See Minton (1960); Lenz (1980) 27–37; Murray (1981), esp. 89–90.

is hinting here, Agamemnon's eyewitnesses need not be *aoidoi* who, as Odysseus' words in *Od.* 8 imply, were not as a rule expected to reproduce the events as faithful as an eyewitness would (Demodocus, in other words, is exceptional, and his excellent song is attributed by Odysseus to the Muses' or Apollo's teaching at *Od.* 8.488).

While this fact does not in and of itself make the truth content of Agamemnon's account necessarily inferior to that of an *aoidos*, it is nevertheless important that there is no divine, transcendental source of inspiration in Agamemnon's narrative nor does he claim such an authority. The Theban story does not belong to the remotest past, but is located in the horizon of experience of some members of the *Iliad*'s internal audience (some of whom had indeed participated in the expedition of the *Epigonoι*) and thus does not emanate from some supernatural source of inspiration but rather from other men's accounts. What was an independent epic tradition centered on a cycle of stories concerning Thebes which, to judge by its textualized form known to us, began with an invocation to the 'goddess'

Ἄργος ἄειδε, θεά, πολυδίψιον, ἔνθα ἄνακτες (fr. 1 PEG 1)

Sing, goddess, of Argos the much-thirsty, from where the lords

and was consequently thought of as inspired by the Muse as any other epic poem, becomes now that it is introduced into the temporal fabric of the *Iliad* a story that depends on other men's telling, is not divinely inspired, does not belong to a mythical past but to the characters' recent "historical" past, and is thus secondary to the poem that we are just listening.⁷ Indirectly, then, the poet may be distancing himself from such an important tradition from which he himself had been influenced, and Agamemnon's mention of his source of information here may thus have also a metapoetic significance.⁸

Then, there is the emphasis on divine help for the hero and respect for the divine. We hear twice of divine signs (once these are said to be Zeus' signs), which Tydeus and the Mycenaeans obey (*Il.* 4.381, 398). We also hear of Athena's assistance to Tydeus (390), a point which we may interpret as foreshadowing the

⁷ Homer knew and interacted with oral poetic traditions and not necessarily the texts that we know as the Cycle: see Burgess (2001), (2012), and Davies (1989/2001) 4–5.

⁸ Differently in Mimnermus fr. 14 W (on a Colophonian warrior) that alludes to this passage, as well as to Diomedes' performance in *Il.* 5.93–96 and Athena's reproach of him at 5.800–824, and also mentions eyewitnesses who saw the warrior fight at the field beside the river Hermus. For the implications of these allusions, see Grethlein (2010) 64–68 who adopts Meineke's emendation in l. 2 ὅς μιν ἴδον (referring to the poem's speaker) instead of the transmitted οἱ μιν ἴδον (i.e. the πρότεροι whom the speaker has heard speak of the warrior).

goddess' help to Diomedes in the following Book. But this respect for the divine is perhaps another way in which the poet distances himself from his Theban intertext. For *Thebaid* fr. 9 PEG 1 (*apud* Σ [D] *Il.* 5.16) presents us with a different view of Tydeus' personality: there he is not the god-respecting champion of the *Iliad* but a brutish cannibal whose actions disgust even his protecting goddess, Athena:

Τυδεὺς ὁ Οἰνέως ἐν τῷ Θηβαϊκῷ πολέμῳ ὑπὸ Μελανίππου τοῦ Ἀστακοῦ ἐτρώθη· Ἀμφιάρεως δὲ κτείνας τὸν Μελάνιππον τὴν κεφαλὴν ἐκόμισε <Τυδεῖ> καὶ ἀνοίξας αὐτὴν ὁ Τυδεὺς τὸν ἐγκέφαλον ἐρρόφει ἀπὸ θυμοῦ. Ἀθηνᾶ δὲ κομίζουσα Τυδεῖ ἄθανασίαν ἰδοῦσα τὸ μῖσος ἀπεστράφη αὐτόν. Τυδεὺς δὲ γνοὺς ἐδεήθη τῆς θεοῦ ἵνα κἂν τῷ παιδί αὐτοῦ παράσχη τὴν ἄθανασίαν.

Tydeus the son of Oeneus in the Theban war was wounded by Melanippus the son of Astacus. Amphiarus killed Melanippus and brought back his head, which Tydeus split open and gobbled the brain in a passion. When Athena, who was bringing Tydeus immortality, saw the horror, she turned away from him. Tydeus on realizing this begged the goddess at least to bestow the immortality on his son.⁹

Scholars have pointed out that the Homeric epics avoid supernatural or blasphemous elements, and Griffin has made special reference to this story of the *Thebaid* as an illustration of this tendency.¹⁰ While this is of course true, I believe this is not the only explanation for the absence of this detail of Tydeus' career in the *Iliad*. Assuming that this detail of Tydeus' biography was part of the Theban tradition known to the *Iliad* poet, we may witness here the poet's attempt to cast Tydeus into a positive mould so that he can function as a model that Diomedes unfortunately cannot reach (at least as far as Agamemnon is concerned).

Third, Tydeus' story reminds of another hero whose biography is introduced paradigmatically in the *Iliad* and is directed, incidentally, at Diomedes: this is the account regarding Bellerophon in *Iliad* 6, a hero who suffers because of his virtuous character.¹¹ Both Tydeus and Bellerophon follow divine signs: characteristically, the phrase θεῶν τεράεσσι πιθήσας is used only of these two characters in the poem (*Il.* 4.398, 6.183). Both, furthermore, defeat a set of enemies (Tydeus in athletic contests, Bellerophon in battle) and are subsequently ambushed, only to prove victorious again. Bellerophon kills all his ambushers, while Tydeus allows one of them to live (Maeon), precisely because he is obeying a sign from the gods. In addition, both heroes' stories are stripped of their supernatural elements: the bringing of immortality to Tydeus by Athena, and the riding of Pegasus in Bel-

⁹ Translation by West (2003) 51–53.

¹⁰ See Griffin (1977) esp. 46–47.

¹¹ See Andersen (1978) 38.

lerophon's case. Both, finally, are said to have been abandoned by the gods: for Bellerophon this is simply stated without any explanation (*Il.* 6.200), for which we need to turn to other tellings of his story where we find out that he had attempted to ride Pegasus to Olympus.¹² Both his insolence and Pegasus are omitted from the *Iliad*. Likewise, Athena abandons Tydeus on account of his treatment of his opponents corpse, something that is also absent from the Iliadic account.

The first appearance of the story of Tydeus, borrowed from the Theban tradition, is then used as a way to hurt Diomedes' pride by making him feel inferior to his father so that he throws himself into battle in order to prove that he is equal to, if not better than Tydeus. This resonates with the epic's preoccupation with the relative worth of the current generation of heroes, a concern that is manifested on several occasions. For instance, the poet might sometimes point at the gulf that separates the men of his own generation from the heroes of the Trojan war, as at *Il.* 5.304, 12.383, 20.287, where the strength of men who belong to the poet's generation (οἱοὶ νῦν βροτοὶ εἶσιν) is contrasted to that of the Trojan heroes. The same point is expressed also with reference to the heroic society, when the son (Diomedes) is said to be inferior to his father or when Nestor recounts how he fought against enemies in his youth who were far superior to the heroes of today (e.g. *Il.* 1.262–273).

But the fact that this story does not have a higher source of poetic authority is troubling and allows Sthenelus, who replies to Agamemnon instead of Diomedes, to claim that this is not true. *Il.* 4.404–410 are especially important in this respect, because it presents Agamemnon's account of Tydeus' career as a lie, a fiction invented by Agamemnon who knows what the truth was:

Ἀτρεΐδῃ, μὴ ψεύδε' ἐπιστάμενος σάφα εἰπεῖν·
 ἡμεῖς τοι πατέρων μέγ' ἀμείνονες εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι·
 ἡμεῖς καὶ Θήβης ἔδος εἵλομεν ἐπταπύλοιο,
 παυρότερον λαὸν ἀγαγόνθ' ὑπὸ τεῖχος ἄρειον,
 πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν καὶ Ζηνὸς ἄρωγῃ·
 κείνοι δὲ σφετέρῃσι ἀτασθαλίῃσιν ὄλοντο
 τῷ μὴ μοι πατέρας ποθ' ὁμοίῃ ἔνθεο τιμῇ.

"Son of Atreus, do not utter lies, when you know how to speak truly. We declare ourselves to be better men by far than our fathers: we took the seat of Thebes of the seven gates, when we two had gathered a lesser army against a stronger wall, putting our trust in the portents of the gods and in the aid of Zeus; but they perished through their own blind folly. So do not ever place our fathers in the same honour with us". (A. T. Murray, revised by W. F. Wyatt).

¹² See Pind. *Isthm.* 7.44–47. Although Pindar knows the details of this story, he refrains from telling it in *Ol.* 13.

Characteristically, Sthenelus repeats some of Agamemnon's wording (πειθόμενοι τεράεσσι θεῶν, cf. *Il.* 4.398) which he strengthens by adding Ζηνὸς ἄρωγι. The generation of Tydeus, furthermore, appears in Sthenelus' words to be not only weaker but also morally inferior (σφετέρῃσι ἀτασθαλίῃσιν). On the basis of Sthenelus' reply and considering the question of the authority of Agamemnon's source it appears that the first mention of Tydeus' exploits in the *Iliad* is nothing more than an *ad hoc* invention of one of the poet's characters.¹³

Agamemnon's account of Tydeus in *Il.* 4 seems to gain support by Athena's words at *Il.* 5.800–808. The goddess' speech echoes some of Agamemnon's words: she repeats that he was alone out of the Achaeans (νόσφιν Ἀχαιῶν... πολέας μετὰ Καδμείωνας) when he came to Thebes as a messenger; nonetheless he challenged them to battle and easily defeated them since he had a great ally in Athena. In fact, this same phrase τοῖη τοι ἐγὼν ἐπιτάρροθός εἰμι will be later repeated by Athena (828) in a speech in which the negative comparison of Diomedes to his father aims at inducing Diomedes to fight harder. Athena, in other words, employs the same strategy that Agamemnon had used a little earlier,¹⁴ as is suggested also by the verses that frame Athena's account of Tydeus' career (*Il.* 5.800–1, 811–3). One suspects, thus, that Athena's account might also be the "invention" rather than the reflection of a genuine tradition on Tydeus.

Tydeus' exploits are next recalled in the *Doloneia* (*Il.* 10.284–91). Here the Theban material is recast in the form of a prayer, and in typical fashion the hero reminds Athena of her support to his father in the past by recalling his going to Thebes as a messenger and by allusively pointing to the mischief, which he had worked there (μέμρεα ἔργα). This prayer of Diomedes comes as an answer to Odysseus' prayer that was uttered a few moments earlier (NB *Il.* 1.2284: κέκλυθι νῦν καὶ ἐμεῖο). A comparison between the two prayers highlights the peculiarities of Diomedes' words. Odysseus asks for the goddess' help at *Il.* 10.278–282.¹⁵ After the typical opening, addressing the goddess and asking her to lend a kind ear to his request (κλυθί μεν, αἰγίοχοιο Διὸς τέκος), Odysseus immediately reminds Athena of her continuous assistance to him (ἧ τε μοι αἰεὶ | ἐν πάντεσσι πόνοισι παρίστασαι), which he never forgets (οὐδέ σε λήθω | κινύμενος). On the basis of this past assistance he asks that her support be repeated on the present occasion

¹³ Andersen (1978) 35–36 maintains that the Tydeus story told by Agamemnon is the poet's invention; see Dentice di Accadia Ammone (2012) 147–148. Interestingly, Diomedes, who had not proven his martial valor yet in the poem, does not reply to Agamemnon's words but remains silent out of a sense of *aidos*; see Montiglio (2000) 57–59.

¹⁴ Alden (2001) 121–122.

¹⁵ See Pulleyn (1997) on prayers.

(νῦν αὖτε μάλιστα με φίλαι) so that he and Diomedes might return to the Achaeans' ships with glory (εὐκλείας).

On the contrary, Diomedes does not mention in his prayer the support he has received from Athena thus far, despite the fact that this led to his *aristeia* in which he was able even to wound gods. Interestingly, even though in *Iliad* 6 he claimed that he does not remember his father (6.222–223), he asks Athena to support him as she had supported Tydeus, and it is he who reminds her of his father's actions at Thebes. An audience familiar with Agamemnon's earlier recounting of Tydeus' exploits and Athena's allusive reference to these events in *Il.* 5, will be in position to fill in the missing details.¹⁶ Does this mean that the earlier accounts of Tydeus' career that we heard from Agamemnon and Athena are truthful? Or is Diomedes simply repeating what he has heard other authority figures narrate?

Besides evoking the goddess (perhaps a bit more emphatically than Odysseus, as he uses an additional epithet, Ἀτρυτώνη, rather than simply Διὸς τέκος), Diomedes' prayer is executed in a manner corresponding to the expectations created by the genre, as he, unlike Odysseus, concludes with a promise for a sacrifice that he will offer Athena if they are victorious. By evoking Athena's aid to Tydeus, Diomedes implicitly asks to be made equal to his father (NB *Il.* 10.290–291 παρέστης ~ παρίσται), but he also displays his piety and implicitly contrasts himself to his father of whom the Theban tradition had it that he was abandoned by the goddess on account of his reprehensible behavior. Is the poet implying that the son is also morally superior to his father, just as Sthenelus had emphatically stated in *Il.* 4.404–410 that the generation of Diomedes conquered Thebes rather than that if his father when answering Agamemnon's accusation of cowardice?

Be that as it may, the Theban material regarding Tydeus' exploits undergoes another transformation in *Iliad* 14.¹⁷ There it is recounted during a debate among the wounded Achaean leaders. Odysseus strongly objects to Agamemnon's renewed suggestion to abandon the war and sail from Troy secretly at night, whereupon Agamemnon asks for anyone, whether younger or older, to propose a preferable solution if they have one. Diomedes intervenes and offers a simple proposition: they should all join battle, even the wounded ones if need be, who should however remain out of shot and encourage the others to fight (*Il.* 14.110–132).¹⁸ This short and direct proposition that consists of only five verses is introduced by eighteen lines containing again references to Tydeus which are now better contextualized as we hear more about Diomedes' *genos* (thus the gaps that

¹⁶ See Andersen (1978) 130.

¹⁷ See Andersen (1978) 140–141.

¹⁸ On this speech, see Alden (2001) 164–167.

the previous accounts had left are filled). In this case Diomedes aims at obtaining his audience's *benevolentia* given that it is a younger hero who addresses the older ones. Interestingly, however, Diomedes seems to feel the need to justify his right to speak even though Agamemnon had just explicitly said that he would welcome any proposal that is better than his, whether by a young or by an old fighter.¹⁹ He backs up his right to address the elders through the fact that he too descends from a noble family (πατρός δ' ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ καὶ ἐγὼ γένος εὖχομαι εἶναι), and goes on to present Tydeus' line (Porthus and Oeneus) and how Tydeus went to Argos and married one of Adrastus' daughters and was extremely wealthy. He also surpassed everyone in the art of the spear. But he does not elaborate upon Tydeus' skill in spear-fighting since it is likely that his audience have heard this (τὰ δὲ μέλλετ' ἀκούμεν, εἰ ἐτεόν περ). This resonates with Diomedes' earlier evocation of the will of Zeus and the gods (*Il.* 14.120) as the reason for Tydeus' wandering and establishment in Argos, and thus points back to Diomedes' prayer in the *Doloneia* where a pronounced religious feeling can also be detected. Tydeus' martial exploits are presumed to be already known, an intra-textual hint at *Iliad* 4 where Agamemnon himself recalled Tydeus' martial valor as well as a hint at the epic's audience who know the Theban material. At the same time, with this re-telling of Tydeus' story we gain a new insight on him: he is now not the valiant fighter of whom we have been hearing but also the wealthy king (in other words, he too is an ἀγαθός aristocrat). Thus these lines which ostensibly serve to present Diomedes' credentials in addressing the assembly of the elders also provide the audience with another facet of Tydeus' personality and show Diomedes as someone who is now in position to incorporate his family history into his speeches, whereas until now he was only reminded of it by the others. Now he uses Tydeus' story, and especially a part that may not have been known to everybody (is it perhaps his own invention?) in order to prove to the kings that he is one of them. Tydeus, then, becomes the argument that grants Diomedes the right to make a contribution to the debate worthy to be heeded by the other leaders (cf. *Il.* 14.133: ὧς ἔφαθ', οἱ δ' ἄρα τοῦ μάλα μὲν κλύον ἢδ' ἐπίθοντο).

¹⁹ This need might stem from Nestor's reaction to Diomedes' speech in *Iliad* 9, where the old king mentioned that Diomedes' words had not reached their τέλος (9.56). See Beck (2005) 196–197, Dentice di Accadia Ammone (2012) 168–174.

Theban Material in the *Nekyia*

Turning now our attention to the *Odyssey*, we notice a different kind of interaction with the Theban lore. For unlike the linear presentation of the references to the events involving Tydeus in the *Iliad*, in the *Odyssey* the Theban material is for the most part concentrated in Book 11, the *Nekyia*,²⁰ and is combined with reminiscences from other cyclic or local traditions within Odysseus' *Apologoi* and thus it holds no privileged position at all.

In the course of narrating to the Phaeacians his own *nostos*, Odysseus mentions the characters he encountered in the Underworld. After his interview with Elpenor, Teiresias and Anticleia, Odysseus recounts a "Catalogue of Women". Several heroines appear to him, sent by Persephone, who were the wives and daughters of kings (*Od.* 11.225–227). These are:

- Tyro, the daughter of Salmoneus and wife of Kretheus (*Od.* 11.235–259);
- Antiope, daughter of Asopos, who bore Amphion and Zethus to Zeus (*Od.* 11.260–265);
- Alcmena, wife of Amphytrion, and mother of Heracles from Zeus (*Od.* 11.266–268);
- Megare, daughter of Kreon, wife of Heracles (*Od.* 11.269–270);
- Epicaste, mother of Oedipus (*Od.* 11.271–280);
- Chloris, daughter of Amphion and wife of Neleus, mother of Nestor, Chromius, Periclymenus and Pero who is linked to the Melampus narrative (*Od.* 11.281–297);
- Leda, wife of Tyndareus, mother of Castor and Pollux (*Od.* 11.298–304);
- Iphimedeia, mother of Otus and Ephialtes, the two Aloades (*Od.* 11.305–319);
- Phaedra and Procris (*Od.* 11.320);
- Ariadne, daughter of Minus (*Od.* 11.320–325);
- Maera and Clymene (*Od.* 11.326);²¹
- Eriphyle, the wife of Amphiaraus for whose death she was responsible (*Od.* 11.326–327).

Not all of these heroines have the same degree of importance. Some, such as Tyro, are graced with a narrative, others like Maera or Clymene are mentioned only by name. From this enumeration of the heroines included in Odysseus' "Catalogue

²⁰ The other Odyssean passage where Theban material is alluded to is 15.243–248.

²¹ These two women appeared also in the *Nostoi*; the same may be true also of Eriphyle. See fr. 1, 5, 8 PEG 1 and West (2013) 274–275.

of Women” emerges clearly at first sight that the material traditionally identified as Theban²² is in fact prominent,²³ but is by no means self-standing. While a good number of these female characters are directly associated with Thebes and thus give the catalogue a Theban (or Boeotian) flavor (Antiope, Alcmene, Megare, Epicasté, Eriphyle), not to mention Teiresias, whose presence as a seer earlier in the *Nekyia* clearly presupposes his Theban career, the catalogue incorporates material from the Thessalian, Pylian,²⁴ Spartan, Cretan, and Athenian traditions.²⁵ Sometimes a heroine is the link that establishes a connection to more than one tradition. Thus Tyro, who was mentioned in the *Nostoi*, is connected to Thessaly both through Salmoneus and Cretheus and through her giving birth to Pelias; she is also linked to the Pylian tradition through her giving birth to Neleus who ruled in Pylos. Chloris is related to the Theban traditions as daughter of Amphion, son of Iasus, but also to Pylos through her marriage to Neleus. Pero, on the other hand, is firmly rooted in the Pylian tradition. With Leda we enter the Spartan tradition, while through Phaedra and Ariadne we are introduced to the Cretan and Athenian traditions. Athenian is also Procris and Clymene, and both constitute yet another reminiscence of the *Nostoi*.²⁶ The same may be true of Maera as well.²⁷ Finally with Eriphyle, we are again reminded of the Theban traditions and Argos, in particular the *Epigonoí*, though she may also have featured in the *katabasis* of the *Nostoi*.²⁸

What is the point in including this material in Odysseus’ narration? One line of interpretation holds that the hero is trying to please his audience. The Phaeacians descend from Poseidon (see *Od.* 7.56–67), and given that some of these heroines are linked to Poseidon,²⁹ the hero is essentially narrating stories that remind the Phaeacians of their divine ancestor, hence stories that are relevant to the internal audience.³⁰ On the other hand, Odysseus’ inclusion of so many hero-

²² See Torres-Guerra (1995) 65.

²³ The prominence of the Theban material in the *Nekyia* is pointed out already by van der Valk (1935) 102–103 and 111–113.

²⁴ See van der Valk (1935) 104–108 who observes that the emphasis on Nestor in the “Catalogue of Heroines” corresponds to the old hero’s treatment in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

²⁵ For the links of these women to various traditions, see Larson (2000) 197–204.

²⁶ See fr. 5 *PEG* 1. See Σ^{HGV} *Od.* 11.326.

²⁷ See *Nostoi*, fr. 6 *PEG* 1. However, Pherecydes (fr. 170a–b *EGM*) reports that she was the mother of Locrus (through Zeus) who founded Thebes with Amphion and Zethus, and thus she was subsequently linked to Theban traditions as well. In the *Nostoi* she died a virgin. See Severyns (1928) 390.

²⁸ See fr. 8 *PEG* 1.

²⁹ See Larson (2000) 195 n. 11.

³⁰ Larson (2000) 195–196.

ines has been seen as a way by which the hero can win the sympathy and ultimately the help of Arete,³¹ the only female member of his audience who seems to hold considerable power in the Phaeacian society. Yet another approach has been to consider this material as pointing to the particular milieu in which the epic was crystalized: it has been argued that this happened in Athens, through the agency of the Peisistratids, who claimed descent from the Neleids and would also have been responsible for the shape and contents of the *Nekyia*'s "Catalogue of Heroines". In other words, the internal narrator, Odysseus, attempts to please his audience (the Phaeacians, Arete), while the external narrator attempts to achieve a similar goal with respect to the external audience.³²

I wish to ask here a different question: what is the effect of the poet's mixing this material? If his goal is that Odysseus win the support of the Phaeacians, then why not include only stories that involve Poseidon and not Zeus or Thebes? If he wishes to win Arete's favor, why conclude with Eriphyle, who was responsible for the death of her husband, Amphiaraus, a story which is reported in *Od.* 15.247: she accepted the necklace of Harmonia as a bribe to convince Amphiaraus to participate in the campaign of the *Epigonoï* against Thebes. Amphiaraus' participation meant certain death, something which he knew too well as a seer, and therefore charged his son (Alcmaon) to avenge his death by killing Eriphyle. Granted that when Odysseus recounts his encounter with Leda, he leaves Helen and Clytemnestra out of the list of her progeny, the audience would nevertheless have supplied what the poet left unsaid, since these were famous and important characters for the poem. Such stories are not appropriate if one wishes to achieve the female audience's *benevolentia*.

A more satisfactory answer might be found if we take into consideration the entire narrative frame in which this catalogue material is embedded. None of the traditions evoked here is privileged in any way. Rather, the heroines are included in order to evoke various traditions from a great part of the Greek world, some of which are of course connected to each other. But this is not something that the poet attempts only here. This narrative strategy can be detected through-

³¹ See, for instance, de Jong (2001) *ad loc.* Doherty (1995) 66–68 proposes that Odysseus has removed from his tale any possible misogynistic interpretations. However, if we grant that the audience was familiar with the traditions surrounding these heroines, it would be reasonable to assume that they would have been able to add what Odysseus has omitted from his account.

³² Larson (2000) esp. 220–222. But see the cautious remarks in Radke (2007) esp. 38–41 regarding the difficulties involved in the argument that draws an analogy between the internal and external narrator and holds that just as the internal narrator shapes his story in such a way as to persuade the poem's internal audience, the poet is shaping the traditional stories in order to please his (external) audience.

out the *Apologoi*. In fact, Odysseus' first-person account combines material that derives from various strands. The mirror image of the "Catalogue of Heroines" in the *Nekyia*, is a "Catalogue of Heroes" whom Odysseus met in the Underworld. These are his companions from the Trojan War, and by introducing them the poet gives his hero the opportunity to narrate events from the Cycle. It is especially important that, in contrast to the "Catalogue of Heroines", the heroes are given now the opportunity to speak for themselves and tell their own story in considerable detail.³³ Incidentally, this militates against the thesis that Odysseus tries to please Arete; if this had been his purpose, then it would have been more sensible to endow the heroines with their own voice, rather than mediating their experiences through himself, as is the case in Odysseus' catalogue, where their only significance seems to be their being mothers, daughters, wives, and mistresses. This is of course at home in catalogue/genealogical poetry, where what matters is to draw clear lines of filiation by which the *male* audience can assert its traditions, heritage, and even territorial claims.³⁴ In that way women function as vehicles or means that help assert these rights but do not possess any power of their own.³⁵ The "Catalogue of Heroines" might be seen as a specimen of *Ehoie* poetry, not in the sense that it derives from it, as earlier scholars had thought,³⁶ but because it shares certain generic characteristics with it. In it, Thebes has a prominent position but it is not the only protagonist. What emerges from this catalogue is mainly the interconnectedness of this network of stories.

As mentioned above, after this specimen of *Ehoie* – type of poetry follows the account of Odysseus' comrades-in-arms. Agamemnon recounts his own death, the end of what was his *nostos*, and a story told to Menelaus by the Old Man of the sea (*Od.* 4.512–537). Odysseus' comment in 436–439 recalls the entire fate of

³³ This is of course implied in some of the narratives of the heroines which are reported as indirect speech (see *Od.* 11.236 φάτο, 11.237 φῆ, 11.261 εὔχετ(ο), 11.306 φάσκε). But this is not the case with the heroes who are given the opportunity to utter character speech.

³⁴ See Larson (2000) 193–194.

³⁵ Doherty (1995) 94–104 detects a certain segregation of genders in the two halves of the *Nekyia*, in that the first half would appeal to Arete whereas the second (that contains explicit misogynistic statements, albeit uttered by Agamemnon) would be of interest to Alcinoos who after all asks to hear about the Greek heroes Odysseus encountered in the Underworld. We should not forget, however, that the poem's external audience was familiar with these traditions of the heroines and that, in terms of internal audience, Arete is present also during the second half of the *Nekyia*, meaning that she does hear the negative comments included therein.

³⁶ For instance Page (1955) 35–38. West (2013) 277 discusses the similarities of the *Nekyia*'s (and *Nostoi*) "Catalogue of Women" to the Hesiodic *Catalogue* and concludes that both the *Odyssey* and the *Nostoi* poets drew on genealogical poetry that had affinities with but was older than the *Catalogue*.

the Atreidae (Ἀτρείος γόνον) and calls to mind Orestes' killing of Clytemnestra and Aegisthus (see Agamemnon's question at *Od.* 11.456–461). It is especially important since the story of Orestes has been mentioned several times throughout the *Odyssey* and thus establishes a link between this portion of the *Nekyia* and the remainder of the poem.³⁷ It also shows once more that the catalogue's purpose cannot have been to win Arete on Odysseus' side (notice γυναικείας διὰ βουλᾶς at *Od.* 11.437). Likewise, Achilles' appearance gives Odysseus the opportunity to recount the bravery of Neoptolemus, Achilles' son, by essentially drawing material from the Epic Cycle (*Od.* 11.508–537): Odysseus' fetching Neoptolemus from Scyros and Neoptolemus' inclusion in the group of heroes who were in the Trojan horse, a story told in the *Ilias parva*.³⁸ Ajax too provides an opportunity for Odysseus to remind the audience of another event narrated in the Cycle, the ὄπλων κρίσις, which led to Ajax's madness and suicide. This story belongs to the tradition of the *Aethiopis*³⁹ or the *Ilias parva*.⁴⁰ The same is true also of the other characters Odysseus encounters in the Underworld: they represent allusions to stories known in the epic tradition and deriving from various parts of the Greek world: Crete (Minos), Boeotia (Orion), Corinth (Sisyphus),⁴¹ and Thebes / Argos (Heracles),⁴² while some of these appeared also in the *Nostoi* (Tantalus, Tityus)⁴³. The encounter with Heracles besides returning us to the Theban world, is also an acknowledgment of one of the *Odyssey* poet's predecessors, an epic tradition regarding Heracles in which Heracles' *katabasis* was narrated. The same can be said about Theseus and Peirithoos whose names should be sufficient to call to the informed audience's mind these heroes' *katabaseis*.

In addition to what has been observed thus far, even the general frame of Odysseus' narrative creatively reworks stories that were associated with other heroes and traditions: certain of Odysseus' adventures in his narrative derive from an Argonautic narrative which, though perhaps not textually fixed before our

³⁷ See Marks (2008) ch. 1.

³⁸ See Procl. *Chrest.* 206.10–11. See Severyns (1928) 337–338.

³⁹ See Procl. *Chrest.* 172.23–4 Seve. and *Aethiopis* fr. 5 PEG 1, *Ilias parva* fr. 2, 3 PEG 1. See also Severyns (1928) 329–331.

⁴⁰ See Procl. *Chrest.* 206.3–5.

⁴¹ See Severyns (1928) 392 who considers *Od.* 11.593–600 “a fragment of the *Nekyia* of the *Nostoi*”.

⁴² See Danek (1998) esp. 23–28; Clay (1983) 93–96 for a parallelism and contrast between Odysseus and Heracles in the *Nekyia*.

⁴³ Tantalus seems to have appeared also in the *Nostoi* (see fr. 4 PEG 1), where however his punishment was different. Assuming that this tradition was known to the *Odyssey* poet, his treatment of Tantalus may be another way in which he distances himself from one of his traditional models.

Odyssey, must have been known as an oral tradition. Thus the meeting with Circe on Aeaëa, Odysseus' encounter with the Sirens, the mention of the Πλαγκταί, the encounter with the Laestrygonians are all thought to derive from this cycle. And in case the audience has not noticed this, the poet gives it away by means of his metapoetic comment Ἀργῶ πᾶσι μέλουσα (*Od.* 12.70).⁴⁴ Are we to think of this Argonautic song in positive terms, as a tradition popular with the audiences of the time? Or is it meant in a negative manner, implying that the Argonautic story is old and common, not a modern one as the story we are now hearing. There are, moreover, folktale elements, such as the story of the Cyclops or even riddles such as the one we find in the encounter of Odysseus with Aeolus and his progeny.⁴⁵ The Theban reflections in the *Nekyia* are thus part of an intricate web of various traditions combined with each other in Odysseus' narrative *tour de force*.

Concluding Remarks

Clearly, then, the *Odyssey* interacts with the Theban material in a different way than the *Iliad*. In the *Iliad* the references to the story of Tydeus were intricately linked to the immediate context: Agamemnon and Athena used it as a way to chide Diomedes; Diomedes himself reminisced of his father in a prayer to Athena and used Tydeus' past as an argument to win her support; and Diomedes evoked Tydeus once more when arguing that he too can give good advice in the assembly. In the *Odyssey*, on the other hand, the Theban tales are one tradition among the many that make up Odysseus' *Apologoi*. In other words, the Theban material does not hold a special position in the broad spectrum of traditions that have been embedded in this epic. Unlike Tydeus' story in the *Iliad* it is neither repeated nor does it have the same (explicit) rhetorical, paradigmatic function. By weaving this colorful tapestry of epic stories Odysseus shows to his audience that he is in command of the entire poetic tradition. His knowledge is not limited to one kind of story but spans over various genres and geographic provenance.

The reason for the *Odyssey*'s different handling of the Theban material may be sought in Telemachus' programmatic words in 1.351–352, reacting to Penelope's urging Phemius to sing some other song rather than Ἀχαιῶν νόστον... λυγρόν (1.326–327):

⁴⁴ See West (2005) with abundant references to earlier treatments of this question.

⁴⁵ Page (1973) for folktales in the *Odyssey*, and (1955) 1–20 on the Cyclops.

τὴν γὰρ αἰοιδὴν μᾶλλον ἐπικλείουσ' ἄνθρωποι
ἢ τις ἀκούοντεςσι νεωτάτη ἀμφιπέληται.

"For men praise that song the most that comes the newest to their ears". (A. T. Murray, revised by G. E. Dimock).

The newest song attracts more praise from the audience. But these words also contain an implicit suggestion, an argument by analogy: Just as Penelope's suitors sit still and listen to Phemius' newest song, should the *Odyssey's* audience not do the same? The *Odyssey* is after all the song that narrates the *nostos* of the last of the Achaeans to return home, and is the νεωτάτη αἰοιδή of its kind. This newest song is also superior to the previous ones not only because it is the more recent one, but especially because it is the most inclusive one, containing elements of several types of possible plots and genres, from fairytale to other *nostoi*, catalogue or *Ehoie* poetry and heroic tales that derive from different poetic cycles. This characterizes the *Odyssey* as a whole⁴⁶, but it is executed especially masterfully in the *Apologoi* where the hero takes over the role of the bard and shows himself knowledgeable in many kinds of stories.⁴⁷ The different handling of the Theban material in the *Odyssey* is the result of that poem's claim of a special place among αἰοιδαί, and through its inclusiveness it renders all other song traditions obsolete.

⁴⁶ One may think in this context of the references to the Agamemnon *nostos* throughout the poem or Nestor's and Menelaus' recounting their own *nostos* in Books 3 and 4, respectively.

⁴⁷ See the pertinent remark in Danek (1998) 231: "Odysseus zeigt sich damit als Held, der potentiell mit jeder dem Hörer bekannten Heldengeschichte in Verbindung gebracht werden könnte, und unsere Odyssee präsentiert sich als Epos, das potentiell den Stoff aller bekannten Epen aufnehmen und somit letztlich alle anderen Epen ersetzen könnte".

Bibliography

DOI 10.1515/tc-2014-0024

Vase Archives

ABV = Beazley, J. D. (ed.) (1956), *Attic Black-Figure Vase-Painters*, Oxford.

ARV² = Beazley, J. D. (ed.) (1963), *Attic Red-Figure Vase-Painters*, 2nd ed, Oxford.

Addenda² = Carpenter, T. H., T. Mannack, and M. Mendonca (eds.) (1989), *Beazley Addenda*, 2nd ed., Oxford.

Paralipomena = Beazley, J. D. (ed.) (1971), *Paralipomena*, Oxford.

BAD = Beazley Archive Database, <http://www.beazley.ox.ac.uk>.

LIMC = *Lexicon Iconographicum Mythologiae Classicae* (1981–1999), Zurich.

Adkins, A. W. H. (1970), *Merit and Responsibility: A Study in Greek Values*, Oxford.

Alden, M. (2000), *Homer Beside Himself: Para-narratives in the Iliad*, Oxford.

D'Alessio, G. (2006), "Note al nuovo Archiloco", *ZPE* 156, 19–22.

Allan, W. (2006), "Divine Justice and Cosmic Order in Early Greek Epic," *JHS* 126, 1–35.

Aloni, A. (2000), "Anacreonte a Atene: Datazione e significato di alcune iscrizioni tiranniche," *ZPE* 130, 1–94.

Andersen, Ø. (1978), *Die Diomedesgestalt in der Ilias*, Oslo.

— (2012), "Older heroes and Earlier Poems: The case of Heracles in the *Odyssey*," in Ø. Andersen and D. T. T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, Cambridge, 138–151.

Apthorp, M. J. (2000), "Did Athene Help Tydeus to Win the Cadmean Games (*Iliad* 5.808)?," *ZPE* 131, 1–9.

Arnush, M. (1995), "The Career of Peisistratos Son of Hippias," *Hesperia* 64, 135–162.

Aronen, J. (2002), "Genealogy as a Form of Mythic Discourse: The Case of the Phaeacians," in: S. des Bouvrie (ed.), *Myth and Symbol I: Symbolic Phenomena in Ancient Greek Culture*, Papers from the First International Symposium on Symbolism at the University of Tromsø, June 4–7, 1998, Athens, The Norwegian Institute at Athens, 89–110.

Athanassaki, L. (2011), "Song, Politics, and Cultural Memory: Pindar's *Pythian* 7 and the Alcmaeonid Temple of Apollo," in: L. Athanassaki and E. Bowie (eds.), *Archaic and Classical Choral Song: Performance, Politics, and Dissemination*, Berlin, 235–268.

Austin, N. (1975), *Archery at the Dark of the Moon: Poetic Problems in Homer's Odyssey*, Berkeley CA.

Bakker, E. J. (1997), *Poetry in Speech: Orality and Homeric Discourse*, Ithaca NY.

— (2013), *The Meaning of Meat and the Structure of the Odyssey*, Cambridge.

Ballabriga, A. (1989), "La prophétie de Teiresias," *Mètis* 4, 291–304.

Barker, E. (2009), *Entering the Agon: Dissent and Authority in Homer, Historiography and Tragedy*, Oxford.

— (2011), "The *Iliad*'s Big Swoon: A Case of Innovation Within the Epic Tradition," *TC* 3.1, 1–17.

- Barker, E. and J. Christensen (2006), "Flight Club: The New Archilochus Fragment and Its Resonance With Homeric Epic," *MD* 57, 19–43.
- (2008), "Oedipus of Many Pains: Strategies of Contest in the Homeric Poems," *Leeds International Classical Studies* 7, 1–30.
 - (2011), "On not Remembering Tydeus: Diomedes and the Contest for Thebes," *MD* 66, 9–44.
- Bassett, S. E. (1938), *The Poetry of Homer*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Beck, D. (2005), *Homeric Conversation*. Washington D. C.
- Bener, F. (1945), *Amphiaraoassage in der griechischen Dichtung*, Chur.
- Berman, D. (2004), "The Double Foundation of Boiotian Thebes," *TAPA* 134, 1–22.
- (2007), *Myth and Culture in Aeschylus' Seven Against Thebes*, Rome.
 - (2013), "Greek Thebes in the Early Mythographic Tradition," in: S. Trzaskoma and R. S. Smith (eds.), *Writing Myth: Mythography in the Ancient World*, Leuven, 37–54.
- Bernabé, A. (ed.) (1987, corrected edition 1996²), *Poetae Epici Graeci: Testimonia et Fragmenta*, vol. 1, Stuttgart and Leipzig. Abbreviated as PEG 1.
- Bernardini, P. A. (2010). "Eracle: una biografia eroica tra epos arcaico, poesia lirica e tradizioni locali," in: E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali*, Alessandria, 385–409.
- Bethe, E. (1891), *Thebanische Heldenlieder. Untersuchungen über die Epen des thebanisch-argivischen Sagenkreises*, Leipzig.
- (1929²), *Homer. Dichtung und Sage*, vol. 2, Leipzig-Berlin.
- Binder, G. (1964), *Die Aussetzung des Königskindes: Kyros und Romulus*, Meiserheim am Glan.
- Bizard, L. (1920), "Fouilles du Ptoion: Inscriptions," *BCH* 44, 227–262.
- Boardman, J. (1975), "Herakles, Peisistratos, and Eleusis," *JHS* 95, 1–12.
- (1978). "Herakles, Delphi, and Kleisthenes of Sikyon," *Révue Archéologique* 2 (n.s.), 227–234.
- Bölte, F. (1934), "Ein Pylisches Epos," *RhM* 83, 319–347.
- Bousset, W. (1915), *Jüdisch-Christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandria und Rom*, Göttingen.
- Bowra, C. M. (1950), *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*, Oxford.
- (1957), "Asius and the Old-Fashioned Samians," *Hermes* 85, 391–401.
- Boyd, T. W. (1995), "A Poet on the Achaean Wall," *Oral Tradition* 10, 181–206.
- Braswell, B. (1971), "Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*," *CQ* 21, 16–26.
- (1998), *A Commentary on Pindar Nemean Nine*, Berlin.
- Bremer, J. M. (1987), "Stesichorus: The Lille Papyrus," in: J. M. Bremer, A. M. van Erp Taalman Kip, and S. R. Slings (eds.), *Some Recently Found Greek Poems: Text and Commentary*, Leiden, 128–174.
- Brisson, L. (1976), *Le mythe de Tirésias: essai d'analyse structurale*, Leiden.
- (1997), *Le sexe incertain. Androgynie et hermaphrodisme dans l'antiquité gréco-romaine*, Paris.
 - (1979a), "The Historical Traditions of Early Boiotia," in: J. Fossey and A. Schachter (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities*, Montreal, 21–24.
- Buck, R. (1979a), "The Historical Traditions of Early Boiotia," in: J. Fossey and A. Schachter (eds.), *Proceedings of the Second International Conference on Boiotian Antiquities*, Montreal, 21–24.
- (1979b), *A History of Boiotia*, Edmonton.
- Burgess, J. (1997), "Beyond Neoanalysis: Problems with the Vengeance Theory," in: *AJP* 118, 1–19.
- (2001), *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*, Baltimore and London.

- (2006), “Neoanalysis, Orality, and Intertextuality: An Examination of Homeric Motif Transference,” *Oral Tradition* 21, 148–189.
- (2009), *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*, Baltimore.
- (2012), “Intertextuality without Text in Early Greek Epic,” in: Ø. Andersen, & D. T. T. Haug (eds.), *Relative Chronology in Early Greek Epic Poetry*, Cambridge, 168–183.
- Burkert, W. (1981), “Seven Against Thebes: An Oral Tradition Between Babylonian Magic and Greek Literature,” in: C. Brillante, M. Cantilena, and C. O. Pavese (eds.), *I poemi epici rapsodici non omerici e la tradizione orale*, Padova, 29–51.
- (1983), “Itinerant Diviners and Magicians. A Neglected Element in Cultural Contacts,” in: R. Hägg (ed.), *The Greek Renaissance of the 8th Century BC*, Stockholm, 115–119.
- (1985), *Greek Religion*, Cambridge MA.
- Burnett, A. (1988), “Jocasta in the West: The Lille Stesichorus,” *CA* 7, 107–154.
- Buslepp, C. (1915), “Teiresias,” in: W. H. Roscher (ed.), *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*, vol. V, Leipzig, 178–207.
- Camp, J. (1994), “Before Democracy: Alkmaionidai and Peisistratidai,” in: W. Coulson et al. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, Bloomington ID, 7–12.
- Campbell, D. (ed.) (1991), *Greek Lyric: Stesichorus, Ibycus, Simonides, and Others*, vol. 3, Cambridge MA.
- Chantraine, P. (1983–1984²), *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque: Histoire des mots*, Paris. Abbreviated as DELG.
- Chantray, M. (1996), *Scholia in Thesmophoriazusas; Ranas; Ecclesiazusas et Plutum*; pars III, fasc. IV^b, Leiden.
- Christensen, J. (2010), “First-Person Futures in Homer,” *AJP* 131, 543–571.
- (2013), “Innovation and Tradition Revisited: the Near-synonymy of Homeric ΑΜΥΝΩ and ΑΛΕΞΩ as a Case Study in Homeric Composition,” *CJ* 108, 257–296.
- Cingano, E. (1992), “The Death of Oedipus in Epic Tradition,” *Phoenix* 46, 1–11.
- (2000), “Tradizioni su Tebe nell’epica e nella lirica greca arcaica,” in: P. A. Bernardini (ed.) *Presenza e funzione della città di Tebe nella cultura greca. Atti del convegno internazionale (Urbino 7–9 luglio 1997)*, Pisa-Rome 2000, 127–161.
- (2003), “Riflessi dell’epos tebano in Omero e in Esiodo,” *Incontri triestini di filologia classica* 2, 55–76.
- (2004), “Tradizioni epiche intorno ad Argo da Omero al VI sec. A. C.,” in: P. A. Bernardini (ed.), *La città di Argo: mito, storia, tradizioni poetiche*, Rome, 59–78.
- (2008), “A Catalogue Within a Catalogue: Helen’s Suitors in the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women* (frr. 196–204),” in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*, Cambridge, 118–152.
- (forthcoming a), “*Oedipodea*,” in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- (forthcoming b), “*Epigonoï*,” in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Clarke, M. (1999), *Flesh and Spirit in the Songs of Homer. A Study of Words and Myths*, Oxford.
- Classen, C. J. (2008), *Vorbilder- Werte – Normen in den homerischen Epen*, Berlin-Boston.
- Clay, J. S. (1983), *The Wrath of Athena: Gods and Men in the Odyssey*, Princeton.
- (2003), *Hesiod’s Cosmos*, Cambridge.
- (2011), *Homer’s Trojan Theater: Space, Vision, and Memory in the Iliad*, Cambridge.
- Collins, D. (1998), *Immortal Armor: The Concept of Alkê in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Lanham.

- Cook, E. (1995), *The Odyssey in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins*, Ithaca NY.
- (1999), “Active and passive heroics in the *Odyssey*,” *CW* 93, 149–167.
 - (2012), “Introduction,” in: E. McCrorie (transl.), *Homer. The Iliad*, Baltimore.
- Coppola, A. (2008). *L'eroe ritrovato. Il mito del corpo nella Grecia classica*, Venice.
- Crome, J. (1935–1936). “HIPPARXEIOI ERMAL,” *AM* 60–61, 305.
- Currie, B. (2005), *Pindar and the Cult of Heroes*, Oxford.
- (2006), “Homer and the Early Epic Tradition,” in: M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie, and R. O. A. M. Lyne (eds.), *Epic Interactions. Perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the Epic Tradition Presented to J. Griffin by Former Pupils*, Oxford, 1–45.
 - (2012), “The *Iliad*, *Gilgamesh*, and Neoanalysis,” in: F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*, Berlin, 543–580.
 - (forthcoming), “*Cypria*,” in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Danek, G. (1992), “Zur Prologrede der Aphrodite im Hippolytos des Euripides,” *WS* 105: 19–37.
- (1998), *Epos und Zitat: Studien zur Quellen der Odyssee*, Vienna.
 - (2002), “Traditional Referentiality and Homeric Intertextuality,” in: F. Montanari and P. Asheri (eds.), *Omero tremila anni dopo*, Rome, 3–19.
 - (forthcoming), “*Nostoi*,” in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Davidson, O. M. (1980), “Indo-European dimensions of Herakles in *Iliad* 19.95–133,” *Arethusa* 12, 197–202.
- Davies, M. (1988a), *Epicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, Göttingen. Abbreviated as *EGF*.
- (1988b), “Stesichorus’ Geryoneis and its Folk-Tale Origins,” *CQ* 38, 52–64.
 - (1989/2001), *The Greek Epic Cycle*. London.
 - (1991), *Poetarum Melicorum Graecorum Fragmenta: Alcman, Stesichorus, Ibycus*, vol. 1, Oxford. Abbreviated as *PMGF*.
 - (2000), “Euripides *Telephus* fr. 149 (Austin) and the Folk-Tale Origins of the Teuthranian Expedition,” *ZPE* 133, 7–10.
 - (2002), “The Folk-tale Origins of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,” *WS* 115, 5–43.
 - (2003), “The Judgements of Paris and Solomon,” *CQ* 53, 32–43.
 - (2007), “Hesiod’s *Theogony* and the folk-tale,” in: P. J. Finglass, C. Collard, and N. J. Richardson (eds.), *Hesperos: Studies in Greek Poetry presented to M. L. West on his seventieth birthday*, Oxford, 66–82.
 - (2008), “Hermes the Helper-Figure,” *Prometheus* 34, 27–32.
 - (2013a), “The hero at the Crossroads: Prodicus and the Choice of Heracles,” *Prometheus* 39, 3–17.
 - (2013b), “‘Stat vetus ... silva’: Burlesque and Parody in Ovid *Amores* 3.1 and Persius *Satires* 5.132–53,” *Prometheus* 39, 165–176.
 - (2014). *The Theban Epics*, available on-line from the CHS website.
- Davison, J. A. (1968), “Quotations and Allusions in Early Greek Literature,” in: J. A. Davison (ed.), *From Archilochus to Pindar: Papers on Greek Literature of the Archaic Period*, New York, 70–85.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1987), *Narrators and Focalizers: the Presentation of the Story in the Iliad*, Amsterdam.
- (2001), *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*, Cambridge.

- de Kock, E. L. (1962), "The Peisandros scholium. Its Sources, Unity and Relationship to Euripides' *Chrysippos*," *Acta Classica* 5, 15–37.
- Debiasi, A. (2013), "The Norm of the Polyp," *TC* 5.2, 195–207.
- (forthcoming) "*Alcmeonis*," in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Delcourt, M. (1958), *Hermaphrodite. Mythes et rites de la bisexualité dans l'antiquité classique*, Paris.
- Dentice di Accadia Ammone, S. (2012), *Omero e i suoi oratori: tecniche di persuasione nell'Iliade*, Berlin-Boston.
- Di Rocco, E. (2007), *Io Tiresia. Metamorfosi di un profeta*, Rome.
- Dickie, M. (1983), "Phaeacian athletes," in: *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* 4, 237–276.
- Dietrich, B. C. (1964), "Xanthus' Prediction – a Memory of Popular Cult in Homer," *Acta Classica* 7, 9–24.
- Dillery, J. (2005), "Chresmologues and Manteis: Independent Diviners and the Problem of Authority," in: S. I. Johnston and P. T. Struck (eds.), *Mantike. Studies in Ancient Divination*, Leiden, 167–231.
- Dindorf, W. (1855), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Odysseam*, Oxford.
- Dodds, E. R. (1951), *The Greeks and the Irrational*, Berkeley.
- Doherty, L. (1995), *Siren Songs: Gender, Audiences, and Narrators in the Odyssey*, Ann Arbor MI.
- (2008), "Nausikaa and Tyro: Idylls of Courtship in the Phaiakian Episode of the *Odyssey* and the *Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*," *Phoenix* 62, 63–76.
- Donlan, W. (2002), "Achilles the Ally," *Arethusa* 35, 155–172.
- Dova, St. (2012), *Greek Heroes in and out of Hades*, Lanham.
- Ducat, J. (1971), *Les Kouroi du Ptoion*, Paris.
- Du, C. (2002), *Homeric Variations on a Lament by Briseis*, Lanham.
- Du, C. and Ebbott, M. (2010), *Iliad 10 and the Poetics of Ambush: A Multitext Edition with Essays and Commentary*, Washington DC and Cambridge MA.
- Duffy, W. (2013), "The Necklace of Eriphyle and Pausanias' Approach to the Homeric Epics," *CW* 107, 35–47.
- Duplain-Michel, N. (1991), *Tirsias et les chamanes. tude comparative des liens entre bisexualit et divination dans la mythologie grecque et l'idologie chamannique*, Neuchtel (on-line: <http://home.page.ch/pub/henaro@vtx.ch/Teiresias.htm>).
- Ebbott, M. (2010), "Error 404: Theban Epic Not Found," *TC* 2.2, 239–258.
- Edmunds, L. (1981a), "The Cults and the Legend of Oedipus," *HSCP* 85, 221–238.
- (1981b), *The Sphinx in the Oedipus Legend*, Knigstein.
- (1997), "Myth in Homer," in: I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden, 415–441.
- EM: *Enzyklopdie des Mrchens*. Berlin-New York 1979–2014.
- Edwards, M. W. (1987), *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*, Baltimore.
- (1991), *The Iliad: A Commentary, vol. 5: Books 17–20*, Cambridge.
- Ekroth, G. (1999), "Pausanias and the Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-cults," in: R. Hagg (ed.), *Ancient Greek Hero Cult: Proceedings of the Fifth International Seminar on Ancient Cult*, organized by the Department of Classical Archaeology and Ancient History, Gteborg University, 21–23 April 1995, Stockholm, 145–158.
- Elmer, D. (2013), *The Poetics of Consent: Collective Decision-making and the Iliad*. Baltimore.
- Erbse, H. (1961), "Betrachtungen ber das 5. Buch der Ilias," *RhM* 104, 156–189.
- Falkner, T. M. (1995), *The Poetics of Old Age in Greek Epic, Lyric, and Tragedy*, Norman.

- Farnell, L. R. (1920), *The Cults of the Greek City-states*, Cambridge.
- Faulkner, A. (2011), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Text and Commentary*, Oxford.
- Fenik, B. (1968), *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*, Wiesbaden.
- (1974), *Studies in the Odyssey*, Wiesbaden.
- Finkelberg, M. (2000), "The Cypria, the Iliad, and the Problem of Multiformity in Oral and Written Tradition," *CP* 95, 1–11.
- (2011), "Homer and His Peers: Neanalysis, Oral Theory and the Status of Homer," *TC* 3.2, 197–208.
- Fitch, E. (1922), "The Evidence for the Homeric *Thebais*," *CP* 17, 37–43.
- Floyd, E. (1968), "The Première of Pindar's Third and Ninth *Pythian Odes*," *TAPA* 99, 181–202.
- Foley, J. M. (1990), *Traditional Oral Epic: The Odyssey, Beowulf, and the Serbo-Croatian Return Song*, Berkeley CA.
- (1991), *Immanent Art: From Structure to Meaning in Traditional Oral Epic*, Bloomington IN.
- (1995a), *The Singer of Tales in Performance*, Bloomington, IN.
- (1995b), "Sixteen Moments of Silence in Homer," *QUCC* 50, 7–26.
- (1999), *Homer's Traditional Art*, University Park, PA.
- (2002), *How to Read an Oral Poem*, Urbana and Chicago.
- Foley, J. M. and J. Arft, (forthcoming), "The Epic Cycle and Oral Tradition", in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Ford, A. (1992), *Homer: The Poetry of the Past*, Ithaca NY.
- Forrest, W. G. (1956), "The First Sacred War," *BCH* 80, 33–52.
- Foster, M. (2013), "Hagesias as Sunoikistêr: Seercraft and Colonial Ideology in Pindar's Sixth *Olympian Ode*," *CA* 32, 283–321.
- Fowler, D. (2000), *Roman Constructions*, Oxford.
- Fowler, R. L. (1998), "Genealogical Thinking, Hesiod's *Catalogue*, and the Creation of the Hellenes," *PCPS* 44, 1–19.
- (2000), *Early Greek Mythography*, vol. 1: Text, Oxford. Abbreviated as *EGM*.
- (2004), "The Homeric Question," in: R. L. Fowler (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to Homer*, Cambridge, 220–232.
- (2013), *Early Greek Mythography*, vol. 2: Commentary, Oxford.
- Frame, D. (2009), *Hippota Nestor*, Washington DC and Cambridge MA.
- Frazer, J. G. (ed.) (1921), *Apollodorus. The Library*, Cambridge MA.
- Galinsky, G. K. (1972), *The Herakles Theme*, Oxford.
- Gantz, T. (1993) *Early Greek Myth: A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, Baltimore.
- García Gual, C. (1975), "Teiresias o el adivino como mediador," *Emerita* 43, 107–132.
- Garvie, A. F. (1994), *Homer: Odyssey, Books 6–8*, Cambridge.
- Gera, D. L. (1997), *Warrior Women: The Anonymous Tractatus De Mulieribus*, Leiden.
- Gibbons, R. and C. Segal (2003), *Sophocles. Antigone*, Oxford.
- Gostoli, A. (1978), "Some Aspects of the Theban Myth in the Lille Stesichorus," *GRBS* 19, 23–27.
- Grant, M. A. (1967), *Folktale and Hero-Tale Motifs in the Odes of Pindar*, Lawrence.
- Graziosi, B. (2002), *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*, Cambridge.
- Graziosi, B. and J. Haubold (2005), *Homer: The Resonance of Epic*, London.
- Grethlein, J. (2006), *Das Geschichtsbild der Ilias: Eine Untersuchung aus phänomenologischer und narratologischer Perspektive*, Göttingen.
- (2008), "Memory and Material Objects in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*," *JHS* 128, 27–51.

- (2010), *The Greeks and Their Past: Poetry, Oratory and History in the Fifth Century BCE*, Cambridge.
- Griffin, J. (1977), "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer," *JHS* 97, 39–53.
- Griffith, M. (1999), *Sophocles. Antigone*, Cambridge.
- Grote, G. (1869²), *A History of Greece*, vol. 2, London.
- Guillon, P. (1943), *Les trépieds du Ptoion*, Paris.
- Hainsworth, J. B. (1988), "Book VII: Introduction," in: A. Heubeck, St. West, and J. B. Hainsworth (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume II: Introduction and Books IX–XVI*, Oxford, 316–319.
- (1993), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 5: Books 9–12, Cambridge.
- Hammer, D. (2002), *The Iliad as Politics: The Performance of Political Thought*, Norman.
- Handley, E. (1957), *The Telephus of Euripides*, London.
- Hansen, W. F. (2002), *Ariadne's Thread, A Guide to International Tales Found in Classical Literature*, Ithaca NY.
- Harrison, J. E. (1980), *Prolegomena to the Study of Greek Religion*, London.
- Haslam, M. (1978), "The Versification of the New Stesichorus. *P.Lille* 76abc," *GRBS* 19, 29–57.
- Haubold, J. (2000), *Homer's People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation*, Cambridge.
- Heath, M. (1987), *The Poetics of Greek Tragedy*, Stanford.
- Hedreen, G. (1992), "The Cult of Achilles in the Euxine," *Hesperia* 60, 313–330.
- Hedrick, C. (1988), "The Temple and Cult of Apollo Patroos in Athens," *AJA* 92, 185–210.
- Held, G. (1987), "Phoinix, Agamemnon and Achilles. Problems and Paradeigmata," *CQ* 36, 141–154.
- Helly, B. (1991), "Les cités antiques de la Thessalie," *Les Dossiers d'archéologie* 159, 30–43.
- Heubeck, A. (1983), *Omero. Odissea. 3. Libri IX–XII*, Rome.
- (1986), "ἐπινύς in der archaischen Epik," *Glotta* 64, 143–165.
- (1989), "Books IX–XII," in: A. Heubeck and A. Hoekstra (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume I: Introduction and Books I–VIII*, Oxford, 3–143.
- Heubeck A., St. West, and J. B. Hainsworth (eds.) (1988), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume II: Introduction and Books IX–XVI*, Oxford.
- Heubeck, A. and Hoekstra, A. (eds.) (1989), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume I: Introduction and Books I–VIII*, Oxford.
- Hoekstra, A. (1990), "Books XIII–XVI," in: A. Heubeck and A. Hoekstra (eds.), *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey: Volume II: Books IX–XVI*, Oxford, 147–287.
- Holt, P. (1992), "Herakles' apotheosis in Lost Greek Literature and Art," *AC* 61, 38–59.
- Hommel, H. (1980), *Der Gott Achilleus*, Heidelberg.
- Hooker, J. T. (1980), "The Apparition of Heracles in the *Odyssey*," *LCM* 5, 139–146.
- (1988), "The cults of Achilles," *RhM* 131, 1–7.
- Hubbard, T. K. (1992), "Remaking Myth and Rewriting History: Cult Tradition in Pindar's Ninth *Nemean*," *HSCP* 94, 77–111.
- Hurwit, J. (1987), "Narrative Resonance in the East Pediment of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia," *The Art Bulletin* 69, 6–15.
- Huxley, G. L. (1969), *Greek Epic Poetry from Eumelos to Panyassis*, London.
- Immerwahr, H. (1990), *Attic Script: A Survey*, Oxford.
- Immisch, O. (1889), *Klaros. Forschungen über griechische Stiftungssagen*, Leipzig.
- Irwin, E. (2005), "Gods Among Men? The Social and Political Dynamics of the Hesiodic *Catalogue of Women*," in: R. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 35–84.

- Jacoby, F. (ed.) (1923–1954), *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Berlin and Leiden.
- Jamison, S. (1994), “Draupadi on the Walls of Troy: ‘Iliad’ 3 from an Indic Perspective,” *CA* 13, 5–16.
- Janko, R. (1986), “The Shield of Heracles and the Legend of Cycnus,” *CQ* 36, 38–59.
- (1981), “ΑΘΑΝΑΤΟΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΨΗΡΩΣ: The Genealogy of a Formula,” *Mnemosyne* 34, 382–385.
- (1992), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 4: *Books 13–16*, Cambridge.
- Jebb, R. C. (ed.) (1888), *Sophocles: The Plays and Fragments. III: The Antigone*, Cambridge.
- Jeffery, L. (1990), *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece: A Study of the Origin of the Greek Alphabet and Its Development from the Eighth to the Fifth Centuries BC*, rev. ed. with a supplement by A. Johnston, Oxford.
- Jensen, M. (1980), *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory*, Copenhagen.
- Johansen, K. F. (1967), *The Iliad in Early Greek Art*, Copenhagen.
- Jouan, F. (1966), *Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens*, Paris.
- Kakridis, J. (1944), *Ομηρικές έρευνες*, Athens.
- Kakridis, J. (1949), *Homeric Researches*, Lund.
- Kamerbeek, J. C. (1978), *The Plays of Sophocles. Commentaries. III. The Antigone*, Leiden.
- Kamptz, H. von (1982), *Homerische Personennamen: Sprachwissenschaftliche und historische Klassifikation*, Göttingen.
- Katz, M. A. (1981), “The Divided World of *Iliad* VI,” in: H. P. Foley (ed.), *Reflections of Women in Antiquity*, Philadelphia, 19–44.
- Kearns, E. (1989), *The Heroes of Attica*, London.
- Kelly, A. (2006), “Homer and History: *Iliad* 9.381–4,” *Mnemosyne* 59, 321–333.
- (2007), “How to End an Orally-Derived Epic Poem,” *TAPA* 137, 371–402.
- (2010), “Hypertexting with Homer: Tlepolemos and Sarpedon on Herakles (*Il.* 5.628–698),” *TC* 2.2, 259–276.
- (2012), “The Audience Expects: Penelope and Odysseus,” in: E. Minchin (ed.), *Orality, Literacy, and Performance in the Ancient World*, Leiden-Boston, 3–24.
- (forthcoming), “*Ilias parva*,” in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Ketel, E. E. (1991), *The Historiography of Grammatical Concepts*, Amsterdam.
- Kirk, G. S. (1973), “Methodological Reflexions on the Myths of Herakles,” in: B. Gentili and G. Paioni (eds.), *Il Mito Greco: Atti del Convegno Internazionale*. Urbino.
- (1985), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 1: *Books 1–4*, Cambridge.
- (1990), *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 2: *Books 5–8*, Cambridge.
- Kossatz-Deissmann, A. (1981), “Achilleus,” *LIMC* 1.1, 37–200.
- Krafft, F. (1963), *Vergleichende Untersuchungen zu Homer und Hesiod*, Göttingen.
- Krauskopff, I. (1981), “Amphiaraos,” *LIMC* 1.1, 691–713.
- Kühr, A. (2006), “Invading Boeotia. ‘Polis’ and ‘Ethnos’ in the Mirror of Theban Foundation Myths,” *Hermes* 134, 367–372.
- Kullmann, W. (1960), *Die Quellen der Ilias (Troischer Sagenkreis)*, Wiesbaden.
- (1984), “Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research,” *GRBS* 25, 307–324.
- (1991), “Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse),” in: J. Latacz (ed.), *200 Jahre Homerforschung – Rückblick und Ausblick*, Stuttgart, 425–455 (= W. Kullmann (ed.), *Homerische Motive*, Stuttgart 1992, 100–134).
- (2002), “Nachlese zur Neoanalyse,” in: A. Rengakos (ed.), *W. Kullmann: Realität, Imagination und Theorie. Kleine Schriften zu Epos und Tragödie in der Antike*, Stuttgart, 162–176.

- (forthcoming), "Motif- and Source-Research: Neanalysis, Homeric, and Cyclic Epic," in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Lane Fox, R. (2008), *Travelling Heroes: Greeks and their Myths in the Epic Age of Homer*, London.
- Lang, M. L. (1969), "Homer and Oral Techniques," *Hesperia* 38, 159–168.
- (1983), "Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad*," in: C. A. Rubino and C. W. Shelmerdine (eds.), *Approaches to Homer*, Austin, 140–164.
- Lardinois, A. P. M. H. (2000), "Characterization through Gnomai in Homer's *Iliad*," *Mnemosyne* 53, 641–661.
- Larson, J. (1995), *Greek Heroine Cults*, Madison.
- Larson, S. (2000), "Boiotia, Athens, the Peisistratids, and the *Odyssey*'s Catalogue of Heroines," *GRBS* 41, 193–222.
- (2007a), *Tales of Epic Ancestry: Boiotian Collective Identity in the Late Archaic and Early Classical Periods*, Stuttgart.
- (2007b), Reassessing a Late Sixth-Century Boiotian Dedication: Delphi Museum inv. no. 3078," *ZPE* 162, 99–106.
- Lattimore, R. (trans.) (1951), *The Iliad of Homer*, Chicago.
- (trans.) (1965/2007), *The Odyssey of Homer*, New York.
- Lavelle, B. (1985), "Hipparchos' Herms," *EMC* 29, 411–420.
- (1997), "Epikouros and epikouroi in Early Greek Literature and History," *GRBS* 38, 229–262.
- Lazzarini, M. (1976), *Le Formule delle dedichee votive nella Grecia arcaica*, Rome.
- Lee, M. Owen. (1997), *The Olive-Tree Bed and Other Quests*, Toronto.
- Legras, L. (1905), *Les légendes thébaines dans l'épopée et la tragédie grecques*, Paris.
- Lenz, A. (1980), *Das Proöm des frühen griechischen Epos: ein Beitrag zum poetischen Selbstverständnis*. Bonn.
- Lewis, D. (1988), "The Tyranny of the Pisistratidae," *CAH* 2 IV, 287–302.
- Liapis, V. (2006), "Intertextuality as Irony: Heracles in Epic and in Sophocles," *G&R* 53, 48–59.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. (1971), *The Justice of Zeus*, Berkeley.
- (2002), "Curses and Divine Anger in Early Greek Epic. The Pisander Scholion," *CQ* 52, 1–14.
- Löffler, I. (1963), *Die Melampodie. Versuch einer Rekonstruktion des Inhalts*, Meisenheim am Glan.
- Lohmann D. (1970), *Die Komposition der Reden in der Ilias*, Berlin.
- Lorau, N. (1989), *Les expériences de Tirésias. Le féminin et l'homme grec*, Paris.
- (1990), "Herakles: the super-male and the feminine," in: D. M. Halperin (ed.), *Before Sexuality: The Construction of Erotic Experience in the Ancient Greek World*, Princeton, 21–52.
- (2010), "Ce que vit Tirésias," *Revue française de psychanalyse* 74, 1141–1159 (<http://www.cairn.info/revue-francaise-de-psychanalyse-2010-4-page-1141.htm>).
- Lord, A. (1960/2000?), *The Singer of Tales*, Cambridge MA.
- Louden, B. (1999), *The Odyssey: Structure, Narration, and Meaning*, Baltimore.
- Lyne, R. O. A. M. (1994), "Vergil's *Aeneid*: Subversion by Intertextuality. Catullus 66.39–40 and other examples," *G&R* 41, 187–204.
- Lyons, D. J. (2003), "Dangerous Gifts: Ideologies of Marriage and Exchange in Ancient Greece," *CA* 22, 93–134.
- (2012), *Dangerous Gifts: Gender and Exchange in Ancient Greece*, Austin.

- Maass, E. (1887), *Scholia Graeca in Homeri Iliadem Townleyana*, vol I, Oxford.
- MacInnes, D. (2007), "Gainsaying the Prophet: Jocasta, Teiresias, and the Lille Stesichorus," *QUCC* 86, 95–108.
- Mackie, C. J. (2008), *Rivers of Fire: Mythic Themes in Homer's Iliad*, Washington DC.
- Mackie, H. (1996), *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*, Lanham.
- Malkin, I. (1998), *The Returns of Odysseus. Colonization and Ethnicity*, Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Marks, J. (2008), *Zeus in the Odyssey*, Washington DC.
- Maronitis, D. (1983), "Références latentes de l'Odysée à l'Iliade," in: *Mélanges É. Delebecque*, Aix-en-Provence, 277–291.
- Martin, R. (1989), *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*, Ithaca NY.
- Mastronarde, D. J. (1994), *Euripides*. Phoenissae, Cambridge.
- Matthews, V. J. (1996), *Antimachus of Colophon: Text and Commentary*, Leiden.
- Mendel, G. (1907), "Fouilles du Ptoion (1903)," *BCH* 31, 185–207.
- Meritt, B. (1939), "Greek Inscriptions," *Hesperia* 8, 48–82.
- Merkelbach, R. (1951), *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*, Munich.
- Miller, S. (1978), *The Prytaneion: Its Function and Architectural Form*, Berkeley.
- Minchin, E. (2007a), *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender*, Oxford.
- (2007b), "The Language of Heroes and the Language of Heroines: Storytelling in the Oral Traditional Epic," in: C. Cooper (ed.), *Politics of Orality*, Leiden, 3–38.
- Minton, W. M. (1960), "Homer's Invocations to the Muses: Traditional Patterns," *TAPA* 91, 292–309.
- Montanari F., A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis, C. (eds.) (2012), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*, Berlin.
- Montiglio, S. (2000), *Silence in the Land of the Logos*, Princeton.
- Morgan, C. (1997), "The Archaeology of Sanctuaries in the Early Iron Age and Archaic Ethne," in: L. Mitchell and P. Rhodes (eds.), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece*, London, 168–198.
- Morris, S. (1989), "A Tale of Two Cities: The Miniature Frescoes from Thera and the Origins of Greek Poetry," *AJA* 93, 511–535.
- Most, G. W. (1989), "The Structure and Function of Odysseus' Apologoi," *TAPA* 119, 15–30.
- (2007), *Hesiod. The Shield, Catalogue, Other Fragments*, Cambridge MA.
- Müller, C. W. (1976), "Ennius und Äsop," *MH* 33, 193–218 (= [1999] *Kleine Schriften*, Stuttgart-Leipzig, 526–557).
- Mueller, M. (1984), *The Iliad*, London.
- Muellner, L. (1996), *The Anger of Achilles: Mēnis in Greek Epic*, Ithaca NY and London.
- Munck, J. (1933), *Untersuchungen über Klemens von Alexandria*, Stuttgart.
- Murnaghan, S. (2011), *Disguise and Recognition in the Odyssey*, Lanham.
- Murray, P. (1981), "Poetic Inspiration in Early Greece," *JHS* 101, 87–100.
- Nagler, M. N. (1974), *Spontaneity and Tradition: A Study in the Oral Art of Homer*. Berkeley.
- (1980), "Entretiens avec Tirésias," *CW* 74, 89–108.
- Nagy, G. (1979/1999), *The Best of the Achaeans: Concepts of the Hero in Archaic Greek Poetry*, Baltimore.
- (1990), *Pindar's Homer: The Lyric Possession of an Epic Past*, Baltimore.
- (1996), *Homeric Questions*. Austin.
- (2000), "'Dream of a Shade': Refractions of Epic Vision in Pindar's *Pythian* 8 and Aeschylus' *Seven against Thebes*," *HSCP* 100, 97–118.

- (2002), “Reading Bakhtin Reading the Classics: An Epic Fate for Conveyors of the Heroic Past,” in: R. Branham (ed.), *Bakhtin and the Classics*, Chicago, 71–96.
- (2003), *Homeric Responses*, Austin.
- (2004), *Homer’s Text and Language*, Urbana.
- (2009a), “Hesiod and the Ancient Biographical Traditions,” in: F. Montanari, A. Rengakos and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Brill’s Companion to Hesiod*, Leiden and Boston, 271–311.
- (2009b), *Homer the Classic*, Washington DC and Cambridge MA.
- Naiden, F. S. (2006), *Ancient Supplication*, Oxford.
- Nicholls, R. (1970), “Architectural Terracotta Sculpture from the Athenian Agora,” *Hesperia* 39, 115–138.
- Obbink, D. (2005), “4708. Archilochus, Elegies,” *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. 69, 19–42.
- (2006), “A New Archilochus Poem,” *ZPE* 156, 1–9.
- Olivieri, O. (2010), “La geografia mitica delle imprese di Alcmeone dalla poesia epica alla tragedia,” in: E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali*, Alessandria, 299–314.
- Osborne, R. (1985), “The Erection and Mutilation of the Hermai,” *PCPS* 31, 47–73.
- (2005), “Ordering Women in Hesiod’s *Catalogue*,” in: R. L. Hunter (ed.), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women: Constructions and Reconstructions*, Cambridge, 5–24.
- Pache, C. (2004), *Baby and Child Heroes in Ancient Greece*, Urbana.
- Page, D. L. (1955), *The Homeric Odyssey: The Mary Flexner Lectures Delivered at Bryn Mawr College, Pennsylvania*. Oxford.
- (1973), *Folktales in Homer’s Odyssey*. Cambridge, MA.
- Papadopoulou, T. (2005), *Heracles and Euripidean Tragedy*, Cambridge.
- Papaioannou, S. (2007), *Redesigning Achilles. ‘Recycling’ the Epic Cycle in the ‘Little Iliad’ (Ovid, Metamorphoses 12.1–13.622)*, Berlin and New York.
- Parker, R. (1996), *Athenian Religion: A History*, Oxford.
- Parry, A. (ed.) (1971), *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*, Oxford.
- Parsons, P. J. (1977), “The Lille ‘Stesichorus’,” *ZPE* 26, 7–36.
- Pearson, A. C. (1917), *The Fragments of Sophocles*, Cambridge.
- Pellin, A. (2010), “Il mito di Telefo nell’epos ellenistico: l’Epyllium Telephi, fr. ep. adesp. 3 Powell,” in: E. Cingano (ed.), *Tra panellenismo e tradizioni locali: generi poetici e storiografia*, Alessandria, 519–540.
- Peradotto, J. (1990), *Man in the Middle Voice: Name and Narration in the Odyssey*, Princeton.
- Pestalozzi, H. (1945), *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias*, Erlangen–Zürich.
- Petropoulos, I. (2012), “The Telemachy and the Cyclic *Nostoi*,” in: F. Montanari, A. Rengakos & C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*, Berlin, 291–308.
- Petsalis-Diomidis, A. (2006), “Amphiaraos Present: Images of Healing Pilgrimage in Ancient Greece,” in: R. Shepherd and R. Maniura (eds.), *Images and Presence: Essays on the ‘Presence’ of the Prototype Within the Image*, Ashgate, 205–229.
- Platter, Ch. (2007), *Aristophanes and the Carnival of Genres*, Baltimore.
- Porter, A. (2011), “‘Stricken to Silence’: Authoritative Response, Homeric Irony, and the Peril of a Missed Language Cue,” *Oral Tradition* 26, 493–520.
- Porter, J. (2011), “Making and Unmaking: The Achaeian Wall and the Limits of Fictionality in Homeric Criticism,” *TAPA* 141, 1–36.
- Preiser, C. (2000). *Euripides, Telephos. Einleitung, Text, Kommentar*. Hildesheim.
- Pritchett, K. (1969), *Studies in Greek Topography III: Roads*, Berkeley.

- Pucci, P. (1987), *Odysseus Polutropos: Intertextual Readings in the Odyssey and the Iliad*, Ithaca NY.
- (1998), *The Song of the Sirens: Essays on Homer*, Lanham.
- Pulley, S. (1997), *Prayer in Greek Religion*, Oxford.
- Raaflaub, K. (1993), "Homer to Solon: The Rise of the Polis, The Written Sources," in: M. Hansen (ed.), *The Ancient Greek City-State*, Copenhagen, 41–105.
- (1998), "A Historian's Headache: How to Read 'Homeric Society'?", in: N. Fisher and H. van Wees (eds.), *Archaic Greece: New Approaches and New Evidence*, London, 169–194.
- Radke, G. (2007), "Die poetische Souveränität des homerischen Erzählers," *RhM* 150, 8–66.
- Reece, S. (1993), *The Stranger's Welcome: Oral Theory and the Aesthetics of the Homeric Hospitality Scene*, Ann Arbor MI.
- Reichel, M. (1994), *Fernbeziehungen in der Ilias*, Tübingen.
- (1998), "How Oral is Homer's Narrative?," *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 10, 1–22.
- Reinhardt, K. (1960), "Die Abenteuer der Odyssee," in: K. Reinhardt, *Tradition und Geist*, Göttingen, 47–124.
- Ribbeck, O. (1875), *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik*, Leipzig.
- Rieu E. V. (trans.) (2003 [1945] rev. by D. C.H. Rieu, with introduction by P. Jones), *Homer. The Odyssey*, London.
- Rivero García, L. (2008), "Virgil Aeneid 6: 445–446. A Critical Note," *HSCP* 104, 273–287.
- Robert, C. (1915), *Oidipus. Geschichte eines poetischen Stoffs im griechischen Altertum*, Berlin.
- (1924⁴), *Die griechische Heldensage*, Berlin.
- Röhrich, L. (1977), *Märchen und Wirklichkeit*, Stuttgart ([1991] transl. by P. Tokofsky as *Folktales and Reality*, Indianapolis).
- Rose, G. (1969), "The Unfriendly Phaeacians," *TAPA* 100, 387–406.
- Rubino, C. A. (1979), "A Thousand Shapes of Death': Heroic Immortality in the *Iliad*," in: G. W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, and M. C.J. Putnam (eds.), *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies Presented to Bernard M. W. Knox on the Occasion of his 65th Birthday*, Berlin, 12–18.
- Russo, J. (1999), "Stesichorus, Homer, and the Forms of Early Greek Epic," in: J. N. Kazazis and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Euphrosyne. Studies in Ancient Epic and its Legacy in Honor of Dimitris N. Maronitis*, Stuttgart.
- Rutherford, I. (2000), "Formulas, Voice, and Death in *Ehoie*-Poetry, the Hesiodic *Gunaikon Katalogos*, and the Odyssean *Nekuia*," in: M. Depew and D. Obbink (eds.), *Matrices of Genre: Authors, Canons, and Society*, Cambridge MA, 81–96.
- Rutherford, R. B. (2001), "From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*," in: D. L. Cairns (ed.), *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*, Oxford, 117–146 (= *BICS* 38, 1991–3, 47–54).
- Rzach, A. (1922), "Kyklos," *RE* 11.2, 2347–2435.
- Sakellariou, M. B. (1958), *La migration grecque en Ionie*, Athens.
- Saldino, V. (1990), "Kalchas," *LIMC* 5.1, 931–935.
- Sammons, B. (2009), "Brothers in the Night: Agamemnon & Menelaus in Book 10 of the *Iliad*," *CB* 85, 27–47.
- (2010), *The Art and Rhetoric of the Homeric Catalogue*, New York.
- (2013), "Narrative Doublets in the Epic Cycle," *AJP* 134, 529–556.
- Santamaría Álvarez, M. A. (2011), "Diálogos entre vivos y muertos en los poemas homéricos (*Ilíada* XXIII 65–107 y *Odisea* XI)", in: R. Martín and S. Torallas (eds.), *Conversaciones con*

- la muerte: *Diálogos del hombre con el más allá desde la antigüedad hasta la Edad Media*, Madrid, 23–50.
- Schachter, A. (1981–1994), *Cults of Boiotia*, 4 vols, London.
- (1994), “The Politics of Dedication: Two Athenian Dedications at the Sanctuary of Apollo Ptoieus in Boeotia,” in: R. Osborne and S. Hornblower (eds.), *Ritual, Finance, Politics: Athenian Democratic Accounts Presented to David Lewis*, Oxford, 291–306.
- Schadewaldt, W. (1959). *Von Homers Welt und Werk*, Stuttgart.
- (1966³), *Iliasstudien*, Darmstadt.
- Schefold, K., and F. Jung, (1989), *Die Sagen von den Argonauten, von Theben und Troia in der klassischen und hellenistischen Kunst*, Munich.
- Schein, S. (1984), *The Mortal Hero: An Introduction to Homer's Iliad*. Berkeley.
- Schmidt, M. (1982), “Oidipus und Teiresias”, in: B. von Freytag gen. Lörringhoff, D. Mannsperger, and F. Prayon (eds.), *Praestant interna. Festschrift für Ulrich Hausmann*, Tübingen, 236–243.
- Schwenn, F. (1933), “Teiresias,” *RE* 9.1, 129–132.
- Schischwani, S. (1994), *Mündliche Quellen der Odyssee*, Freiburg.
- Scodel, R. (1982), “The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction,” *HSCP* 86, 33–50.
- (1984), “Epic Doublets and Polyneices’ Two Burials,” *TAPA* 114, 49–58.
- (2002), *Listening to Homer: Tradition, Narrative and Audience*, Ann Arbor MI.
- (2004), “The Modesty of Homer,” in: C. J. Mackie (ed.), *Oral Performance and its Contexts*, Leiden, 1–19.
- (2008), *Epic Facework: Self-presentation and Social Interaction in Homer*, Swansea.
- Scully, S. (1990), *Homer and the Sacred City*, Ithaca NY.
- Seaford, R. (1994), *Reciprocity and Ritual*, Cambridge.
- Segal, C. (1974), “The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: A Structuralist Approach,” *CW* 67, 205–212.
- (1985), “Archaic Choral Lyric,” P. E. Easterling and B. M.W. Knox (eds.), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 1: *Greek Literature*, Cambridge, 165–201.
- Severyns, A. (1928). *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*. Liège and Paris.
- Sewell-Rutter, N. J. (2008), *Guilt by Descent. Moral Inheritance and Decision Making in Greek Tragedy*, New York and Oxford.
- Shapiro, H. A. (1983), “Herakles Theos: the death and apotheosis of Herakles,” *CW* 77, 7–19.
- (1984a), “Herakles, Kyknos and Delphi,” in: *Ancient Greek and Related Pottery: Proceedings of the International Vase Symposium*, Amsterdam, 271–274.
- (1984b), “Herakles and Kyknos,” *AJA* 88: 523–529.
- (1989), *Art and Cult under the Tyrants*, Mainz.
- Shear, Jr., T. L. (1978), “Tyrants and Building in Archaic Athens,” in: W. Childs (ed.), *Athens Comes of Age: From Solon to Salamis*, Princeton, 1–15.
- (1994), “*Isonomous t'Athenas epoiesaten*: The Agora and the Democracy,” in: W. Coulson et al. (eds.), *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy*, Bloomington ID, 225–248.
- Sherratt, E. (1990), “Reading the Texts,” *Antiquity* 64, 802–824.
- Sifakis, G. (1997), “Formulas and their Relatives: A Semiotic Approach to Verse Making in Homer and Modern Greek Folk Songs,” *JHS* 117, 136–153.
- Simon, E. (1992a), “Melampous,” *LIMC* 6.1, 405–410.
- (1992b), “Mopsus,” *LIMC* 6.1, 652–654.
- Singor, H. W. (1992). “The Achaean Wall and the Seven Gates of Thebes,” *Hermes* 120, 401–411.

- Skempis, M. and Ziogas, I. (2009). "Arete's Words: Etymology, *Ehoie*-poetry and Gendered Narrative in the *Odyssey*," in: J. Grethlein and A. Rengakos (eds.), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin, 213–240.
- Slatkin, L. (1991), *The Power of Thetis: Allusion and Interpretation in the Iliad*. Berkeley.
- (1996), "Composition by Theme and the *Mētis* of the *Odyssey*," in: S. Schein (ed.), *Reading the Odyssey: Selected Interpretive Essays*, Princeton, 223–237.
- (2011), *The Power of Thetis and Other Essays*, Washington DC.
- Snodgrass, A. (1998), *Homer and the Artists: Text and Picture in Early Greek Art*, Cambridge.
- Sommerstein, A. (2012), "Fragments and Lost Tragedies," in: A. Markantonatos (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Sophocles*, Leiden, 191–209.
- (forthcoming), "Tragedy and the Epic Cycle," in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Spyropoulos, Th. (1981), *Ἀμφειὼν. Ἐρευνα καὶ μελέτη τοῦ μνημείου τοῦ Ἀμφείου Θηβῶν*, Sparta.
- Stafford, E. J. (2010), "Herakles between Gods and Heroes," in: J. N. Bremmer and A. Erskine (eds.), *The Gods of Ancient Greece*, Edinburgh, 228–244.
- Stanford, W. (1959), *The Odyssey of Homer*, vol. 1, London.
- Stanley, Th. (1663), *Aeschyli tragoediae septem: cum scholiis Graecis omnibus; deperditorum dramatum fragmentis, versione e commentario Tomae Stanleii*, London.
- Stern, J. (1996), *On Unbelievable Tales. Translation, Introduction and Commentary*, Wauconda IL.
- Stinton, T. C. W. (1965), "Euripides and the Judgement of Paris," *JHS* Suppl. paper 11 (= [1990] *Collected Papers on Greek Tragedy* Oxford, 17–75).
- Stoneman, R. (1981), "Pindar and the Mythological Tradition," *Philologus* 125, 44–63.
- Strasser, F. X. (1984), *Zu den iterata der frühgriechischen Epik*, Königstein/Ts.
- Terranova, Ch. (2013), "Il mito di Amphiaraos in età omerica fra costruzione e destrutturazione," *QUCC* 103, 11–32.
- Thomas, R. (1989), *Oral Tradition and Written Record in Classical Athens*, Cambridge.
- Thompson, H. (1937), "Buildings from the West Side of the Athenian Agora," *Hesperia* 6, 1–226.
- (1940), *The Tholos of Athens and Its Predecessors* (*Hesperia* Suppl. 4), Baltimore.
- Torres, J. B. (1995), *La Tebaida Homérica como fuente de Ilíada y Odisea*, Madrid.
- (2012), "The Writing Down of the Oral *Thebaid* that Homer Knew: in the Footsteps of Wolfgang Kullmann," in: F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*, Berlin, 517–530.
- (forthcoming), "Thebaid," in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Tsagalis, C. (2008), *The Oral Palimpsest: Exploring Intertextuality in the Homeric Epics*, Washington DC.
- (2010), "The Dynamic Hypertext: Lists and Catalogues in the Homeric Epics," *TC* 2.2, 323–347.
- (2011a), "Towards an Oral, Intertextual Neoanalysis," *TC* 3.2, 209–244.
- (2011b), "Intertextuality," in: M. Finkelberg (ed.), *The Homer Encyclopedia*, vol. 2, Chichester, 413–414.
- (2012a), "Deauthorizing the Epic Cycle: Odysseus' False Tale to Eumaeus (*Od.* 14.199–359)," in: F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*, Berlin, 309–345.
- (2012b), *From Listeners to Viewers: Space in the Iliad*, Washington DC.

- (2012c), “*Cypria*, fr. 19 (Bernabé, West): Further Considerations,” *RFIC* 140, 257–289.
- (forthcoming), “*Telegony*,” in: M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (eds.), *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*, Cambridge.
- Tsagarakis, O. (2000), *Studies in Odyssey 11*, Stuttgart.
- Tsitsibakou-Vasalos, E. (1989), “The Homeric ἄφαρ in the Oedipus Myth and the Identity of the Lille mother,” *Glotta* 67, 60–88.
- Turkeltaub, D. (2010), “Reading the Epic Past: The *Iliad* on Heroic Epic,” in: Ph. Mitsis and C. Tsagalis, (eds.) *Allusion, Authority, and Truth: Critical Perspectives on Greek Poetic and Rhetorical Praxis*, Berlin, 129–152.
- Ugolini, G. (1995), *Untersuchungen zur Figur des Sehers Teiresias*, Tübingen.
- Usener, K. (1990), *Beobachtungen zum Verhältnis der Odyssee zur Ilias*, Tübingen.
- Valgiglio, E. (1963), “Edipo nella tradizione pre-attica,” *RSC* 11, 18–43 and 153–171.
- van der Valk, M. H. (1935), *Beiträge zur Nekyia*, Kampen.
- van Eck, J. (1978), *The Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite: Introduction, Commentary, and Appendices*, Utrecht.
- Verbanck-Pierard, A. (1989), “Le double culte d’Héraklès: légende ou réalité,” in: A.-F. Laurens (ed.), *Entre Hommes et Dieux: Le convive, le héros, le prophète*, Paris, 43–65.
- Vermeule, E. (1966), “The Boston Oresteia Krater,” *AJA* 70, 1–22.
- (1987), “Baby Aigisthos and the Bronze Age,” *PCPS* 213 (n.s. 33), 122–152.
- Vian, F. (1963), *Les origines de Thèbes. Cadmos et les Spartes*, Paris.
- Viviers, D. (1992), *Recherches dur les ateliers de sculpture et la cite d’Athènes*, Brussels.
- von der Mühl, P. (1962), *Homeri Odyssea*, Basel.
- Watrous, V. (1982), “The Sculptural Program of the Siphnian Treasury at Delphi,” *AJA* 86, 159–72.
- Webster, T. (1967), *The Tragedies of Euripides*, London.
- Weil, H. (1900), “Nouveaux fragments de Ménandre et d’autres classiques grecs,” *JS* 1900, 95–106.
- Welcker, F. G. (1865²), *Der epische Cyclus oder die homerischen Dichter*, vol. I, Bonn.
- West, M. L. (1969), “The Achaean Wall,” *CR* 19, 255–260.
- (1978), “Stesichorus at Lille,” *ZPE* 29, 1–4.
- (1983), *The Orphic Poems*, Oxford.
- (1985), *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women. Its Nature, Structure, and Origins*, Oxford.
- (1988), “The Rise of the Greek Epic,” *JHS* 108, 151–172.
- (1992), *Ancient Greek Music*, Oxford.
- (1997), *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*, Oxford.
- (1999), “The Invention of Homer,” *CQ* 49, 364–82.
- (2003), *Greek Epic Fragments: From the Seventh to the Fifth Centuries BC*, Cambridge MA – London. Abbreviated as *GEF*.
- (2005), “*Odyssey* and *Argonautica*,” *CQ* 55, 39–64.
- (2006), “Archilochus and Telephos,” *ZPE* 156, 11–17.
- (2011), *The Making of the Iliad: Disquisition and Analytical Commentary*, Oxford.
- (2013), *The Epic Cycle. A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*, Oxford.
- Whittaker, H. (1999), “The Status of Arete in the Phaeacian Episode of the *Odyssey*,” *SO* 74, 140–150.
- Wickersham, J. (1991), “Myth and Identity in the Archaic Polis,” in: D. Pozzi and J. Wickersham (eds.), *Myth and the Polis*, Ithaca NY, 16–31.

- Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, U. von (1884), *Homerische Untersuchungen*, Berlin.
- Willcock, M. M. (1964), "Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*," *CQ* 14 (n.s.), 141–154.
- (1977), "Ad hoc invention in the *Iliad*," *HSCP* 81, 41–53.
- (1997), "Neoanalysis," in: I. Morris and B. Powell (eds.), *A New Companion to Homer*, Leiden, 174–189.
- Williams, D. (1983), "Herakles, Peisistratos, and the Alcmaeonids," in: F. Lissarague and F. Thelamon (eds.), *Image et céramique grecque*, Rouen, 131–140.
- Wilson, D. F. (2002), "Lion Kings: Heroes in the Epic Mirror," *Colby Quarterly* 38, 231–254.
- Winter, N. (1993a), *Greek Architectural Terracottas*, Oxford.
- (1993b), "Kroisos' Role in the Diffusion of Greek Mainland Architectural Terracottas to Ionia," in: J. Courtils and J.-C. Moretti (eds.), *Les grandes ateliers d'architecture dans le monde Egéen du VI^e siècle av. J.-C.*, Paris, 29–33.
- Wyatt, W. F. (1989), "The Intermezzo of *Odyssey* 11 and the Poets Homer and Odysseus," *SMEA* 27, 235–253.
- Zimmermann, K. (1997), "Teiresias," *LIMC* 8.1, 1188–1191.
- Zutt, G. (1894), *Über den Katalog der Heroinnen in der Nekyia*, Baden-Baden.