



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file *Votre référence*

Our file *Notre référence*

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

Canada

The Death of Achilles in the *Iliad*

by

Jonathan Seth Burgess

**A thesis submitted in conformity with the requirements
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Graduate Department of Classical Studies
University of Toronto**

© Copyright by Jonathan Seth Burgess 1995



National Library
of Canada

Acquisitions and
Bibliographic Services Branch

395 Wellington Street
Ottawa, Ontario
K1A 0N4

Bibliothèque nationale
du Canada

Direction des acquisitions et
des services bibliographiques

395, rue Wellington
Ottawa (Ontario)
K1A 0N4

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted an irrevocable non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of his/her thesis by any means and in any form or format, making this thesis available to interested persons.

L'auteur a accordé une licence irrévocable et non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de sa thèse de quelque manière et sous quelque forme que ce soit pour mettre des exemplaires de cette thèse à la disposition des personnes intéressées.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in his/her thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without his/her permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège sa thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

ISBN 0-612-02643-4

Canada

Name

JONATHAN BURGESS

Dissertation Abstracts International is arranged by broad, general subject categories. Please select the one subject which most nearly describes the content of your dissertation. Enter the corresponding four-digit code in the spaces provided.

CLASSICAL LITERATURE

0294

U-M-I

SUBJECT TERM

SUBJECT CODE

Subject Categories

THE HUMANITIES AND SOCIAL SCIENCES

COMMUNICATIONS AND THE ARTS

Architecture	0729
Art History	0377
Cinema	0900
Dance	0378
Fine Arts	0357
Information Science	0723
Journalism	0391
Library Science	0399
Mass Communications	0708
Music	0413
Speech Communication	0459
Theater	0465

EDUCATION

General	0515
Administrative	0514
Adult and Continuing	0516
Agricultural	0517
Art	0273
Bilingual and Multicultural	0282
Business	0688
Community College	0275
Curriculum and Instruction	0727
Early Childhood	0518
Elementary	0524
Finance	0277
Guidance and Counseling	0519
Health	0680
Higher	0745
History of	0520
Home Economics	0278
Industrial	0521
Language and Literature	0279
Mathematics	0260
Music	0522
Philosophy of	0998
Physical	0523

Psychology	0525
Reading	0535
Religious	0527
Sciences	0714
Secondary	0533
Social Sciences	0534
Sociology of	0340
Special	0529
Teacher Training	0530
Technology	0710
Tests and Measurements	0288
Vocational	0747

LANGUAGE, LITERATURE AND LINGUISTICS

Language	
General	0679
Ancient	0289
Linguistics	0290
Modern	0291
Literature	
General	0401
Classical	0294
Comparative	0295
Medieval	0297
Modern	0298
African	0316
American	0591
Asian	0305
Canadian (English)	0352
Canadian (French)	0355
English	0593
Germanic	0311
Latin American	0312
Middle Eastern	0315
Romance	0315
Slavic and East European	0314

PHILOSOPHY, RELIGION AND THEOLOGY

Philosophy	0422
Religion	
General	0318
Biblical Studies	0321
Clergy	0319
History of	0320
Philosophy of	0322
Theology	0469

SOCIAL SCIENCES

American Studies	0320
Anthropology	
Archaeology	0324
Cultural	0326
Physical	0327
Business Administration	
General	0310
Accounting	0272
Banking	0770
Management	0454
Marketing	0338
Canadian Studies	0385
Economics	
General	0501
Agricultural	0503
Commerce-Business	0505
Finance	0508
History	0509
Labor	0510
Theory	0511
Folklore	0358
Geography	0366
Gerontology	0351
History	
General	0578

Ancient	0579
Medieval	0581
Modern	0582
Black	0328
African	0331
Asia, Australia and Oceania	0332
Canadian	0334
European	0335
Latin American	0336
Middle Eastern	0333
United States	0337
History of Science	0585
Law	0398
Political Science	
General	0615
International Law and Relations	0616
Public Administration	0617
Recreation	0814
Social Work	0452
Sociology	
General	0626
Criminology and Penology	0627
Demography	0938
Ethnic and Racial Studies	0631
Individual and Family Studies	0628
Industrial and Labor Relations	0629
Public and Social Welfare	0630
Social Structure and Development	0700
Theory and Methods	0344
Transportation	0709
Urban and Regional Planning	0999
Women's Studies	0453

THE SCIENCES AND ENGINEERING

BIOLOGICAL SCIENCES

Agriculture	
General	0473
Agronomy	0285
Animal Culture and Nutrition	0475
Animal Pathology	0476
Food Science and Technology	0359
Forestry and Wildlife	0478
Plant Culture	0479
Plant Pathology	0480
Plant Physiology	0817
Range Management	0777
Wood Technology	0746
Biology	
General	0306
Anatomy	0287
Biostatistics	0308
Botany	0309
Cell	0379
Ecology	0329
Entomology	0353
Genetics	0369
Limnology	0793
Microbiology	0410
Molecular	0307
Neuroscience	0317
Oceanography	0415
Physiology	0433
Radiation	0821
Veterinary Science	0778
Zoology	0472
Biophysics	
General	0786
Medical	0760
EARTH SCIENCES	
Biogeochemistry	0425
Geochemistry	0996

Geodesy	0370
Geology	0372
Geophysics	0373
Hydrology	0388
Mineralogy	0411
Paleobotany	0345
Paleoecology	0426
Paleontology	0418
Paleozoology	0985
Polyzoology	0427
Physical Geography	0368
Physical Oceanography	0415

HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENTAL SCIENCES

Environmental Sciences	0768
Health Sciences	
General	0565
Audiology	0300
Chemotherapy	0992
Dentistry	0567
Education	0350
Hospital Management	0769
Human Development	0758
Immunology	0982
Medicine and Surgery	0564
Mental Health	0347
Nursing	0569
Nutrition	0570
Obstetrics and Gynecology	0380
Occupational Health and Therapy	0354
Ophthalmology	0381
Pathology	0571
Pharmacology	0419
Pharmacy	0572
Physical Therapy	0382
Public Health	0573
Radiology	0574
Recreation	0575

Speech Pathology	0460
Toxicology	0383
Home Economics	0386

PHYSICAL SCIENCES

Pure Sciences	
Chemistry	
General	0485
Agricultural	0749
Analytical	0486
Biochemistry	0487
Inorganic	0488
Nuclear	0738
Organic	0490
Pharmaceutical	0491
Physical	0494
Polymer	0495
Radiation	0754
Mathematics	0405
Physics	
General	0605
Acoustics	0786
Astronomy and Astrophysics	0606
Atmospheric Science	0608
Atomic	0748
Electronics and Electricity	0607
Elementary Particles and High Energy	0798
Fluid and Plasma	0759
Molecular	0609
Nuclear	0610
Optics	0752
Radiation	0756
Solid State	0611
Statistics	0463
Applied Sciences	
Applied Mechanics	0346
Computer Science	0984

Engineering	
General	0537
Aerospace	0538
Agricultural	0539
Automotive	0540
Biomedical	0541
Chemical	0542
Civil	0543
Electronics and Electrical	0544
Heat and Thermodynamics	0348
Hydraulic	0545
Industrial	0546
Marine	0547
Materials Science	0794
Mechanical	0548
Metallurgy	0743
Mining	0551
Nuclear	0552
Packaging	0549
Petroleum	0765
Sanitary and Municipal	0554
System Science	0790
Geotechnical	0428
Operations Research	0796
Physics Technology	0795
Textile Technology	0994

PSYCHOLOGY

General	0621
Behavioral	0384
Clinical	0622
Developmental	0620
Experimental	0623
Industrial	0624
Personality	0625
Physiological	0989
Psychobiology	0349
Psychometrics	0632
Social	0451



THE UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
 MANUSCRIPT THESIS - DOCTORAL
 AUTHORITY TO DISTRIBUTE

NOTE: The AUTHOR will sign in one of the two places indicated. It is the intention of the University that there be NO RESTRICTION on the distribution of the publication of theses save in exceptional cases.

(a) Immediate publication in microform by the National Library is authorized.

Author's signature Paul Berger Date 1/8/95

- OR -

(b) Publication by the National Library is to be postponed until _____ 19____
 (normal maximum delay is two years). Meanwhile this thesis may not be consulted in the University Library except with written permission on each occasion from me.

Author's signature _____ Date _____

This restriction is authorized for reasons which seem to me, as Chair _____ of the Graduate Department of _____, to be sufficient.

Signature of Graduate Department Chair _____

Date _____

BORROWERS undertake to give proper credit for any use made of the thesis, and to obtain the consent of the author if it is proposed to make extensive quotations, or to reproduce the thesis in whole or in part.

Signature of borrower	Address	Date

Abstract of the Thesis, *The Death of Achilles in the Iliad*

by Jonathan Seth Burgess
for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy
Graduate Department of Classical Studies
University of Toronto
1995

This dissertation examines an event that lies outside the dramatic time of the *Iliad*, the death of Achilles. At first the relation between Homer and his tradition is discussed, with particular focus on the poems of the epic cycle. I propose that Homer was not greatly influential in the Archaic Age, whereas a "cyclic" tradition was then dominant. It is then argued that a traditional story underlies the *Iliad's* frequent references to Achilles' death and that this story can be reconstructed from the evidence of art and literature. Finally, I indicate how Homer indirectly narrated the death of Achilles within the *Iliad*.

In one sense the title of the dissertation refers to the manner in which the topic of Achilles' fate is repeatedly discussed throughout the *Iliad*, with certain poetic effects resulting. This study explores more extensively, however, the primary sense of the title: how Homer represents the death of Achilles through Patroclus and Achilles. As part of Homer's indirect yet masterful narration of extra-Iliadic events, the actions of Achilles mirror the circumstances of his future death and the actions of Patroclus especially reflect them. A school of thought known as neo-analysis has often explored these parallels, and a thorough examination of its theories precedes the conclusions that I reach.

A final chapter focuses on the myth of Achilles' heel. It is often suggested that this story was known in the Archaic Age, perhaps even by Homer. I argue that the evidence we possess does not support this interpretation. However, early Greek myth does seem to indicate that there was something remarkable about the wounding of Achilles. The possible nature of this story is explored.

Through examination of these issues the dissertation demonstrates that Homer knew traditional myth and that this myth can often be recovered through close examination of early art and the poems of the epic cycle. Furthermore, it is suggested that Homer knew a traditional story about the death of Achilles and represented it within the *Iliad* in order to broaden the temporal scope of the poem.

Acknowledgments

I wish to thank especially my supervisor, Professor E.I. Robbins, for his nurturing direction of the dissertation at all of its stages, from initial discussions to final draft. His enthusiasm inspired me to work at a steady pace and finish the project in a timely fashion, and it was his insight that neo-analysis would provide an excellent context for my long-standing interest in the use of time in the *Iliad* (Professor Robert J. Rabel deserves my gratitude for encouraging this interest). Professors J.N. Grant, M.O. Lee, W.E. McLeod, as members of my committee, improved the dissertation through careful reading of the penultimate draft; Professors S. Solecki and M. Mueller contributed to the productive discussion that occurred at the oral examination. Professor B.C. Inwood provided me with welcome advice as Graduate Co-ordinator, a service that Professor Grant continued at a later date. Members in the audience at the University of Toronto Graduate Classics Students' Colloquium 1993 and 1994, as well as at the Classical Association of the Atlantic States Spring Meeting 1994, made interesting comments on papers based on parts of the dissertation (I thank Professor Glenn Most in particular for his encouragement).

I would also like to express my loving gratitude to my wife, Jane Aspinall, who lived with and through the project supportively and patiently. The work on this dissertation coincided with the birth and initial year of our first child, William, and I will always fondly recall the busy yet joyous days of that time. Finally I should acknowledge the contribution of my hound dog Corky, who faithfully napped at my feet while I composed at the computer, often using the latest draft as a pillow. I hope the work has a less soporific effect on its readers.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Chapter One: The Tradition of the Trojan War	7
1. Homer and the Tradition of the Trojan War	9
The tradition of the Trojan war in the Homeric Poems	9
Date of the Homeric poems	12
Influence of Homer on his tradition	20
2. The Epic Cycle and the Tradition of the Trojan War	26
Authors, dates, and titles	26
The manufacture of the epic cycle	32
Differences between the original poems and the epic cycle	36
<i>a. changes and omissions</i>	38
<i>b. cropping</i>	39
When the tampering occurred	42
The "cyclic" tradition	48
<i>a. early Archaic Age</i>	49
<i>b. the "cyclic" tradition after the Archaic Age</i>	53
3. The Relation between the Epic Cycle and Homer	56
Cropping of the epic cycle around the <i>Iliad</i> ?	59
<i>a. the end of the Cypria</i>	60
<i>b. the beginning of the Aethiopis</i>	65
Possible extent of the original poems	67
Influence of Homer on the epic cycle?	72
<i>a. the homelands of Chryseis and Briseis</i>	73
<i>b. the resources and motives of "late" epic authors</i>	75
Non-Homeric aspects of the epic cycle	78
<i>a. exotic geography</i>	79
<i>b. religious beliefs and practices</i>	86
<i>c. supernatural material</i>	90
<i>d. erotic material</i>	91
Chapter Two: The Destiny of Achilles	96
1. Achilles' Fate in the <i>Iliad</i>	98
What Thetis tells him	98
Information from other characters	100
2. The Homeric Use of Achilles' Fate	104
The Homeric portrayal of prophecy from Thetis to Achilles	106
Inconsistency and <i>ad hoc</i> invention	110
The poetic effect of Achilles' fate	121

3. Prophecy of Achilles' Fate in Pre-Homeric Myth	125
How Thetis would know Achilles' fate	126
The time of the prophecy	131
Chapter Three: The Death of Achilles	136
Chapter Four: The Death of Achilles in the <i>Iliad</i>	178
1. General Issues in Neo-analysis	180
Pre-Homeric texts	180
Typology	182
Priority of motifs	187
The nature of motif transference	188
2. The Vengeance Theory	192
The motif of withdrawal	192
The motif of vengeance	194
The correspondence between Patroclus and Antilochus	199
Invention in Homer	202
The effect of motif transference	211
3. The Achilles-Memnon Episode in the <i>Iliad</i>	216
According to the vengeance theory	216
The Patroclus sequence and the Achilles sequence	252
Chapter Five: Achilles' Heel	261
1. Thetis and the Infant Achilles	263
2. The Wounding of Achilles	268
Conclusion	286
References	294

List of Appendices

Appendix A: The Achilles-Memnon Episode	290
Appendix B: Reflection of the Achilles-Memnon Episode in the <i>Iliad</i>, According to the Vengeance Theory	291
Appendix C: The Patroclus Sequence and the Achilles Sequence	292

Introduction

This study examines an event which lies outside the dramatic time of the *Iliad*, the death of Achilles. A traditional story about his death, I believe, underlies the *Iliad*'s frequent references to the fate of its hero. Using evidence from art and literature, I will explore how the death of Achilles was commonly related and argue that this story has pre-Homeric origins. Then it will be demonstrated that the *Iliad* symbolically represents Achilles' death through the actions of Achilles and Patroclus. I hope readers gain new insight into how Homer narrates an event of traditional myth, the death of Achilles, within the *Iliad*.

Chapter one will discuss the relation between Homer and traditional myth. I will argue that throughout the Archaic Age the Homeric poems did not have much influence on the tradition they inherited. Even evidence from art and literature which is post-Homeric can contain pre-Homeric myth. Because the poems of the epic cycle are a major source for myth about the Trojan war, I will focus on them in particular. My examination suggests that they are not greatly dependent on the Homeric poems and that it is justifiable to view them as representatives of a tradition that Homer would have known.

Chapter two examines what the *Iliad* tells us about the death of its hero and how the poet makes use of that topic. Thus the chapter focuses on one sense of the dissertation's title: the complex and significant manner in which the death of Achilles is discussed in the *Iliad*. Achilles and his mother refer to his fate throughout the poem, and the poem increasingly stresses his coming death. I will first of all demonstrate that a consistent picture of the death of Achilles emerges from these passages, one which is based on tradition. A second concern of this chapter will be how Homer employed Achilles' fate to achieve certain poetic effects. It will be especially instructive in this

endeavor to examine Achilles' knowledge of his fate through prophecy from Thetis. A final concern will be to explore how prophecy from Thetis to Achilles might have been portrayed in pre-Homeric myth.

In chapter three I will proceed to outline what I think was the essential sequence of events in traditional myth about the death of Achilles. Examination of the tradition about the Trojan war is very difficult, for the evidence is scarce. Of the poems in the epic cycle, our main source for the early epic tradition, we have only prose summaries and a small number of fragments. But poetry about the Trojan war in other genres adds some information, and art work contributes greatly to our knowledge. In addition, a wealth of comments from scholia and ancient authors provides important clues. Slowly, painstakingly, a picture of the traditional death of Achilles can be gained.

Chapter four has the same title as that of the dissertation as a whole because it explores the main topic of my study: how Homer indirectly represents the death of Achilles within the *Iliad*. It is commonly recognized that the *Iliad* manages to tell the story of the whole Trojan war. As part of Homer's indirect yet masterful narration of extra-Iliadic events, the actions of Achilles mirror the circumstances of his future death and the actions of Patroclus especially reflect them. The chapter will begin by providing a critique of a school of thought known as neo-analysis, which has often explored these parallels. Then I will present my own understanding of how Achilles and Patroclus symbolically act out a sequence of events from the traditional story of Achilles' death.

Chapter five will present a thorough study of the wounding of Achilles in art and literature. It is often suggested that the story of Achilles' uniquely vulnerable heel was known in the Archaic Age, perhaps even by Homer. I will argue that the evidence we possess does not support this interpretation. However, it does seem that early Greek myth stressed that Achilles was wounded in the lower leg. To account for this I will argue that such a wound served to immobilize Achilles. It is this story that I believe Homer would have known, and there may be some reflections of it in the *Iliad*.

In general I strive to show that the Homeric poems and the poems of the epic cycle share the same tradition. The Homeric poems, I think, should be considered rather unusual branches off the trunk of this tradition. Undoubtedly the Homeric poems and the poems of the epic cycle were very different from each other; in fact I suspect that the Homeric poems were greatly superior in an artistic sense, for I admire the Homeric poems so much that I cannot conceive of their being equaled. Yet I also suspect that the poems of the epic cycle were more representative of the epic tradition that they shared with Homer. Therefore, we should look to the epic cycle when we wonder about the mythical tradition that lies in the background of the Homeric poems. Ultimately we can thereby gain a better sense of the idiosyncratic manner in which Homer transformed his tradition into the complex poems that still move us today.¹

This study will stress the continuity of myth by suggesting that pre-historic and non-Greek motifs can be found in the epic tradition of the Trojan war and that the tradition Homer knew remained stable throughout the Archaic Age. It is assumed that we can reconstruct myth known to Homer from sources in art and literature that may be later than Homer in date. Of course myth was not uniform in all places and at all times in the ancient world.² But certain stories were told repeatedly, and a narrator of them could assume their general outlines were recognizable to his audience. To this extent they were traditional, and I hope to show that a version of the death of Achilles commonly known in the Archaic Age was presupposed by Homer.

My assumption that the Homeric poems allude to traditional myth found in the Archaic Age may cause some surprise. An influential schematic approach portrays Homer as markedly different from people of later ages, even the Archaic Age.³

¹ Russo 1968; Mueller 159ff. well discuss Homer as distinct within his tradition.

² E.g. Young 1979: 3ff.; Andersen 1982: 7-8; Gantz xvi stress the flexibility, innovation, and variance of Greek myth.

³ Displayed, in different ways, by Fränkel; Dodds; Snell; Adkins. A distinction between the poet and his characters is not always clearly made in the work of these scholars, adding to the sense that Homer is some type of primitive.

According to this view, Homer reflects a dim and distant beginning of Greek (or even human) thought and culture. I follow those scholars who have found this simplistic and misleading.⁴ As I point out in chapter one, it is even questionable whether Homer existed as early as the late eighth century B.C. That date for Homer is commonly accepted but sometimes seems supported by not much more than a desire to separate Homer from non-Homeric myth about the Trojan war. A similar phenomenon often occurs in discussion of Near Eastern influences on the Greek world, for it is often suggested that the "oriental revolution" divides Homer from the Archaic Age. Burkert's study of this time period should dampen enthusiasm for this line of thought, for he shows that Near Eastern influence was strong well before even an eighth-century Homer.⁵ Similarly, at times scholars have employed oral theory to portray Homer as a primitive oral poet to be contrasted with sophisticated literates of the seventh century.⁶ I think this attitude both underestimates Homer's poetic abilities and neglects the continuation of orality through the Archaic Age.

In this study I take a unitarian attitude towards the texts of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, considering them the works of one poet, Homer. The Homeric poems are traditional, I believe, in the sense that they are based on traditional material and also employ traditional compositional techniques. Yet I view them as unified works begun and finished over the lifetime of one monumental poet. The view that supposes there was a self-contained Iliadic tradition or Odyssean tradition in which the poet inherited poems much like our Homeric poems or passed on works that were subsequently developed in our poems does not attract me. Thus the term "pre-Homeric," which will occur frequently in this work, refers to the time preceding a single monumental poet. The terms "pre-

⁴ E.g. Lloyd-Jones 1983; Mueller 3, 6, 27, 192; Fowler 4ff.; Stanley 248.

⁵ Burkert 1992; on page 92 he links early dating of Homer with a desire to place him before the oriental revolution (which he dates as 750-650).

⁶ See Thomas 102-103.

Iliadic" and "post-Iliadic," on the other hand, refer to the dramatic time of the whole Trojan war, i.e. the events that precede and follow the events of the *Iliad*.

I take an eclectic approach in my research and have found arguments from many different schools of thought useful. A unitarian conception of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* is obviously incompatible with analytical theories, but on the other hand I have often found the discussion by analysts of the pre- and post-Homeric epic tradition more realistic than that of unitarians, who often have tried to portray Homer as separate from tradition or as the root of all other epic poetry. In addition, unitarians have sometimes explained away analytical questions about problematic passages in the *Iliad* too glibly. My arguments occasionally refer to peculiarities in the texts that have been commonly discussed by analysts, though I do not explain the oddities as evidence of multiple authorship or of interpolation. Rather, I explain the peculiarities as part of a design to narrate extra-Iliadic myth. Scholarship on orality has placed the traditional nature of Homer beyond doubt, I believe, and I am happy to consider Homer an oral poet. I also stress in chapter one that Greek society remained largely oral well into the Archaic Age. However, my focus on traditional myth necessitates a broader approach than the focus on formulaic and metrical concerns that the oralist school of research favors. Another issue that is discussed in this study is also a feature of oral research, that of typology in traditional myth. Neo-analysts have often neglected to appreciate this phenomenon, but on the other hand oral theorists have tended to over-stress its importance and implications. This study (especially chapter four) will make clear that the school of thought which has most influenced my thought has been neo-analysis. Such an approach allows one to accept the integrity and sophistication of the Homeric poems and yet recognize that they are based on traditional myth.

Neo-analysts have most consistently and thoroughly explored how the death of Patroclus is related to the death of Achilles, but I should point out that other scholars not following the neo-analytical approach have come to similar conclusions. It is obvious that

to some degree the character of Patroclus is fused with that of Achilles; he wears the armor of Achilles and ultimately his ashes are mixed with those of Achilles. Some have thought that the death of Patroclus reflects a typical narrative pattern in which a hero dies symbolically through the death of one close to him. At times this argument has a psychological component: Patroclus is an "alter ego" of Achilles, and his death represents a stage in the inner development of Achilles.⁷ Another approach has argued that underlying the death of Patroclus is a long-standing rite involving the sacrificial death of a substitute.⁸ My study is at times compatible with these interesting and provocative views, as they are often compatible with each other, and I take encouragement from the frequent comparison of Patroclus with Achilles. But I prefer to stress a different reason for the similarities of the two characters. My explanation is that through great narrative sophistication Homer has broken through the temporal boundaries of his poem and portrayed the death of Achilles within the *Iliad*.

⁷ See e.g. Lord 186-187, 195; Nagler 137ff.; M. Edwards 1991: 15; and for a more psychological approach, e.g. Campbell; Nethercut (esp. 7ff.); Van Nortwick.

⁸ See G. Nagy 1979: 33, 292-295, 1990: 211ff.; Sinos 29ff.; Lowenstam 1981: 126ff.; Schein 166 n.46. This theory traces the etymology of the word *θεράπων* to an Anatolian word for "ritual substitute." Since I think that one poet, Homer, first expanded the death of Patroclus and made it similar to that of Achilles, I cannot agree that a second millennium ritual generated the story of the *Iliad*.

Chapter One: The Tradition of the Trojan War

In this chapter I will discuss the tradition of the Trojan war. At first I will focus on the Homeric poems, attempting to learn what they tell us about the tradition which preceded them, then attempting to determine how the Homeric poems affected this tradition. Since the epic cycle is an essential source of information about the Trojan war, I will discuss its nature in the second part of this chapter. An important question with major implications for my study is the relation of the epic cycle to the *Iliad*, and so I will end with an examination of that issue.

It is generally agreed that the tradition of the Trojan war had a long development before Homer's time.¹ Indo-European and Near Eastern poetry may have influenced some concepts in it,² and Mycenaean poetry may be the origin of some of its characters.³ Of course, the fall of Troy in the last quarter of the second millennium B.C. would be the historical inspiration for the saga.⁴ An increasingly fictional account about the fall of Troy then arose through the centuries. The tradition of the Trojan war was not simply saga in its strictest sense, i.e. a chronicle of real events narrated and embellished in a suitably heroic tone. It included fanciful elements of myth and folklore. Two major events in the story, the rape of Helen and the wooden horse, underscore this aspect of the

¹ M. West 1973, 1988 explores its various origins and the possibilities of its development.

² In general see Schein 16ff.; M. Edwards 1991: 15-16. On Indo-European elements in Greek myth see e.g. Kirk 1974: 44ff.; M. West 1973: 179-180; 1988: 151ff.; Nagler 147-50; Burkert 1985: 15ff.; J. Nagy; G. Nagy 1990a: 16-17. On Near Eastern elements see Burkert 1992 with bibliography. Near Eastern influences may have entered the epic tradition during the Bronze Age or after the Dark Age.

³ Nilsson 1932, 1933 demonstrated that much of Greek myth originated in Mycenaean times. For the possibility of Mycenaean poetry, see Webster 1958: 64ff.; Kirk 1962: 105ff.; M. West 1973: 187, 1988: 156ff.; Wood 130ff. Luce provides a general discussion of Mycenaean elements in the Homeric poems. Ahlberg-Cornell 13-15 strongly argues that Mycenaean art depicted mythical scenes.

⁴ Wood provides an introductory overview of archaeological study of Troy and discusses the impact of history on myth about the fall of Troy.

tradition.⁵ This tradition of diverse material from a variety of origins developed during a time when Greek culture was non-literate. Its transmission was oral, as the intricate oral technique found in the Homeric poems seems to confirm. Poetic epic narrative would best preserve this tradition, but it probably was also spread in other poetic genres or even in non-metrical form.⁶

Epic poetry that transmitted this tradition used the Ionic dialect for the most part and was apparently based in Asia Minor. It may have first spread to the mainland in the late eighth century B.C., as some conclude from the first occurrence of hexameter verse inscriptions and epic scenes in art then. A renewed interest in bronze age locations at that time may also reflect the arrival of an Ionic epic tradition on the mainland.⁷ It may be too much to say that epic poetry (or Homer) was the sole cause of all these late eighth-century phenomena, but at least one can conclude that the mythical tradition of the Trojan war was known on the mainland by the late eighth century.

⁵ Bascom well defines the differences between myth, folk tale, and saga. Many (e.g. Bowra 1952: 5; Kirk 1974: 23ff.) have correctly noted that they are often mixed together. A few well-known books have stressed the folk element in the Homeric poems: Woodhouse, Page 1973 for the *Odyssey*; R. Carpenter for both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Hoelscher discusses the transformation of folklore into epic; McLeod 1987a: 39 provides a thorough list of folk tale motifs in the *Odyssey*; Hansen 1990 explores a specific instance of a folklore motif in the *Odyssey*.

⁶ The variety in types of song mentioned in the Homeric poems, surveyed by Davison 1968: 90-92; Thomas 105-106, suggests that pre-Homeric poetry existed in genres other than epic; see further M. West 1973: 179ff; Fowler 9ff.; G. Nagy 1990b: 2-3; Suter 8 n.2 (with further bibliography). The schematic approach to early Greek literature (see pp. 3-4 of the introduction) has misleadingly suggested that an epic age preceded an lyric age. For non-verse traditions see Nilsson 1932: 25-26; Kirk 1962: 108-109; Edmunds 4ff.; Mondt 150; Hoelscher 52-53. Many have warned that art does not necessarily reflect literature or reflects it in accordance to its own purposes and traditions; see esp. Cook; Snodgrass 1980: 70ff., 189ff.; Ahlberg-Cornell 184ff.; Lowenstam 1993a: 213. This point is also briefly made by Rzach 3250; Friis Johansen 1967: 39-40; Jensen: 203-204; Edmunds 393-394, 437; Olmos (at Bernabé p. 210); Davies 1989a: 10. Cf. Kannicht, who is confident that art does reflect epic poetry.

⁷ This view in general can be found at Snodgrass 1971: 192-194, 397-399, 431; M. West 1973: 182. For early verse inscriptions, see Wade-Gery 10, 66 n.28; Kirk 1962: 69ff.; Snodgrass 1971: 351; Coldstream 1977: 296ff.; Thomas 58. Geometric art apparently first represented myth, including Trojan war myth, in the late eighth century; see Fittschen 169ff.; Friis Johansen 1967: 23-24; Snodgrass 1971: 431, 1980: 65ff., 1987: 132-169 (see esp.); Ahlberg-Cornell 18ff. Again (see previous note), art about myth is not necessarily evidence of epic poetry. On the possibility of epic poetry generating hero cult in the late eighth century, see Farnell 1921; M. West 1978: 370-373; Coldstream 1976; 1977: 341ff.; Burkert 1985: 203-204. But the question of the relation between hero cult and epic poetry is very difficult, and the theory that poetry generated cult in the late eighth century is probably too simplistic. On the one hand hero cult as it is commonly understood preceded the late eighth century (see further pp. 89-90 below); on the other hand Antonaccio dates (62) a stricter definition of hero cult to the seventh century at the earliest and so severely criticizes this theory. And none of the above evidence precludes the possibility that there was continuous poetic tradition on the mainland from Mycenaean times; see Webster 1958, esp. 289ff.; Gentili 58.

Though this poetic tradition developed in Asia Minor, its subject matter is clearly Pan-Hellenic. The characters in it originated in places throughout the Greek world, and the mainland is well represented by mythic strata from places as distant as Thessaly and Pylos. Probably the tradition had traveled with migrations from the mainland, and various characters and stories joined the saga at different times. By the late eighth century, this conglomerate had been welded into a sophisticated whole. In addition, the relation of Trojan myth to other sagas had become established at some point, as we can see by Homer's handling of myth about Heracles or the Theban war.⁸ For much of our understanding of the tradition of the Trojan war we depend on information gained from Homer, and it is to the Homeric poems that we should now turn in order to gain some insight into the tradition which Homer received.

1. Homer and the Tradition of the Trojan War

The tradition of the Trojan war in the Homeric poems

The Homeric poems provide important clues about pre-Homeric traditions concerning the Trojan war and other mythical material.⁹ The *Iliad* clearly presupposes a well-developed Trojan saga which extended far beyond the short period of the *Iliad*'s dramatic time. It frequently mentions the death of Achilles and the fall of Troy, and also alludes to such events as the judgment of Paris (24.29-30), the wound of Philoctetes and his coming return (2.698ff), and the death of Protesilaus (2.718ff).¹⁰ In the *Odyssey* the

⁸ See Bowra 1955: 17.

⁹ Myth mentioned in the Homeric poems which is not about the Trojan war includes theogonic material (*Il.* 14.201=302), theomachic material (e.g. *Il.* 2.781-283, 8.479-481, 14.203-204, 20.54-66), the journey of the Argo ("well-known to all," *Od.* 12.70; Jason is mentioned at *Il.* 7.469, 21.40-41, 23.746-47, *Od.* 12.72), the Theban wars (*Il.* 4.370ff., 5.800ff., 14.110ff., *Od.* 11.326-327, 15.244ff.), Pylian heroic warfare (e.g. *Il.* 7.132ff., 11.668ff., 23.630ff.), the story of Bellerophon (*Il.* 6.155ff.), the Calydonian boar hunt (*Il.* 9.527ff.), Heracles (*Il.* 19.96ff., 20.145ff., *Od.* 11.601ff.), Theseus (*Il.* 1.265, *Od.* 11.322, 631), Amazons (*Il.* 3.189, 6.186, and perhaps 2.814 [see scholia *ad loc.* and Kullmann 1960: 303]) and centaurs (*Il.* 1.268, 11.832).

¹⁰ See Kullmann 1960: 5-11 for a complete list of events from the Trojan war to which the *Iliad* possibly alludes. Allen 1924: 75-76 lists passages from the *Odyssey* that refer to cyclic material.

Trojan war is a matter of song for Phemius (1.325ff.), Demodocus (8.72ff., 499ff.), and the Sirens (12.189-190). The *Odyssey* mentions many details about post-Iliadic events, such as the killing of Antilochus by Memnon (4.186-88), the death of Achilles followed by a fight over his corpse, an elaborate funeral, and funeral games (5.308-310, 24.36ff.), a quarrel over the arms of Achilles by Ajax and Odysseus at the funeral games (11.553-555), the killing of Eurypylos by Neoptolemus (11.519-21), a reconnaissance mission into Troy by Odysseus (4.240ff.), the wooden horse (4.271ff., 8.499ff.), the returns of various heroes (3.130ff, 4.351ff.), and the murder of Agamemnon (1.35ff., 4.512ff., 24.96-97).

Thus the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* reveal knowledge of a long saga about the war. I consider Homer to be the one poet of both poems, but if the *Odyssey* is the work of a different poet, it is undoubtedly so close in time to the *Iliad* that both poems must share the same tradition. Many scholars have been uncomfortable with a Homer who is familiar with "cyclic" material and as a result argued that interpolations from "later" myth were added to them, or at least that new material unknown to the *Iliad* was used in the *Odyssey*.¹¹ Aristarchus pioneered the practice of condemning passages where Homer demonstrates knowledge of "cyclic" material (e.g. *Il.* 24.25-30, where the judgment of Paris is mentioned).¹² German analysis also labeled some sections of the Homeric poems "cyclic," and thus late.¹³ But it is very misguided to remove indications of a well-developed Trojan saga from the Homeric poems. After all, oral theory has shown that Homer inherited the poetic mechanics of a long tradition, and it is natural to suppose that

¹¹ Wade-Gery 84 n.109 labels the *Iliad's* reference to Philoctetes' wound and later return an interpolation, and at 85 n.114 claims that mention of Telephus, Eurypylos, Penthesilea, and Memnon in the *Odyssey* is based on new mythology from the epic cycle (at 2 he proposes that the *Odyssey* is substantially later than the *Iliad* and by a different author). Forsdyke 110ff. thinks that references in the *Iliad* to Neoptolemus and Aethra are interpolations, and elsewhere claims that the following were interpolated to legitimize the cycle poems: "the final scenes at Troy and the post-war adventures of other heroes" (13, cf. 131), Memnon (97), and bk. 24 (26). The end of the *Odyssey* (23.297ff.) has often been suspected to be an interpolation, but throughout this work I will consider it an authentic part of the *Odyssey* (for defense of it see A. Edwards 1985: 223 n.22; Heubeck 1992: 313-314, 353-355 [with bibliography on the issue]).

¹² See Severyns 1928; Kullmann 1960: 18; Janko 1992: 25-29 for his reasoning and method.

¹³ See Kullmann 1960: 18ff. for a survey of such thought, which is exemplified by e.g. Rzach.

he also inherited stories, not just technique. The stories he knew were probably part of a tradition which led to the poems of the epic cycle, as I will show below. The conclusion to be drawn from the evidence of the Homeric poems alone, even before other evidence is examined, is that an extensive range of material about the saga of the Trojan war existed before the time of Homer.

I should add a word about *ad hoc* invention, because research on this phenomenon has increasingly questioned whether Homeric allusions to extra-Iliadic myth are based on tradition.¹⁴ The phenomenon undoubtedly exists; Homer could effectively invent details in accordance with the needs of a particular passage. This technique should not be described as the invention of myth, however.¹⁵ Nearly all suspected passages of *ad hoc* invention involve details, not myth made out of whole cloth.¹⁶ Thus it would be wrong to conclude from a few examples of undoubted *ad hoc* manipulation of myth in the Homeric poems that Homer's allusions to extra-Iliadic myth are freely invented and without traditional basis. We should also recognize that the source of a suspected *ad hoc* invention is usually a character with a motive to misrepresent the past. It is no surprise that characters in such circumstances add details that do not correspond to tradition. Distinguishing such situations from others in which there would be no reason for *ad hoc* invention is not too difficult. In addition, we should recognize that Homeric narrative was

¹⁴ Willcock 1964, 1979; Braswell presented important discussions on the subject. Andersen 1990 represents the extreme to which this line of thought can lead ("The epic poem does not 'refer to' and is not 'based on' tradition;" 44). Slatkin 115ff. ably critiques theory about *ad hoc* invention in Homer ("to infer that allusions for which we have no other corroborating text are inventions devised for the sake of the immediate context is only one—and perhaps not the most far-reaching—approach to the workings of traditional narrative," 116). Gaisser well demonstrates how Homer modifies traditional myth about Bellerophon.

¹⁵ M. Edwards 1990: 313 says that Willcock's use of the word "invention" is bold: "It is safer to speak of the adaptation of conventional motifs, or the modification of a tale by the inclusion of a different traditional motif."

¹⁶ As Willcock 1964: 147, 1977: 44 n.12, 53; Braswell 1971 *passim* admit. Willcock's supposition (1964: 143 n.2) that the past adventures of Nestor are invented is the only extensive alleged example of *ad hoc* invention of which I know, and I think he is mistaken in this. The reference to a rescue of Zeus from a revolt of other gods mentioned at *Il.* 1.396ff. is often described as an invented myth (e.g. Kullmann 1960: 15 n.2; Willcock 1964: 143-144; Braswell 18-20), but that conclusion is based on the dangerous assumption that myth not mentioned outside of Homer is untraditional. Lesky 1966: 79 points out that stories like this could easily have become lost; Slatkin 60ff. considers it traditional; Burkert 1992: 104-106 traces its Near Eastern precedents.

undoubtedly more expansive than that of his predecessors; the addition of details to traditional tales was thus necessitated by his style. I see no reason to suspect any of the allusions to non-Homeric Trojan myth listed above as invention. In fact they are often elliptical, which suggests that the audience is expected to be familiar with such myth.

Date of the Homeric poems

Though Ionian poetry may have been known throughout the Greek mainland by the end of the eighth century, it is unlikely that the Homeric poems were its sole representatives.¹⁷ In fact, it is not certain that Homer is from that time, though that is the *communis opinio* today.¹⁸ The eighth-century date is often inspired by the belief that cyclic poems dependent on Homer date from the seventh or even late eighth century, thus establishing a *terminus ante quem* for the time of the Homeric poems. But the dates of poems in the epic cycle are hard to establish with confidence (an issue discussed below), and their dependence on Homer is debatable anyway (as I shall demonstrate below). The common schematic approach which places the age of epic before the age of lyric also encourages an eighth-century date. But the schematic notion that 700 B.C marks the end of an epic age and the beginning of a lyric age is unlikely, as I have pointed out. This time would be better considered the beginning of written preservation of lyric poetry (and of epic poetry, though it may have been less commonly preserved because of its greater length).

When we turn to more specific evidence for the date of the Homeric poems, we find that some *realia* and practices in the poems may be dated to the eighth or even

¹⁷ As M. West 1973: 182 well stresses. Cf. Coldstream 1977: 341ff., who views Homer as the force responsible for changing Hellenic society at this period.

¹⁸ E.g. Webster 1958: 208ff.; Kirk 1962: 282ff., 1985: 1ff.; Heubeck 1974: 71-73. Some critics, though, have argued for a seventh-century date: R. Carpenter 179; Kuilmann 1960: 381, 1981: 30; M. West 1966: 46; Burkert 1976: 5-21, 1992: 204 n.32; Taplin 1992: 31 ff. (see also Fowler 7; Mueller 1ff.). Some have even suggested a sixth-century date, at least for a final and significant fixation of the texts: Jensen 9 (and *passim*); G. Nagy 1992: 51, Stanley 279ff. (and *passim*).

seventh century.¹⁹ If this evidence is from the seventh century, the poems cannot be dated to the eighth century unless allegations of interpolation are made. If the evidence does date from the eighth century, one might wonder why an eighth-century poet would allow poems ostensibly about a past age to acquire aspects of very recent origin (Taplin 1992: 33). On the whole the evidence is hard to explain away by those who insist on an eighth-century date. It is true that Janko has employed linguistic evidence to argue that Homer dates from the middle of the eighth century. But the precision of this method is debatable, and I think Taplin is correct to challenge his conclusion.²⁰

Arguments for an eighth-century Homer rest more commonly on external evidence. A common flaw in such arguments is an assumption that any reference to the Trojan war is inspired by Homer rather than by tradition in general. The different interpretations of a geometric jug should underscore the nature of this problem. Friis Johansen has argued (1961) that the work depicted the duel between Ajax and Hector that we know of from book 7 of the *Iliad*. Since he dated the jug to the middle of the eighth century at the latest, too early for Homer, he concluded the duel was a traditional episode in the pre-Homeric tradition. Kirk, on the other hand, has discussed the vase as early evidence for Homer, citing Friis Johansen's work but not indicating his thesis (or his full title, "*Aias und Hektor: Ein vorhomerisches Heldenlied?*," which would have revealed the thesis).²¹ Since it is very uncertain if the vase in fact is meant to represent a mythic scene, we need not accept either argument.²² But the readiness of Kirk to assume that such evidence reflects Homer and not the tradition in general is deplorable. This attitude is

¹⁹ E.g. Gorgon shield, wealth of Delphi, hoplite arrangement of warriors, the roofing of temples. For further evidence, the Homeric passages which contain this evidence, and discussion see Kirk 1962: 185ff., 1985: 9-10; Taplin 1992: 33-34 (the two scholars hold diametrically opposed views).

²⁰ Janko 1982: 196, 200 (Fig. 4); Taplin 1992: 33 n.39.

²¹ Kirk 1962: 284 (the work is reproduced at pl. 5A), 1985: 4. He suggests its date is 735.

²² Lesky 1967: 78 thinks Friis Johansen's thesis is possible. Fittschen 39-41 thinks the vase does not reflect myth at all (he dates it to the third quarter of the eighth century). Ahlberg-Cornell agrees (notably, since early evidence of the *Iliad* in art is eagerly sought by this scholar). I cannot find this vase in the *LIMC* articles "Aias I" and "Hektor."

common in discussions about the date of Homer, and it is necessary to be on guard against it.

When does art first reflect the Homeric poems? Since only a small percentage of ancient art work has been recovered, conclusions based on art work may be misleading.²³ But we need to work with the evidence we do have, and this evidence is quite revealing. Representations of Homeric scenes are surprisingly late and few in number. Fittschen's book on myth in early Greek art and Friis Johansen's book on the *Iliad* in early Greek art (1967) provide overviews of the evidence. They reveal that the late seventh century is the earliest time in which scenes probably reflect the *Iliad*. Friis Johansen cannot positively identify any scenes as Iliadic before that time. Fittschen considers several possibilities (172ff.) but concludes that there are no certain representations of the *Iliad* before the late seventh century. He is tempted to think that two art scenes before that time could be about the *Iliad*, though he admits he is uncertain about their interpretation.²⁴ One scene is from the second quarter of the seventh century and shows women carrying a square object. Fittschen thinks that this may show the offering of a robe to Athena by Trojan women at *Il.* 6.85-95. That strains credibility, as Friis Johansen points out, and I think it would be willful to view this as certain evidence.²⁵ The other scene, from the middle of the century, shows Achilles receiving armor from Thetis (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 506). But this probably reflects a scene in Phthia before the war, not book 19 of the *Iliad*, if Friis Johansen is correct in his persuasive argument that all early scenes of the arming of

²³ See Ahlberg-Cornell 154-155 for discussion.

²⁴ It is noteworthy that Kannicht follows Fittschen in his discussion of epic in early art but cannot agree with any of his proposals for depiction of the *Iliad* before the end of the seventh century.

²⁵ Friis Johansen 1967: 271-275, where he gathers other critical views. Laurens includes the work in her article, *LIMC* "Hekabe," (no. 12) and seems inclined to accept it an offering to Athena (though she wonders if the leading woman is Theano). Most scholars agree that the object carried is some type of container. Friis Johansen's suggestion that it pictures Hypsipyle carrying her father Thoas in a chest, an episode from Argonautic legend, is not especially convincing, and the same can be said for Pinney's argument (134) that it shows Thetis and the Nereids transporting Achilles in a shroud to Leuke. Note that only two other depictions of Hecabe offering a robe to Athena exist in ancient art, both from the Roman empire.

Achilles are situated in Phthia.²⁶ If it does depict an arming of Achilles in the Troad, it could be depicting that as a traditional event, not necessarily a Homeric event.²⁷ There are other art scenes before the late seventh century that scholars have thought reflected the *Iliad*, but it always seems the interpretation is very debatable. What is especially striking is that scholars tend to expect to find early evidence of the *Iliad* in art and are surprised that they cannot find it.

A much different conclusion, however, has recently been made by Ahlberg-Cornell, who eccentrically proposes that the *Iliad* was the first epic represented in art. But her arguments for early reflections of the *Iliad* are very questionable. She revives (58ff.) the dubious proposals hesitantly suggested by Fittschen regarding the *Iliad* in seventh-century art, adding no arguments of note. More remarkably, she argues (32ff., 62-63) that depictions of the Siamese twins Aktorione/Molione fighting a man in Geometric and later art are based on recollections of them by Nestor in *Iliad* 11 and 23. The scenes probably do depict Aktorione/Molione, but they do not certainly depict Nestor.²⁸ If they do, it is an extraordinary leap of imagination to insist that not Pyliaic epic but a few remarks by Nestor in the *Iliad* are their inspiration. Ahlberg-Cornell further argues that a work from c. 700 B.C. has one scene which depicts Ajax dueling Hector and another which shows them exchanging gifts (58-62). She focuses on the shape of a shield as an indication that a warrior in the first scene is Ajax. But if the scene does show Ajax, even Ajax and Hector fighting, that would not necessarily mean the *Iliad* was the inspiration. The other scene surely shows two warriors menacing each other with swords, though we are assured by Ahlberg-Cornell that they are exchanging the swords as gifts in reflection of the

²⁶ Friis Johansen 1967: 92ff., 257-260. His view (first formulated over fifty years ago) has been widely accepted (e.g. by Cook 2; M. Edwards 1990: 311ff., 1991: 156-157; T. Carpenter 199-200), but see now Lowenstam 1993a for criticism of it. Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a largely accepts the theory (pp. 71-72, 122), yet thinks the vase under question (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 506) has Troy as its setting (cf. no. 509 and see her comments under these).

²⁷ See Lowenstam 1993a: 215-216.

²⁸ Cf. Hampe 1981 (*LIMC* "Aktorione"). Of the many scenes which show the twins fighting a man, he identifies Nestor in only one (no. 3); usually he interprets the man as Heracles or believes no identification can be made.

conclusion of the duel between Ajax and Hector found in book 8 of the *Iliad*. She lamely ends her argument by noting, "other scholars interpret the scene as a fighting action: this would give rise to other interpretations."

Ahlberg-Cornell is confusing when she speaks of art scenes as (e.g.) "from *Ilias*" or "from *Aithiopsis*," for she allows that only oral prototypes of the Homeric and cyclic poems probably existed during the time of the earliest art she examines. She supposes that somehow these oral prototypes would be exactly similar to later written texts, even in the small details upon which she focuses (cf. 23, 186). It is especially difficult to understand how she reconciles her thesis with her belief that early artists were non-literate, and furthermore, that they learned of epic myth not through recitations but by word-of-mouth (184ff.). Is it credible that artists would represent Aktorione/Molione not because they knew the twins from myth in general but because they had indirectly heard about two minor episodes in an oral prototype of the *Iliad*? Ahlberg-Cornell does raise many important issues about early Greek art. For instance, perhaps artists did base their representations on word-of-mouth myth, not on epic poetry. And a reader could certainly benefit from the great amount of information presented in this haphazardly written work.²⁹ But her attempt to show that the *Iliad* inspired art work from the eighth century onward should be firmly rejected.

I find the best account of the relationship between early Greek art and epic is given by Cook. Considering the art work without pre-conceived notions about Homer, he finds no reflection of the *Iliad* in art before the late seventh century. He furthermore challenges several of Friis Johansen's arguments that Iliadic scenes existed in art even at that time. We may conclude that art provides no certain evidence for the early existence of the *Iliad*. As Kannicht admits (85), the *Iliad* is "virtually neglected by seventh-century

²⁹ Notably, a comparison of her conclusions with those of Fittschen, Kannicht, and Cook at 158ff., and extensive tables and graphs on chronological appearance, geographical location, and material of the art (esp. at 192ff.).

art." Jensen claims (106) that there is no reflection of the *Iliad* in seventh-century art, saying that Iliadic scenes are "conspicuously absent." Stanley is similarly skeptical (267).

The second quarter of the seventh century is often viewed as a *terminus ante quem* for the date of the *Odyssey* because art scenes featuring Polyphemus begin then.³⁰ Yet one cannot be certain that the *Odyssey* we know is the inspiration for this art. The representations could reflect other epic poems about Odysseus, or, since the scenes are not inscribed, they may not even represent Odysseus at all. It is frequently observed that the folk tales in the *Odyssey* probably have origins which long precede that poem (see n.5 above); as Kirk says (1974: 169), they are "for the most part not only independent from but older than Odysseus himself, or mythical Troy, or Ithaca." Thus folklore in general may be the source for the art work about Polyphemus.³¹ It may be significant that other Odyssean motifs do not exist in art until the sixth century and that these also are about the deep sea adventures of Odysseus. The issue is especially important because most scholars consider the *Odyssey* to be later than the *Iliad*, and the existence of early art work about the *Odyssey* would shore up the debatable evidence for an eighth-century *Iliad*. One cannot conclude with confidence, however, that seventh-century art work does reflect the *Odyssey*.

Let us turn to other evidence for the date of the Homeric poems. An eighth-century verse inscription seems to reflect the *Iliad* because it apparently refers to "Nestor's cup" (see n.7 above for early verse inscriptions). But a reference to Nestor's cup is not necessarily a reference to *Il.* 11.670 ff., for Nestor's cup could have existed in mythology independently of Homer.³² Kullmann argues that Nestor's cup would have been a feature of a meeting before the war between Menelaus and Nestor, a scene that the

³⁰ Fittschen 193-194; Friis Johansen 1967: 34-35; T. Carpenter 233-234; Ahlberg-Cornell 94-96.

³¹ Cook 4; Jensen 106.

³² Thus Burkert 1976: 19-20; Taplin 1992: 33 n.39, Stanley 267. Kirk 1962: 283-284 admits this, but Snodgrass 1971: 431; Coldstream 1977: 343; and Thomas 58 think the inscription reflects knowledge of Homer.

Cypria narrated.³³ This argument is attractive because if such a massive, prized object was known in myth, its most natural setting would be the home of Nestor, not the battlefield of Troy.

It is widely believed by "panhomerists" (Gentili 58) that literature of the seventh century reflects Homer and that this necessitates an eighth-century Homer.³⁴ But the assumption that Homer has cast a great shadow over seventh-century literature is problematic. There is no direct mention of Homer in this early literature, and *testimonia* about early authors discussing Homer are unreliable.³⁵ Direct quotations of Homer do not begin until the fifth century (see p. 23 below). We are left to look for allusions to the Homeric poems or imitation of them. Numerous phrases in early lyric poetry appear to be based on "Homeric" passages, but a generally known oral or at least traditional system of phraseology may be the cause of that. Positive identification of allusion or imitation is thus very difficult.³⁶ Kirk acknowledges the problem (1962: 282), but oddly speaks of "common" Homeric phrases found in other poets. These are exactly the kind one would immediately suspect of being traditional. Even less common phrases in Homer may have existed widely in literature which has not survived. Longer passages frequently suspected of imitating Homer are usually gnomic in nature and thus hardly "belong" to Homer. And even thought or expression that seems distinctly "Homeric" may have existed commonly in literature now lost. Myth about the Trojan war is present in various authors from Hesiod onward (see p. 49ff. below), but these passages do not necessarily indicate the influence of Homer as opposed to that of the tradition in general. They often refer to

³³ Kullmann 1960: 257, 1991: 435. The summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus mentions this meeting.

³⁴ E.g. Kirk 1962: 282, 1985: 4.

³⁵ *Testimonia* which portray Hesiod speaking of (or competing against) Homer need not be taken seriously (see Davison 1962: 235, and the first two chapters on the "lives" of Homer and Hesiod in Lefkowitz), nor do the "vague and perhaps corrupt" (Davison 1955: 13) *testimonia* which suggest that Archilochus (fr. 303 West) and Callinus (fr. 6 West) ascribed the *Margites* and *Thebais* respectively to Homer (see esp. Davison 1968: 71, 81 ff.).

³⁶ This problem is stressed by Davison 1968: 70ff., esp. 84, 1962: 256, and thoroughly considered by Fowler, esp. 8, 39ff. Notopoulos 19-20; Gentili 58; Jensen 101ff. are very critical of assumptions about Homer's influence on early Greek poetry. Cf. Janko 1982: 225-228 on the issue of mimesis in early epic.

material not contained in the Homeric poems, or only mentioned in passing by them, and so suggest a non-Homeric source.

To what degree can we confidently say that Homer has influenced early Greek literature? Fowler's recent discussion of this issue provides a thorough and thoughtful guide on the issue. He concludes that just a few seventh-century fragments probably reflect the *Iliad*.³⁷ He stresses that these reflections are very imprecise and do not imply there was a widely known fixed text of the *Iliad*. In my opinion, the passages he cites are not necessarily a reflection of the *Iliad*. M. West considers a fragment of Alcaeus (44.6-8 L-P) the first certain example of the influence of the *Iliad* (it describes Achilles calling on Thetis and her intercession on his behalf with Zeus), and even this is debatable.³⁸ Early reflections of the *Odyssey* are even more difficult to find. Fowler concludes (33) that only one passage in Archilochus reflects that poem (fr. 131-132 West; Fowler joins the two fragments together). Again, he thinks that the reflection is very imprecise and that it does not imply there was a widely known text of the poem. A fragment of Alcman (80 *PMGF*) mentions Odysseus and Circe, but scholars have suspected it reflects an *Odyssey* different from the one we know.³⁹

The evidence of literature about Homer's influence in the Archaic Age is similar to the evidence of art. It can be argued that both seventh-century art and literature contain some reflections of Homer, but the possibilities are not numerous and the first probable reflections date from the end of the seventh century. We can find a greater number of probable reflections of Homer in art and literature in the sixth century, but even these do

³⁷ Fowler's conclusions are on page 33. He cites Tyrtaeus fr. 10.21ff., 11.11-14 (and perhaps 29-34) West, Mimnermus fr. 2 West. The fragment of Semonides that he cites is probably Simonides; see n.49 below. Note that Fowler discusses these passages as reflections of Homer with greater caution earlier in his chapter. Stanley 266 agrees with his analysis. Cf. Garner 1990: 1ff., who is certain that early lyric poets did allude to the Homeric poems. He specifically disputes Fowler's conclusions at 224 n.12, but I find his discussion of the issues involved at 18-19 very inadequate.

³⁸ M. West 1978: 60, 1988: 151 n.5. Cf. Fowler 37. Jensen 101-102 argues that it does not reflect the *Iliad*.

³⁹ Davison 1962: 265 n.72; 1968: 85; M. West 1978: 60-61 (at 1988: 151 n.4 he questions the ascription itself); Fowler 30.

not occur in large numbers at first. The nature of the evidence has even allowed some recent scholars to argue that our Homeric poems date from the late sixth century (see n.18 above). I doubt that, but the evidence of art and literature does suggest that the influence of the Homeric poems was minimal throughout the Archaic Age, whatever their date.⁴⁰

Influence of Homer on his tradition

The conclusion that Homer did not immediately dominate the tradition of the Trojan war may seem surprising, for a different view is widespread: that the influence of Homer was so strong he caused the tradition to die out.⁴¹ The theory may be appealing because it seems to confirm our own high estimation of the poems, but we have seen that there is actually little evidence to support it. All available evidence indicates that myth about the Trojan war in general was known from the late eighth century onward (see further at pp. 49ff. below); on the other hand, probable evidence for knowledge of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* does not exist until late in the seventh century. I do not think that the poems were too poor to be worthy of notice; indeed, I yield to no one in admiration of them. I do think, however, that we must conclude these poems were not immediately influential despite their excellence. Why would this be so?

It is possible that the Homeric poems were at first not well received. "Typical" epic poems that were readily understood and full of wondrous stories could have been preferred at first to what were undoubtedly idiosyncratic poems.⁴² Another explanation is the fact that Greek culture remained predominantly non-literate until well into the fifth

⁴⁰ Lowenstam 1993b (a paper delivered at the 1993 APA convention) has also reached this conclusion (previously suggested at 1993a: 215-216). He leaves open the possibility that the Homeric poems date from the third quarter of the sixth century. He also notes that "none of the dozen or so verses in the dactylic meter that are painted on [Archaic] vases correspond with our Homeric poems, which again suggests that our poems were not authoritative at the time of the vases" (1993 APA *Abstracts*, p. 43).

⁴¹ E.g. Bowra 1952: 431-432; Kirk 1976: 1-2; Mueller 162. Kirk admits it is "certainly a problem" to understand how the pre-Homeric epic tradition expired. Sometimes in discussion of his theory of the stages in which epic deteriorates (1962: 95ff., 204ff., 301ff.) he describes seventh-century Greek epic as decadent and derivative from Homer, which I find an impossibly swift development. See Parry 204ff.; Jensen 113-114 for criticism of his theory of stages.

⁴² Friis Johansen 1967: 229; Davies 1989a: 10.

century.⁴³ Those who suppose literacy immediately killed off living traditions have overestimated its spread and use (on this point see especially Thomas 44ff.). And the limitations of literacy would have prevented single texts from having great influence. Writing materials were rare and the recording of long epic poems would have been difficult at an early period.⁴⁴ Even if the Homeric poems were written down at an early date,⁴⁵ there can be no doubt that publication of them would occur only through oral recitation. That would have limited the influence of a poem, especially one requiring days to perform. The Homeric poems, though excellent, could not have become known immediately to all of Greece. And listeners who enjoyed them could only come away with a general sense of their worthiness, not with detailed knowledge of them. It cannot even be assumed that a privileged few, poets for instance, possessed a text of the poems. If any did, they would not have written for an audience which had texts of the Homeric poems.⁴⁶

It may be significant that according to the evidence of art different areas learned of the *Iliad* at different times. Athenian art, for instance, demonstrates no strong

⁴³ See Havelock; Pfeiffer 24ff.; Davison 1968: 86-128; and now Thomas.

⁴⁴ See Parry 182 n.14; Heubeck 1974: 221 for discussion of the issue. Papyrus may not have been easily obtainable until renewed contacts with Egypt in the seventh century. Thomas 56, 83 thinks that papyrus could have been available as early as the eighth century, but adds it would have been very expensive. Burkert 1992: 30ff. makes a case for a fairly widespread use of leather skins as writing material before then (a practice he thinks came with the alphabet from the East), but it is hard to see how this material could easily have been used to record lengthy epic poems. Thornton 1984: 18-20 thinks Homer may have been able to use papyrus or hides for preservation of his poetry but not for composition of it.

⁴⁵ Of course a much debated question is whether Homer himself wrote; a second major controversy is how the Homeric texts were preserved. The compositional techniques in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are demonstrably oral; on the other hand, the poems also seem well-preserved and so writing must have been used at some point to fix the texts. Two important contributions to this issue in the past were Lord's theory of an orally dictated text (1960: 124ff.; recently supported by Janko 1992: 37-38, but see McLeod 1966: 110), and Kirk's theory of an orally preserved text (1962: 98ff.; generally discredited: see McLeod 1966: 109). It is often believed that the sophistication and architectural structure of the *Iliad* necessitates writing, but Russo 1992: 15-16; Taplin 1992: 8-9 have recently argued persuasively that an oral poet could achieve these results over time (see also Willcock 1973: 8-9; Jensen 28ff.; Mueller 160ff.). Parry's article is a famous examination of these issues; Mueller 162ff.; Thornton 1984: 13ff.; Thomas 29ff.; Stanley 26ff. provide recent discussion of them. I do not think that scholars have yet come to terms with the difficulty of explaining the preservation and transmission of the Homeric poems if we follow the commonly accepted date for Homer (Austin 22 effectively mocks the "miracle" of oral dictation and oral transmission).

⁴⁶ These issues are repeatedly considered by Gentili and Fowler. See also R. Carpenter 11; Notopoulos 36; M. West 1978: 60; and G. Nagy 1990a: 38ff.

awareness of the *Iliad* until rather late in the sixth century.⁴⁷ Perhaps this was caused by the difficulties of publishing the poem, both in writing and by recitation. Some have thought the sudden rise in Athenian art work about the *Iliad* reflects a Pisistratean "recension" that first allowed the poem to become well known in Athens.⁴⁸ It is possible that the widespread availability of a text of the Homeric poems first occurred after this legendary recension, whatever its nature.

It certainly is a problem to understand how in a largely oral society an apparently thriving and widespread oral tradition could be quickly eliminated through the influence of texts of the Homeric poems. Indeed, we cannot even assume that the Homeric poems were written down at an early date. As Wood (127-128) strongly puts it, "It is, bluntly, inconceivable that such a mammoth and expensive task as recording (on papyrus or parchment?) such lengthy poems would have been undertaken when society—and, more important, the poet's audience—was still to all intents and purposes illiterate." Even if the Homeric poems were preserved by writing at an early date, they would not necessarily become influential. As Thomas says (48), "How could a written text have such authority in a society which still relied almost overwhelmingly on oral communication and was to continue to do so for at least another three centuries?" It is doubtful that many copies of fixed texts of such length could be manufactured, and they would not become well known through oral recitation. We must therefore conclude that the pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan war resisted the influence of the Homeric poems and remained vibrant and widespread throughout the seventh and well into the sixth century.

Undoubtedly the fame of the Homeric poems did gradually spread. In the sixth century probable reflections of the Homeric poems become more common in art work.

⁴⁷ See Friis Johansen 1967: 40, and on Attica, 234ff. I do not agree with his suggestion that some parts of the *Iliad* became known before other parts.

⁴⁸ Davison 1955: 14; Friis Johansen 1967: 223ff.; Schapiro 104. On the "recension" in general, cf. Davison 1955; Whitman 65ff.; Kirk 1962: 306ff.; Jensen 128ff.; Janko 1992: 29-32, Stanley 280ff. The "recension" is often considered simply an arrangement for festival performance

By the end of the century the name "Homer" seems to be known as that of a great poet.⁴⁹ Around the same time poets began to quote directly from the Homeric poems.⁵⁰ And increasingly in the sixth and fifth centuries poems other than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and material not from the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* were ascribed to "Homer."⁵¹ This remarkable practice probably reflects the fame of Homer. I think the reports that claim Callinus considered the *Thebais* to be by Homer (fr. 6 West) and that Archilochus considered the *Margites* to be by Homer (fr. 303 West) are false (see n. 35 above for doubts about their authenticity), but they may have been generated by a genuine belief in later times, fueled by his growing reputation then, that Homer wrote those poems. The report at Herodotus 5.67.1ff. that in the early sixth century the Sicyonian tyrant Cleisthenes banned Homeric poetry that sung of Argos may mean that poetry about the Theban saga (perhaps the *Thebais* and *Epigoni* of the epic cycle) was considered Homeric at that time (and also by Herodotus at a later date, though he admits doubt about Homeric authorship for the *Epigoni* at 4.32).⁵² Simonides ascribes some material which is not in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* to Homer (fr. 564 PMG). Pindar at *Pyth.* 4.277-278 quotes as Homeric a line which does

⁴⁹ Above I discounted reports of early authors speaking of Homer (see n.35). We should perhaps first turn to a *testimonium* from a papyrus which implies that Stesichorus specified Homer (and Hesiod) in his palinode (fr. 193 PMGF). There is no direct citation of the name until the end of the sixth century by Simonides (fr. 564 PMG) and Xenophanes (fr. 10, 11 D-K); numerous *testimonia* about the pre-Socratics Heraclitus and Theagenes suggest they were also familiar with the name Homer. The man from Chios specified in the *Homeric Hymn to Delian Apollo* (l. 172) may mean Homer, but interpretation of the passage remains controversial (Burkert 1979b: 57; Stanley 291-292 survey critical views on the issue). A similar phrase probably means Homer in Simonides fr. 19, 20 West (often thought in the past to be Semonides; see Davison 1968: 72ff.; cf. M. West 1974: 179-180).

⁵⁰ Allen 1924: 250 states that Homer is not quoted until the fifth century. Simonides fr. 19, 20 West (on which see previous note) may be considered an early example, for *Il.* 6.146 (comparison of leaves to mankind) is quoted as by "the man from Chios." The quotation of Homeric lines is also ascribed to Heraclitus by *testimonia* (see A22A, B 105 D-K). The phenomenon of any author directly quoting another author does not seem to have occurred before end of sixth century (see M. West 1974: 180).

⁵¹ Cf. Wilamowitz 351ff.; Murray 315-317; Scott 11ff.; Allen 1924: 249ff.; Davison 1955: 13, 1952: 236, 1968: 70ff.; Pfeiffer 43ff., 73; Lloyd-Jones 1973: 115; Bernabé pp. 2-3; Most 48-49; G. Nagy 1990b: 78ff.; Richardson 1993: 25-35.

⁵² Wilamowitz 352; Davison 1955: 13; Lloyd-Jones 1973: 115; Bernabé p. 21; G. Nagy 1990b: 22 n.22, 74 n.111, 78 think Theban war poetry is meant; Scott 17ff.; Friis Johansen 1967: 233ff. think the *Iliad* is meant.

not seem to be from the *Iliad* or *Odyssey*.⁵³ Many think *Isthm.* 4.37-41 implies that material from the *Aethiopsis* is Homeric.⁵⁴ A *testimonium* suggests that Pindar considered Homer the real author of the *Cypria* (*Cypria* test. 2 Bernabé). The *testimonium* may be doubted,⁵⁵ but perhaps a belief that Homer wrote that poem generated the story. Further examples can be adduced, for false attributions to Homer continued throughout antiquity.⁵⁶ We might conclude that though by the end of the sixth century the Homeric poems had caused the name "Homer" to become famous as that of a great poet, the poems themselves were not readily available. Thus confusion easily arose as to what exactly Homer had composed.

Since Herodotus is the first to refer directly to poems by title,⁵⁷ all early references to "Homer" do not necessarily mean the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. The first doubts about false ascriptions to Homer are also found in Herodotus; he questions Homeric authorship for the *Cypria* (2.116-117) and the *Epigoni* (4.32). Soon afterwards, it seems, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* became commonly viewed as the only or main works by Homer. Plato quotes the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* exclusively, Xenophon *Symp.* 3.5 links Homer with those two poems only, and Aristotle in the *Poetics* focuses on them as quintessentially Homeric.⁵⁸

⁵³ Wilamowitz 352 thinks it is based on a line in the *Iliad*; Nisetich I thinks that is possible; Most 48 and Murray 289, 298 state flatly it is not a Homeric line.

⁵⁴ Thus Wilamowitz 352, Davison 1955: 13; but Nisetich 1, 9ff. raises doubts that I think are compelling.

⁵⁵ Some think the *testimonium* is accurate; see p. 27 below.

⁵⁶ See Allen 1924: 251ff. for possible confusion of Homer with cyclic material by Aristophanes, Hippocrates, Xenophon, and Plato (on the last cf. Bernabé p. 3 concerning *Cypria* fr. 18). His discussion concerns early quotations of Homer that do not agree with our *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Often these misquotations are based on variant texts or faulty memory, but Allen thinks confusion of Homeric and cyclic poetry may lie at the root of some.

⁵⁷ See Davison 1962: 236; 1968: 79. Some *testimonia* might be interpreted as meaning earlier authors knew titles; e.g. the *testimonia* about Archilochus speaking of the *Margites* (fr. 303 West), Callinus speaking of the *Thebais* (fr. 6 West; on these two *testimonia* see n.35 above), Pindar speaking of the *Cypria* (*Cypria* test. 2 Bernabé), and Hellanicus speaking of the *Ilias parva* (*Iliades parvae* test. 10 Bernabé; see Davison 1962: 236). I doubt their authority.

⁵⁸ See Allen 1924: 270; Most 48; Richardson 1993: 30 on Plato's fondness of quoting of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but note that Plato and Xenophon may have spoken of non-Homeric material as Homeric (see n.56 above), that at *Poetics* ch. 4 Aristotle considers the *Margites* Homeric, and that elsewhere Aristotle seems to acknowledge the cycle was still considered Homeric by his contemporaries (see further at p. 34 below).

Since the reputation of the poems of the epic cycle is low in the modern world, some are troubled that Homer was once considered their author and try to explain away the evidence for such ascriptions.⁵⁹ Yet the phenomenon is really testimony to the high esteem in which Homer was held. One would think that as long as Greek society remained non-literate, fixed texts would have had difficulty in gaining recognition. The act of performing, not skill in composing an idiosyncratic text, would have been valued. Yet the Homeric poems, whenever they were performed, must have turned attention to their unique poetic qualities. That would have eventually made the name "Homer" very famous as that of a great poet. Yet the limitations of publication and the absence of titles (probably; see p. 31 below) would have made it unclear what exactly was Homer's corpus of work. Poems about epic topics became associated with his name, even if, as we might suppose, they were not of similar poetic skill. Indeed, eventually the whole genre of epic poetry became equated with him. It is impossible to trace this process in detail, but other poems which were anonymous may have drifted under his aura, or false ascriptions to Homer were consciously made to increase the cachet of some poems (see p. 27 below). Perhaps by convention "Homer" became a convenient label for the genre even for those who knew or suspected he was not the author of all heroic poetry.⁶⁰

Herodotus, who first uses titles for poems, who first directly quotes Homer, and who first casts doubt on false attributions to Homer, seems to represent a time of growing literacy in which a more precise conception of Homer developed. We should conceive of this process as occurring over a long period of time, however, beginning before Herodotus and continuing after him. For instance, recognition of the special value of Homer may have inspired the Pisistratean "recension."⁶¹ Other evidence discussed above

⁵⁹ This is the attitude of e.g. Scott and Nisetich (the latter on Pindar). Hainsworth 1993b: 43 calls the false ascriptions "a grave injustice."

⁶⁰ At least some false ascriptions probably fall under this category. See n.58 above on this phenomenon in Aristotle. I suspect this occurs in an engraving on an Iliac table which portrays the fall of Troy as well as the *Iliad*: "Θεοδώρον μάθε τάξι' Ὀμήρου" (Sadurska 39; see Wilamowitz 353).

⁶¹ Thus Richardson 1993: 27; Schapiro 101ff.

shows that the name "Homer" was becoming celebrated before the time of Herodotus, and it is hard not to believe that growing appreciation of the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* was the cause of this fame. On the other hand, even after Herodotus there remained confusion over what was and what was not Homeric.

2. The Epic Cycle and the Tradition of the Trojan War

The living tradition of the Trojan epic, i.e. a widespread system of bards skilled in oral technique, was probably dying toward the end of the sixth century. Growing literacy, the popularity of other literary genres, and the ascendancy of Homer over the tradition would have hurried it to its grave. A limited number of recorded examples would now represent the tradition. The poems of the epic cycle are examples of these recorded specimens.⁶² Perhaps they were a source for authors in the fifth century such as Pindar and the tragedians when they wrote of myth about the Trojan war. Eventually they became the only surviving examples of early epic poetry about the Trojan war (besides the Homeric poems), and so they certainly were relied upon in later ages as a source for a lost tradition. For these reasons they deserve careful consideration.

Authors, dates, and titles

Testimonia which provide the names of the authors of the poems in the epic cycle are difficult to believe.⁶³ The practice of ascribing many epic works to Homer until the late fifth century suggests that the names of the real authors were lost. Once attribution to

⁶² The recent edition by Bernabé collects the fragments and *testimonia* and includes extensive bibliography and notes. The recent edition by Davies has not yet been supplemented by a planned commentary; however, he has also produced a book intended for a non-specialist audience (1989a) and an article of dense argumentation and bibliography (1986) that together provide a valuable discussion of the main issues.

⁶³ *Testimonia* on dates and authors can be found in Bernabé at the beginning of each section for the poems; cf. the convenient graph in Notopoulos 38. Wilamowitz 331ff. initiated skepticism about the alleged authors; they are rejected by e.g. Murray 341ff.; Forsdyke 11; Lesky 1967: 135; and Davies 1986: 99-100 (where he provides an overview of the issue), 1989a: 5ff.

Homer became suspect, authors such as Aristotle used anonymous phrases such as "the writer of the *Cypria*." At a later date ancient scholars provided names and homelands for the authors. The fact that often many authors are provided for single works casts great doubt on the veracity of these ascriptions. The ascriptions cannot all be correct, for they contradict one another. Deciding which ascriptions are more likely to be true is difficult, and it is easy to suspect that they all are false. Even in antiquity some scholars doubted them (e.g. Athenaeus, Pausanias; see Murray 342-343).

It has been thought, nonetheless, that some truth lies behind the ascriptions, at least the ones most commonly repeated in antiquity. Bernabé seems to accept these in his edition, though he does not provide a discussion of his reasoning. Allen argued (1924: 69ff.) that ancient scholarship belatedly but accurately established who the true authors were. Merkelbach supports their authenticity (138ff.) with a different argument. He suggests that anecdotes of cyclic poets obtaining their poems from Homer as students or relatives (see *Cypria* test. 2-3, 7, *Aethiopsis* test. 6, *Iliades parvae* test. 8 Bernabé) were invented to honor Homer and so must originate from a time before the cyclic poems were discredited (they were discredited after 450 B.C., he suggests, which seems arbitrarily early to me). He accepts questionable evidence that these stories were known at an early date (e.g. by Pindar, *Cypria* test. 2 Bernabé, doubted by me at n.57 above), and reasons that the cyclic authors featured in these stories must be authentic, if not the contents of the stories themselves. Lloyd-Jones also credits (1973) at least a fifth-century date for the stories but suggests they were invented to bolster fading reputations of the poems, not to honor Homer. I think these different arguments are ultimately not convincing. The anecdotes about the cyclic poets and Homer are probably later than the fifth century; perhaps they resulted from an attempt to join older traditions attributing the poems to Homer with newly invented attributions.⁶⁴ And even if these are the names of real poets who did compose in the Archaic Age, that does not mean they wrote the particular poems

⁶⁴ See Lefkowitz 16, 21-22.

found in the epic cycle.⁶⁵ The best argument for some truth to the attributions is made by Kullmann, who supposes that it would be unusual to attribute both the *Aethiopsis* and the *Ilii excidium* to Arctinus if names were being grasped out of thin air.⁶⁶ It seems best, however, to regard the attributions as unfounded guesswork, though we may suspect that the names belonged to real poets remembered from the past.

What is the date of the poems in the epic cycle? There is no clear answer to this question. The ancient anecdotes which speak of cyclic authors as pupils or relatives of Homer are hardly reliable. The *testimonium* about Callinus discussing "Homer's" *Thebais* (fr. 6 West) would place one poem at least in the seventh century, but it does not seem trustworthy (see n.35 above). Early art work on cyclic themes need not reflect the specific poems in the epic cycle, though many scholars make that unnecessary assumption.⁶⁷ Below at pages 78ff. I will demonstrate that the contents of the epic cycle are not conclusively "late." Thus one cannot assume that the poems of the epic cycle are post-Homeric on the basis of their cultural practices and beliefs. Aristarchus was certain that the poets of the cycle were later than Homer (as his term "neoterói" for them and other authors suggests), but we do not know what date he placed on them, and his opinion is worth little anyway because it is based on misguided assumptions.⁶⁸

Other evidence leads to two extremes. Arctinus, the supposed author of the *Aethiopsis* and the *Ilii excidium*, was dated in the eighth century by chronologies found in such sources as Eusebius and the *Suda*, whose information may be based on Hellenistic scholarship. Other authors follow in the seventh or sixth century, according to this ancient chronology. However, Wilamowitz effectively questioned this dating scheme, which

⁶⁵ Davies 1986: 100. Dihle 146ff. suggests that they were real poets who composed not the poems in the epic cycle but oral prototypes of them.

⁶⁶ Kullmann 1960: 215; see also 1986: 116-117.

⁶⁷ E.g. Jouan 1980: 90, 100-101 uses art work as *termini ante quem* for the poems of the epic cycle. Davies 1989b: 100 n.64 opposes this line of thought.

⁶⁸ E.g. that Homer is the root of all Greek literature, or that Homer invented most of the myth in his poems. See n.12 above on the methodology of Aristarchus. Note that even Hesiod was considered one of the "neoterói" by Aristarchus (see Severyns 1928: 31ff.).

among other things is inconsistent (cf. *Aethiopsis* test. 2 and 4 Bernabé). His arguments are still influential.⁶⁹ Thus the most compelling evidence that these poems began to be composed in the eighth century is questionable. And even if it were certain that the alleged poets date from that time, we could still not be sure that they are the authors of the specific poems in the epic cycle, as I pointed out above.

It should also be noted that scholars have often based their dating on the poems of the epic cycle on their dating of Homer. In the past critics who were convinced that the cyclic poems are derivative from Homer were comfortable with eighth-century dates for them because they thought Homer was of an even earlier date.⁷⁰ The date commonly accepted for Homer today, the late eighth century, has made it difficult to accept an early dating for the poems of the epic cycle yet consider them derivative from Homer. Yet many scholars attempt to do just that, speaking of the first cyclic poems as from the turn of the century or the early seventh century.⁷¹ This undoubtedly accounts for the popularity of the notion that the Homeric poems, having quickly annihilated the pre-Homeric tradition, immediately became widely influential (see p. 20 above).

The other extreme in dating is the sixth century. If the *Telegony* is correctly ascribed to Eugammon of Cyrene, that would mean one poem at least did not originate before the sixth century (when Cyrene was founded). But even if one poem is from the sixth century, that does not mean the other poems are. A common argument for dating the poems of the epic cycle to the sixth century derives from analysis of the linguistic nature of fragments. A century ago Wilamowitz concisely made such an argument, and Davies

⁶⁹ Wilamowitz 348ff. The following also question the ancient chronology: Murray 343ff.; M. West 1970: 388; Davies 1986: 93ff., 1989a: 3-5. Other scholars have seemed to accept, or lower only slightly, the ancient dating. For example, A. Lang 348; Jebb 153; Allen 1924: 68-69, 75-76; Notopoulos 36 believe poems in the epic cycle begin to be composed in the eighth century; Severyns 1928: 313; Whitman 85; Huxley 144; Rankin 41 n.15 date Arctinus or the *Aethiopsis* in the eighth century. Bernabé tends to follow the ancient dating for all the poems, a practice which Davies 1989c severely criticizes ("far too early" and "misleadingly dogmatic and specific dates," 5).

⁷⁰ E.g. Jebb 153; A. Lang 348; Allen 1908: 88; Evelyn-White xxx; Severyns 313. Cf. Forsdyke, who dates Homer in the ninth century (11), and the first cyclic poems in the seventh (121-122).

⁷¹ E.g. Wade-Gery 1ff.; Kirk 1962: 69, 286; 1985: 4; Coldstream 1977: 343.

has recently championed this position.⁷² I cannot presume to pass judgment on this issue, but it should be stressed that the fragments are too meager to provide much evidence; indeed, for some poems, like the *Aethiopsis* (the main concern of my study in the later chapters), there are so few fragments that no conclusions can be made through this method. And again, if one were to date convincingly one poem through this method, that would have no significance for the other poems in the epic cycle. It should also be noted that this argument originated at a time when it was widely believed that some parts of the *Iliad* could be dated "later" than other parts on the basis of linguistic evidence. That endeavor has been largely discredited because it displayed little sensitivity to the mixed nature of traditional language and to the effect which transmission can have on a text.⁷³ One must wonder if the linguistic analysis which has been applied to fragments from the epic cycle is any more valid.

It is notable that the two most recent editors of the fragments, Bernabé and Davies, each follow one of the extreme positions on dating. This difference of opinion should underscore the need to avoid dogmatism on the matter. Many scholars either take an agnostic stance, or settle for a seventh-century date.⁷⁴ In this study I will consider the poems of the epic cycle to date from somewhere between the two extremes of the late eighth and the late sixth century. I will also assume they are later than the Homeric poems, though it will become apparent below that I do not think they are obviously derivative from Homer or that they contain "late" elements. I make this guess after consideration of the largely non-literate culture of the Archaic Age. Above I noted that it would have been expensive and difficult to record long epic poems in this period. Only

⁷² Wilamowitz 366. Recent versions of this argument can be found at Dihle 148ff.; Davies 1989b. Lloyd-Jones 1973: 118-119 approves of it (he cites Wackernagel, whom many of these scholars cite as building upon Wilamowitz's argument); Griffin 1977 n.9 finds it persuasive, but not necessarily for a date as late as the sixth century. Kullmann 1960: 362ff. presented an opposing position, and at 1991: 427 n.6 he states that the argument of Davies is inadequate. Bernabé lists linguistic and grammatical peculiarities for each poem at the beginning of his edition.

⁷³ Of course the practice still exists, e.g. Kirk 1962: 306ff. Dihle 149 specifically compares cyclic linguistic forms with "late" parts of the *Iliad*.

⁷⁴ Lesky 1966: 82 suggests such a compromise, which Griffin 1977: 39 n.9 is inclined to accept.

exceptional poems would have inspired the effort of preservation by writing, and we might therefore suppose that the Homeric poems were recorded before more typical epic poems. The paucity of fragments makes it difficult to decide if the poems of the epic cycle display the techniques of oral composition.⁷⁵ If they were orally composed, that does not necessarily mean that they are from the early Archaic Age. If they were composed through writing, they are probably not of an early date. The length of the poems is a factor. Lyric poetry and the Hesiodic poems, for example, would have been relatively easy to compose or record with writing. The poems of the epic cycle, even if shorter than the Homeric poems, were undoubtedly much longer than lyric poems or the Hesiodic poems. The difficulties involved with writing at an early date make it less likely that long works were then composed or recorded through writing.

Do the titles of the poems give us any information about these poems? Usually they simply indicate the action or hero of the poem, and so are of little significance. However, if the poet of the *Ilias parva* knew and used the title "*Ilias parva*," would that indicate he knew of the *Iliad*? Not necessarily, for the term "*Iliad*" is generic and well applies to any poem about the Trojan war. And since we first find direct mention of titles in Herodotus (see p. 24 above), we may suspect that this and other titles were applied to the poems of the epic cycle long after they were composed. For epic poetry, the proem is sufficient to indicate the subject of a poem. The phenomenon of titling was probably introduced in a more literate and academic world than the Archaic Age (that would help explain the early confusion over ascription). Thus if the title "*Ilias parva*" is an allusion to our *Iliad*, the allusion may have been made by a scholar long after the death of the poet who wrote the poem.

⁷⁵ Lord 150, 156 seems to imply they were orally composed; Notopoulos more explicitly presents a argument that they were. Kirk 1966 criticizes his methodology for ascertaining oral composition (Davies 1989b: 99 supports Kirk on this issue). At 1962: 69, 98, 301ff. Kirk describes the style of the earlier cyclic poems as a "decadent" oral one, with some characteristics of literate composition.

The title "*Cypria*" (or "*Cypriaka*;" see n.142 below) is also of interest. It is not clear what the significance of the title is. It has been thought to be either an allusion to Aphrodite (because she is at times featured in the poem) or to Cyprus (as the place where the poem was composed).⁷⁶ If the latter is true then the place of origin for one poem at least is known (whether or not its author used that title). However, conclusions made on the basis of this possibility are not well justified. It is even debatable whether the title is neuter plural (as it is usually considered) or feminine singular.⁷⁷ As a feminine singular it would be equivalent to *Κύπρις* (as at Pindar *Ol.* 1.75) and be a reference to the goddess and not to Cyprus.

The manufacture of the epic cycle

Besides the meager fragments of the poems in the epic cycle, we possess the Trojan war section of a summary of the epic cycle (the cycle in its entirety contained theogonic and Theban war poems).⁷⁸ This summary was made by Proclus and included in a large work of his about ancient poetry and poets called the *Chrestomathy*. We are not sure about the date of Proclus; he could be from either the second or fifth century of our era.⁷⁹ What we know in general about the *Chrestomathy* depends on a description of it by Photius (ninth c. A.D., see *Cyclus epicus* test. 13, *Cypria* test. 7 Bernabé; Allen 1912: 95-98). The summary of the Trojan war poems that we have was apparently taken out of the *Chrestomathy* (along with a life of Homer) and placed in manuscripts of the *Iliad*.

⁷⁶ See Bernabé p. 38; Davies 1989a: 33. Lloyd-Jones 1973; Burn 63; Burkert 1992: 103-104 explore the possibilities of the *Cypria* as a poem from Cyprus. Burkert 207 n.10 denies that the title can be a reference to Aphrodite.

⁷⁷ See Photius in Allen 1912: 97, ll. 17-19, or at *Cypria* test. 7 Bernabé.

⁷⁸ Opinion has varied on exactly what poems outside of the Trojan war section were included in the cycle. See Davies 1986: 96-97.

⁷⁹ See Rzach 2351ff.; Bernabé p. 5 for overviews of this issue. Controversy over it continues unabated. Scholars who favor a fifth-century date include Wilamowitz 330; Murray 340; Allen 1924: 51ff.; Vian 88; Lesky 1967: 136; Kullmann 1986: 116; a second-century date, Monro 1901: 341; Severyns 1928: 75; Scheliha 355; Lloyd-Jones 1973: 119; Schein 18 n.4.

The process which eventually resulted in this summary was long and complicated. It should first be realized that the poems we find in the epic cycle were not the only ones of their type in the Archaic Age. Evidence from antiquity suggests that the material we find in the cycle was also related in epic poems now lost.⁸⁰ Poets of non-epic genres also composed about the Trojan war. Sacadas may have written a *Fall of Troy*.⁸¹ Stesichorus wrote an *Iliou persis* and a *Nostoi* (fr. S88ff., 196ff., 208-209 *PMGF*; I repeat the titles employed by Davies), and some recently found fragments of his have been interpreted as narrating the death and funeral of Achilles.⁸² Ibycus also seems to have composed poems about the Trojan war; there is a fragment about the fall of Troy (282 *PMGF*) and many fragments about Trojan war topics (e.g. the death of Polyxena [307 *PMGF*], Achilles and Medea at Leuke [291 *PMGF*]). Undoubtedly these few indications of "cyclic" material in early Greek poetry represent only the tip of the iceberg. Thomas compares (105) the loss of oral poetry "which continued long after Homer but simply never got preserved at all" to the loss of texts in the Middle Ages.

Somehow some poems about the Trojan war were recorded, and certain ones were selected long after their composition (whether by chance or merit) to be part of a continuous series of works now known as the epic cycle. When was this done? One possibility is the Pisistratean "recension." *Testimonia* about the recension from the fourth century B.C. discuss it in connection with Homer. But we are again faced with the

⁸⁰ Variants of the cycle's theogony: Hesiod's *Theogony* and Orphic theogonies; see Bernabé p. 8; Huxley 19ff.; M. West 1983: 125-126. Of the *Thebais*: an 'Αμφιαράου ἐξέλασις (*Thebais* test. 7, 8 Bernabé). Of the *Cypria*: a "Palamedeia" (fr. 42 "dubium" Bernabé); see also Huxley 134; Murray 343 (but cf. Severyns 1938: 94) on the possibility of more than one *Cypria*. Of the *Aethiopsis*: an "Amazonia" (test. 12 Bernabé); see also *Iliades parvae* fr. 32 "dubium" Bernabé (M. West 1966b: 22 doubts this verse is ancient). Of the *Ilias parva*: see Huxley 150; Bernabé p. 72 for the possibility that there were many poems called "Ilias parva" (thus "Iliades parvae" is used in Bernabé; Davies 1989c: 6 calls this an "eccentric" view). Of the *Nosti*: a "Return of the Sons of Atreus" (fr. 4, 11 Bernabé; see also p. 93); see test. 2 Bernabé for *testimonia* about multiple "Returns." Of the *Telegonia*: a "Threspotia" (test. 3 Bernabé). In general see Murray 341-343; cf. M. West's criticism (1971: 67-69) of Huxley's repeated reference to variants. Confusion over authors and titles may account for some of this evidence.

⁸¹ According to an emendation of Athenaeus 13.610c (*Ilii excidium* test. 3 Bernabé). See Fowler 96, 130 n.38; Davies 1989c: 8.

⁸² Garner 1993; see further at n.11 in chapter three. Pausanias 3.19.11ff. might be interpreted as indicating that Stesichorus mentioned Leuke in his palinode.

problem of what "Homer" means. Probably *testimonia* from the fourth century meant the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* when they spoke of "Homer."⁸³ In the sixth century, however, "Homer" often indicated heroic poetry in general, as I demonstrated above. Would the organization of the performance of epic poetry at a festival (the extent of the "recension" which is usually credited today) have focused on only the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, and if so, would contemporary witnesses have clearly passed on that specification?⁸⁴ That is unclear, and some scholars have argued that this activity involved the manufacture of the epic cycle.⁸⁵

A second possibility is the early Hellenistic period.⁸⁶ One might suspect that the scholars of this age would have been interested in creating such a cycle, and the first evidence of the existence of an epic cycle (as opposed to simply the individual poems within it) dates from this time. The earliest possible references to the cycle are in remarks attributed to the "Eristics" by Aristotle.⁸⁷ Some conclude that the epic cycle was known in Aristotle's time, but that is disputed⁸⁸ (Aristotle in the *Poetics* refers to individual poems of the cycle, not to the cycle). The adjective *κυκλικός* is found frequently in scholia which may reach back to the Hellenistic period, and Callimachus uses it in one famous epigram (*Cyclus epicus* test. 20 Bernabé). Most scholars believe that this adjective refers to the epic cycle.⁸⁹ Occasionally scholiasts mention a "cyclic" text of the *Odyssey* (Bernabé pp. 99-100), which might mean there was a special version of this poem adapted to its place in the epic cycle. A different version of the *Iliad's* proem

⁸³ Thus Murray 300; Friis Johansen 1967: 235-36; Richardson 1993: 27; and (cautiously) Davison 1955: 13.

⁸⁴ See Wilamowitz 362ff. (he is skeptical about the recension in γεν(ταί).

⁸⁵ Wolf 146; Verrall 164ff. argued that the recension included the epic cycle. Schefold 31, 194 n.112 thinks that is possible. Allen 1924: 76 denied it; Davies 1986: 93 calls this theory "idle speculation." Schapiro 101ff., Janko 1992: 30-31, Stanley 280ff. prefer to see the recension as the *exclusion* of non-Homeric traditions.

⁸⁶ See M. West 1983: 129 for the development of such an argument.

⁸⁷ *Cyclus epicus* test. 1; 8 Bernabé. See Bernabé's note under test. 8 and Pfeiffer 73; Davies 1986: 94-95.

⁸⁸ E.g. by Monro 1883: 321ff.; see further bibliography at Davies (previous note).

⁸⁹ Monro 1883: 329ff. denies it, but see Severyns 1928:155-159; Pfeiffer 230; Davies 1986: 95; Blumenthal.

quoted by Aristoxenus may have been designed to follow the *Cypria* as a join between the two poems,⁹⁰ and a join between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopsis* may also date from this time (see p. 65 below). All this evidence seems to indicate that the epic cycle existed in the Hellenistic period, though much remains obscure.

Some evidence, like the possible verse joins mentioned above, suggests that the epic cycle originally consisted of verse. Apparently it was such an arrangement of poems that Proclus summarized in prose. It seems that other prose summaries, different from the one we know, were also made. The description of the Trojan war in Apollodorus' *Epitome* is essentially a summary of the epic cycle, or based on one.⁹¹ A Dionysius of variously attributed origin who lived in the Alexandrian period (sometimes called Dionysius the Cyclograph) is reported to have made a prose summary of mythic material,⁹² and a Pisander who lived in the third century of our era apparently made a summary of the epic cycle.⁹³ A papyrus fragment contains a summary of material apparently from the *Ilias parva*, with wording different from that of Proclus (Bernabé p. 75). The Iliac tables vary from Proclus in a number of ways, which may be caused by the carelessness of their manufacture (see p. 55 below), but perhaps they are based on a different summary, or even a different epic cycle, for Stesichorus is cited for the *Ilii excidium* section on one table (Sadurska 29; see Bernabé p. 87).

In any event, added to early manuscripts of the *Iliad* (from the tenth century onward) were summaries of the poems in the epic cycle about the Trojan war and a life of Homer. Headings identify them as from the *Chrestomathy* of Proclus, and indeed they are consistent with what Photius tells us about that work. The summaries by Proclus of poems in the epic cycle which were not about the Trojan war were not included and did not survive. The Trojan war section of the summary includes the *Cypria*, the *Aethiopsis*,

⁹⁰ Bernabé p. 64. M. West 1983: 129 bases his argument for a Hellenistic origin of the cycle on this evidence; cf. his remarks at 1970: 388, 1966: 49-5. See also Davies 1986: 93 n.21, 95.

⁹¹ See M. West 1983: 125ff.; Davies 1986: 104ff., 1989a: 7-8.

⁹² See Wilamowitz 360-361; A. Lang 327-328; Monro 1883: 26-327.

⁹³ See Severyns 1928: 75-76, 1938: 92.

the *Ilias parva*, the *Ilii excidium*, the *Nosti*, and the *Telegony*. Each poem is briefly introduced by title, author, and number of books.⁹⁴ The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are not summarized, but it is indicated where their contents fit into the cycle as a whole. It may be concluded that the section of the summary of the epic cycle by Proclus which covered the Trojan war was excerpted from its original context (the *Chrestomathy*) and placed in the manuscripts of the *Iliad* as background information for readers of the *Iliad*.

Thus it seems that selected poems from the Archaic Age about the birth of the gods, the Theban war, and the Trojan war were assembled together into a collection of verse called the epic cycle at some point, probably in the Hellenistic age. Perhaps this collection functioned as a small library which presented mythical events in chronological order. Subsequent to that time Proclus, among others, made a prose summary of this epic cycle. Then the Trojan war section of this summary was excerpted and placed in a manuscript of the *Iliad* and subsequently copied in later manuscripts of the *Iliad*.

Differences between the original poems and the epic cycle

The process of making the epic cycle produced discrepancies between the original poems and the summary that we possess. A comparison between the *testimonia* and Proclus quickly demonstrates that the original poems have been shortened, and parts of them omitted or changed. Three major opportunities for tampering occurred in the process just outlined—the manufacture of a verse cycle from poems, the making of a prose summary of this cycle, and the placing of part of this summary in manuscripts of the *Iliad*. In addition, changes could have been made at any time during the transmission of the poems, or during the transmission of the verse version of the epic cycle, or during the transmission of the prose version of the epic cycle, or during the transmission of the Trojan war section in manuscripts of the *Iliad*. Why would these changes have been

⁹⁴ The headings for the sections (which can be found in Allen) and probably a slight interpolation to the introduction to the *Aethiopsis* were added later. See Severyns 1953: 245ff., who argues that two different hands are responsible for these. The headings also report the titles and book numbers.

made? We should consider the possible function of the epic cycle in order to answer this question. A desire to provide a continuous overview of mythical events might have led to the removal of superfluous parts. Another motivation could have been a desire to provide background information for the Homeric poems, leading to the removal of material unnecessary for that purpose or the changing of material contradictory to it.

Growing devaluation of the poems would have made tampering more permissible. It does not seem that the original poems themselves were scorned at first, but attitudes eventually changed. Herodotus suspected that the *Cypria* was un-Homeric on the basis of data, not quality. Aristotle in the *Poetics* made acute distinctions between the architectural strategies of cyclic poems and the Homeric poems, but did not criticize the quality of the former. In the Hellenistic period we sense a new attitude. Aristarchus as a rule considered the cyclic poems later than and inferior to Homer as the result of professional rivalry with his predecessor Zenodotus, who had taken a different attitude toward such poems (see Severyns 1928: 44). Callimachus found in them an antithesis of his poetry (*Cyclus epicus* test. 20 Bernabé), and Horace in the *Ars poetica* (*Cyclus epicus* test. 24 Bernabé) and Pollianus (*Cyclus epicus* test. 21 Bernabé) offered more specific and scathing criticisms. Thus demonstration of one's appreciation of Homer by despising other poems of his tradition grew popular, an attitude unfortunately still prevalent today.⁹⁵ In that climate it is easy to see how tampering with the original poems would have been allowed. Below I will discuss when such tampering occurred, but deciding this question is of less importance than realizing that it happened. Whether it occurred in Alexandrian times, the time of the Roman empire, or the Byzantine era, whether it is the fault of Proclus or not, we have in Proclus an inexact representation of epic poems from antiquity. Let us begin by examining the nature of the tampering.

⁹⁵ See Wilamowitz 374 for pithy criticism of the modern attitude, which he ascribes to the influence of Aristarchus. I am more concerned in this study with the material of the epic cycle, not with the quality of the poems in it. Though I find it easy to believe they were of less quality than the Homeric poems, there are too few fragments to justify scorn of them. Cf. G. Nagy 1992: 29.

a. changes and omissions

It needs to be stressed from the start that there is not much evidence of tampering which involved changes or omissions of detail. There is only one clear example of a change of detail. Herodotus stated that the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* differed about the voyage of Paris and Helen from Sparta. He claimed that in the *Cypria* they traveled immediately to Troy, enjoying smooth sailing, and interpreted *Il.* 6.289ff. as indicating Paris stopped at Sidon.⁹⁶ Yet the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus states that Hera raised a storm against them and that they ended up at Sidon, which Paris sacked. Perhaps the remarks of Herodotus led to tampering with the *Cypria*, and then Proclus unwittingly included the change in his epitome.⁹⁷ Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.4 agrees with the version in Proclus, so the change must have occurred by his time (probably second century of our era). It has also been suspected that the summary by Proclus does not accurately indicate Achilles' adventures at Scyros, but that issue remains unclear.⁹⁸ There is also only one clear case of a major omission in Proclus, and that is of the *nekyia* in the *Nosti* to which numerous *testimonia* attest.⁹⁹ Of course, Proclus cannot report everything in a summary, but the omission of such an important episode is suspicious. Perhaps it was omitted because a *nekyia* already existed in the *Odyssey*.¹⁰⁰ Nonetheless it should be noted that there is not much evidence of such omissions and changes. It does not appear that anyone extensively changed, omitted, or manipulated details of the original contents of the poems. We shall

⁹⁶ Herodotus 2.117=*Cypria* fr. 14 Bernabé. Sidon was destroyed in 677, but one cannot use this evidence to place the *Cypria* or the Homeric poems before that date (see Burkert 1976: 20).

⁹⁷ Thus Monro 1901: 344; Allen 1908: 81-82; Davies 1989a: 41; Bernabé pp. 52-53 (after well summarizing other interpretations).

⁹⁸ See Kullmann 1960: 190-92; Severyns 1928: 285ff.; *Cypria* fr. 19 Bernabé with his notes. There are very different accounts of Achilles' adventures in Scyros; most famously, that he hid there dressed in feminine garb. This story has been attributed by scholia to the cycle, but Proclus does not indicate it was in the *Cypria* and in fact mentions a potentially contradictory account of Achilles at Scyros.

⁹⁹ *Nosti* fr. 3-9 Bernabé. For discussion see Rzach 2424ff.; Severyns 1928: 385ff.; Huxley 164ff.; Bernabé p. 95.

¹⁰⁰ As Monro 1983: 319; Bernabé (see previous note) suggest. It is possible that the *nekyia* in the *Nosti* featured Odysseus, and thus was even more redundant than these scholars suspect. It would follow, in that case, that the *Nosti* also originally narrated the return of Odysseus. A brief mention of a meeting between Odysseus and Neoptolemus is mentioned in Proclus, which suggests the poem originally offered more about Odysseus. On the issue of whether Odysseus visited the underworld in pre-Homeric myth see Heubeck 1989: 75-76 (he does not think he did).

see in the next section, however, that a different form of tampering did occur, the removal of the beginnings and endings of the original poems.

b. cropping

One thing which should be underscored is that the authors of the poems in the epic cycle did not intend to join their poems together to form an epic cycle.¹⁰¹ There is no reason to think that the poets knew each other or that they were even aware of the other poems later used to form the cycle.¹⁰² A quick perusal of the *testimonia* and fragments is sufficient to demonstrate that often the beginnings or endings of the original poems could not have been the same as the ones found in the summary by Proclus. Often it appears that the poems covered the same material. For example, Proclus ends the *Aethiopsis* before Ajax's suicide, which follows in his summary of the *Ilias parva*, but a *testimonium* reveals that the *Aethiopsis* in fact narrated the suicide (fr. 5 Bernabé).¹⁰³ And numerous *testimonia* report that the *Ilias parva* narrated the sack of Troy (fr. 9-22 Bernabé), though Proclus ends the poem after the Trojans drag the wooden horse inside the city. Sometimes it is even apparent that two poems of the epic cycle differed about the material which they shared. For instance, the summary of the *Ilii excidium* by Proclus states that Odysseus killed Astyanax, but a fragment of the *Ilias parva* (*Iliades parvae* fr. 21 Bernabé) states that Neoptolemus killed Astyanax. In addition, according to Proclus Aeneas fled from Troy before its fall in the *Ilii excidium*, but a fragment of the *Ilias parva* (21 Bernabé) reports that Neoptolemus left Troy with Aeneas as his captive. It is therefore clear that the original poems did not join harmoniously together; in fact they often narrated the same material and sometimes disagreed about details in it. The common belief that the original

¹⁰¹ See Monro 1883: 316-317; Rzach 2377; Murray 341.

¹⁰² There is a story of a contest between Arctinus and Lesches (test. 4 *Iliades parvae* Bernabé) which Huxley 159; Allen 1908: 85, 1924: 73-74 surprisingly treat as factually based. G. Nagy 1990b: 76 extrapolates more symbolic significance from this anecdote than I think is reasonable (see n.104 below).

¹⁰³ See Monro 1883: 319; Huxley 149; Davies 1989a: 60.

poems were designed to join together is an illusion caused by the inaccurate summary of them by Proclus.¹⁰⁴

It is difficult to understand how it was decided which version of material found in more than one poem should be included in the epic cycle. Perhaps one version provided more detail or was of better quality. Another difficult question is when these changes were made. Were the original poems shortened, or did Proclus decide to create a smoother epitome by omitting material which overlapped? Or were the changes made at some other point in the long, complicated history of the epic cycle? We should take a closer look at how the summary says these poems join before hazarding a guess.

There is much that is odd in the beginnings and endings that the summary reports. I will examine how the *Cypria* and the *Aethiopsis* join with the *Iliad* later in the chapter, and now concentrate on how poems in the cycle join with each other. The division between the *Aethiopsis* and the *Ilias parva* occurs between the dispute over Achilles' arms (στράσις) and the judgment on them (κρίσις). It is unlikely that a poet would have narrated only the rise of a dispute without continuing on to narrate its conclusion, or that a poet would have started his poem with the conclusion of a dispute without having narrated its beginning. Thus even without *testimonia* one would be able to guess that Proclus does not report the original ending of the *Aethiopsis* and the original beginning of the *Ilias parva*. But why would a subsequent arranger divide the poems at this point? Why would he not use one poem or the other to tell the whole story of the dispute over the arms of Achilles?

Let us leave those questions unanswered for now and look at the division between the *Ilias parva* and the *Ilii excidium*. According to the summary by Proclus, the *Ilias*

¹⁰⁴ Very misleading conclusions can be reached if this is not understood. E.g. Allen 1908: 85, 1924: 72 faults the cyclic poets for awkward endings and beginnings; G. Nagy 1990b: 76 suggests that Arctinus (alleged poet of the *Aethiopsis* and the *Ilii excidium*) or his tradition built around Lesches (alleged poet of the *Ilias parva*) or his tradition. Cf. the unrealistic proposition by Severyns (1928: 324-25, 356-358, 1953: 324-325) that the poet of the *Ilias parva* intentionally reduplicated the contents of the *Aethiopsis* and the *Ilii excidium* when filling in the gap between them.

parva ends with the Trojans holding a victory feast after having hauled the wooden horse into the city. The beginning of the *Ilii excidium* contains this same victory feast, which occurs after a dispute over what to do with the wooden horse. Thus here two poems do not join together smoothly. There is an overlap between the two poems. One event, the victory feast, occurs in both. And it seems as if the two poems narrated the reception of the horse in different ways. This all seems very odd indeed (see Davies 1989a: 74). We know that someone has shortened the end of the *Ilias parva* a great deal, for it originally went on to narrate the sack of the Troy (as I noted on p. 39 above). Apparently this was done in an effort to avoid overlap with the *Ilii excidium*. If the arrangers made this major change, why would they not have taken the much smaller step of making the two poems join smoothly together? Why is overlap and inconcinnity allowed at this artificial division between the two poems?

Recapitulation of content also seems to occur between the *Ilii excidium* and the *Nosti*. The summary by Proclus indicates that in the *Ilii excidium* the Greeks sailed off and Athena planned a disaster for them at sea. Yet we read in Proclus that the *Nosti* began with the Greeks still at Troy. It is true that at the end of the summary of the *Ilii excidium* there is a chronological problem, for we are told of deeds done at Troy after we are told of the departure of the Greeks.¹⁰⁵ Perhaps the deeds done at Troy (division of spoils, deaths of Astyanax and Polyxena) occurred as the Greeks were planning to leave but had not actually set sail. Athena could then be preparing her vengeance.¹⁰⁶ If Proclus is wrong to suggest that the Greeks actually set sail in the *Ilii excidium*, it is possible that the poems did not actually overlap, as they appear to do in the summary. A final instance of an overlapping transition occurs between the *Odyssey* and the *Telegony*. The *Telegony* opens with the burial of the suitors. Thus it would seem to overlap with the *Odyssey*, for a

¹⁰⁵ On this issue see a different edition than Allen, where Proclus is "tacitly reshuffled" (Davies 1986: 100).

¹⁰⁶ See Davies 1989a: 76 for a different attempt to untangle this problem.

burial of the suitors occurs in book 24 of the Homeric poem. Of course, the issue of where the *Odyssey* originally ended is essential to this question (see n. 11 above).

When the tampering occurred

It is clear that cyclic data has not been arranged into a completely harmonious whole. Some efforts have been made to create a continuous narrative of the Trojan war with no major redundancy or contradictions, yet minor instances of overlap or inconcinnity were allowed to remain between the poems. What conclusion can we draw about when and how the original poems were changed? Severyns has argued that the discrepancies between the original poems and the summary by Proclus result from tampering with the summary which occurred after the summary was placed in Homeric manuscripts, a view championed by Davies.¹⁰⁷ He supposes that Proclus had summarized the full extent of the original poems but that parts of this summary were later omitted. The attraction of this theory is that an excellent motive for changing the nature of the summary would exist after the summary of Proclus was placed in the manuscripts of the *Iliad*. Undoubtedly the summary was placed in the manuscripts to provide a background for that poem. That certainly would explain why sections of the summary about the birth of the gods or the Theban war were not included. It is easy to imagine that eventually the summary would be even further manipulated so that it would best serve its purpose. Anything which did help provide a background to the *Iliad*—such as redundancy—could have been eliminated.

Yet there are problems with this theory. Above I demonstrated that the one clear example of a change of the internal contents of the original poems had occurred by the time of Apollodorus (see p. 38). Thus it could not have occurred after the summary was placed in the manuscripts of the *Iliad*. In addition, the divisions we have examined would

¹⁰⁷ Severyns 1953 *passim* (cf. 1928: 245, 325, 357-358); Davies 1986: 96, 101ff. (he summarizes the views of Severyns). How this could have happened is speculation with no bearing on my discussion, but note that Severyns thinks the changes were not made immediately or necessarily by one person.

not have been made by someone who left out whatever he wanted from a prose summary. Why would the *Aethiopsis* be cropped so that two events which are closely linked, dispute over arms and decision of the dispute, be split between two poems? Why would any overlap at all have remained between the other poems? The summary we have does not look as if it has been made by someone who felt free to create a smooth, seamless story. And the convincing demonstration by Severyns that the original wording of the Trojan war section of the summary was carefully and accurately preserved when removed from its larger context of the *Chrestomathy* (see esp. 1953: 379ff.) creates another problem for his overall theory. We see in the introductions to the summaries of the poems in the epic cycle references to parts of the *Chrestomathy* which lay outside the Trojan war section of the summary. Those references would have been senseless after this Trojan war section of the summary was extracted from its original context (the *Chrestomathy*), yet they were preserved nonetheless. In other words, it is clear that no one after Proclus rewrote his summary; what we possess are his words (with a few minor additions; see n.94 above). Thus Severyns would have us believe that the same process which so conscientiously passed on the words of Proclus also shortened the summary. Severyns' theory also downplays the extent of the discrepancies between the summary and the original poems, as if, for example, the excision of the narration of the fall of Troy in the *Ilias parva* were a minor matter.¹⁰⁸ The changes made to the original poems were radical, as I have shown. These must have been made before the summaries were added to the manuscripts, for after that point the transmission of the summaries seems to have been painstakingly faithful, even preserving remarks that were irrelevant to the purpose of providing a background to the *Iliad*. I therefore think that no changes to the summary of Proclus were made after it was placed in manuscripts of the *Iliad*.

¹⁰⁸ See Severyns 1953: 282 ff. Cf. his unlikely portrayal of cyclic poets intentionally filling in the gaps between previous poems, mentioned in n.104 above. I do agree with his view that Proclus is not to blame for the discrepancies, as will become apparent below.

Where should we look then, if the undoubted misrepresentation of the original poems did not occur after selections from Proclus were placed in manuscripts of the *Iliad*? Was Proclus somehow to blame for the discrepancies? Suspicious eyes have been frequently cast in his direction. A theory arose among German scholars of the late nineteenth century that he did not summarize the poems themselves, but instead used a prose summary which itself may have been based on previous prose summaries.¹⁰⁹ A distorted picture of the original poems could have easily arisen at any number of points in such a prose summary tradition. The Trojan war section of Apollodorus' epitome, which was published in the late nineteenth century, is very similar to Proclus and encouraged the view that Proclus used a similar summary.

Photius has passed along comments of Proclus which bear on this issue: λέγει δὲ ὡς τοῦ ἐπικοῦ κύκλου τὰ ποιήματα διασώζεται καὶ σπουδάζεται τοῖς πολλοῖς οὐχ οὕτω διὰ τὴν ἀρετὴν ὡς διὰ τὴν ἀκολουθίαν τῶν ἐν αὐτῷ πραγμάτων (*Cyclus epicus* test. 22 Bernabé). These words, besides providing further evidence of the low esteem into which the epic cycle eventually slipped, imply that the original poems were available to Proclus. Instead of supposing that Proclus is lying, or senselessly repeating the words of predecessors though they no longer were valid in his day, we should conclude that he based his summary on the poems, and not on prose summaries of them. Does that mean he knew the full extent of the poems and used them as a source, but chose not to include all of their contents? That is as unlikely as the proposition that the summary of Proclus was altered after he wrote it. If Proclus simply desired to create a smoothly running narrative of the Trojan war, he would not have divided the poems at odd places or allowed redundancy to remain. The peculiar beginnings and endings of the poems in the summary suggest that Proclus has not tried to remove difficulties. On the

¹⁰⁹ See Bernabé p. 5, Davies 1986: 107ff. Wilamowitz 331; Rzsch 2352-2353; Murray 353; M. West 1970: 388; Lesky 1966: 81 have thought that Proclus did not know the poems; Allen 1908: 68ff., 1924: 56; Scheliba 355; Forsdyke 11; Davies 1989a: 7-8 have thought that he did. The question of the date of Proclus (see p. 32 above) is closely linked with this issue, for it is usually suspected that the poems no longer survived in the fifth century.

contrary, they are testimony that he conscientiously reported all he knew of the poems, no matter how awkward the result. The poems that he knew must have already had their beginnings and endings cropped.

We have already decided that the original poets could not have created such odd transitions between the poems, indeed, that these poets did not even intend their poems to be linked with other poems. Thus we are forced to conclude that sometime between the composing of the original poems and the time of Proclus these poems were cropped so that they would fit together, but cropped in such a way that they only fit roughly together. I have demonstrated that the epic cycle was manufactured in verse form sometime after the composing of the original poems, probably during the early Hellenistic period (see pp. 34-35 above). This must be the time when this cropping occurred. But why would the creation of a verse epic cycle result in such awkward transitions between the poems? If the poems were cropped, why were they not cropped so that they fit together more harmoniously?

Perhaps the transitions reflect divisions that already existed in these poems.¹¹⁰ The creators of the epic cycle may have been familiar with a system of book division devised for the original poems. They could thus have omitted books from the beginnings and endings of the poems but respected the full extent of the books they retained. A selection of books from the original poems would cause general continuity to be achieved but would allow slight awkwardness to remain at the joins. For example, inconcinnity between the *Ilias parva* and the *Ilii excidium* could have arisen because the compilers of the cycle did not break off until "the first convenient stopping-point" (Monro 1883: 320). This point could have been at the end of a book. The references to books in the introduction to each section of the summary need not indicate the total number of books of the original poems, though that is rarely noticed (see Monro 1901: 342 n.3). One can

¹¹⁰ To some degree I here follow Monro 1883: 316ff., whom Davies 1986: 96 strongly opposes.

easily change customary translations of Proclus from, for example, "following are the five books of the *Aethiopsis*" to "following are five books of the *Aethiopsis*."¹¹¹ In addition, the word "φερόμενα" in the phrase τὰ λεγόμενα Κύπρια ἐν βιβλίοις φερόμενα ἔνδεκα calls attention to the *transmission* of books, as if that is of significance. It certainly would be significant if some books had not been included in this transmission; perhaps this is an oblique acknowledgment that a selection of books is being summarized, not the complete poem. The ποιήματα that Proclus says are still preserved in his day could be the shortened forms of the original poems. Indeed, underlying the report by Photius that Proclus discussed their ἀκολουθία may be an explanation of how selections from the original poems were used to achieve a continuous cycle (Monro 1883: 316).

Let us now examine the problems this theory raises. I argued above that no poet would have created such awkward endings and beginnings. Is it possible that editors, or even the original poets, would have made such divisions for books? Yes, for a division between books is different from an ending or a beginning of a poem. We can imagine a book ending with the quarrel over the arms of Achilles and the next book beginning with the resolution of the quarrel, though such an ending or beginning would be intolerable for an epic poem. Is it likely, however, that book division would exist between the arising and judgment of the quarrel in both the *Aethiopsis* and the *Ilias parva*, so that a book from one poem could be smoothly joined to a book from the other poem? I do not see why that would be impossible. It is beyond belief that a smooth transition could result every time poems were joined together in this manner, but we have seen that this is not the case, for example, with the *Ilias parva* and the *Ilii excidium*.

But could the poems of the epic cycle have been divided into books before the epic cycle was made? We simply do not know. The date of book division has frequently been discussed in relation to the Homeric poems. Many suspect that their book division is

¹¹¹ Monro 1883: 314 translates this phrase similarly. There is no article before book numbers in Proclus except in reference to those of the *Nosti*.

of an Alexandrian date.¹¹² Perhaps during this same period the poems of the epic cycle were divided into books and then a selection of these books were chosen for the construction of a cycle. Or perhaps book divisions existed long before the epic cycle was manufactured. It is evident that the Homeric poems were divided into episodes, at least, as early as the fifth century,¹¹³ and some have supposed that earlier rhapsodes or even Homer required some sort of division for the performance of the poems (e.g. Taplin 1992 and Stanley sense three major divisions in the *Iliad*). It is possible that divisions used by the poet or later rhapsodes are equivalent to some or all of the book divisions that we now know.¹¹⁴ Therefore divisions could have long existed in the original poems of the epic cycle before the cycle was created from them. These divisions could be books of the type mentioned in Proclus and in some fragments,¹¹⁵ or sections appropriate for performance, or even divisions demanded by the exigencies of recording them on writing material. Whatever their origin, such divisions seem to explain best why we have such odd transitions in the summary we possess.

Another pertinent issue is the evidence that lines of verse were concocted or changed at the beginning and ending of the *Iliad* to join it to the epic cycle (see pp. 34-35 above). Perhaps such artificial joins existed between all the poems after the epic cycle was manufactured. If someone took the trouble to create these, why would they not eliminate redundancy or inconcinnity? First of all, it is not clear if these "joins" were part of the cycle, or if they were, how they were made and used. Secondly, it is possible that only slight joins were manufactured, and these were not enough to smooth the awkward transitions between poems. After all, these would have to be made in verse, which would not invite extensive creation.

¹¹² Wilamowitz 369; and now Janko 1992: 31 n.47; Richardson 1993: 20-21; Taplin 1992: 285ff.

¹¹³ Besides Kirk and Stanley (see next note), see Schapiro 103-104; Richardson 1993: 20; cf. G. Nagy 1992: 41.

¹¹⁴ Kirk 1962: 306; Stanley 36ff., 249ff. argue that the book divisions were made before the Alexandrian age.

¹¹⁵ E.g. *Titanomachia* test. 2, *Nosti* fr. 11 Bernabé (Athenaen's 7.277d, 9.399a respectively).

Another possible objection involves the *testimonia* that I have so frequently mentioned concerning the full extent of the original poems. If the poems were shortened in the early Hellenistic period, how could scholars of a later date know their original dimensions? Why do they sometimes seem to speak as if they had read these poems outside of the context of a compilation or summary?¹¹⁶ The original poems need not have disappeared after abridgments and summaries were made of them. A limited number of scholars may have possessed complete texts of them, though the world at large would be more familiar with the useful and therefore more popular epic cycle. Of course, the likelihood of the continued existence of the poems decreases as time goes by. If Proclus lived in the fifth century of our era (see p. 32 above), it is not likely that the original poems were still extant. And even if they were available to him he may have chosen to use their shortened forms, as best creating a continuous story. A discussion of these issues may lie behind the report of the words of Proclus by Photius quoted above (see p. 44).

According to this interpretation, then, an abridgment of poems, or an epic cycle, was made in verse out of books or sections of poems, which were originally much longer. This created a picture of the Trojan war that was generally continuous. However, the transitions between the poems are slightly awkward because no effort was made to change the original scope of the books when different poems were joined together. Such a process explains why slight overlap and inconcinnity exists between the poems in this summary.

The "cyclic" tradition

Now that we have a better understanding of the poems in the epic cycle, we can examine their role in what might be called the "cyclic" tradition. Episodes found in the

¹¹⁶ Such as Pausanias and Athenaeus. At one time it was suspected, rather unreasonably (e.g. by Wilamowitz 338ff.), that these authors were lying when they spoke as if they had read the poems themselves, not summaries.

epic cycle have roots in pre-Homeric myth and continued to be used by poets and artists throughout antiquity. I will now briefly survey this tradition, dividing my examination into two parts. The first part concentrates on art and literature of the Archaic Age that narrated material present in the epic cycle. Since we do not know the date of the poems in the epic cycle, such evidence may not reflect the specific poems later placed in the epic cycle. In this time period we should not consider the "cyclic" tradition as one which results from, or is limited to, the poems we know as part of the epic cycle. But early evidence of cyclic myth demonstrates that whatever the date of the poems in the epic cycle, undoubtedly a "cyclic" tradition existed at an early date. In the second part of my survey I discuss later art and literature that probably were influenced by the poems in the epic cycle. Eventually the living tradition of the Trojan war died out and these poems became the sole or main surviving representatives of the tradition they inherited. Later poets and artists must have relied on the poems of the epic cycle as a source for the story of the Trojan war. What I call the "cyclic" tradition is essentially the living pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan war that led to the poems in the epic cycle; later, having died out, the tradition of the Trojan war became based on these poems. This tradition is the one that preceded and led to the Homeric poems but then in turn was gradually overshadowed and influenced by them.

a. early Archaic Age

Of course, early poems in this tradition would have been oral and are now lost. They may have helped reawaken interest in Bronze Age sites in the late eighth century B.C. or caused the frequency of epic phraseology in lyric poetry of the seventh century B.C., since I noted above (see p. 12) that Homer is probably not the sole cause of those phenomena. Seventh-century poets well knew the story of the Trojan war and were fond of alluding to non-Iliadic Trojan myth.¹¹⁷ Hesiod knows of the birth of Achilles and

¹¹⁷ M. West 1988: 151 provides a brief survey of Trojan war material in seventh-century literature.

Aeneas (*Theog.* 1006ff.) and the gathering at Aulis (*Erg.* 651-653). He knows of fruitful unions between Odysseus and Circe and Odysseus and Calypso (*Theog.* 1011ff.). He also speaks generally of the Trojan war and the Theban war together as a time when heroes died (*Erg.* 156-73). Undoubtedly many oral "cyclic" epics existed in the early Archaic Age, and some poems similar to the ones in the epic cycle were recorded by writing, as a few hints from the ancient world demonstrate (see n.80 above). Alcman refers to Memnon (fr. 68 *PMGF*), and some suspect he knew of Odyssean material from a non-Homeric source (fr. 80 *PMGF*; see p. 19 above). Alcaeus and Sappho have an "obsessive" interest in myth about the Trojan war that may be independent of Homer.¹¹⁸ Stesichorus and other lyric poets like Ibycus also composed about the Trojan war, sometimes at great length (see p. 33 above). Unfortunately so little poetry from the Archaic Age has survived that we do not have a clear picture of cyclic material in the literature of this period. It does seem, however, that there was a strong tradition of cyclic myth.

Art is more revealing than literature on this matter and confirms the impression that cyclic myth was then well-known. We saw above that reflections of the Homeric poems in art are surprisingly late and infrequent. A completely different picture emerges when we look for art about cyclic themes. Early examples of non-Homeric scenes occur more frequently than Homeric ones. No matter how one judges the number of Homeric scenes in early art, it must be admitted that non-Homeric incidents from the Trojan war precede Homeric incidents and remained far more popular in art throughout the seventh century and into the sixth century. A brief perusal of the graphs supplied by Fittschen and Cook make this manifestly clear.¹¹⁹ Snodgrass counts (1980: 71) five Homeric, fifty

¹¹⁸ See M. West 1973: 191; 1988:151; Gentili 37-38. The quotation is from M. West 1988: 151.

¹¹⁹ In Ahlberg-Cornell, as I noted above (see pp. 15-16), several representations implausibly identified as Iliadic precede cyclic ones. Despite this flaw, her graphs at 192ff. also demonstrate the popularity of cyclic representations in early Greek art. See also Notopoulos 27; Snodgrass 1980: 70ff.; Jensen 105-106; Kannicht; and Friis Johansen 1967: 26ff., esp. 38-39, 228 (he states that Homeric scenes were "undeniably eclipsed" by cyclic ones in early art).

scenes; he does not specify which art work he is thinking of). Kannicht interprets (84) seventh-century art about the Trojan war myth as 70% cyclic, 20% "Cyclopeia," and 10% Iliadic (and this too is generous to the *Iliad*). After perusing these calculations we can see that Kirk's statements on this issue can be very misleading. He has claimed (1962: 285) that non-Homeric representations in art dominated only "between 680 and 640;" elsewhere (1985: 4) he rather grudgingly notes that artists had an "equal or greater interest in subjects not in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* but in poems of the epic Cycle." Interpretation of scenes and their dates varies from scholar to scholar, but some cyclic scenes probably appear in late eighth-century art, and early seventh-century art definitely represents episodes we now associate with such poems as the *Cypria*, *Aethiopsis*, *Ilias parva*, and *Ilii excidium*. We need not view the art work as evidence for these specific poems (see p. 28 above), but it is notable that almost all the Trojan war scenes portrayed in early art correspond to episodes in these poems. That is why scholars who make graphs of them use the titles of the various poems in the epic cycle as section headings. This correspondence between early art and the poems of the epic cycle suggests that these poems accurately continued a stable tradition about the Trojan war, a tradition that is at least as old as the late eighth century.

The evidence of art is a rather blunt tool, and the absence of an episode does not prove that it was not known. For example, the death of Achilles is rarely represented in early art, as chapter five will demonstrate, whereas the scene of Ajax carrying his corpse, which necessarily presupposes Achilles' death, is frequent. The lack of Homeric scenes in early art does not prove the Homeric poems did not yet exist, as I stressed earlier in this chapter. However, if we look at all the available evidence of early art, we certainly can conclude that non-Homeric themes about the Trojan war were far more popular than Homeric ones. It should be added that other mythical subjects besides the Trojan war were also popular at this time.¹²⁰

¹²⁰ See Jensen 106; Snodgrass 1980: 71; Cook 2.

This evidence implies that at least some cyclic themes are independent of the Homeric poems and based on a tradition that preceded and survived Homer. No scholar has been able to explain away this evidence. Kirk would have us believe (1962: 285) that the early representations reflect new, non-traditional myth. In fact, he considers cyclic themes in art evidence for an eighth-century date for Homer, on the assumption that cyclic material was invented to complete the Homeric poems. Since he cannot explain why the art work does not reflect the Homeric poems, his argument is very problematic. The lack of Homeric scenes in early art suggests that these mythical episodes could not have been based on the Homeric poems or intended to complete them. They must be based on a pre-Homeric tradition that was known by Homer. It is difficult enough to argue that within a generation the Homeric poems eliminated the genuine Trojan tradition which preceded them and inspired new myth to complete their stories. It is inconceivable that artists would ignore such dominant poems and instead choose to portray the new, non-genuine myth inspired by them.

Another approach has claimed that early artists did not possess the ability to portray the sophisticated nature of the Homeric poems or that somehow this art on non-Homeric subjects actually reflects the spirit of Homer.¹²¹ For those predisposed to view Homer as original and other Trojan myth as derivative, this view may seem an attractive way of explaining away the evidence of art. But artists of the Archaic Age could have portrayed scenes from the Homeric poems.¹²² It is true that the absence of inscriptions on art scenes early in this period would make some scenes difficult to convey. Yet gods are iconographically easy to portray, and one would think that artists aware of a famous *Iliad* could portray a scene such as Thetis and the Nereids in *Il.* 18. Scenes that are frequent in later art, for example the ransom of Hector's body, could easily have been represented by

¹²¹ Cf. Friis Johansen 1967: 228; Fittschen 177; Schefold 29, 195 n.114; Coldstream 1977: 352ff.; and especially Kannicht.

¹²² Thus Ahlberg-Cornell 183, who mocks Kannicht's argument as "remarkable;" of course, she thinks early artists *did* portray Homeric scenes.

iconography without script. And even after labeling by inscription became common in the seventh century we find no rush to represent scenes from the Homeric poems.¹²³ Why do we not find after this time representations of the meeting between Hector and Andromache in *Il.* 6, or the duel between Hector and Achilles? Similar questions can be applied to the reflection of the *Odyssey* in art. Why is only the story of Cyclops portrayed in art before the sixth century? If the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* had dominated the tradition from which they came in the Archaic Age, would artists with the ability to indicate at least some of their scenes from the late eighth century onwards and virtually any scene from the early seventh century onward have refrained from portraying them? The suggestion that art on non-Homeric themes actually reflects the spirit of Homer is obviously untenable. The evidence of art may not prove anything about the date of Homer and the poems found in the epic cycle, but it does indicate that the Homeric poems were not well known in the seventh century, whereas cyclic myth about the Trojan war certainly was. If we lower the date of Homer to the seventh century this would not be surprising. If we date Homer in the eighth century, then we must conclude that he did not heavily influence the tradition of the Trojan war for some time. Even such a prolonged period of indifference to Homer would not be too surprising when we consider the limits that a mostly oral culture placed on the effect of any single poem (see pp. 20ff. above).

b. the "cyclic" tradition after the Archaic Age

As the living oral tradition of the Trojan war died out, the poems of the cycle became increasingly relied upon as a source for the story of the Trojan war throughout antiquity. Gradually their reputations suffered, but as long as they were available—whether in the form of the original, independent poems, or as part of the verse epic cycle, or summarized in epitomes—they continued to be of use to artists, poets, and scholars interested in the complete saga of the Trojan war. It is possible that the tradition of the

¹²³ Inscriptions identifying figures in art begin at c.675; see Ahlberg-Cornell 176-178.

Trojan war survived in part outside the influence of the epic cycle, but the cycle must be considered the main source for myth about the Trojan war in later times. Since the summary by Proclus does not provide us with as much information about these poems as we wish, all post-Archaic art and literature that may have used them for sources should be examined in trying to reconstruct the contents of these poems. The more we can ascertain about the poems of the epic cycle, the more we can potentially know about pre-Homeric myth.

Evidence for the contents of the poems of the epic cycle does exist outside of Proclus. As we have seen already in this chapter, scholars from antiquity provide us with many useful *testimonia* about these poems. The account of the Trojan war in Apollodorus is invaluable because it is undoubtedly based on the cycle and is usually more detailed than Proclus.¹²⁴ Art or literature influenced by the poems of the epic cycle may also provide us with further details about their contents. Pindar and the tragedians were obviously well-versed in cyclic material and perhaps depended on the poems we know in the epic cycle as a source.¹²⁵ The cycle also seems to be an important source for the narration of post-Iliadic events in the Trojan war by Quintus of Smyrna.¹²⁶ These authors were creative and inventive, but it is clear that they are retelling traditional stories. The traditional foundation in other authors is considerably harder to ascertain. Philostratus (author of the *Heroicus*; a second Philostratus who described paintings will also be

¹²⁴ See p. 35 above; Davies 1986: 104ff. cautions that one cannot tell when Apollodorus turns to other sources.

¹²⁵ On Pindar's use of cyclic material see King 56-66, 122, esp. 66. Nisetich well demonstrates Pindar's respect for Homer, but his assumption (22) that Pindar could not value cyclic poets that we do not value is problematic. It is possible that Pindar knew the poems of the epic cycle because society was becoming thoroughly literate in the fifth century, but I suspect that even for authors of his age the cyclic tradition was not just a few texts. G. Nagy 1990b: 414ff. argues that Pindar's use cyclic material is more than "merely borrowings from the Cycle" and suggests that Pindar is "drawing upon a continuum of epic tradition."

¹²⁶ The influence may be indirect and other sources are also probably used. In addition, Quintus employs an expansive style, employing Homer as his model, which undoubtedly results in serious changes of his sources. See Combellack 1968: 8-9; Vian 86ff., esp. 108-109. J. Kakridis 1949: 75ff. bases a brilliant argument about pre-Homeric myth on information gained from Quintus, for which see further at p. 250 in chapter four.

discussed in this study) and Dictys/Dares are "anti-Homerist" authors who seek to give a realistic "correct" view of the war, and as a result their works are self-consciously sophisticated, exuberantly inventive, and perversely idiosyncratic. Nonetheless, they apparently use the cycle in this endeavor, and occasionally their works can be sifted for potentially traditional material.¹²⁷ Of course, caution must be employed when using them. The same can be said for the verse of Lycophron and Tzetzes on the Trojan war, which seems to contain much late and obscure material.

Art, on the other hand, continues to supply a great amount of information about the Trojan war throughout antiquity. The Trojan bowls and Iliac tables call for special attention, for they claim to represent the epic cycle. They were not isolated examples of such work (see Kopff 58), and perhaps were part of a tradition of illustrated texts of the epic cycle or a tradition of art work that featured cyclic material.¹²⁸ There are some odd aspects about their contents, and caution should again be applied when using the evidence they provide.¹²⁹ On the whole, however, it is justifiable to believe that art and literature throughout antiquity, no matter how late, may contain some pre-Homeric myth.¹³⁰ How much is traditional and how much is invented is the question facing any scholar. A second question is the influence of Homer. The eventual dominance of Homer makes it possible that authors after his time based their stories on the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, not on traditions reaching back to pre-Homeric time. In the next section of my chapter I consider these questions in regard to the epic cycle. Since the epic cycle is the main source of our information about the Trojan war, and since it was also an influence on later authors and

¹²⁷ For the principles of composition behind Dictys/Dares, see R. Frazer 1966: 5ff. Of course, the conceit that their work represents contemporary documents of the Trojan war is a fraud. Allen 1924 is wrong to see them as inheriting a true tradition (ch. 7, "Dictys of Crete: The Heroic Chronicle;" 130ff.); his compilation of similarities and variances between Dictys/Dares and the cycle is useful, however). Kullmann 1960: 70 n.9; Lord 158 believe there may be wheat among the chaff. For the principles of composition in Philostratus, see Anderson.

¹²⁸ Cf. Weitzmann 31ff.; Horsfall 46ff.

¹²⁹ See Horsfall; and on the Borgia table, McLeod 1985.

¹³⁰ Cf. the confident remarks on the ability to use post-Homeric evidence for pre-Homeric traditions by Willcock 1973: 4ff.; Mueller 28; Brillante 113ff.; Mondì 157ff.; Slatkin 1ff. Neo-analysts in general share this confidence, as will become clear in chapter four below.

artists interested in the Trojan war, an understanding of its relationship to Homer is very important.

3. The Relation between the Epic Cycle and Homer¹³¹

I demonstrated earlier in this chapter that Homer was not greatly influential in the Archaic Age and that the pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan war must have continued to thrive after his time. The evidence of art shows that "cyclic" themes, i.e. material found in the poems of the epic cycle, were dominant from at least the beginning of the seventh century and well into the sixth century. It is therefore likely that the poems of the epic cycle are largely based on a tradition which reaches back into a pre-Homeric past. Were they also influenced by Homer? Undoubtedly the Homeric poems became increasingly influential as time went on, and I have demonstrated that by the end of the sixth century the name "Homer" had become famous as that of a great poet. If the poems of the epic cycle were composed after the Homeric poems, as I assume they were, their contents could be based on both pre-Homeric traditions and Homer. To what extent they were based on each is a very difficult question to decide. It will be necessary, therefore, to look closely at the contents of the poems of the epic cycle before reaching conclusions.

There are two extreme views on this issue. According to one, the poems of the epic cycle are based entirely on Homer and not on any genuine tradition.¹³² This view is very unlikely for many reasons. We saw above that Homer extensively alludes to "cyclic" material that apparently existed in a widely developed tradition that preceded him (see p. 9ff. above). Some have tried to deny that Homer does allude to "cyclic" material by

¹³¹ I regret that what appears to be a most learned recent work on this subject, by M. Oka ("Homer and the Epic Cycle," *Memoirs of the Faculty of Letters, Kyoto University* 16 [1976]: 55-338), is only available in Japanese (Bernabé xxii is incorrect to report that there is an English résumé). Kullmann 1960: 18ff. usefully surveys research on this topic by scholars from the unitarian, analyst, and neo-analyst schools.

¹³² E.g. Monro 1884, 1901: 350 ff.; Wade-Gery (though these two display brief moments of hesitation); Forsdyke; Andersen 1982: 8-9.

labeling such passages later interpolations (see p. 10 above). Others have suggested that the apparent allusions to cyclic material are only *ad hoc* details invented for background verisimilitude (see pp. 11-12 above). If that were true, then the fuller accounts of such material in the epic cycle would be nothing but the expansion of details mined from Homer.¹³³ But not all of Homer's allusions to "cyclic" material can be explained away in this manner, and art gives ample testimony that cyclic material existed at early date (see pp. 50ff. above). We may conclude that the cyclic tradition is pre-Homeric and that the poems of the epic cycle are based on it.

According to a second extreme view the poems of the epic cycle are completely independent of Homer. This view would require the argument that the original poems did not surround and fill in the gaps between the Homeric poems, as they seem to do in the summary of the epic cycle by Proclus. In addition, material similar to both Homer and the cycle has to be explained as the result of a common tradition. Below I will demonstrate that these are possibilities that should be taken into consideration, though firm conclusions cannot be reached. What seems very unlikely to me, however, is a radical form of this extreme view: the proposal that the poems of the epic cycle influenced Homer. Such an argument necessarily depends on dating the poems before Homer. Analysts who tended to place the cycle somewhere between early and late parts of the *Iliad* pioneered this line of thought (Allen must have been thinking of them when he labeled the concept a fad of "singular perversity" [1924: 72]), and neo-analysts at one time generated much controversy by sometimes advocating this idea. Recently, however, they have ceased to suggest that the poems in the epic cycle preceded the *Iliad*, a development that has made their arguments more attractive, in my opinion (see pp. 180ff. below in chapter four).

The *communis opinio* lies between the two extreme views. According to this moderate view, the poems of the epic cycle, though influenced by Homer, do contain pre-

¹³³ Rzsch 2378; Murray 196-197; J. Kakridis 1949: 93-94 effectively criticize this notion.

Homeric traditions not derived from Homer.¹³⁴ Opinion varies widely on the extent of the traditional material in the cyclic poems, however. An obstacle to crediting the cycle with a great amount of traditional material is its apparent dependence on Homer. The poems in it seem to surround the Homeric poems and seem to have detailed knowledge of them, which leads many to believe that they are based more on Homer than on a pre-Homeric tradition. In addition, their tone and cultural practices are frequently very different from that of the Homeric poems. This presents a different obstacle to crediting them with much traditional material, for it is usually concluded that these non-Homeric aspects are "late," i.e. they originated in post-Homeric times. If that is true, then much of the material in the epic cycle was not based on pre-Homeric myth but was invented in a later and different time from that of Homer.

In this study I will follow the *communis opinio* but stress that the influence of Homer has not overwhelmed the traditional nature of the poems in the epic cycle. Examination of several issues will demonstrate that certain assumptions about the nature of the poems in the epic cycle are debatable. Scholars have been too eager to conclude that the poems in the epic cycle are derivative from Homer, not from tradition. They have also too quickly labeled the contents of the cycle "late" and untraditional. Below I will explore the validity of these reasons for suspecting the traditional nature of the epic cycle. The manner in which the poems of the epic cycle seem to surround the *Iliad* may be illusory. In addition, the apparent dependency of some material in the epic cycle on the *Iliad* is often better explained as resulting from shared traditions, not from the influence

¹³⁴ This view, well discussed and graphed at Kullmann 1960: 360ff. (model no.3), has been ascendant since Welcker (his attitude is summarized by Kullmann 1960: 18-19, 1986: 116ff.). Such a position is held in some form by such diverse scholars as A. Lang 335ff.; Chadwick 236; Murray 359-360; Rzach 2378; Severyns 1928: 333; Nilsson 1932: 1, 1933: 207, 249ff., 1949: 43-44; Scheliba 81ff.; Webster 1958: 250-251; Lord 150; Davison 1962: 257; Lesky 1967: 77, 137-38; Huxley 124, 161; Dible 9-10, 43, 146; Willcock 1973: 4-5; Griffin 1977: 40-41; Kannicht (see esp. his graph on 71); Clarke 213; Schein 18-19; Davies 1989a: 4-5, 1989b: 100 n.64; Barron/Easterling 66; Hainsworth 1993a: 44. Allen in his unusual theory about Dictys representing a pre-Homeric, written verse "chronicle" (1924: 130ff.) assumes the cycle knew this chronicle and therefore is largely pre-Homeric. Though neo-analysts have stressed the pre-Homeric aspects of the cycle, they and others influenced by their theories often belong to this category, especially Heubeck 1991, 1954: 88ff.

of the *Iliad* on the poems of the epic cycle. Finally, the common listings of "late" material in the epic cycle are very misleading and need to be challenged. Often it is apparent that Homer himself knew of such "late" material but suppressed it. And non-Homeric aspects of the poems in the epic cycle do not indicate that they date from a later time. In fact often it seems that cyclic material is more traditional than the idiosyncratic nature of the Homeric poems.

Since I suspect that the poems of the epic cycle are later than Homer, I would not claim that Homer had no influence on them, or that they contain no aspects which originated in post-Homeric times. But even if Homer had some influence on the poems of the epic cycle, that would not lessen the traditional basis for much of their material. And even if one poem were deemed to be entirely dependent on Homer, or full of untraditional material, that would prove nothing about the other poems. There is not enough space in this study to examine the whole cycle in an effort to determine the traditional nature of every incident in it, but I will examine some material very closely in order to demonstrate that previous conclusions may have been hasty. A fresh consideration of these issues without prejudice will lead to the conclusion that in fact the poems of the epic cycle are largely traditional.

Cropping of the epic cycle around the *Iliad*?

First the apparent encircling of the *Iliad* by the *Cypria* and the *Aethiopis* should be examined. Did the original poems lead up to the *Iliad* and then proceed from where it finished, as it appears from Proclus' summary? That has been a common view since ancient times, and in fact this apparent surrounding of Homer has been considered the main characteristic of the epic cycle (see *Cyclus epicus* test. 11, 12 Bernabé). That view of the epic cycle is unfair to it, for the theogonic and Theban war sections of the cycle (see p. 32 above) cannot be said to surround the Homeric poems. Indeed, the neglect of these sections of the epic cycle has made the Homeric poems seem more central to the

epic cycle than they really were. And the obvious tampering with the original dimensions of the poems in the epic cycle should at least make us wonder if the same type of tampering occurred with the ending of the *Cypria* and the beginning of the *Aethiopsis*.

a. the end of the Cypria

Let us look at the *Cypria* first. Near the end of it Proclus reports a division of spoils in which Achilles received Briseis and Agamemnon received Chryseis. Thereupon followed the death of Palamedes, a plan of Zeus to remove Achilles from the Greek alliance, and finally a catalogue of Trojan allies. The mention of Briseis and Chryseis and the plan to remove Achilles from the alliance certainly seem like preparation for the *Iliad*. Monro has suggested (1884: 4-5) that the original form of the *Cypria* did not contain this plan to remove Achilles, arguing that since the *Cypria* opens with a plan of Zeus to begin the Trojan war (according to Proclus) a second plan of Zeus has no place in the poem. But this second plan could be a continuation of the first one. Zeus at the start of the *Cypria* apparently intends to destroy Greeks as well as Trojans by causing the Trojan war,¹³⁵ and Achilles' withdrawal causes many Greek deaths, as the proem of the *Iliad* stresses.¹³⁶ And though we have seen that the summary of the epic cycle often does not accurately reflect the extent of the original poems, there is not much evidence that the internal details of the poems were misrepresented. In this case there is no reason to doubt Proclus in his report that Zeus planned to remove Achilles from the Greek alliance.

¹³⁵ See scholia listed at Bernabè pp. 43-44, under *Cypria* fr. 1.

¹³⁶ Recognition that the plan of Zeus at the beginning of the *Cypria* is similar to long-standing Near Eastern myth about de-populating the earth (notably by flood; see Scodel 1982 on reflection of this in the *Iliad*) has undercut the view that it is simply an expansion of the plan of Zeus mentioned at *Il.* 1.5. See Webster 1958: 180ff.; Kullmann 1960: 227ff., 1991: 432; Slatkin 118ff.; Burkert 1992: 103. The plan of Zeus at *Il.* 1.5 has usually been understood since ancient times (see Kirk 1985 *ad loc.*) as a reference to Zeus's later agreement with the request of Thetis to honor Achilles. Kullmann argues that it is an allusion to Zeus's first plan in the *Cypria*; Notopoulos 33-34 and M. Edwards 1987a: 175 argue it refers to neither Zeus's agreement with Thetis' request (I do not think it is) nor to his plan in the *Cypria*, but to his general will.

Others have argued that the ending of the *Cypria* actually does not agree with the *Iliad*. Allen thinks the *Cypria* is narrating a variant account of Achilles' wrath, pre-Homeric in origin, in which the murder of Palamedes is the cause of Achilles' withdrawal.¹³⁷ The unfortunately concise summary by Proclus does not provide us with enough information to disprove this theory, but it seems unlikely. It is difficult to understand why Allen, who thinks the *Cypria* is designed to introduce the *Iliad*, does not think it would correspond to the *Iliad* on this matter. Kullmann has argued that the *Cypria* is preparing for the *Aethiopsis*, not the *Iliad*. He supposes that the plan of Zeus in the *Cypria* to remove Achilles from the Greek alliance is fulfilled by actions of Achilles in the *Aethiopsis*—Achilles temporarily departs from Troy to be purified of a murder, and Kullmann believes he withdraws from battle after a prophecy from Thetis.¹³⁸ But it is hard to see why the *Cypria* would mention Briseis and Chryseis at all if it did not know the story of Achilles' quarrel with Agamemnon and subsequent withdrawal from battle. One of the more compelling points of Kullmann, however, is that Zeus's second plan in the *Cypria* does not exactly correspond to the request of Thetis in the *Iliad*. In the *Cypria* the quarrel is part of Zeus's plan, and his purpose is to help the Trojans. In the *Iliad*, Zeus agrees to a request by Thetis after the quarrel, and the request is to honor her son. The help given to the Trojans is only a means to achieve this end, not the end itself. Davies acknowledges this discrepancy (1989a: 50), but prefers to think that either the *Cypria* revised the story of the *Iliad*, or the *Cypria* was inaccurately summarized so that it appeared to introduce the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon, though in fact it originally did not (Davies, influenced by Severyns [see p. 42 above], thinks such tampering to the summary would have occurred after the time of Proclus). Why the

¹³⁷ Allen 1924: 72-73, citing a few ancient sources which follow this version.

¹³⁸ Kullmann 1960: 109, 212-214, 225-26, 358-359, 1991: 438 (Kullmann is more cautious here, and admits that the *Cypria* may introduce the *Iliad*). For his belief that Achilles withdraws from battle in the *Aethiopsis* see further pp. 192ff., 217ff. below in chapter four. Bethe 1966: 50ff. had earlier proposed that the cyclic epics, though originally conceived separately, were at one time joined together (see Kullmann's discussion of his theory at 1960: 20).

Cypria would revise a poem it strives to introduce is unclear; on the other hand, I have pointed out above that there is little evidence that the summary of Proclus does not accurately reflect the internal details of the original poems of the epic cycle. Perhaps the quarrel of Achilles and Agamemnon was traditional, and the *Cypria* independently narrated a version which was slightly different from the one which the *Iliad* told.

It is notable that the summary indicates that the *Cypria* did not end with the capture of Briseis and Chryseis. It continues on with the death of Palamedes and a catalogue of Trojan allies. Of course, the quarrel over these women does not have to follow immediately after their capture, and the poet of the *Cypria* may have simply wished to include additional material at that point. Something like the death of Palamedes, a character not mentioned by Homer, could easily fit in then. The *Cypria*'s catalogue of Trojan allies, however, remains a problem, and in fact its presence suggests that the *Cypria* did not intend to introduce the *Iliad*.

Kullmann's argument (1960: 214, 1991: 438) that this catalogue of Trojan allies is a reference to Penthesileia, Memnon, and Eurypylos is unlikely. If Apollodorus follows the *Cypria* in the contents of the catalogue (he does in its placement in the narrative), then the allies come from neighboring towns. Huxley best explains (140-141) why a catalogue would exist at this point in *Cypria*. Inhabitants of the sacked neighboring towns would flee to Troy, and the whole of Asia Minor would now be roused to defend Troy. What is remarkable about the catalogue in the *Cypria* is that it is very similar to the one found in book 2 of the *Iliad*, if Apollodorus has based his version on the *Cypria*. It is therefore doubtful that the *Cypria* is supplementing the *Iliad* with its Trojan catalogue, as Monro and Allen suggested.¹³⁹

Why would a work introducing the *Iliad* contain a catalogue of Trojan allies which largely duplicates the *Iliad*'s own catalogue of allies? The fact that the catalogue of Trojan allies is missing from the summary of the *Cypria* in one manuscript of the *Iliad*

¹³⁹ Monro 1901: 351; Allen 1908: 82ff.

seems to indicate that someone considered it to duplicate the catalogue in book 2 of the *Iliad*, and so omitted it (Huxley 140-141). M. West agrees (1966: 402) that these catalogues would have been similar and concludes that such reduplication would not have been tolerated in the epic cycle, suggesting that one catalogue of Trojan allies appeared in either the *Cypria* or the *Iliad*, not both. Davies has called this idea "the merest speculation" (1986: 96 n.39) but elsewhere supposes (1989a: 50) that the *Iliad* originally did not have the Trojan catalogue. If one must make a choice, it seems that such a catalogue would more naturally belong to the *Cypria*.

Yet if the *Cypria* was not originally meant to introduce the *Iliad*, then it is no surprise that both it and the *Iliad* contain a version of a traditional catalogue of the Trojans.¹⁴⁰ M. West's assumption that the cycle did not tolerate reduplication is not always true, as we saw above with the divisions between poems. It is possible that the editors of the cycle allowed the catalogue of Trojan allies to stand in the *Cypria* because it existed within the last book of the *Cypria* included in the cycle. As I suggested above, some books from the beginnings and endings of the original poems of the epic cycle might have been excluded when the epic cycle was manufactured, with the complete form of retained books preserved even if they did not join smoothly with other poems in the epic cycle. The Trojan catalogue could have thus been preserved as a final item of the last book retained from the original form of the *Cypria*, even though the Trojan catalogue of the *Cypria* reduplicated information in the *Iliad*.

I am suggesting as part of this argument that the original form of the *Cypria* did not end where the summary says that it does, with a Trojan catalogue. Is there any

¹⁴⁰ Though Proclus does not indicate that the *Cypria* contained a catalogue of the Greek ships, perhaps it also independently contained a traditional version of this, occurring at its most natural place, the gathering at Aulis. Proclus or his predecessors might not have specifically mentioned a catalogue of ships because they considered it obviously part of the gathering at Aulis (two such gatherings are mentioned in the summary of the *Cypria*). Wade-Gery 49ff., 55, 84-85 nn.113, 114 explores the possibility that both catalogues (of ships and Trojan allies) existed in the pre-Homeric tradition and that various post-Homeric manifestations of them may be more traditional than their Homeric versions (he focuses on Hellanicus, but also considers the *Cypria*). He points out that these catalogues most naturally occur at Aulis and after the Greek foray into the Troad. That is where Apollodorus places them (*Epir.* 3.11ff.; 3.34).

evidence that it continued after its catalogue of Trojan allies? Surprisingly, two *testimonia* about the *Cypria* mention events concerned with the sack of Troy. A line of verse attributed to Stasinus, the reputed author of the *Cypria*, states that it is foolish to spare the children of a slain man (fr. 33 Bernabé). This is usually taken to be spoken in reference to the death of Astyanax.¹⁴¹ A scholiast reports that the author of the *Cypria* related that Polyxena died after having been wounded by Odysseus and Diomedes in the taking of Troy (fr. 34 Bernabé; more commonly she is said to have been slaughtered at the grave of Achilles, as in the summary of the *Ilii excidium* by Proclus). These details should not be in a poem which ends before the events of the *Iliad*, and no satisfactory explanation of them has been offered. Some critics have suggested that the attributions are wrong,¹⁴² and others have argued that the deaths of Astyanax and Polyxena were related in predictions or proleptic digressions in the *Cypria*.¹⁴³ But the description of Polyxena's fate in fragment 34 seems too detailed to belong in a prediction. One might also wonder why a poem designed to introduce the *Iliad* would be so concerned with post-Iliadic events. A possible solution of this problem is that the original *Cypria* covered the whole Trojan war, including a simpler version of major events in the *Iliad*.¹⁴⁴ I hasten to add that this need not mean that the *Cypria* is earlier than the *Iliad*, or its source. Nor does it necessarily mean that the poet of the *Cypria* was unaware of the *Iliad*. It would

¹⁴¹ Davies 1989a: 51 questions this conclusion.

¹⁴² Jouan 1966: 372 n.5 denies the suggestion (e.g. by Welcker 2: 528, following Müller) that fr. 33 belonged to the *Ilii excidium*. Welcker 2: 164; Wilamowitz 181 n.27; Bethe 1966: 18, 69 n.5 argued that the "*Cypriaka*" (τὰ Κυπριακά) mentioned in fr. 34 is actually not the *Cypria*. But "*Cypriaka*" was a common variation of the *Cypria*'s title; see Bethe 1966: 18; Bernabé p. 38.

¹⁴³ E.g. Rzsch 2394; Jouan 1966: 373 in reference to fr. 33; Davies 1989a: 51; Bernabé (under fr. 34) in reference to fr. 34.

¹⁴⁴ Huxley 158 concedes that the *Cypria* might have covered the whole war. Bethe 1966: 68ff., 137-138 denies that there could have been a cyclic version of the events in the *Iliad*. Lowenstam, however, has argued (1993b) that early art indicates there were other versions of the *Iliad*. The use of the title *Cypria Ilias* by Naevius (fr. 6 Bernabé) may suggest that author knew an original version of the poem which covered the events in the *Iliad* or the whole war. An Iliac table implies that the capture of Chryseis is related in the *Iliad* (Sadurska 41; cf. Weitzman 42-43; Horsfall 47); this confusion may have arisen as a result of shared material between the two poems. I also wonder if the charge by Pollianus (*Cyclius epicus* test. 21 Bernabé) that cyclic poets stole from Homer to such a degree that they even wrote "μήνιν ἄειδε, θεά" results from a mistaken belief that shared traditional material belonged to Homer. But such evidence is admittedly more suggestive than conclusive.

mean that the original version of the *Cypria*, commonly viewed as a mere appendage to the *Iliad*, was in fact no such thing.

b. the beginning of the Aethiopis

Next let us consider whether the *Aethiopis* began where the *Iliad* ends. A variant of the last line of the *Iliad* seems to indicate that it did: "Ὡς οἱ γ' ἀμφίεπον τάφον Ἐκτορος· ἦλθε δ' Ἀμαζών/ Ἄρηος θυγάτηρ μεγαλήτορος ἀνδροφόνιοι."¹⁴⁵ The summary of the *Aethiopis* by Proclus begins with reference to this Amazon, Penthesileia. If the variant ending of the *Iliad* was the beginning of *Aethiopis*, then it would be undeniable evidence that the poems of the epic cycle were built around the *Iliad*. That seems to be a common assumption. But though some have accepted these lines as the genuine beginning of the *Aethiopis*, most scholars, including the two most recent editors of the fragments, Bernabé and Davies, consider the verses to be manufactured by a rhapsode or grammarian as a join.¹⁴⁶ It is extremely doubtful that any epic poem would begin without a proem, or that the poet of the *Aethiopis* would choose to begin his poem by changing the second half of the last line of the *Iliad*.¹⁴⁷ Even if the *Aethiopis* was designed to provide a sequel to the *Iliad*, I do not think it could have started so abruptly.

Since we have seen that the boundaries to these poems set by Proclus are often inaccurate, we might even wonder if the original poem actually began with the arrival of Penthesileia. Some evidence suggests that it may not have. A set of Homeric bowls portray three scenes (with inscriptions): the ransom of Hector's corpse, the arrival of Penthesileia, and Achilles meeting Penthesileia in battle.¹⁴⁸ On the basis of this evidence, Kopff has argued that the original *Aethiopis* contained the ransom of Hector and his

¹⁴⁵ *Aethiopis* fr. 1 Bernabé. Bernabé also includes a variant of the second line found in a papyrus.

¹⁴⁶ Welcker 1: 199; Allen 1908: 85; Lesky 1966: 83, 1967: 138 accept the verses as genuine, but Wilamowitz 373; Mourou 1884: 12-13; Jebb 154; Rzach 2396; J. Kakridis 1949: 90; Kullmann 1960: 46; Notopoulos 36-37; Dihle 43 n.54; Griffin 1980: 159 n.29; Davies 1989a: 61 do not. See further the notes by Bernabé under fr. 1.

¹⁴⁷ The *Iliad* may not even have originally contained the last line attributed to it; see p. 67 below.

¹⁴⁸ *Aethiopis* test. 11 Bernabé (Sinn MB 23-26).

funeral (at least) before continuing on to narrate the arrival of Penthesileia.¹⁴⁹ The more common interpretation is that scenes have been brought together from two different works, the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopsis*, perhaps under the influence of the join discussed immediately above (fr. 1 Bernabé).¹⁵⁰ Kopff counters in two ways: first, by pointing out that these bowls do not otherwise contaminate scenes from different works, and secondly, by arguing that the bowls and the Iliac tables stem from different traditions. The attempt to disassociate the bowls from the tables is central to Kopff's argument. He groups the tables, Apollodorus, and the epic cycle in a tradition which has shortened the poems in order to present a continuous narrative. If the bowls are to provide evidence for an *Aethiopsis* with a beginning different from the one in Proclus, they cannot belong to this tradition. In addition, the Iliac tables can be inaccurate (see p. 55 above), and Kopff wants to portray the bowls as reliable reflections of the poems they illustrate. Webster has brought into question the accuracy of the bowls (1964: 150ff.), demonstrating they do not always report episodes of their sources in the proper order. On the other hand, *testimonia* confirm some information on the bowls (and tables) which would otherwise seem wrong. For example, another set of Homeric bowls indicates that Priam died in the *Ilias parva* (*Iliades parvae* fr. 16 [I] Bernabé [Sinn MB 27-29]), and an Iliac table indicates that the madness of Ajax occurred in the *Aethiopsis* (*Aethiopsis* test. 8 Bernabé [Sadurska 29ff.]).¹⁵¹ Though these events do not fit in the boundaries for the poems that Proclus provides, other *testimonia* confirm that these events did indeed occur in those poems. Perhaps Kopff has correctly argued that a set of Homeric bowls reveal that the *Aethiopsis* started earlier than Proclus would lead us to believe.¹⁵²

¹⁴⁹ I do not agree with his argument that the *Aethiopsis* is pre-Homeric.

¹⁵⁰ Cf. Severyns 1928: 314; Lesky 1966: 83; Weitzmann 43-44; Horsfall 47. Certainly later art works featuring a "cycle" of scenes from the life of Achilles mixed Homeric and cyclic material (e.g. LIMC "Achilles" no. 856 depicts the dragging of Hector's corpse and then the death of Achilles).

¹⁵¹ But note that the tables generally seem to belong to a tradition of shortened poems.

¹⁵² Kopff 60 also cites as evidence a Roman sarcophagus lid (LIMC "Andromache I" no. 40, 2nd c. of our era) which shows two scenes of Andromache mourning interspersed with two scenes of Penthesileia arriving and preparing to fight. He thinks these scenes were based on the *Aethiopsis* (similarly Weitzman

Once again it is possible that the original version of a poem in the epic cycle narrated material also covered by the *Iliad*, and so was cropped. Leaf once noted the argument of Fick that the first line of the "join" between the *Iliad* and the *Aethiopsis* (Il. 24.804) never belonged to the *Iliad* in any form, and pointed out that ὤς usually introduces new material in Homer.¹⁵³ If this argument is correct then the two lines may not be a manufactured join at all. Both verses could have been in the *Aethiopsis*, not at the beginning, but at a later point (Kopff 60-61). In accordance with my theory about the manufacture of the epic cycle, these lines could have begun a book about the arrival of Penthesileia, which originally followed a book about the funeral of Hector. After a verse epic cycle portrayed the lines as the beginning of a sequel to the *Iliad*, the first line could have become incorporated into the *Iliad* with a slight change. The line δώμασιν ἐν Πριάμοιο, διοτρεφέος βασιλῆος could be the original ending of the *Iliad*, with dissatisfaction over its anticlimactic nature leading to the incorporation from the *Aethiopsis* of the line which now ends our *Iliad*.

Possible extent of the original poems

I pointed out above that a fragment about the suicide of Ajax reveals that the *Aethiopsis* extended at least a little beyond the boundary given to it in Proclus (see p. 39 above). Did the *Aethiopsis* originally continue even further, beyond the suicide of Ajax? Kullmann has argued (1960: 225, 359) that the poem originally joined with the *Ilii excidium*, pointing out that the author of both was said to be Arctinus. The attributions to authors are probably too unreliable for this argument to be persuasive. But Dionysius of

45), and that the scene of Andromache mourning occurred during the funeral of Hector. The latter assumption is necessary to make this evidence support his thesis, but may not be correct. In addition, Kopff 59 suggests that the *Aethiopsis* is the source for early art work which portrays events from the end of the *Iliad* in a non-Iliadic manner (cf. n.144 above). However, the *Aethiopsis* need not be the source for such art, if indeed the art does not reflect the *Iliad*.

¹⁵³ Leaf 1886-1888 (1st edition, only) *ad loc.*

Halicarnassos reports that Arctinus spoke of the stealing of the palladion (*Ilii excidium* fr. 1 Bernabé), an event which occurs only in the *Ilias parva* section of Proclus. In addition, a fragment attributed to the *Ilii excidium* discusses Machaon and Podalirius (fr. 4 Bernabé). Some conclude it refers to the cure of Philoctetes, which occurs in the *Ilias parva* section of Proclus; Kullmann links it with the madness of Ajax (1960: 336, 1981: 40-41). We still cannot decide with confidence the boundaries of the *Aethiopsis* (and the *Ilii excidium*), but this evidence might suggest that either the *Aethiopsis* continued much further than its boundary in Proclus or the *Ilii excidium* began much earlier than its boundary in Proclus (or both).

The *Ilias parva* originally extended to cover the fall of Troy, as I pointed out above (see p. 39). Did it begin earlier than where Proclus indicates it does? A frequently discussed piece of evidence concerning the contents of the *Ilias parva* comes from chapter 23 of the *Poetics* by Aristotle. Listed there are the titles of plays that could be composed from the material in the *Ilias parva* (*Iliades parvae* test. 7 Bernabé). Remarkably, the material indicated by these titles corresponds to the material of both the *Ilias parva* and the *Ilii excidium* in the summary of the epic cycle by Proclus. This passage thus agrees with other evidence that indicates the *Ilias parva* narrated the fall of Troy. It also suggests that the poem began where Proclus reports it does. However, the passage listing titles of plays is very odd and commonly considered an interpolation.¹⁵⁴

We may therefore proceed to explore the possibility that the original form of the *Ilias parva* had an earlier beginning than the one reported by Proclus. One fragment attributed to the *Ilias parva* tells how Achilles was blown to Scyros after his encounter with Telephus, an event from the early years of the war (*Iliades parvae* fr. 24 Bernabé, under "*Incerti operis fragmenta*;" cf. the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus). This, however, may be a retrospective passage from the episode in the *Ilias parva* in which

¹⁵⁴ Else prints his text of this passage at 580 with two sets of brackets, having decided that interpolations were made by two different hands under the influence of Proclus; he explains his reasoning at 587ff.

Neoptolemus is fetched from Scyros.¹⁵⁵ It therefore does not necessarily indicate that the *Ilias parva* narrated the beginnings of the Trojan war. The *Vita Homeri Herodotea* states that the *Ilias parva* opened with the lines Ἴλιον αἰίδω καὶ Δαρδανίαν εὐπωλον/ ἧς πέρι πόλλ' ἔπαθον Δαναοί, θεράποντες Ἄρηος (*Iliades parvae* fr. 28 Bernabé). These lines might suggest that the whole war will be narrated, especially since they stress the suffering of the Greeks, not the Trojans.¹⁵⁶ A final piece of evidence to consider is a Homeric cup. One scene on it, labeled as belonging to the *Ilias parva*, features Hector, who of course died long before the beginning given to the poem by Proclus.¹⁵⁷ The evidence is not conclusive, but the *Ilias parva* may have told the story of the whole Trojan war, just as the *Cypria* may have.

It is common to think that the pre-Homeric tradition consisted of short songs, not long poems telling the story of the whole war.¹⁵⁸ The short songs by Phemius and Demodocus in the *Odyssey* are often thought to be representative of pre-Homeric epic, and old analyst views about short lays leading to longer cycles still seem to have a vague influence on thought about this matter. It is more logical to assume that expanded songs about episodes occurred after the story of the war was known and narrated as a whole (see J. Kakridis 1949: 91ff.). Of course, both types—the complete overview of the war and songs focusing on individual episodes—could have co-existed. Poems of greater scope would necessarily require a concise and swiftly moving style.¹⁵⁹ The original poems of the cycle certainly covered more ground than the Homeric poems and

¹⁵⁵ Thus Bethe 1966: 69-70; Monro 1901: 366; Davies 1989a: 66.

¹⁵⁶ Bethe 1966: 64-65; Monro: 1901: 364; Kullmann 1981: 39-40 suggest this proem is meant to introduce the final fall of Troy, not the whole war. Bernabé lists it under "*alterius Iliadis Parvae vel aliarum Iliadum Parvarum fragmenta*," supposing that the *Ilias parva* cited is not the *Ilias parva* in the cycle (he considers a different fragment [fr. 1 Bernabé] to be the proem of this *Ilias parva*). Note that it is his speculation about multiple "*Little Iliads*" that also lies behind his placement of a papyrus fragment concerning the death of Achilles [*Iliades parvae "fragmentum dubium"* 32, mentioned above at n.80] in his *Iliades parvae* section, not in his *Aethiopsis* section.

¹⁵⁷ Simm MB 32 (see comments at p. 53); cf. *Iliades parvae* test. 1 Bernabé.

¹⁵⁸ E.g. Bowra 1930: 29-30, 1955: 29; Hainsworth 1993a: 43-44; Jensen 33-34 (adducing comparative evidence). Nilsson 1932: 25; Thornton 1984: 10-11 oppose this view.

¹⁵⁹ Besides Kakridis, see M. Edwards 1987a: 76; 1987b: 50; Hoelscher 56.

fragments from them do appear to have such a style.¹⁶⁰ Some, such as the *Cypria* and the *Ilias parva*, may have belonged to the type of epic which narrated the whole war.

Aristotle's comments in the *Poetics* might indicate that is the case. In chapter 23 he complains that most poets either write about a single person, a single period, or one *πρᾶξις* of many episodes. He then specifically mentions the *Cypria* and the *Ilias parva*, apparently as poems about one *πρᾶξις* of many episodes.¹⁶¹ This has surprised many: how can the *Cypria* and the *Ilias parva* as found in the summary by Proclus be considered to be about one matter?¹⁶² Young's paraphrase of this passage (1983: 165-166) is useful, and I think points the way to a solution: "Aristotle is allowing *the epic poet in general* (his italics) his many *μῦθοι*, and the right to compose his 'epic mass' as a whole, chronologically from beginning to end. *Any other epic poet* (his italics) would have done just that, and that is just what other epic poets did with their own subjects. But Homer's *Iliad* is not that generic 'Iliad,' and Homer was not just any other epic poet." Young nowhere suggests that poems of the epic cycle told the story of the whole war. But he has correctly interpreted Aristotle to be speaking of poets who do compose real "Iliads," i.e. poems about the whole war. It must be more than a coincidence that the *Cypria* and the *Ilias parva* are specified by Aristotle in this context. Heath's discussion of the passage (49-50) leads to the same conclusion, again without the conscious design of the scholar, since Heath does not suspect the *Ilias parva* or the *Cypria* told the story of

¹⁶⁰ E.g. *Ilias parva* fr. 21 Bernabé fails to dramatize the death of Astyanax, as Griffin 1977: 52 complains (it must be remembered, however, that in myth of the Trojan war Astyanax is only a child of one of many of Troy's defenders, and we may get an exaggerated sense of his importance from such moving passages as *Il.* 6.390ff., 22.477ff.).

¹⁶¹ Monro's attempt (1901: 349, 367-368), following a different interpretation of Aristotle's words, to find one hero, one period, and one *πρᾶξις* for the *Cypria* and *Ilias parva* is very unconvincing (he suggests Paris and Odysseus respectively as the heroes of these poems). Note that Aristotle had previously discussed biographical epics in ch. 8 and historical epics earlier in ch. 23 without reference to the *Cypria* or to the *Ilias Parva*. The mention of one hero and one period can be seen as allusions to these previous discussions.

¹⁶² E.g. Monro 1901: 349; Lucas *ad loc.*; Janko 1987 *ad loc.* Else 580ff. sees that Aristotle is referring to the type of poem which narrates the whole war but never explicitly considers the *Cypria* and *Ilias parva* to be that type of poem. However at 587 n.52 he suggests that Aristotle may have anticipated Bethe in thinking that "the *Cypria* and the *Little Iliad* were conceived by the same brain" (see n.138 above; by *Little Iliad* Bethe meant the *Aethiopsis*, *Ilias parva*, and *Ilii excidium*).

the whole war. He defines Aristotle's conception of an "Iliad embracing the whole Trojan war" as a "unified *praxis* of many parts." Later, following Aristotle's words, he states that the *Cypria* and the *Ilias parva* "have a unified *praxis* of many parts." It follows that these poems are generic Iliads which told the story of the whole war. Commentators have been tempted to think that Aristotle understands the *Cypria* and *Ilias parva* to be poems which narrated the whole war, but they have been unable to reach that conclusion because it contradicts the common understanding of the poems in the epic cycle as appendages to the Homeric poems. But the solution to the questions which Aristotle's words raise may be that the original versions of the *Cypria* and the *Ilias parva*, which Aristotle would have known, were "Iliads."¹⁶³

Why then would there be need of many poems to complete the epic cycle if some told the whole story? Perhaps the longest ones did not give equal attention to all periods of the war, and were selected for the part of the story which they told especially well or in great detail. As the tradition grew, undoubtedly it would become increasingly difficult to supply a detailed narrative about all the events in this long war. Nestor states it would take him five or six years to tell the whole war (*Od.* 3.113-117; not the swiftest storyteller, though!). The song of the Sirens, which features all that happened at Troy (*Od.* 12.189-190), is perhaps deadly because listeners wither away before its seductive strain comes to an end, as Ford has suggested (83). Yet it is conceivable that various poets could swiftly relate the war from its beginnings to its end. Homer's allusions to events from the whole war demonstrate that he has the complete story in his head and assumes his audience does also (see pp. 9-10 above). The same can be said about Phemius and

¹⁶³ Cf. the complaint of Horace in the *Ars poetica* (136ff) about the "scriptor cyclicus" who writes of the whole war. The poem ascribed to the cyclic author, "fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum" (137), is similar to the one ascribed to the *Ilias parva* (*Iliades parvae* fr. 28 Bernabé; quoted at p. 69 above). Monro 1884: 332-333 argues that Horace is speaking of contemporaries, not poets of the epic cycle (cf. *Epicus cyclus* test. 25 Bernabé), but most (e.g. Pfeiffer 230, Davies 1986: 95) assume Horace is referring to the epic cycle. Brink *ad loc.* points out that this poem is not exactly like that of the *Ilias parva*, but thinks Horace is speaking of poets of the epic cycle with Aristotle *Poetics* ch. 23 in mind.

Demodocus¹⁶⁴ and the poets of the epic cycle.¹⁶⁵ Ford has related this phenomenon (40-41) to the genre of epic poetry in general: "The basis for this genre of singing, then, is the fiction that behind the telling of each story exists one divinely superintended tale, one connected whole that never alters, though parts of it may be performed in this or that time and place." In the case of the Trojan war, some poems of the cycle may have been actual examples of this "connected whole" of the Trojan war.¹⁶⁶

Influence of Homer on the epic cycle?

I hope to have shown that the apparent encircling of the *Iliad* by the poems of the cycle may be illusory, perhaps the result of the production of the cycle and not an indication of their original nature. Next let us examine the proposition that these poems are heavily dependent on the *Iliad*. A thorough examination of every alleged example of the *Iliad's* influence on them cannot be accomplished within the scope of this study (I can say that I know of nothing in the epic cycle which is necessarily based on the Homeric poems).¹⁶⁷ Instead, I will consider an example in which a cyclic poem seems to have detailed knowledge of the *Iliad* in order to clarify the issue.

¹⁶⁴ Allen 1924: 143; Hainsworth 1993a: 43 (he adds that a Demodocus would never sing the whole story).

¹⁶⁵ See Bethé 1966: 139-140; Kullmann 1960: 212-214, 225-226, 358-359, who stress that poems in the epic cycle look forward and backwards to events in the Trojan war. I think their arguments that these poems were once united (see n.138 above) are very unlikely, but they do establish that the poets of these poems have the whole war on their minds.

¹⁶⁶ Cf. the speculation by some scholars that there was a pre-Homeric corpus that covered the whole war, e.g. a "heroic chronicle" (Allen 1924: 130ff.), a "Faktikanon" (Kullmann 1960: 12-13), or an "Urkyklos" (Schefold 27; Thornton 10-12). I differ with the implication of these scholars that there existed one such poem or canon which preceded Homer, or at least a rigid sequence which was always adhered to. Instead, I prefer to think there were countless very different poems on a generally agreed sequence of traditional events. Fenik 1964: 14-15 also argues for variation in the pre-Homeric cyclic tradition.

¹⁶⁷ For example, it is usually assumed (e.g. Bernabé p. 195; Heubeck 1989 *ad* 11.134b-137) that the killing of Odysseus by Telegonus with a spear made from a spike of a sea fish (see *Telegonia* fr. 4 Bernabé) is ludicrously based on the prophecy of Teiresias that death for Odysseus will come ἐξ ἁλός (*Od.* 11.134-135), but some scholars have argued that this weapon is very primitive, and that the riddling prophecy of Teiresias alludes to this manner of death (cf. Scheliba 415-416; Burkert 1983: 159; A. Edwards 1985: 227 n.28; G. Nagy 1990a: 214). The Thersites of the *Aethiopsis* is commonly assumed to be based on the Thersites of *Il.* 2, but many scholars dispute this (bibliography gathered at Kullmann 1991: 439 n.60). We should also hesitate before considering "Homeric" phraseology in the epic cycle evidence that Homer has been used as a model, for we have seen that it is difficult to distinguish Homeric from traditional phraseology (see p. 18 above).

a. the homelands of Chryseis and Briseis

Scholia to the *Iliad* (see *Cypria* fr. 28 Bernabé) report that there existed different versions of the capture of Chryseis in Hypoplacian Thebe, a matter only briefly mentioned by Homer (*Il.* 1.366).¹⁶⁸ In the *Cypria*, a *scholion* reports, Chryseis went to Thebe to attend a sacrifice for Artemis. It appears that the *Cypria* felt a need to supplement the *Iliad* by explaining why Chryseis was captured in a town other than Chryse.¹⁶⁹ If that is so, it would be revealing and significant. The poet of one of the poems in the epic cycle would have intimate knowledge of the *Iliad* (here one line), and would be concerned with explaining a "Homeric problem," just as scholars in subsequent ages were. Kullmann argues against this impression by proposing that the *Cypria* simply gives a fuller account of a traditional story.¹⁷⁰ That argument does not upon first consideration counter the impression that the story in the *Cypria* is explaining a detail in the *Iliad*. But his view is more persuasive when one considers the *testimonium* which reports that Briseis was captured at Pedasos in the *Cypria*, and not at Lyrnessus, as the *Iliad* reports (*Il.* 2.690).¹⁷¹ Why would the author of the *Cypria* desire to explain an obscure "problem" in Homer about the capture of Chryseis, yet contradict Homer about the capture of Briseis? The view of Wilamowitz (374) that the poet of the *Cypria* knew book 1 of the *Iliad* but not book 2 will satisfy few today. If we follow those critics who think the *Cypria* is influenced by the *Iliad*, a curious picture of the *Cypria*-author emerges: he is concerned with supplementing and justifying Homer on a minor detail

¹⁶⁸ Critical views concerning this detail in Homer are summarized by de Jong 20 n.29. Robbins 1990a: 9ff. discusses how Homer significantly employs such details from the sack of cities neighboring Troy. Cf. Mueller 38: "Through a stroke of economy pregnant with narrative implications Homer has identified the expedition against Thebe with the expedition during which Chryseis was captured."

¹⁶⁹ Thus Monro 1901: 350; Heubeck 1991: 452, 1954: 99; Severyns 1928: 307-308; Reinhardt 62 ("cheap invention"); Davies 1989a: 48; Taplin 1992: 85 n.5 (who cites this as conclusive proof that the epic cycle is derivative from Homer).

¹⁷⁰ Cf. Kullmann 1960: 209, 287ff. (esp. 288 n.1), 297ff., 1991: 438.

¹⁷¹ Fr. 27 Bernabé. I think the failure of many scholars to mention this *testimonium* undercuts their conclusions about the capture of Chryseis. For discussion of it, see Wilamowitz 374; Severyns 1928: 307-308 ("cheap originality"); Kullmann 1960: 208ff., 284ff., 298ff., 1991: 437-38. Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.33 states that Achilles captured Thebe, Lyrnessus, and "many other cities," but does not specify at which Chryseis and Briseis were taken. Note that Proclus mentions the capture of both Lyrnessus and Pedasos.

concerning Chryseis, but contradicts Homer on a similar matter concerning Briseis. A better explanation of such general similarity with minor differences is that the *Iliad* and the *Cypria* independently belonged to the same tradition. If the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* were both based on the same mythical tradition, then correspondence between the two would not necessarily be the result of influence.¹⁷²

There is some indication that details related to the story of Chryseis and her capture belong to pre-Homeric tradition. The numerous and detailed references in the *Iliad* to the sacking of cities in the Troad, especially Thebe, suggests the capture of these cities was part of pre-Homeric myth.¹⁷³ The use of an article of demonstrative force before the name of Chryses at *Il.* 1.11 suggests that he was a known figure.¹⁷⁴ Taplin correctly points out (1992: 85) that it would not be unusual for Chryseis to dwell in Thebe, for she could have lived with a husband in Thebe and been later ransomed to her father in Chryse (Robbins 1990a: 11 n.31 argues the capture and ransom of Andromache's mother is similar; Taplin compares Briseis, on the theory she comes from Lesbos). But the plausibility of Chryseis living in Thebe does not exclude the possibility that traditionally she was visiting there when captured. In addition, if some accounts of her visit there are designed to explain the situation in the *Iliad*, that does not mean the one in the *Cypria* is (Severyns 1928: 308 suggests that scholiasts invented some accounts as

¹⁷² Kullmann 1960: 369 insisted that since the *Cypria* and the *Iliad* so rarely disagreed they could not be independent of each other, but I do not think we know enough about the *Cypria* to come to this conclusion.

¹⁷³ Thus Redfield 14 on the Homeric details about Thebe (but Robbins 1990a: 10 n.28; Taplin 1992: 222 n.30 point out that Homer's consistency of detail need not imply traditional material; cf. Kullmann 1960: 13). Leaf 1912: 242-252; Wade-Gery 85 n.114; Kullmann 1960: 281ff. consider stories about the capture of towns neighboring Troy pre-Homeric. G. Nagy 1979: 140-141, 272-273, following Bethe 1927: 66ff., thinks stories of the taking of these cities are based on Aeolic expansion in the Troad (cf. the similar argument of R. Carpenter 56ff.), which I think is doubtful (Nilsson 1932: 6ff., 1933: 44ff. strongly criticises Bethe's ideas concerning tribal history engendering myth). *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 389, a relief amphora from c. 650, apparently shows Achilles raiding the cattle of Aeneas (thus not only Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a under no. 389 but also Kemp-Lindemann 88-89; Ahlberg-Cornell 53), a central incident within these forays (cf. *Il.* 20.90-93, 187-190; the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus; Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.32).

¹⁷⁴ Willcock 1978-1984 *ad loc.*; de Jong 265 n.103 conclude Chryses was either traditional or meant to seem so. Cf. the opinion of Murray 204; Friis Johansen 1967: 153, that Briseis was not traditional.

alternatives to the one in the *Cypria* because followers of Aristarchus refused to use a cyclic poem to explain the *Iliad*).

b. the resources and motives of "late" epic authors

There is a larger issue related to these issues that has not been addressed. Those who think the *Cypria*-author is responding to a single line in the *Iliad* about the capture of Chryseis seem to assume he possesses a text, for one is not likely to notice such a minor detail by auditory reception. And critics frequently seem to assume that the cyclic authors not only possess a text, but pore over it in a scholarly fashion. This activity is difficult to posit for any age in which the poems of the cycle can be placed.

Let us consider the matter in relation to the Hesiodic *Catalogue*, which is often said to have similarly supplemental purposes. Because it continues the *Theogony*, M. West has compared it to the cyclic poems and suggested this type of poem dates from the sixth century, "a period of editorial activity, largely agglutinative in character."¹⁷⁵ Without addressing the issue of literacy and use of texts, he argues (1985: 126ff.) that the poet of the *Catalogue* imitates the *Theogony* in a very detailed manner. For example, he suggests (128) that somebody composed one fragment (26.18-20 MW) by drawing from three places of the *Theogony* (lines 3, 9, 68). Is it really likely that a poet would thumb through the *Theogony* and patch together phrases from three separate lines? We have discussed this issue before in relation to the question of Homeric influence on the lyric poets (see p. 18 above). Seemingly "Homeric" or "Hesiodic" phrases may well be traditional, and we cannot easily ascertain imitation of such authors on this basis (West

¹⁷⁵ M. West 1966: 49. This statement should be regarded with extreme suspicion, since the *Theogony* itself catalogues in an agglutinative way, and it is apparent that Hesiod knew other poetry like it (see *Theog.* 43ff.). Cf. Janko 1983: 247 n.37, who questions West's dating of the end of the *Theogony* to the sixth century. Janko views it as part of the *Catalogue* (1983: 221-225, 248), which he considers contemporaneous with the *Theogony* (1983: 196, fig. 4 on 200, 1992: 14) and by Hesiod (1992: xxv). His arguments should be kept in mind when considering the sixth-century dating of the poems of the epic cycle by Davies, since he cites M. West's dating of the *Catalogue* in support of his view (1989a: 3, 1989b: 89ff.; but he is more cautious on this point at 1986: 93 n.21).

himself has challenged the common assumption that "Homeric" phraseology in lyric poetry indicates Homeric influence; see p. 19 above). West also provides an unlikely psychological profile of the poet of the *Catalogue* that is reminiscent of the common view of cyclic poets. The catalogue-poet is supposed to revel in "gratuitous variation" (1985: 129), yet he is also "studiously imitative" of the *Theogony* (130). It is this type of shifting and contradictory criteria for assessing imitative poetry that has helped create the impression that early poetry is heavily dependent on Homer and Hesiod.

In any event, a larger question remains: would poets of even the sixth century necessarily possess texts? Perhaps the Homeridae possessed rare texts of the Homeric poems.¹⁷⁶ There is some evidence of poets sending manuscripts to others before the establishment of a book trade in the fifth century,¹⁷⁷ and some critics suppose that poets were literate and in possession of texts long before society in general was.¹⁷⁸ Could the cyclic poets have possessed the Homeric texts, which they could then have imitated in a detailed manner? Some evidence for intricate study of the Homeric texts exists at the end of the sixth century, the latest possible time for the poems of the epic cycle. A line variant of the *Iliad* is ascribed to Theagenes.¹⁷⁹ In Aristotle there is a reference to the use of a line in Homer by the Athenians during a dispute with Salamis that may have occurred in the sixth century.¹⁸⁰ But we are far from being certain that epic poets even as late as the sixth century would possess the Homeric texts. I suspect that Burkert is close to the truth when he suggests (1979b: 56) that "poets were literate by then [the end of sixth century],

¹⁷⁶ See Whitman 84; Davison 1968: 100.

¹⁷⁷ See Havelock 16-18, 34 n.27, 35 n.30.

¹⁷⁸ Cf. Davison 1968: 89; Forsdyke 124; Havelock 233; Thomas 13, 113ff. "Craft literacy" is a frequent term of Havelock's, not always clearly in reference to poets. At 23 he attributes Homer's influence to the spread of Homeric manuscripts. Thomas thinks poets in the Archaic Age possessed texts of their own work only as an *aide-mémoire* and to leave to posterity; publication, she thinks, would be entirely oral.

¹⁷⁹ Theagenes fr. 8.3 D-K. On Theagenes, see Clarke 61ff; Pfeiffer 9ff.; Davison 1962: 235-236; Richardson 1993: 28 (who describes him as the start of a new attitude toward epic which widened with the sophists of the fifth century; cf. Pfeiffer 43ff., who stresses the absence of critical abilities even in the fifth century).

¹⁸⁰ Aristotle *Rhet.* 1.15.13 (=1375b30). See Janko 1992: 29-30; Davison 1968: 16-17. Davison notes that the reference may be to a fourth, not sixth-century dispute. If it was the sixth century, the story does not necessarily mean a text of Homer was widely used then.

but most of their training must still have been based on hearing other specialists performing in view of their audience, and memorizing." One might then argue that poets who had memorized the Homeric texts could easily base their own poetry on the smallest of details in Homer.¹⁸¹ Yet much remains obscure, and the common assumption that poets of even the late Archaic Age based their poetry on texts of Homer and Hesiod must be questioned. Intricate knowledge of the Homeric texts may not have been possible for the cyclic authors, no matter how late we date them. It is just as easy and, I would suggest, more plausible to explain correspondences between the poems of the epic cycle and Homer as the result not of imitation but of a shared tradition. It is also necessary to remember that the cyclic poems differ from the Homeric poems on many details. The most famous example occurs in the *Cypria*, the original version of which apparently knew nothing of Paris stopping at Sidon (see p. 38 above). Its poet either did not know that the *Iliad* suggests Paris stopped at Sidon or did not care if he did. In either case he could not have possessed the characteristics so often imagined of him and other cyclic poets.

My discussion above should cast doubt on the claim that the poems of the epic cycle attempted to supplement and expand the Homeric poems by inventing an unusual amount of detail, and especially a proliferation of characters.¹⁸² If the poets of the epic cycle did not possess texts of Homer, their work, however detailed, would not be concerned with such supplemental activity. We should also remember that the pre-Homeric Trojan saga was already very well-developed by Homer's time. Detail and expansion in the saga of the Trojan war cannot be considered a mark of the late Archaic Age. Homer himself seems to have invented a plethora of minor detail and characters, yet no one calls him decadent for that reason. Griffin has shown that there can be a more restrained use of detail in Homer than in the poems of the epic cycle, sometimes to good

¹⁸¹ Kirk 1966: 160 argues for "literate imitation" of Homer based on memorization in the sixth century.

¹⁸² Thus Forsdyke 12; Griffin 1977: 43-44; Davies 1989a: 40, 83-84, 89; Hainsworth 1993a: 44.

artistic effect, but this does not mean that Homer did not know of details that we find in the epic cycle.

Non-I Iomeric aspects of the epic cycle

I hope to have now at least raised doubts about evidence of extensive influence by Homer on the poets of the cycle and about the cycle's encircling of Homer. A different issue is the charge that the cycle repeatedly betrays its lateness in its themes and cultural practices. This view has its roots in the attitude of Aristarchus, and recently Griffin in a well-known article (1977) has tended to popularize it. Griffin well establishes that the cycle contains many un-Homeric aspects. But though he announces at the beginning that he is not concerned with the issue of the date of the epic cycle (39), and though he seems to accept certain elements in it as pre-Homeric (40-41), he repeatedly suggests that the good taste of Homer must be earlier than the alleged bad taste of the cycle.¹⁸³ A quick survey of the supposed late material will demonstrate that its "lateness" is highly questionable. It can often be demonstrated that sometimes Homer knew of some of these aspects but suppressed them.¹⁸⁴ Other aspects date from a time which is at least contemporaneous with the earliest period to which Homer can be dated.

Proof that the poems of the epic cycle contained some post-Homeric details would not necessarily mean that the core of their contents is post-Homeric. But I know of nothing in these poems which is conclusively post-Homeric. It should be remembered that many of the early critics cited below readily dated "late" elements in the epic cycle to the eighth century, since they supposed this was a post-Homeric period (see p. 29 above).

¹⁸³ Pinney 37 cites Griffin's article as demonstrating that the epic cycle contains pre-Homeric aspects, but I suspect that most scholars gain the impression from him that the cycle is bad poetry, and that bad poetry is late (as do e.g. Hainsworth 1993b: 43-45 [he cites Griffin at 161 n.3]; O. Murray in transcribed discussion of Kopff's paper [Kopff p. 62]; Ahlberg-Cornell 23). Davies 1989a passim more carefully describes various cyclic characteristics as un-Homeric without reference to date.

¹⁸⁴ On suppression by Homer see A. Lang 336-337; Murray 125ff.; Scheliha 91, 93-94, 362-363; Griffin 1977: 40-41; de Romilly 14-15; Schein 46; M. Edwards 1987a: 137; Mondy 157; Davies 1989a: 9. As Mondy points out, it is often possible that Homer idiosyncratically stands alone in relation to what preceded and followed him.

Unfortunately modern critics have repeated the same ideas, only with later dates for Homer and the poems of the epic cycle. The shifting date in this line of argument demonstrates that it is not based on historical, cultural, or sociological knowledge but rather on prejudice about the relation between Homer and the epic cycle. Below I will base my discussion on the assumption that Homer composed towards the end of the eighth century, but the possibility that Homer should be dated later (see p. 12ff. above) increases the difficulty of maintaining there are post-Homeric elements in the epic cycle.

a. exotic geography

One claim is that the cycle is full of exotic elements which demonstrate geographical knowledge impossible in Homer's time.¹⁸⁵ The *Aethiopsis* is frequently cited because it features Trojan allies from a distant land, the Aethiopians and the Amazons. Of course, Homer knows about Aethiopians (*Il.* 1.423, 23.206, *Od.* 1.20ff., 4.84, 5.282, 287), and other early references to them include Hesiod *Theog.* 984-985 (with Memnon; cf. the reference to "dark" people at *Erg.* 527), a fragment of the *Catalogue* (150.15-18 MW), and a fragment of Mimnermus (12 West). Homer also knew of Amazons (*Il.* 3.189, 2.814 [see n.9 above], 6.186), and they are often featured in early Greek myth. In fact, the earliest Amazomachy in art, from the late eighth century, is often interpreted as Penthesileia fighting Achilles.¹⁸⁶ I cannot fathom why anyone would regard the *Aethiopsis* as singular or late because it features Aethiopians or Amazons. One might object that they are too fabulous to be at Troy, but that would wrongly exclude folk and supernatural elements from the tradition of the Trojan war. Greek myth is full of encounters with people and monsters not of this world, and there is no reason to suppose that legend about the Trojan war would be any different.

¹⁸⁵ Monro 1884: 14, 16-17, 32-33, 1901: 361, 377; Jebb 155; Evelyn-White xxx-xxxi; Allen 1924: 76 n.1; Forsdyke 12, 97ff., 132; Jouan 1980: 102. See Kullmann 1960: 46, 1991: 439 for an opposing view.

¹⁸⁶ *LIMC* "Amazones" no. 168="Achilleus" no. 719. Fittschen 177; Kannicht 80 n.22 agree with this interpretation; Ahlberg-Cornell 69-70, 159, 163 does not. See further bibliography on this issue at Kopff 59-60.

One might argue that the stress of the *Aethiopsis* on foreigners reflects the wider geographical knowledge of a later age. For instance, Greeks probably first encountered African Aethiopians in the seventh century.¹⁸⁷ Does that mean that the story of the *Aethiopsis* originated after this date, as Forsdyke suggests (97-98)?¹⁸⁸ No, for Memnon, as the son of Dawn, should come from the East, and in fact early literary references tend to favor this location for him and the Aethiopians.¹⁸⁹ Let us suppose for the sake of argument that the *Aethiopsis* did conceive of the Aethiopians as an African people. That would be of little significance, for Homer knows of pygmies (*Il.* 3.6).¹⁹⁰ Report of distant peoples can precede extensive contact with them by a long time, and early epic was fascinated with far-off lands whose geographical location was vague and flexible (see Romm 10ff). No matter from what perspective we examine this issue, it is unjustified to consider the focus of the *Aethiopsis* on Aethiopians an indication of post-Homeric nature.

The homeland of Amazons also varied in early Greek myth (in the *Aethiopsis*, according to Proclus, Penthesileia comes from Thrace).¹⁹¹ It is sometimes thought that

¹⁸⁷ As mercenaries for Egyptians; see Snowden 1983: 26.

¹⁸⁸ Cf. Heubeck 1989 *ad* 11.14-19 on the controversy concerning whether the "Cimmerians" of the *Odyssey* are related to a real historical people called "Gimmerians." He argues that the relation between myth and real life is complex and elusive, noting that the Greeks often applied names derived from myth to real places and people, and concludes that this possible correspondence of Cimmerians/Gimmerians cannot be used to date the *Odyssey*.

¹⁸⁹ In general see the articles on Memnon and Aethiopians in *RE*; with S. West *ad Od.* 1.22; Romm 46ff. Snowden 1970: 144ff. tried to link Homer's Aethiopians with African Aethiopians, who are the focus of his research (see vii). Romm 50 n.13 points out that this is forced, and at 49 stresses that their location is unclear in Homer. Snowden 1993: 46 admits this is so, and at 1970: 151ff. does indicate that Memnon was in fact considered Eastern at first, then came to be viewed as African eventually. Drews 1969 persuasively argues that Memnon first had an Eastern origin. On the other hand, *Od.* 1.22-24, 4.83 and Hesiod fr. 150.15-18 MW may suggest an African location for Aethiopians. Cf. R. Carpenter's argument (176) that for Homer Aethiopians were Egyptians. The etymology of the name suggests it refers to dark skin, but this need not be African. Art as early as the sixth-century depicts African Aethiopians; Memnon in early art is not depicted as an African, though at times his retinue is (see articles on "Aithiopes" and "Memnon" in *LIMC*).

¹⁹⁰ Since the cranes who fight pygmies are fleeing the rainy season of winter (*Il.* 3.4), they are flying south; that points to Africa. "The war between the cranes and the pygmies is a folk story reflecting some knowledge of a diminutive African tribe," says Willcock 1978-1984 *ad loc.* Later Greeks explicitly linked mythical pygmies with Africa (see Kirk 1985 *ad loc.*); admittedly that is not a sure indication the link was longstanding (see n.188 above on Cimmerians/Gimmerians).

¹⁹¹ In general see the articles in *RE* on Penthesileia and Amazons. Kullmann 1960: 46 demonstrates that Forsdyke 104ff. is wrong to find a Thracian origin for Penthesileia unusual. Fenik 1964: 13 notes that Rhesus is also from Thrace and suggests that there was a cyclic interest in Thrace.

the Greek conception of these warrior women was inspired by nomads of the North and East. If that is so, pre-Homeric myth about Amazons could easily have been based on vague knowledge of these areas. Perhaps Amazons are entirely fictional and poets simply bestowed likely enough homelands on them. Certainly their presence in Troy need not have originated in late myth.

In the *Aethiopsis* Achilles is translated to "White Island," ἡ Λευκὴ νῆσος. This island has been central to the issue of geographical knowledge in the cycle. Achilles was worshipped in historical times on an island in the Black Sea called *Leuke*. Milesians led colonization of the Black Sea, and Arctinus, to whom the poem was ascribed, was said to be a Milesian. Some scholars have concluded that the *Aethiopsis* reflects Milesian colonization of the Black Sea.¹⁹² Since such colonization is now often dated to the seventh century B.C., it might be thought that the poem is necessarily later than an (eighth-century) *Iliad*, indeed, that a central aspect of it, the afterlife of Achilles, could only have been invented after that time. The main difficulty in assessing this theory is that scholars are vague about how they conceive of the relationship between the *Aethiopsis*, Milesian colonization of the Black Sea, and worship of Achilles in the Black Sea. I will consider the issue from many perspectives and demonstrate that the contents of the *Aethiopsis* need not date from the seventh century.

The question of how worship of Achilles began is a complex one.¹⁹³ Achilles was worshipped in many areas of the Black Sea. Undoubtedly Milesian colonists played some role in the development of this worship, but we simply do not know what role and under what impetus.¹⁹⁴ Dedicatory inscriptions to Achilles from as early as the late sixth

¹⁹² Cf. Monro 1884: 16-17, 1901: 360-361; Allen 1924: 76; G. Nagy 1979: 167 sec. 27n1, 1990b: 70-71, 421; Hommel 11ff., 21-24; Pinney 133, 137ff.

¹⁹³ Hommel offers a thorough recent discussion of the evidence and issues, along with some very idiosyncratic theories. See also Minns 451ff.; Rohde 565 n.102; Escher 222ff., Fleischer 56ff.; Robert 1194 ff.; Diehl; Farnell 1921: 285ff.; Burn 115-116; Kemp-Lindemann 242-248; Pinney 133-134; Thorjanson 120-121.

¹⁹⁴ Hommel's thesis is that the concept of Achilles as a sea divinity who ruled over an island of the dead preceded and inspired worship of him on *Leuke* in the Black Sea (Hooker disputes her arguments). Fleischer 54 (cf. 58-59) supposes that the story of Achilles' translation to the historical *Leuke* was known to

century have been found in the Black Sea, where Achilles continued to be worshipped into Roman imperial times (when he was known as "Pontarches"). A fragment of Alcaeus, whose phraseology is similar to that of the dedicatory inscriptions, refers to Achilles as ruling over "Scythia" (354 L-P, Ἀχιλλεύς ὁ τὰς Σκυθίας μέδεις) and is the earliest literary reference to the worship. Pindar *Nem.* 4.49-50, which refers to a "shining" island in the Euxine as the domain of Achilles, is the first poetical reference to a Leuke in the Black Sea (cf. Euripides *Andr.* 1259-62, *I.T.* 427-438).

Do these facts suggest that the *Aethiopsis* is a Milesian poem which dates from the seventh century? I do not see how that conclusion can be reached. First of all, we should remember that the ascription of authorship to Arctinus and therefore the labeling of the poem as Milesian is uncertain. Some may feel that it is more than a coincidence that a Milesian was thought to have written about a "White Island," since Milesians knew of a "White Island" in the Euxine. I agree. Let us suppose that after the true authorship of the *Aethiopsis* was lost, ancient scholars desired to provide the poem with an author. Why would they choose Arctinus? They would have assumed that the place called Leuke in the *Aethiopsis* was the island Leuke in the Black Sea. Since they associated the Black Sea island with Milesian colonization, they looked for the name of a Milesian author from the past. Arctinus met the qualification. Ancient scholars could have proclaimed Arctinus the author of the *Aethiopsis* for these reasons (cf. Hommel 21-22).

A false assumption would have been made by such ancient scholars, one that is often made by modern scholars. It is that the *Aethiopsis* told of a Leuke *in the Black Sea*.

Black Sea natives before Greeks arrived (Diehl 3 disputes this); and others have argued that worship of Achilles originated with natives (see discussion at Kemp-Lindemann 244; Fleischer 58-59). Danoff and Thordarson 121 propose that a native god was subsequently equated with Achilles by Greek settlers (Boardman 267ff., Thordarson 120ff. think that the Greek colonists had interactive relations with the native Scythians; Burn 122ff. thinks the Scythians exerted influence on the Greeks; cf. the thesis by Pinney that Scythians were associated with Achilles in Greek art; Artemis at least was identified with a local deity in the Cheronese through false etymology: see Minns 543). It may be significant that four of the six names known as priests of the cult of Achilles at Olbia are non-Greek (Minns 481ff.). Hommel 16 n.35 provides further bibliography for this issue.

Many scholars have pointed out that Leuke probably existed as a mythical place long before any island in the Black Sea was called "Leuke."¹⁹⁵ That seems most likely because in early Greek poetry paradisiacal settings need to be distant and inaccessible.¹⁹⁶ The motif of a fabulous island of paradise was known in Mediterranean culture long before the first millennium, and the concept could have passed into Greek thought long before Homer's time.¹⁹⁷ It is more likely that the Black Sea island was named after a mythical place than that a poem about the death of Achilles was inspired by a Black Sea island.¹⁹⁸ The phenomenon of naming a location on the basis of myth seems in fact to have been quite common in the ancient world (e.g. toponyms in Sicily and Italy inspired by myth about Odysseus).

Another fact to consider is that there was a second island in the Black Sea associated with Achilles and perhaps even called "Leuke," a matter of confusion for both ancients and moderns.¹⁹⁹ There also existed many other toponyms which referred to

¹⁹⁵ Thus Welcker 2: 220; Rohde 66, 565 n.102; Robert 1194; Diehl 1; Scheliha 242; 394; A. Edwards 1985: 215 n.1. Monro 1884: 17 and Pinney 133 admit that this is possible. The name may be related to the pale shades, "White Rock" (see *Od.* 24. 11), and the white poplar associated with Hades (see Rohde 565 n.102; Hommel 21 n.53).

¹⁹⁶ At times myth allowed mortals to cross from the real world into such never-never lands. E.g. Hercules travels to the Hyperboreans at Pindar *Ol.* 3.16ff., as does Perseus at Pindar *Pyth.* 10.29ff. (the placement of Croesus there in Bacchylides 3 is more of a translation; see Vermeule 134-135), and Odysseus crosses the line often in the *Odyssey*, as at Calypso's island and Scheria, which both have aspects of a paradise.

¹⁹⁷ For Minoan-Mycenaean, Egyptian, and Near Eastern prototypes of such an island, see Welcker 2: 220; Rohde 60; M. West 1978 *ad* Hesiod *Op. et dies* 171; Dietrich 1965: 346-3; Burkert 1985: 198; Vermeule 70ff.; Hommel 18 n.43; A. Edwards 1985: 218.

¹⁹⁸ Farnell 1929: 285 thinks that epic poetry inspired the worship of Achilles in the Black Sea. Vermeule 74 comments that worship at Leuke (and other remote spots) had "more a literary than a practical tone" (I do not understand why she dates worship of heroes on paradisiacal settings to after the Persian wars). It is possible that the historical island "Leuke" was first named after its appearance (see schol. *ad* Pindar *Nem.* 4.49; Hommel 20-21), and only later associated with a mythical place of the same name.

¹⁹⁹ Both islands shared another designation, "Achilles' island;" it is not clear whether inhabitants of the Black Sea (as opposed to ancient and modern scholars) used the term "Leuke" for both. The modern Fidonisi was the better known. The second was the modern Berezan and was near the river Borysthene (Dnieper today) and the town Olbia. Cf. Minns 14-15, 452-453; Rohde 565 n.102; Fleischer 59-61; Diehl 6-7; Escher 223-224; Robert 1194; Hommel 14-15. One confronted by the contradictions displayed by the ancient sources and by modern scholars should be aware that Fidonisi is out in the sea, perhaps vaguely east of the Ister (Danube) or south of the Borysthene (Dnieper), but not "in the mouth of" or "at" either river (see the map at Kemp-Lindemann 247 or Talbert 50; the existence of a island called "Peuke" at the mouth of the Danube undoubtedly added to the confusion). Rohde misleadingly reports that there were more than two islands called "Leuke," apparently thinking of a location called the "Racecourse of Achilles" (cf. Minns 481, who proposes that Achilles may have been worshipped at some temporary sandbank islands). There

Achilles, most famously the "Racecourse of Achilles." It should therefore be understood that an island called "Leuke" was not the only place for worship of Achilles in the Black Sea or even its focal point, though that is commonly assumed. Achilles was thought to rule over the whole of the Black Sea area (thus Alcaeus calls him lord of "Scythia" [see p. 82], and he was later known as "Pontarches"). The variety of locations for worship of Achilles suggests that Leuke did not possess a very important role in worship of Achilles, though that is often assumed. In chapter three I will argue that the ancient world conceived of the *spirit* of Achilles existing on Leuke, not his body or bones. Thus this worship was not a hero cult as that term is commonly understood, i.e. worship of a hero whose powers were thought to emanate from a grave (see p. 88 below).

The possibility that there were two different islands called "Leuke" suggests that a common source of myth about a unreal island of that name preceded and inspired their naming.²⁰⁰ Apparently myth about Achilles allowed Greek colonizers to believe that Achilles should be worshipped throughout the Black Sea area, but confusion or disagreement arose about the exact location of the island "Leuke." Perhaps myth had vaguely placed the island in the Black Sea in a time when that area still seemed inaccessible. Perhaps myth simply placed Leuke at the ends of the earth, a common attribute of paradisiacal settings, and to early explorers the Black Sea seemed to be just that. Much remains obscure about the worship of Achilles in the Black Sea, but it should be clear that worship of Achilles by Milesian colonizers did not lead to the invention of myth about the afterlife of Achilles. It is more probable that the fabulous island Leuke, a paradisiacal setting for the soul of Achilles, led to the naming of an island or islands in the Black Sea "Leuke."

are ancient reports of temples at the two islands and at Olbia, but no remains have been found. Minns, Diehl, and Hommel best unravel these problems.

²⁰⁰ Cf. Minns 453, 480-481, who suggests that the worship of Achilles on Berezan replicated that on Leuke (Fidonisi) after Olbians lost jurisdiction of Leuke.

For the sake of argument, let us suppose that the concept of a mythical Leuke arose after Black Sea colonization by Milesians. Drews has shown that the *communis opinio* that this colonization occurred in the seventh century is probably wrong.²⁰¹ Ancient dating gave the eighth century as the time of colonization in the Black Sea, but that has been doubted because of a lack of archaeological evidence for it. Drews points out (18) that a view based on scanty archaeological research is an *argumentum ex silentio* of little value. He also criticizes (19-21) scholars who overlook or athesize passages in Hesiod and Homer which suggest knowledge of the Black Sea. *Theogony* 337-345 lists rivers from that area, including the Istros (the Danube, which is near modern Fidonisi, the most famous "Leuke"), and *Iliad* 2.851-857 lists Trojan allies from the Anatolian shore of the Black Sea. These passages at least suggest an early Greek knowledge of the shores of the Black Sea if not naval exploration of it. Drews adds (19) that the early poet Eumelus wrote Argonautic myth and that this myth probably presupposes a Black Sea Colchis.²⁰² All this suggests that the colonization occurred in the eighth century, or that knowledge of the Black Sea preceded later colonization. Thus even if one thinks that the story of Achilles' translation to Leuke was invented after Greeks knew of the Black Sea, it is clear that such myth could have existed before even a late eighth-century Homer.

For the further sake of argument, let us suppose that the first poet to write of "Leuke" was a Milesian of the seventh century, somehow inspired by Milesian colonizers who invented the name for an island they had discovered in the Black Sea. That would mean that the name Leuke was a Milesian invention, and perhaps post-Homeric. But the motif of Achilles' translation would not necessarily be post-Homeric. Such a story could have previously existed with a different term for the hero's happy hunting ground, as it

²⁰¹ Drews 1976. On the topic see also Boardman 245ff., whose account generally lends credence to the argument of Drews; at 247 he notes that eighth-century dating of the colonization has been revived. See Burn 107; Coldstream 1977: 268 for the seventh-century dating.

²⁰² The eighth-century date often given to Eumelus may be questioned (see Bernabé pp. 106-108 for *testimonia*), but cf. the evidence for Homeric knowledge of Argonautic myth at n.9 above. It has often been supposed that Homer transposed details from the eastward journey of the Argo to Odysseus' westward journey (see summary of these views at Kullmann 1991: 449ff.)

often did throughout antiquity. The term "Leuke" would thus be late, but the motif could still be pre-Homeric.²⁰³

I have concentrated on the story of Achilles' translation because it is central to my study. Similar issues arise concerning the translation of Iphigeneia to the Tauri in the *Cypria*.²⁰⁴ It follows from my investigation above that this story need not have originated in post-Homeric times, and if it did, that its basic form could have been in existence long before then.

We see, then, that the claim that the epic cycle contains foreign or exotic material from a post-Homeric age repeatedly falters upon close examination. It should be added that growing recognition of non-Greek influences on Greek culture in the Homeric age, particularly near-Eastern (see n.2 above), makes this idea seem increasingly outdated.

b. religious beliefs and practice

Several religious attitudes displayed by the cycle have attracted much attention. Achilles receives purification after killing Thersites in the *Aethiopsis*, and it is probable that Penthesileia comes to Troy to receive purification for murder.²⁰⁵ It is often thought that this practice is post-Homeric and that the cycle is therefore from a later time.²⁰⁶ But many scholars have challenged the view that this is a post-Homeric practice.²⁰⁷ Examples of blood purification seem to have existed in early Greek myth, myth which may have

²⁰³ Elysium and the Isles of the Blessed were also considered the place of Achilles' afterlife (see pp. 158-159 below in chapter three). Pliny 4.13.93 reports that Fidonisi and Arrian *Peripl.* 32 reports that Berezan were equated with the Isle of the Blessed. Pindar spoke of the setting of Achilles' afterlife as Leuke in one passage and the Isle of the Blessed at another (see p. 158 below). Hommel 18 ff. argues that Achilles was associated with an island of souls, perhaps not called "Leuke," long before colonization of the Black Sea. See n.197 above for bibliography about the motif of an island of paradise in Mediterranean culture.

²⁰⁴ For example, Monro 1884: 8-9, 1901: 352 claims that if Proclus is correct about this detail of Iphigeneia's translation then "this form of the story is necessarily later than Greek settlements on the northern coasts of the Euxine."

²⁰⁵ Thus Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.1 (other sources for this story are listed at Bernabé p. 67). Davies 1986: 106 thinks that the *Aethiopsis* contained the purification of Penthesileia.

²⁰⁶ Monro 1884: 17, 33; 1901: 361-362, 377; Jebb 155; Chadwick 236-37; Forsdyke 132; Lesky 1966: 82; Griffin 1977: 48; Jouan 1980: 102; Andersen 1982: 25. Dodds 35ff. influentially argued that Homer is separate from the Archaic Age in this aspect.

²⁰⁷ See Schelha 363; Lloyd-Jones 1983: 53-54, 70-78; Parker 130-143; Burkert 1992: 55-64.

pre-Homeric roots.²⁰⁸ Homer knows of purification in general (e.g. *Il.* 1.314, *Od.* 22.480ff.), and some conclude his silence on purification for murder is simply suppression.²⁰⁹ Others have suspected that the exile for murders frequently mentioned in the *Iliad* actually implies or assumes purification.²¹⁰ A scholiast on *Il.* 24.480 thought the line "anachronistically" referred to purification; some conclude he had a different text which explicitly referred to it.²¹¹ Purification for murder may actually date far back in pre-history. Lloyd-Jones in passing notes (1983: 76) that it is probably rooted in Indo-European culture,²¹² and Burkert makes a case for Near Eastern origins for this practice. Parker thoroughly and convincingly argues that one cannot assume it is post-Homeric; he concludes (135), "If Homer had been lost, indeed, and only the mythological evidence survived, no one would have doubted for a moment that these rites [of blood purification] were primeval."

The immortality that is frequently granted to heroes in the epic cycle has been called a post-Homeric concept.²¹³ That it contradicts the stress on mortality in the *Iliad* is true; however, to claim that heroic immortality reflects the taste of a later age is a dubious proposition. It is unlikely that the concept of immortality for heroes is eschatologically later than the Homeric concept of Hades.²¹⁴ Immortality for heroes is a feature of several passages of early Greek poetry (*Od.* 4.561ff., Hesiod *Erg.* 161ff., Pindar *Ol.* 2.78ff. are notable examples), and the concept seems to be implied indirectly by the numerous references in Homer and other early poets to seizure by winds or deities.²¹⁵ I also noted above (n.197) that the motif of a paradisiacal island for the dead dates back at least into the second millennium in Mediterranean culture. For all these reasons it is clear that the

²⁰⁸ See Lloyd-Jones 1983: 73; Burkert 186 n.9; but cf. Parker 131 n.102.

²⁰⁹ E.g. A. Lang 340; Rohde 180; Scheliha 363. Dodds 43-44 almost admits this is possible.

²¹⁰ See Lloyd-Jones 1983: 73-74; Parker 135 (who provides further bibliography).

²¹¹ Cf. Parker 130, 135 n.125; Burkert 55.

²¹² Dodds 44 admits this is so, but argues that blood purification was unusually stressed in the Archaic Age, unlike Homer's age.

²¹³ Monro 1884: 15, 17, 1901: 361, 377; Jebb 153ff.; Forsdyke 130-131; Jouan 1980:102-103.

²¹⁴ See G. Nagy 1979: 165ff.; cf. 208.

²¹⁵ See Rohde 55ff.; Vermeule 162ff.; G. Nagy 1979: 191ff.; A. Edwards 1985: 221ff.

poems of the cycle should not be dated late because they contained immortality for heroes.²¹⁶

At times it has been suggested that the poems in the epic cycle pre-suppose hero-cult and that this is evidence of a post-Homeric date.²¹⁷ Hero cult stress the hero's power manifested from a grave site and involves sacrifice and ritual at the believed location of the hero's grave, at least as it is commonly defined.²¹⁸ It should be immediately pointed out that poetic stories about heroic afterlife are not necessarily linked with these rites. The issue of the relationship between myth and ritual is a controversy that has generated an incredible amount of scholarship over the last century.²¹⁹ Though recently some scholars have discussed possible relationships between myth and ritual in a sophisticated manner, since the decline of the Cambridge school, with all its excesses, simplistic insistence that ritual lies at the root of myth has rightly been regarded with suspicion. It seems best to avoid portraying myth about immortal heroes as simply the result of belief in immortal heroes, though there may be some complex relationship between such beliefs and myth. If we need to decide upon one as the cause of the other, I would suppose it is myth about immortal heroes which engenders ritual belief in immortal heroes.²²⁰

²¹⁶ Welcker 2: 220; Scheliha 242; 394; de Romilly 14-15; Floyd 337, 348; Kullmann 1985: 15ff., Stanley 248. 291 consider heroic immortality to be pre-Homeric; Gantz 135 considers it possible, as did A. Lang 336-337. The pre-Homeric nature of heroic immortality is stressed in G. Nagy's work (notably in 1979: 164ff.). See esp. A. Edwards 1985, who convincingly demonstrates that a special afterlife for Achilles is both the pre- and post-Homeric norm (see further at pp. 157ff. below in chapter three). Jackson Knight presents a good general account of how pre-historic concepts of afterlife and paradise in Mediterranean cultures influenced Greek thought, despite some idiosyncratic arguments based on his personal beliefs.

²¹⁷ E.g. Monro 1884: 16, 32, 1901: 360-361, 377; Jebb 153.

²¹⁸ See Rohde 115ff.; Burkert 1985: 193ff.; Snodgrass 1987: 159-164. But cf. Antonaccio, who concludes that hero cults did not feature tombs or remains at an early date.

²¹⁹ Versnel; Morris thoroughly trace the complicated history of critical views on ritual and myth.

²²⁰ Snodgrass 1987: 159-164 stresses the separate development of epic poetry and hero cult until the late eighth century. The question of whether Ionian epic inspired eighth-century hero cult is related to this issue (see n.7 above). Price 221, 228, proposes that some sort of Mycenaean heroic chronicle gave rise to earlier manifestations of hero cult; Farnell 1921: 285ff.; Hooker 4-5 suggest that hero cult was loosely based on epic poetry about heroes. Early evidence of hero cult may not have featured epic heroes (see Farnell 119; Antonaccio). Antonaccio's illuminating article calls into question basic assumptions about these issues, and underscores the fragility of our understanding.

The most plausible evidence that the epic cycle demonstrates a knowledge of hero cult is the frequent appearance of the ghost of Achilles near his grave site, and especially the sacrifice of Polyxena there.²²¹ Yet it is not certain that the activity of this shade presupposes hero cult. Stories of the ghost of Achilles may be entirely unrelated to hero cult; alternatively, stories of this type may have influenced the development of cult, not vice-versa. And since shades of the dead also appear in *Il.* 23 and *Od.* 11, 24, and since human sacrifices are made at the grave of Patroclus in *Il.* 23, there seems little justification for labeling similar phenomena in the epic cycle post-Homeric.²²²

In fact, most scholars today do not think that hero cult is post-Homeric.²²³ So if we did indeed conclude that the epic cycle does contain material that arose under the influence of hero cult, that would not lead to the conclusion that poems in it are post-Homeric. Though no one today argues that hero cult was practiced continually from Mycenaean times, scholars usually interpret archaeological data to indicate that hero-cult existed well before Homer's time, even if one dates him to the eighth century.²²⁴ Homer does not emphasize hero cult, but internal evidence reveals he is aware of it. Though Rohde was impressed by Homer's general silence about hero cult, he felt the funeral of Patroclus reflected the practice.²²⁵ Other internal evidence includes the sacrifices offered to Erechtheus at *Il.* 2.546ff., the importance of the tomb of Aepetus at *Il.* 2.603-604., the

²²¹ The summary of the *Ilias parva* by Proclus states that Achilles appeared to Neoptolemus. A fragment of a different prose summary of the *Ilias parva* states that this appearance occurred next to Achilles' tomb (*Iliades parvae, Argumenta* 2 Bernabé). The summary by Proclus of the *Ilii excidium* and Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.23 state that Polyxena was slaughtered at Achilles' grave. No reason is given for this action, but later poets linked it with a request by the ghost of Achilles (see J. Frazer 2: 240 n.1; see further at n.44 of chapter five for Polyxena in myth about Achilles). In the summary of the *Nosti* by Proclus Achilles appears to Agamemnon before his departure to give him a warning.

²²² Kullmann 1960: 339, 355 compares Achilles' encounter with the shade of Patroclus with appearances of ghosts in the cyclic poems.

²²³ See especially Price; and also Kullmann 1960: 35 n.1, 1985: 16; Kearns 104; Solmsen 23 n.12; Ford 140 n.14; M. Edwards 1987a: 137; Schein 46ff.; Dietrich 1965: 38-39; A. Edwards 216 n.3; Hommel 10 n.13; Snodgrass 1987: 159ff. G. Nagy has repeatedly stressed that hero cult is not post-Homeric (e.g. 1979: 10). Several of these critics provide further bibliography.

²²⁴ Price 221ff. adduces several examples of pre-Homeric hero cults; again, Antonaccio prefers to see evidence of hero cult as occurring first in the seventh century.

²²⁵ But cf. Snodgrass 1987: 159ff.; Farnell 1921: 5-11.

wording of *Il.* 16. 674-675 in reference to Sarpedon, and the mention of demi-gods at 12.23. Thus two points must be stressed: a) we do not know enough about the poems of the epic cycle (or, I think it should be added, about hero cult) to link the epic cycle with hero cult, and b) knowledge of hero cult by the poems in the epic cycle would not mean they are post-Homeric.

c. supernatural material

Griffin has well demonstrated (1977) that in general the cycle has more supernatural content than Homer does.²²⁶ This is not an indication of decadence on its part. To speak of dignity and realism as the norm of epic is to confuse Homer with his tradition. Some supernatural devices are demonstrably known to Homer but suppressed (e.g. invulnerable armor; see pp. 278ff. in chapter five). It is most likely that supernatural elements entered the epic tradition at an early date.²²⁷ Folk tales commonly contain them, and I argued above that the tradition of the Trojan war contained folk tale aspects from its beginning (see p. 7-8 above). Comparison with other traditions suggest that if anything the supernatural precedes more realistic treatments of traditional material.²²⁸ This division between the supernatural and realism is probably misguided anyway; it appears that the cycle could also be very realistic and graphic.²²⁹ The range of Homer's poetry certainly covers both the supernatural and the realistic. I suspect that the true difference on this issue between Homer and the cycle is that he employs this spectrum of tone in a more sensitive and sophisticated manner.

²²⁶ Preceded by Monro 1884: 10, 1901: 352-354.

²²⁷ Cf. Bowra 1952: 5; Kullmann 1960: 48-49; M. West 1985: 138.

²²⁸ See e.g. Chadwick 110ff. on the supernatural in Teutonic heroic tradition. Cf. Propp's belief (88) that rational variants are later than more supernatural ones in folk tale.

²²⁹ See Kullmann 1960: 223. One reason Wilamowitz 181 n.27 suspected that a *testimonium* is wrongly interpreted as attributing an account of the wounding of Polyxena to the *Cypria* (see n.142 above) was because he deemed the account too realistic for epic poetry.

d. erotic material

Another claim is that erotic material in the poems of the epic cycle reveals the poor taste of a later age.²³⁰ For example, Achilles has an encounter with Helen in the *Cypria* and is apparently attracted to Penthesileia in the *Aethiopis* (though we are not sure of the exact nature of these scenes). As Kullmann points out (45), similar erotic elements were present in non-Greek literature undoubtedly older than Homer, and so there is no need to label such material as intrinsically late. And central to myth about the Trojan war is an erotic incident, the intrigue between Paris and Helen. In fact much of Greek myth of undoubted antiquity has erotic concerns at its core. Vermeule points out that the relationship between sex and death is a recurring theme found in the *Iliad*. Noting that the *Aethiopis* apparently dramatized this same theme by the actions of Achilles and Penthesileia, she effectively mocks critics who consider the episode "Alexandrian" in taste.²³¹

Several of the issues discussed above are related to G. Nagy's theory that the poems of the epic cycle are based on local traditions, and so this seems a good place to discuss his views.²³² He focuses on the local nature of hero cults, which he professes to think underlie the poems in the epic cycle, but has gone so far as to claim that fantastic, miraculous, and erotic elements in the cycle are evidence of their local nature (1990b: 72). Nagy does not insist that local elements are necessarily post-Homeric; in fact he largely accepts the neo-analytical view that the cycle represents an older type of poetry (1990b: 72-73). Nonetheless, if the poems in the cycle contained material which was of interest only to a small area, then their contents would not well reflect a commonly known tradition about the Trojan war. Even if the material in them was based on long-

²³⁰ Rzach 2394; Forsdyke 131; Griffin 1977: 43-45; Jouan 1980: 102. See Kullmann 1960: 43ff. for an opposing view.

²³¹ Vermeule 157-158; cf. Mueller 138 ("sex and violence are the stuff of the Trojan war").

²³² The concept is infused throughout his writings, but see especially 1979: 7ff., 1990a: 10ff., 1990b: 70ff.

standing local traditions, there could be little guarantee that poets outside those areas, like Homer, would know of them. There is no space here to address all of the wide-ranging and learned components of Nagy's theory, but I can contest his characterization of the cyclic poems as local.

First of all, his theory assumes that the attributions of authorship for the poems of the epic cycle are correct. As I have shown above, there is little reason to believe these attributions, and so a fundamental assumption of his theory must be questioned. Even more questionable is his belief that pseudo-biography about the poets somehow reflects the competition of local traditions (e.g. 1990b: 75-76; see also nn.102, 104 above).

Most importantly, it is also difficult to find in the contents of the poems firm evidence of local material. Nagy correctly stresses that hero cults have local significance, but too hastily links stories of heroic immortality with local hero cults (he is obviously even less justified to link the fantastic and miraculous with hero cult, and therefore local concerns. References to an afterlife for heroes in the epic cycle do not necessarily reflect local hero cult. In the case of Achilles, the *Aethiopsis* may have had no knowledge of or relationship with his worship in the Black Sea. As I pointed out above (p. 84), worship of Achilles there was not a hero cult as it is commonly defined, because there was no grave site for Achilles on the Black Sea islands. And we must remember that the nature of hero worship varied greatly (catalogued by Farnell 1921: 19ff.; again, see Antonaccio). I do not see how Milesians could have viewed Achilles as a hero that belonged, by grave site or by ancestral relationship, to Miletus. Greeks living in the Black Sea, where Achilles was supposed to enjoy an afterlife, or Greeks at the Troad, where Achilles was buried, may have felt proud to live in areas of special significance in legend about Achilles, but these legends would have long belonged to pan-Hellenic tradition. Non-Milesians, even non-Ionians worshipped Achilles in the Black Sea area,²³³ and Achilles was worshipped all over the Greek world, undoubtedly as a result of his fame in pan-Hellenic poetry. As I

²³³ See Minns 481; cf. n.194 above on non-Greek involvement.

suggested above, the relation between hero cult and poetry about immortal heroes is complex, and often unrelated. Nagy at times seems to imply heroes in myth function solely to express tribal concerns or historical events like colonization (see n.173 above). It is too simplistic to suggest that hero cult engendered myth about heroic immortality, and that such myth was largely concerned with supporting and expressing local beliefs. For all we know, the poems in the epic cycle demonstrated knowledge of local cult, but they need not have been more interested with expressing its concerns than Homer was, who seems to have known of hero cult.

I mentioned above that Nagy also links the erotic elements in the cycle with local concerns. His argument is that local communities could link themselves genealogically with heroes through stories of their affairs. This is undoubtedly true. But it does not follow that every erotic element in stories about heroes is based on local genealogical concerns. Even when such stories are so employed by local communities, it need not imply that the stories originated with that purpose. And Nagy nowhere actually links an erotic element in the cycle with a specific genealogical claim by a community.

I agree with Nagy's portrayal of the Homeric poems as pan-Hellenic in nature, but I would add that we should consider the cyclic poems also to be pan-Hellenic. In fact, they may even be more representative of a pan-Hellenic Trojan tradition, since I do not think they would contain the sophisticated, idiosyncratic poetic concerns I find in the Homeric poems. Certainly the tradition about the Trojan war was "pan-Hellenic" in content long before Homer's time, as I have pointed out (see p. 9 above). The heroes and material in the epic cycle, as in the Homeric poems, come from all over the Greek world. Since the poems of the epic cycle also seem to have employed the same meter, dialect, and epic phraseology as the Homeric poems, we should consider them to belong to the same tradition to which the Homeric poems belonged, and as pan-Hellenic (if not more) as the Homeric poems.

Another aspect of this issue has been noticed by Snodgrass, who accepts Nagy's distinction between the pan-Hellenism of Ionic epic and the local concerns of hero cult. He stresses that hero cult in early Greece was mostly located on the mainland. He therefore makes a geographical distinction between the pan-Hellenism of Ionia and the local, cultic concerns of the mainland.²³⁴ None of the commonly ascribed authors of the poems in the Trojan section of the epic cycle, including Arctinus, are said to be from the mainland.²³⁵ Nagy accepts these ascriptions without regard to the apparent link between local hero cult and the mainland in the Archaic Age. This is one more problem for a theory that too readily equates stories of immortality with hero cult and therefore with local concerns.

The many claims about late or local concepts in the cycle are thus debatable. It seems these views have been inherited from earlier times without proper re-assessment in the light of recent scholarship. Now Homer is dated in the late eighth century at the earliest, and even this date may be questioned. The schematic approach which portrays an early "Homeric" age as radically different from following ones has lent credibility to the belief that there are "new" elements in the epic cycle, but that approach is surely misguided (see pp. 3-4 of the introduction). Near Eastern influence on Greek culture may have altered Greek culture and Greek epic traditions dramatically, but this cannot be characterized as post-Homeric (see p. 4 of the introduction). It often appears as if detractors of cycle's "late" elements are simply uncomfortable with the nature of Greek myth. "The supreme absurdities of the Wooden Horse" would inspire similar charges of lateness if that episode were not so obviously part of the pre-Homeric tradition.²³⁶

²³⁴ Snodgrass 1987: 159ff. Cf. the distinction in M. West 1978: 370ff. between Ionian "secular" heroes and mainland cult heroes.

²³⁵ Stasinus was said to be from Cyprus, Arctinus from Miletus, Lesches from Mytilene. Agias, purported author of the *Nosti*, was said to be from Troezen.

²³⁶ The quote is from Forsdyke 131, who in fact thinks the wooden horse is a post-Homeric tale interpolated into the *Odyssey*.

Therefore the view that the cycle is full of new material must be questioned. If the cycle is not full of new material, then one can more easily trust the traditional nature of its contents. And since I have also shown that the poems of the cycle may not be dependent on Homer, either in their structure or in their details, it seems entirely justifiable to view the poems of the epic cycle as largely traditional. I do not claim that the cycle demonstrates no influence from Homer or that it contains no post-Homeric elements. After all, I think the poems in the cycle are probably of later date than the Homeric poems. But I hope to have shown that the influence of Homer on them and the presence of late elements in them are greatly exaggerated. As a result, there has been unnecessary hesitation in using the cycle to explore pre-Homeric tradition. I believe it presents a good picture of the material and tone of the tradition in which Homer worked.

Chapter Two: The Destiny of Achilles

The death of Achilles is not portrayed in the *Iliad*, but it is frequently mentioned.¹ Because Achilles is privy to the prophecy of his mother, he is the only major character who is aware of his death long before it occurs.² In book 1 the hero and his mother refer to Achilles' short life several times. The goddess and her child thereafter continue to discuss the brevity of his life throughout the poem. The topic is also mentioned by other characters on numerous occasions. In the later books the approaching death of Achilles is stressed with increasing precision, in what Griffin calls a "crescendo."³ In this chapter I will first seek to ascertain what this oft-mentioned fate of Achilles is. Homer seems to assume knowledge of Achilles' fate by the audience and never explicitly explains what exactly will happen to Achilles. But a clear picture of the coming death of Achilles can be gained from a close consideration of the numerous passages that look forward to it. The story of Achilles' death in pre-Homeric myth probably underlies these passages, and we will be well on our way to reconstructing that story by the end of this chapter.

Another focus of the chapter will be the Homeric use of Achilles' fate, in other words, how the coming death of Achilles is a recurring topic of great significance throughout the poem (this is one sense of the dissertation's title). In particular I will examine the poet's portrayal of prophecy from Thetis to Achilles, an issue intertwined with the issue of Achilles' fate. It is possible that in pre-Homeric myth a prophecy of

¹ Duckworth sensitively discussed narration of the future in Homer (and in Apollonius and Vergil). See now de Jong, who thoroughly categorizes the narration of time in the *Iliad*, and Morrison, who stresses the imprecision of foreshadowing and prediction in the *Iliad*.

² A few minor characters, notably Euchenor at 13.663-670, receive prophecy of their death. See King 239 n.30 for passages and discussion.

³ Griffin 1980: 163 n.39. For the relevant passages cf. Duckworth 28-29; J. Kakridis 1971: 62-63; Morrison 142 n.41; and more briefly M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 18.95-96. Kullmann 1960: 308-314, 320-326; Schoeck 38ff. provide useful discussion, often from a neo-analytical point of view that will be considered in chapter four.

momentous import was given by Thetis to Achilles. Yet we get no sense of such a prophecy from the vague and apparently contradictory manner in which Achilles' foreknowledge of his fate is handled in the *Iliad*. New aspects of what Thetis has told him about his fate are suddenly introduced, and it emerges that Thetis has given him a number of different prophecies, most of them apparently delivered before the dramatic time of the *Iliad*. What Achilles knows about his fate in the *Iliad* is difficult to ascertain at times.

It will therefore be worthwhile to examine the seemingly contradictory manner in which Homer has manipulated the *topos* of Achilles' foreknowledge. My examination will demonstrate that Homer often stresses different aspects of prophecy from Thetis to Achilles in an *ad hoc* manner. The poet is not necessarily inconsistent in these *ad hoc* passages, and in fact he often effects certain poetic effects, chief among them the characterization of Achilles. In this chapter I intend not only to reconstruct details of pre-Homeric myth from the evidence of Homeric passages but also to observe the poet's idiosyncratic use of such myth.

In the last part of this chapter I will explore the possibility that prophecy by Thetis to Achilles existed in pre-Homeric myth. Thetis apparently gave Achilles a prophecy in the *Aethiopsis* shortly before his death (the nature of her words to him will be addressed chapters three and four). We might suppose that Thetis had informed Achilles of his fate at an earlier point in his life, but unfortunately there is little information of other prophecies from Thetis to her son in the cyclic tradition. Therefore no firm conclusions regarding the pre-Homeric nature of prophecy from Thetis to Achilles can be reached. It will be of interest, however, to consider evidence from the ancient world that casts some light on the issue.

1. Achilles' Fate in the *Iliad*

What Thetis tells him

Achilles and Thetis often speak about his short life in a vague manner (e.g. in book 1; see pp. 107-108 below for passages). Sometimes, however, precise details concerning his fate are mentioned. What specific information has Achilles received from her? At 9.410-416, in a famous passage, he claims that his mother has revealed that he has two fates, either to remain at Troy, die young, and earn fame, or to return home, live long, and not receive fame:

μήτερ γάρ τέ μέ φησι θεὰ Θέτις ἀργυρόπεζα
 διχθαδίας κῆρας φερέμεν θανάτοιο τέλοσδε.
 εἰ μὲν κ' αὔθι μένων Τρώων πόλιν ἀμφιμάχωμαι,
 ὤλετο μὲν μοι νόστος, ἀτὰρ κλέος ἄφθιτον ἔσται·
 εἰ δέ κεν οἴκαδ' ἵκωμι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαίαν,
 ὤλετό μοι κλέος ἐσθλόν, ἐπὶ δηρὸν δέ μοι αἰὼν
 ἔσσεται, οὔδε κέ μ' ὦκα τέλος θανάτοιο κιχείη.

At 17.424-09 the poet reports that Achilles, though still ignorant of the death of Patroclus, knows from his mother that he himself will not take Troy:

τό μιν οὐ ποτε ἔλπετο θυμῷ
 τεθνάμεν, ἀλλὰ ζῶν ἐνιχριμφθέντα πύλησιν
 ἄψ ἀπονοστήσειν, ἐπεὶ οὔδ' ἐλπετο πάμπαν,
 ἐκπέρσειν πτολίεθρον ἄνευ ἔθεν, οὔδ' σὺν αὐτῷ·
 πολλάκι γὰρ τό μητρὸς ἐπεύθετο νόσφιν ἀκούων,
 ἧ οἱ ἀπαγγέλλεσκε Διὸς μέγαλοιο νόημα.

At 18.95-96 his mother tells him his death will follow Hector's: ὠκύμορος δὴ μοι, τέκος, ἔσσεαι, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις/ αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἑκτορα πότμος ἐτοῖμος. This is the only detail about his death that we observe Thetis give to Achilles in the poem. At 21.277-278 he mentions his mother's prediction of his death by the shafts of Apollo: ἢ μ' ἔφατο Τρώων ὑπο τείχεϊ θωρηκτάων/ λαιψηροῖς ὀλέεσθαι Ἀπόλλωνος βελέεσσιν. Though the word "βέλος" can be used of other weapons, Apollo is usually associated with arrows and the passage leaves one with the impression that they will be used to kill him (thus Richardson 1993 *ad* 21.113).

Achilles had recently spoke to Lycaon about his death:

ἀλλ' ἔπι τοι καὶ ἐμοὶ θάνατος καὶ μοῖρα κραταιή·
 ἔσσεται ἢ ἠὼς ἢ δαίλη ἢ μέσον ἡμᾶρ
 ὅπποτε τις καὶ ἐμεῖο ἄρη ἐκ θυμὸν ἔληται,
 ἢ ὃ γε δουρὶ βαλὼν ἢ ἀπὸ νευρῆφιν ὀϊστῶ. (21.110-113)

Since the poem has stressed up to this point that Achilles knows his fate from his mother, we might suppose that he is here thinking of her prophecies and is not simply musing aloud about the risks of warfare. But in this passage Achilles is much less specific than in the other passage in book 21 mentioned immediately above (21.277-278). He leaves out mention of Apollo, and talks of his being struck by someone someday with a spear or arrow (δουρὶ...ἢ...ὀϊστῶ). Macleod compares (*ad* 24.734-738) 21.110-113 to two other passages in which the second possibility of a pair becomes true—confirmation in one case occurring in the extra-Homeric tradition, in the other in a later passage in Homer. Confirmation of the second possibility in this passage would seem to occur in extra-Homeric tradition, as we shall see in chapter five. Thus this passage as well seems to suggest that the weapon of his destruction will be an arrow.

Information from other characters

The passages examined above provided the details that Thetis gives to her son concerning his fate. We now require the remarks by other characters about the fate of Achilles in order to gain a more complete picture of his fate. Sometimes others besides Thetis make predictions to Achilles about his death. It is not certain whether Achilles already knows from Thetis the information that they provide. We might suspect he does, since the passage about the "shafts" of Apollo (21.277-278) indicates that she has given him very specific information about his death.

The divine horse Xanthus at 19.416-417 refers to a god and a man as the future slayers of Achilles as he sets out to battle: ἀλλὰ σοὶ αὐτῶ/ μόρσιμόν ἐστι θεῶ τε καὶ ἀνέρι Ἴφι δαμῆναι. The dying Hector is more specific about these details at 22.359-60. Paris and Apollo will be the slayers, and the scene of his death will be at the Scaean gates: ἤματι τῷ ὅτε κέν σε Πάρις καὶ Φοῖβος Ἄπολλων/ ἐσθλὸν ἔοντ' ὀλέσωσιν ἐν Σκαιοῖσι πύλῃσιν. The ghost of Patroclus at 23.80-81 also says the scene of Achilles' death will be under the walls of Troy: καὶ δὲ σοὶ αὐτῶ μοῖρα, θεοῖς ἐπιείκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ,/ τείχει ὑπο Τρώων εὐφηνέων ἀπολέσθαι. If Achilles has not gained a complete picture of his coming fate from his mother, he certainly does acquire it from these characters by the end of the *Iliad*.

There are other references to the death of Achilles not made in his presence, but they give us no further information. On occasion enemies of Achilles speak of his death. Polydamas at 18.283 envisions dogs eating his corpse, Priam 22.41-42 wishes that dogs and vultures would devour his corpse, and Hecuba at 24.212-213 wishes she could gnaw on his liver. These are clearly wishes and not informed predictions. In particular, the references to the mistreatment of the corpse of Achilles are wrong, for the corpse of Achilles is rescued by Ajax in Greek myth. Pope states (7) that mortals do not seem to have knowledge of Achilles' early death. This is essentially true, though some are told about it. The embassy in book 9 hears Achilles speak of a choice of fates, and we might

guess they have reported Achilles' words to Nestor when at 11.794-795 Nestor suggests that Achilles has heard a prophecy from his mother. Lykaon hears Achilles speak of his death in rather vague terms at 21.110-113. And mortals can have foreknowledge of Achilles' fate in special situations: when Hector is about to die (22.356-360; compare Patroclus' last words to Hector at 16.844ff.), and after Patroclus has died and is a shade (23.80-81).

Renehan has stressed (113-114) that the death of Achilles is mentioned only in the speech of characters, not in the narrative. That is not strictly true, for at 17.194-195 the poet notes that Achilles will not grow old in his armor. This must be a reference to his early death, not to the loss of this first set of his two sets of armor in the *Iliad*.⁴ Yet it does seem that the poet is noticeably less willing to speak of Achilles' death than the coming deaths of other characters. He predicts Sarpedon's death (16.458-461), and frequently stresses the death of Patroclus before it occurs (16.46-47; 247-252; 644-651; 684-693; 787). And at 12.10-18 the poet implies the coming death of Hector in his discussion of the future destruction of the Achaean wall, but foregoes the opportunity to mention the death of Achilles.⁵ Why is this so? The poet is the most trustworthy source of what will happen.⁶ Perhaps the death of Achilles was so well-known in myth that such authority was not needed to announce it. The deaths of Patroclus and perhaps Hector may have been different. I do not think the poet invented their deaths, much less their characters (see discussion on Homeric invention at pp. 202ff. in chapter four), but I suspect that he greatly expanded their stories. The audience would require more authoritative direction about what is to happen to them, especially in the case of Patroclus.

⁴ As M. Edwards 1991 *ad loc.* notes. See also Kullmann 1960: 321. Heath 391 does not interpret this passage well.

⁵ Rutherford 153-155 discusses predictions of the deaths of Sarpedon, Patroclus, and Hector by the poet and Zeus. Useful collections of predictions of the deaths of Sarpedon, Patroclus, and Hector, arranged according to who states them, can be found at Morrison 141 nn.36-38.

⁶ See de Jong 97, 178, 193, 225ff. and *passim*; Morrison 17-18.

After the poet, the gods and especially Zeus must be regarded as the most credible about the future.⁷ There is no reference to the death of Achilles by Zeus, though he refers to the death of Sarpedon at 16.433-34, to the death of Patroclus at 15.64-67, and to the death of Hector at 15.68, 17.201-208. It is particularly noticeable that in his broad prediction of the future at 15. 59ff. Zeus fails to mention the death of Achilles, though he states that Patroclus and Hector will die. Janko attributes that to the tact of Zeus when addressing Hera (1992: *ad* 15.56-77), but perhaps the death of Achilles is overlooked in this passage because no such authoritative pronouncement about it was needed. Of course, Thetis and Xanthus are divinities who do predict the death of Achilles, and other gods vaguely speak of the coming death of Achilles (see p. 106 below; Morrison is somewhat misleading to say [101] that the Olympian gods do not foretell the death of Achilles). But we may say that no divinity who is not close to Achilles ever predicts his death in an oracular manner. The lack of comment by the poet or other reliable sources suggests that the audience did not need direction about the matter. We might also suppose that because the ancient audience knew the story well, it was not confused by the variety and flexibility of passages about the death of Achilles, an issue discussed below.

It is not as easy for a modern audience to gain an exact understanding of Achilles' fate from these passages, however. Taplin argues (1992: 245-246) that a sense of the details of Achilles' death is gained by accretion. But could an ancient audience ignorant of Achilles' fate gain a sense of it from these disparate passages? Taplin does often convincingly demonstrate that it is possible to join together widely separated details in the *Iliad*. But I think we must keep in mind that the ancient audience brought knowledge to the poem that we do not possess. If the ancient audience well knew the story of Achilles' death, the poet would not feel obliged to create a clear picture of the death of Achilles. We now lack the knowledge of the ancient audience and can only gain

⁷ Morrison 17-18; but cf. de Jong 170. 228.

a coherent picture of the death of Achilles from careful comparison of all of these passages. Let us now try to draw some conclusions from the passages we have examined. Eventually we should perceive the outlines of a traditional story that Homer and his audience knew.

A variety of statements about the coming death of Achilles are made. The poet seems to allude directly to his death only once, and only in a vague manner. Mortals do not seem to know of it, but the dying Hector and the dead Patroclus foretell it quite specifically. Gods generally know of it, but except for Xanthus and Thetis they do not provide much information. We only once see Thetis give Achilles specific information, but he frequently talks of prophecies he has heard from her, apparently from before the dramatic time of the *Iliad*.

When one compares all the passages that provide specific information, certain details about the death of Achilles emerge. Apollo and Paris will be the slayers, the gates or wall of Troy will be the scene of his death, and he will be killed by bow and arrow. Hector's last words come closest to a complete statement of them. He specifies Apollo and Paris as the slayers and the Scaean gates as the place (22.359-360). This provides two of the three basic elements. Other passages reinforce this information. At 19.417 it is specified that a divinity will participate in the slaying, and at 21.278 Apollo is named as a slayer. In addition, Apollo's words to Achilles at 22.13, "οὐ μὲν με κτενέεις, ἐπεὶ οὐ τοι μόρσιμός εἰμι," may be viewed as implying the antithesis, "but you are fated to be killed by me" (Schoeck 39). Paris is not mentioned outside of Hector's last words in connection with the death of Achilles, but at 19.417 it is predicted that a mortal will be a second slayer. At 21.277 and 23.81 the wall of Troy is specified as the scene of Achilles' death. The passages are not as clear about the weapon to be used, but it is easily concluded from 21.277-278 and 21.110-113 that Achilles will be slain by bow and arrow (see p. 99 above).

These details must be based on the pre-Homeric tradition of the death of Achilles. Above I suggested that the poet and Zeus do not predict the death of Achilles because Homer assumes the audience knows well what is going to happen to Achilles. I imagine that ancient listeners would recognize instantly the three basic elements of the death of Achilles discussed above because they were very familiar with the circumstances of the story. It is unrealistic to suppose that an ancient audience could have sifted the passages (as I have) to gain a unified picture of Achilles' coming fate. If ancient listeners did not know a traditional account of Achilles' death, they would have been thoroughly mystified by Homer's obscure references to the manner of his death. And it is unlikely that Homer simply invented details about Achilles' fate in an *ad hoc* manner. Homer does invent *ad hoc* details, but he only does so for specific purposes. I cannot see any purpose to Homer's invention and repetition of details concerning who would kill Achilles, how they would kill him, and where he would die. It is more likely that the poet is repeating these details because they were part of a well-known tradition about the death of Achilles. From Homer, therefore, we have begun to gain a picture of the traditional death of Achilles. In chapter three I shall turn to other evidence to gain a more complete picture of this story.

2. The Homeric Use of Achilles' Fate

Details about the traditional death of Achilles were reconstructed above from the evidence of Homer after a thorough examination. The task was difficult because Homer is not interested in simply narrating the details of Achilles' fate, which he seems to assume his audience knows. The poet is interested, rather, in using the *topos* of Achilles' fate to achieve various poetic effects. The next section of the chapter will examine what these effects are and how they are achieved. Through this examination we will be able to understand better how Homer employed traditional fate for his own purposes. First I will

discuss the Homeric conception of prophecy from Thetis to Achilles. This issue is intertwined with the issue of Achilles' fate and will be essential to my following examination of *ad hoc* invention and apparent contradiction in passages about Achilles' fate.

I should briefly note here how I understand the phenomenon of *ad hoc* composition relates to inconsistency. It has frequently been proposed that details of an *ad hoc* nature exist in the passages examined below, and I often agree with that assessment. However, I differ with the common view that equates *ad hoc* composition with confusion of the part of the poet or an inability to control his own verse. Two points are essential in the understanding of this issue. One can be gained from common sense, but has been most thoroughly examined from a narratological perspective in recent years (e.g. de Jong). This is that it is necessary to recognize who is the source for a statement. If what one character says about a matter is inconsistent with what another character says or even with what the same character says elsewhere, that does not necessarily mean that the poet is indifferent to consistency. It may be that the poet is portraying the character or the situation through the apparent inconsistency. This is especially important because so much of the *Iliad* is related in the voice of the characters and not narrated by the poet.

A second important point is that an undoubted instance of inconsistency on the part of the poet may prove nothing more than that the poet has chosen to forego consistency in order to achieve a particular poetic effect. It need not mean that the poet is unconscious of the inconsistency. The assertion that a detail is inspired by the context is misleading if it implies (as I am afraid it often does) that the context is creating the poetry, with the poet controlled by the context. In fact the poet is creating the context in the first place. Since there may be significance to an *ad hoc* detail or to a moment of inconsistency, it behooves us to examine and appreciate the effect. Thus *ad hoc* variation on a theme can be evidence of artistic skill, not of neglectful composition or disregard for consistency. In exploring this issue I hope to chart a middle ground between two extreme

views that have been brought to bear on this issue in the past. One is common among unitarians, the denial as a matter of principle that any inconsistency exists. Consistency in itself is not a virtue that I am seeking to establish for Homer. Scholars throughout the ages have demonstrated that on occasion Homer "nods." The other extreme view was once common among analysts but is more frequently found in oral theory today (e.g. Willcock's association of *ad hoc* composition with oral technique). This is an enthusiasm for discovering inconsistency in the belief that the "mistakes" prove a favored theory (e.g. multiple authorship, oral composition). Undoubted instances of "mistakes" on the poet's part have inspired an exaggerated sense of inconsistency that too little regards context and nuance.⁸ Below I shall strive to demonstrate that variation on the *topos* of Achilles' fate often serves the poet's purpose; if that is inconsistency then I am glad it exists.

The Homeric portrayal of prophecy from Thetis to Achilles

It will be worthwhile at this point to wonder how Thetis knows about her son's fate and when she tells him of it. The first question cannot be answered with any explicit evidence from the poem. She may simply know the future because she is divine. Since Thetis knows everything, as Achilles says at 1.365, her questions are unnecessary. Menelaus speaks to Proteus in much the same manner at *Od.* 4.465. That scene in the *Odyssey* also provides us with the relevant phrase *Θεοὶ...πάντα ἴσασιν* (*Od.* 4.379=4.468). These remarks are not made in reference to the future, but to the gods' ability to know events that have occurred elsewhere. Many gods do seem to know of Achilles' coming fate: perhaps Apollo at 16.707-709 (in denying that it is Troy's fate to be taken by Achilles), Hephaestus at 18.464-467, Hera at 20.125-128 (speaking to Athena

⁸ My readers might counter my remarks with reference to the oft-admired article by Perry on "the early Greek capacity for viewing things separately." There one can find apt warnings on the danger of imposing modern conceptions upon early Greek literature, and Perry's remarks (407-408) on the lack of logical sequence in myth are appropriate. But I find his portrayal of Homer distressingly similar to the primitivist approach that I criticised above at pp. 3-4 in the introduction (405: "the primitive mind resembles the mind of a child;" 407: "the early Greek mind has much of the childlike in it"), and I do not agree that oral composition necessarily lacks logic (410; cf. n.45 in chapter one).

and Poseidon), Poseidon at 20.337 and 21.291 (with Athena standing by in this second passage). Some of these passages might only refer to Achilles' mortality in general, but the tone of them suggest that Achilles' early death is at issue. The divine horse Xanthus at 19.408-17 certainly knows of his master's fated early death. Therefore it is not implausible that a goddess like Thetis should know of her son's future through her own divine abilities. In fact sea divinities were thought of as *especially* prophetic in early Greek mythology, though the *Iliad* gives no indication of this.⁹ As such a figure, Thetis could have always have known her son's fate.

However, the gods are frequently portrayed as ignorant of the future in Homer when that suits the poet's purpose.¹⁰ Even Zeus can be deceived by Hera in book 14 of the *Iliad*. So Thetis may not necessarily know of Achilles' fate just because she is divine. One might surmise from the *Iliad* that Thetis knows of Achilles' future through Zeus. Achilles says at 17.408-09 that she has repeatedly told him the νόημα of Zeus. This suggests that she has heard from Zeus his personal plans for the future. Nestor suggests to Patroclus at 11.794-95 that Achilles has received a prophecy from Thetis that ultimately came from Zeus (εἰ δέ τινα φρεσὶν ἦσι θεοπροπίην ἀλεείνει/ καὶ τινά οἱ παρ Ζηνοῦς ἐπέφραδε πότνια μήτηρ...; Patroclus speaks the same words to Achilles with change of person at 16.36-37). Nestor's words may reflect the poet's conception of the relationship between the two divinities. In book 1 Thetis recalls her rescue of Zeus and later goes to request favors for Achilles from him. One might suppose that she has also received privileged information from him in the past. Nevertheless, the relationship between Thetis and Zeus is never precisely established in the *Iliad*, and Thetis often speaks of Achilles' fate without mentioning a source. In the final analysis, Homer's presentation of the matter must be considered unclear.

⁹ See M. West 1966 *ad Theog.* 233; S. West *ad Od.* 4.365-366; Vermeule 132, 190ff. Eidothea of the *Odyssey*, as a daughter of the sea god Proteus, is comparable to Thetis, a daughter of the "old man of the sea." Although it is Eidothea's father, not she, who tells Menelaus of his future (4.563ff.), note her name (and cf. the name "Theonoe," the mantic daughter of a sea god in Euripides *Helen*).

¹⁰ See M. Edwards 1987a: 135; S. West *ad Od.* 4.379-81.

When does the *Iliad* suggest that Achilles learned of his fate from Thetis? The opening book portrays Thetis and Achilles as already knowing of his short life in a general way. Achilles says to his mother:

μητηρ, ἐπεὶ μ' ἔτεκές γε μινυιθάδιόν περ ἔοντα,
τιμήν πέρ μοι ὄφελλεν Ὀλύμπιος ἐγγυαλίξαι
Ζεὺς... (352-254)

Thetis in her reply comments:

αἶθ' ὄφελος παρὰ νηυσὶν ἀδάκρυτος καὶ ἀπήμων
ἦσθαι, ἐπεὶ νύ τοι αἴσα μίνυιθά περ, οὗ τι μάλα
δῆν·
νῦν δ' ἄμα τ' ὠκύμορος καὶ οἰζυρὸς περὶ πάντων
ἔπλεο· τῷ σε κακῇ αἴσῃ τέκον ἐν μεγάροισι. (415-418)

Thetis later in the book says to Zeus: τίμησόν μοι υἱόν, ὅς ὠκυμωρῶτατος ἄλλων/ ἔπλετ' (505-506).¹¹ So she has told her son about his fate before the opening of the poem. Perhaps she had not told him everything, however. Within the poem she tells Achilles that he will die soon after Hector (18.96), a detail that Achilles has apparently not heard before. But one need not think that other information which Achilles says he knows from his mother is given during the span of the poem's temporal framework. Homer always seems to suggest that Achilles heard prophecies from Thetis before the dramatic time of the *Iliad*.

¹¹ These first passages do not refer to Achilles' mortality in contrast to his mother's immortality, as Pope 8 n.14 argues (M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 18.95-96 thinks he may be right). The phrase ὠκυμωρῶτατος ἄλλων at 1.505 makes that quite clear; Pope's proposal that Thetis would mention her son's early death to Zeus but not to Achilles is very unpersuasive. E.g. Kirk 1985: *ad* 1.352-353; Slatkin 34ff. correctly follow the more common (and more natural) view that even these first passages imply an early death.

I say "prophecies," because it is implied that Achilles heard more than one. "Many times" (πολλάκι) Thetis kept telling (ἀπαγγέλλεσκε) Achilles of the thought of Zeus (17.408ff.). Leaf notes (1900-1902 *ad loc.*) that continual prophecy is peculiar to this place and Macleod calls this (*ad* 24.72-73) "rhetorical overstatement." But Homer finds the notion of continual prophecy agreeable in the case of other mantic parents. The word "πολλάκι" is used of the prophecies of Euchenor's father (13.666), and imperfect tenses are used at 11.329ff., where a mantic father repeatedly tries to restrain his sons from going to war. Furthermore, long and repeated conversation is a feature of the Achilles-Thetis relationship. At least some of the time Homer would have us think that Thetis lived at Peleus' home together with her son in the past.¹² There Achilles heard the story of her rescue of Zeus "many times" (πολλάκι, 1.396). Even at Troy Zeus speaks of her as by her son's side day and night (24.72-73). Macleod *ad loc.* is correct in calling this exaggeration, for we do not find Thetis by Achilles' side to that degree in the *Iliad*, but nevertheless the exaggeration is a reflection of the nature of their relationship. When we last hear of Thetis, she is having a long conversation with her son (πολλὰ πρὸς ἀλλήλους ἔπεα πτερόεντ' ἀγόρευον, 24.142). This is the type of scene in which the prophecies took place many times in the past, we might imagine. Their relationship makes it appear that he receives his information not from divine revelation but from discussions naturally arising between a mother and her son.

Achilles' knowledge of Patroclus' fate also seems to suggest different prophecies at different times. When he talked to Menoetius before the war (18.324-327), Achilles apparently did not know either the fate of Patroclus or of himself, since he speaks of them both coming home. When he hoped that Patroclus would tend to Neoptolemus after his

¹² E.g. 16.222-224, 18.57-59. That she would be at Peleus' home if Achilles returned is implied at 18.59-60, 89-90. Cf. 19.421-422, where Achilles illogically says he will die far from his father and mother. Of course he will not die far from her, but the use of this pathetic motif (Griffin 1980: 125) in the case of Achilles may be another reflection of the domestic role sometimes ascribed to Thetis. On the inconsistency of the *Iliad* concerning where Thetis lives cf. Robbins 1990a: 2 n.5, 1993: 7-8; Andersen 1990: 40-41. In my opinion, Homer consciously allows inconsistency on this issue because it suits his poetic needs to have her live in both places. Thus it would be misguided to think that the poet was unable to be consistent or that he spontaneously changed his mind out of whimsy.

death (a hope recalled at 19.328-33), he must have received information about his own fate, but not about that of Patroclus. Apparently he only knew the fates of both his friend and of himself after he later received a prophecy about Patroclus' fate (18.4ff.). Thus different prophecies must have occurred at different times, unless one is willing to believe that Homer does not try to be consistent on this matter (an issue discussed below).

We can conclude that Homer has portrayed prophecy from Thetis to Achilles in a complex manner. It is not clear how she knows of Achilles' fate; she may know through her own divine abilities or she may have learned of it from Zeus. Achilles has apparently discussed it with his mother repeatedly before the dramatic time of the *Iliad*. Homer does not suggest that there is one complete revelation of his fate from his mother, either inside or outside the *Iliad*. Instead, he portrays prophecy from Thetis to Achilles as part of a close relationship between mother and son. The climactic potential of a prophecy about his fate has been refracted into a motif spread out over time and experienced over time in a very human manner.¹³ Willcock well describes this phenomenon as a "pattern" of private information received by Achilles.¹⁴

Inconsistency and *ad hoc* invention

It is apparent that some of the passages about Achilles' fate seem to contradict each other and that some of the details in them are invented in an *ad hoc* manner. But charges of inconsistency between the passages are often exaggerated. We need to take into consideration the circumstances in which the fate of Achilles is discussed. Though Homer has extended the motif of prophecy by Thetis to Achilles with much inventiveness and though he often does so to serve the needs of characterization and narrative development, he is not disorganized or willfully inconsistent in his conception of the fate

¹³ See n.45 below on how this contrasts with the use of prophecy in the epic cycle. Neo-analysts tend to view a single prophecy related in the *Aethiopis* as the sole source for the motif of prophecy in the *Iliad*. Below at p. 125-126 I dispute that idea.

¹⁴ Willcock 1977: 52, cf. 1978-1984 *ad* 17.408 and 18.9.

of Achilles. And there is no need to doubt the validity of the basic elements in the story of the death of Achilles that we have seen in the passages examined above.

One controversy concerns the "choice" of Achilles that is featured in Achilles' reply to the embassy in book 9. Many scholars have become so fascinated by this concept that they speak of Achilles as if he is continuously faced with a decision about his fate until he chooses to stay and die in book 18. But that interpretation ignores the fact that the *Iliad* elsewhere portrays the fate of Achilles as long decided.¹⁵ It is more likely that Achilles is being untruthful in book 9, or perhaps is misleadingly speaking of a choice that he made in the past.

Achilles speaks with Thetis as if his fate is decided already in book 1, as we saw above (see p. 108 above). Thetis does not seem to think there that his fate can be averted. The most for which she hopes is that he at least be happy, and she feels powerless to effect even this (1.415-418; cf. 18.61-62=442-443).¹⁶ And Achilles does not speak as if he has a choice in the matter. That is not surprising; it would be odd if Achilles still contemplated a return home ten years after he arrived at Troy. In addition, Achilles' remark at 19.328ff., that he always hoped he alone and not Patroclus would die in Troy, also implies that he knew of his death long before the dramatic time of the *Iliad*.

In fact Achilles never really denies that he will die at Troy in the course of the *Iliad*. A brief examination of passages in which the opposite might be concluded should demonstrate this. When in book 1 he tells Agamemnon that the plague will force the Greeks to go home (59-60), he is raising a possibility that would preclude his fated death at Troy. But he is emphasizing the seriousness of the plague, and we need not think that he actually believes the Greeks will go home and his fate will not be realized. After becoming enraged later in the same book he does threaten to depart by himself (169). But

¹⁵ Leaf 1900-1902 *ad* 9.411; Hainsworth 1993a *ad* 9.410-416; M. Edwards 1991: *ad* 17.404-411 note that the choice of bk. 9 is not supported by other passages.

¹⁶ Slatkin 17ff. argues that the Homeric portrayal of Thetis as helpless is untraditional. But traditionally at this point in the story Thetis may well have become resigned to her son's fate, even if earlier she may not have been.

we should classify this remark with his threats of returning home and becoming married in book 9 (356-67; 393-97). Then, as in book 1, he speaks in anger and is intent on startling his audience. These passages do not indicate a true denial of his fate.

Peleus had promised Achilles' hair to the river Spercheius if his son returned home safely (book 23.140ff.).¹⁷ Obviously this suggests that Peleus did not know or did not believe in his son's fate. The fact that Achilles waits until book 23 to cut his hair, explaining to Spercheius then that he knows he will not return, might suggest he earlier shared with his father a disbelief in his fate or an ignorance of it. But the earlier failure of Achilles to cut his hair need not be construed as a sharing of his father's attitude. He had repeatedly emphasized his coming death in the books before book 23 without feeling the need to cut off his hair. He may have wished to respect his father's efforts on his behalf. And there was no significant opportunity to cut off his hair before the funeral of Patroclus.

At 21.275ff. Achilles does express disbelief in his fate. Here Achilles mistakenly fears that it is his fate to perish in the river and he explicitly questions the truthfulness of his mother, indeed in the same passage that gives us the most specific details about his fate (Apollo and his shafts). But the dire straits in which he finds himself makes his disbelief of his mother's predictions seem a most natural reaction. And he does not believe in this passage that he will not die; he is just surprised and dismayed at the circumstances in which he apparently will die. What is remarkable is that there is no indication that he has a choice of fates. It is noted by de Jong (280 n.59) that this prophecy seems to contradict the one recalled in book 9 about a choice. She wonders if the prophecy mentioned in book 21 was a second prophecy, delivered after a prophecy about a choice of fates. That may be an explanation; the prophecy of book 21 could have followed a decision by Achilles concerning his choice. Or perhaps we may simply

¹⁷ For the ancient ritual of offering locks of hair to the dead or to a river see Richardson 1993: 182-183. Leaf 1900-1902 *ad* 23.141; Willcock 1978-1984 *ad* 23.142 note that cutting of the hair often took place at the coming of age. The long hair of Achilles is an indication of just how young Achilles was portrayed in the *Iliad*. It may be significant that his slayer Apollo is also long-haired; see n.59 below.

conclude that the choice never existed. Either way we should not view these two prophecies as inconsistent. Instead we should wonder if Achilles is being misleading in book 9.

In fact Achilles outside of book 9 often speaks of prophecies by Thetis from long ago, but never in connection with a choice of fates. Nestor implies at 11.794-795 that Achilles has a conditional prophecy and that he has chosen to withdraw and be safe, but his remark is apparently based on a report of Achilles' words from the embassy (see pp. 115-116 below). The only other passage in the *Iliad* that might reflect a conditional prophecy occurs at 18.95-96. Some conclude that the words of Thetis, ὠκύμορος δὴ μοι, τέκος, ἔσσεαι οἷ' ἀγορεύεις! αὐτίκα γάρ τοι ἔπειτα μεθ' Ἕκτορα πτότμος ἐτοῖμος, imply that Achilles could live if he did not kill Hector. First of all, such a choice, whether to avoid Hector and live or kill him and die, would not be the choice of book 9.¹⁸ And I think her words do not imply he has a choice of fates. She merely observes that his determination to die confirms a fate she views as irrevocable, and then provides more specific information about it (see further on this scene on pp. 122-123 below). Why Achilles' death should follow Hector's is an issue that will be discussed in chapter four.

Thus no other passages in the *Iliad* support Achilles' assertion in book 9 that he can choose to live. Achilles is never really unaware that he will die at Troy, nor does he really ever think that this fate is avoidable. Of course it is natural for him to doubt occasionally his fate in passing, or pretend that it has not already been decided. Other characters to whom he speaks do not know his fate and can easily be misled on the matter. And the poet is interested in portraying him as slowly coming to terms with his fate throughout the poem (this is more thoroughly discussed in the next section). But various misrepresentations or hesitations by Achilles do not preclude his knowing and

¹⁸ Plato *Symp.* 179e, quoted by Hainsworth 1993a *ad* 9.410-416, actually conflates this passage with the choice of bk. 9 and implies that Achilles could have chosen not to kill Hector and live. That must be viewed as a misinterpretation of Homer.

accepting his death from the beginning of the poem. It is always imaginable in the world of Homer that fate can be contravened. Even Zeus briefly wonders whether the fated death of Sarpedon need occur (16.433ff.). Achilles should be allowed to express doubts about what he actually knows is fated and irrevocable.

Those who recognize this sometimes conclude that the concept of a choice is an *ad hoc* invention, only introduced into his story here.¹⁹ The fact that a choice of fates is a general motif not particularly linked to Achilles might encourage the view that the idea has been suddenly introduced into Achilles' story in book 9. Euchenor at 13.663-70 is said to have had a choice (of types of deaths). He belongs to a category of sons with prophets for fathers and so may not simply be a pale imitation of Achilles.²⁰ M. Edwards compares Achilles' choice to those of Heracles and Gilgamesh;²¹ one may compare the choice given to Pollux by Zeus at Pindar *Nem.* 10.80ff. But it is also possible that a choice was intrinsic to Achilles' fate in the past.²² If that was the case, Achilles would have chosen a short but glorious death when he set out for the Trojan war. The threat to return home, it is true, might be viewed as a re-establishment of the earlier choice of fates. But it becomes clear by the end of the scene in book 9 that Achilles has no real intention of leaving. Thus he does not actually re-establish a choice of fates. The impossibility of doing so probably fuels his anger towards Agamemnon. If Achilles once chose honor at the cost of a long life before the beginning of the war, Agamemnon would seem to have ruined the benefit of the difficult choice he made: now Achilles has a short life *and* is dishonored.²³

¹⁹ E.g. Willcock 1977: 49, 1978: 17ff., 1978-1984 *ad* 9.410-416. Hainsworth 1993a *ad* 9.410-416 thinks that is probable.

²⁰ See Fenik 1968: 24, 148-49. Kullmann 1960: 309; 1981: 24-25; 1991: 441 n.65 argues that Euchenor is an Achilles figure. See also n.2 above.

²¹ M. Edwards 1987a: 135-36. Whitman 188; Willcock 1978: 17 also refer to the choice of Heracles.

²² Hainsworth 1993a *ad* 9.10-16 vaguely says, "The choice may have been part of the tradition of Achilles' birth." E.g. Sheppard 9; Mueller 31-32; Whitman 188 speak of Achilles making a choice of fates before the dramatic time of the *Iliad*. I explore that possibility further in the last part of this chapter.

²³ See Sheppard 77; Owen 101; Whitman 188 (who suggests Achilles feels he has suffered a "hoax"); Mueller 31; Slatkin 34.

If I am to be dishonored, Achilles seems to be saying in book 9, then I should receive a long life. But he does not really want a long life, he wants honor and glory. Perhaps he is trying to frighten the embassy in an effort to win his honor back from Agamemnon, or perhaps he is deluding himself when he talks of going home and living for a long time.²⁴ In any event, it is a passing mood and his words are full of ambiguity and deception. His choice may have never existed; in the very least it is inappropriate to the context of book 9. We should not believe that in books 10-17 Achilles is thinking of returning home, i.e. choosing a long but inglorious life. Sensitivity to the situation, especially to Achilles' ability to delude himself or mislead others, should correct two common misperceptions. One is that Achilles actually has a choice of fates and that he makes this choice later in the course of the *Iliad*. The other is that Homer contradicts himself on the fate of Achilles by having Achilles speak of a choice in book 9. Homer has not temporarily diverted from his usual portrayal of Achilles' destiny; rather, he has shown the subtle nuances of Achilles' character.

A second controversy concerns the suggestion by Nestor that Achilles is staying out of battle because of a prophecy from Thetis (11.794-799). When Patroclus confronts Achilles with this suggestion at 16.16-17, Achilles seems to deny that Thetis has foretold anything to him (50-51). Achilles' words are, οὔτε θεοπροπίης ἐμπάζομαι, ἦν τινα οἶδα./ οὔτε τί μοι παρ Ζηνὸς ἐπέφραδε πότνια. Does this conflict with his remarks elsewhere about receiving information about his destiny from his mother? No, for surely Monro was correct in his argument that the hero here denies not knowledge of prophecy, but prophecy as a reason for his disengagement.²⁵ Line 50 makes that quite clear. It is line 51 that has caused misunderstanding, because Achilles repeats the wording of the suggestion in his denial of it. If one takes into consideration the tenacity of word

²⁴ See Kullmann 1960: 308-309; Macleod 10 ("a fantasy of escape [Achilles] had toyed with"); Mueller 32 ("Achilles flirts with unmaking his choice").

²⁵ Monro 1893 *ad loc.* Leaf 1900-1902 *ad loc.* quotes and approves of his suggestion, and Barth 22 emphatically agrees with them. Willcock 1978: 15, 1978-1984 *ad loc.* thinks this explanation is possible, but is less inclined to look for consistency between the passages, explaining their apparent variance as the result of *ad hoc* composition.

grouping in oral poetics and recognizes that question and reply often follow certain patterns in Homer, it becomes obvious that Achilles has simply re-used the phraseology of Nestor's words and does not mean to deny that he has ever heard a prophecy from his mother.²⁶

The denial of Achilles may seem too emphatic, but Willcock points out (1978-1984 *ad loc.*) that Achilles would naturally react strongly to a suggestion that he is avoiding battle out of fear. We may even wonder if Nestor has been deliberately provocative, even "snide."²⁷ Nestor may be thinking of Achilles' words to the embassy.²⁸ Apparently he supposes that Achilles has a conditional fate—if Achilles stays out of battle, he will be safe. That is not exactly the conditional fate of which Achilles spoke in book 9, but Nestor may be re-defining the choice so as to make Achilles seem cowardly. Owen's explanation of Achilles' words in book 16 are worth quoting: "He sees the insinuation in Nestor's suggestion (quoted by Patroclus) that his motive in staying out of the fight may be really to avoid the death prophesied by his mother (a malicious interpretation of Achilles' words in Bk. IX), and is quick to resent and deny it (48-51), and he tries to explain quite honestly what his feeling is" (148; cf. 117). Achilles stresses in the following words that it is Agamemnon's treatment of him that caused his withdrawal.

If Achilles in book 16 seems to overlook his previous talk of a choice of fates, one should remember that Achilles probably misled the embassy in book 9. Since he does not really have a choice of fates, his failure to mention the concept now is not so much an inconsistency as a return to the truth. As Lloyd-Jones points out (1983: 19), Achilles' words in book 16 are in fact very credible, for it would not agree with his character to stay out of battle on account of a prophecy.

²⁶ Similarly Barth 22; see also Janko 1992 *ad* 16.49-50.

²⁷ Willcock 1978: 16-17; he traces this interpretation to Aristarchus.

²⁸ As Willcock 1978-1984 *ad* 11.794-795 thinks; Scodel 1989: 91 n. 1 (cf. 99) disagrees, arguing that Nestor has a different warning in mind.

The recollection by Achilles at 18.8-11 of a prophecy by Thetis about the death of Patroclus has raised concerns over consistency. Achilles recalls that Thetis had told him that the "best of the Myrmidons" would die in his lifetime:

μὲν δὴ μοι τελέσῃσι θεοὶ κακὰ κήδεα θυμῷ,
 ὥς ποτέ μοι μήτηρ διεπέφραδε, καί μοι ἔειπε
 Μυρμιδόνων τὸν ἄριστον ἔτι ζώντος ἐμεῖο
 χερσὶν ὑπο Τρώων λείψειν φάος ἡέλιου.

This prophecy is considered an *ad hoc* invention designed to serve a poetic purpose, that of pathos arising from Achilles' belated recognition of the truth.²⁹ That indeed is the effect, and it is not unlikely that Homer invented the prophecy for that purpose. But does this passage not harmonize with others, as is sometimes supposed?³⁰ Achilles' wish to take Troy with Patroclus alone (16.97-100) is just an impossible wish and does not conflict with any knowledge about Patroclus or himself. Leaf apparently misunderstands 17.410-711, δὴ τότε γ' οὐ οἱ ἔειπε κακὸν τόσον ὅσσον ἐτύχθη/ μήτηρ, ὅττι ῥά πολὺ φίλτατος ὤλεθ' ἐταῖρος, when he thinks that this passage contradicts the recalled prophecy of book 18.³¹ The passage simply says that Thetis has not *now* reported to Achilles that Patroclus has died. The word τότε contrasts with πολλάκι in l. 408, a line that referred to repeated prophecy by Thetis to Achilles in the past. Homer does not imply that Thetis never in the past told Achilles about the death of Patroclus.³² The poet here portrays the pathos arising from the ignorance of a tragedy by that person who is most

²⁹ E.g. by J. Kakridis 1949: 65 n.2; Willcock 1977: 52, 1978-1984 *ad* 9.410-416 and *ad* 16.50-51; M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 18.8-11.

³⁰ See Barth for a very thorough exploration of this issue, which agrees with my interpretation on several points.

³¹ See Leaf 1900-1902 *ad* 17.408 and 18.10-11. He thinks the "contradiction" proves multiple authorship. Rutherford 156 n.54 (cf. 157) disputes Leaf's contention, with some difficulty.

³² Barth 17; M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 17.410-411.

personally affected by it. One may well compare Andromache's initial ignorance of the death of Hector:³³

ἄλοχος δ' οὐ πῶ τι πέπυστο
 Ἔκτορος· οὐ γάρ οἱ τις ἐπήτυμος ἄγγελος ἐλθὼν·
 ἤγγειλ' ὅτι ρά οἱ πόσις ἔκτοθι μίμνε πυλάων... (22.437ff.)

At 17.404 ff. it is reported that Achilles never thought Patroclus would sack Troy, either without him or with him (quoted above on p. 98). That means that Achilles did not think that Patroclus would now try to sack Troy by himself (for Achilles had told him not to attempt to do this); as an afterthought Achilles recognizes that they will never sack the city together (because Achilles knows he will die before that possibility).³⁴ The flow of thought is somewhat associative and free, but in this the poet well represents the thoughts of the worried Achilles. Should we ask why Thetis did not warn Achilles of the fate of Patroclus when Achilles was sending Patroclus out? No, for that would be pedantic, as Taplin states (1992: 198). And Achilles need not have guessed at that time that the predicted death of Patroclus was about to occur. As Leaf *ad* 18.10-11 notes (1900-1902), the statement by Thetis about the "best of the Myrmidons" that Achilles recalls (see pp. 116-117 above) is more oracular than informative. Oracles in myth are commonly understood only in hindsight, especially when their meaning is not explicit. Patroclus is not a Myrmidon technically and Achilles could have misunderstood his mother's words; in the very least he does not seem to have been told any specific information by her about the time and circumstances of his friend's death.³⁵ Even if he knows that according to

³³ As Griffin 1980: n.13; Barth 19 n.51 do. Griffin notes that a scholiast to 17.401 has also compared the two passages.

³⁴ See M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 17.404-411. Barth 14-16 differently interprets the passage to mean that Thetis had told Achilles that neither Patroclus nor he would sack Troy, adducing Apollo's words to that effect at 16.707ff.

³⁵ Leaf 1900-1902 *ad loc.* cites scholars who rejected the passage because Patroclus is not a Myrmidon, but says the description fits Patroclus enough (see also Willcock 1978-1984 *ad* 18.10 on this issue). M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 18.8-11 argues that the current leader of a group would be considered "the

fate Patroclus is in danger of being slain at Troy, he has given his friend stringent instructions and his divine armor. It would be misguided to complain that he has carelessly ignored the prophecy of Thetis.

If Achilles actually understood that Patroclus was fated to die, it is more difficult to account for some of his other statements (see Barth 20-21). Presumably Achilles, since he knows that he himself will die in Troy, would expect Patroclus to die there also, if indeed his friend is to die in his lifetime. Yet he claims that he assured Menoetius that he would lead Patroclus home (18.324-27) and recalls that he hoped that Patroclus would lead Neoptolemus home (19.328-33). Perhaps one might understand that he learned of the death of Patroclus after his earlier promise and hope that Patroclus would return. Or perhaps we might suppose that Achilles deluded himself into believing that the prophecy was incorrect. It takes some effort to coordinate these passages, however, and we might best conclude that Homer has not always been interested in maintaining consistency concerning Achilles' knowledge of the fate of Patroclus.

Yet the prophecy by Thetis about the "best of the Myrmidons" need not be considered inconsistent with other passages. The words of Thetis may have been too vague for Achilles to understand fully until after the fact. Prophecies forgotten by Polyphemus, Circe, and Alcinous in the *Odyssey* (9.507ff., 10.330ff., 13.172ff.) provide parallels. Barth notes (7) that the prophecy to Agamemnon at *Od.* 8.75ff., that the "best of the Achaeans" would someday quarrel, is also very relevant.

I noted above that in book 21 Achilles seems to know he will be killed by bow and arrow, though shortly before he had expressed doubt over whether a spear or bow will be used (see p. 99 above). Leaf believes (1900-1902 *ad* 278) there is a slight contradiction between the two passages. But should we require Achilles to explain to Lycaon or anyone he meets the exact circumstances of his fate? We have seen that in the

best" of them. G. Nagy 1979: 34 notes that the phrase "best of Myrmidons" actually suits Achilles (as part of his argument that Patroclus is the ritual substitute of Achilles). Barth 4ff. discusses the issue in detail and concludes that Achilles knew that Thetis meant Patroclus, but not when or how he would die.

Iliad mortals generally do not know about Achilles' fate and that Achilles is willing to manipulate details about the nature of his fate for a desired effect. Here he well indicates to Lycaon that he accepts his mortality. Disclosure of the details of his fate would be distracting. Sensitivity to the nuances of the situation in this passage should eliminate the wish that it be consistent with all other references to the fate of Achilles. Occasionally some scholars suggest that Achilles' mention of Apollo alone as slayer at 21.277 contradicts other passages in which Paris is also said to be a slayer.³⁶ That also is a very unimaginative interpretation of a passage. It is not clear whether Thetis told Achilles that Paris would be involved in his death, but Xanthus has told him already that a mortal, along with a deity, would be a slayer. We need not demand that Achilles tell Lycaon everything he knows on this point either. Certainly Achilles knows by book 21 that both a mortal and a divinity will kill him.

It is apparent that Homer is willing to apply *ad hoc* invention to the motif of prophecy from Thetis to Achilles and in fact applies it with good effect. Sometimes the poet wishes to stress Achilles' free will, at other times he stresses his powerlessness in the strong grip of destiny.³⁷ Sometimes it is convenient for Achilles to act as if he is ignorant of his fate or unaccepting of it.³⁸ And with his talk of a choice of fates, he apparently conceives of a different arrangement of his destiny than that which is indicated elsewhere in the poem.

Some have concluded that these passages are hopelessly inconsistent. But Homer allows his characters to discuss things in a natural way. The tone of a scene, the state of a character's mind, the person to whom a character is speaking: these can all effect how a character presents a topic. There is a natural, humane quality to Homer's characterization in which characters misunderstand things or delude themselves or try to deceive others.

³⁶ E.g. Bethe 1927: 89-90; Simpson 260. Some authors in antiquity did specify only Apollo as the slayer; see further discussion below at pp. 152-153 in chapter three and pp. 277-278 in chapter five.

³⁷ See Janko 1992: 5-6; cf. J. Kakridis 1971: 28 n.10. As Frame 120 says, "Homer attempts to have this issue both ways;" see further at pp. 122ff. below on his explanation of the opening scene in bk. 18.

³⁸ Kullmann 1969: 31ff.; Taplin 1992: 198; Janko 1992 *ad* 16.49-50.

Things in the text that seem inconsistent may say more about the poet's skill in portraying character than about his ability to get his facts straight. I am not interested in defending Homer from all charges of inconsistency; indeed, it is clear that the poet can be deliberately inconsistent and imprecise when that suits his poetic purpose (cf. nn.12, 37, and 44) or when the matter is too small to be important. But to think that the poet is hopelessly inconsistent about the topic of Achilles' fate would be misguided. With some persistence, we have seen that the poet's conception of Achilles' fate is generally consistent, and we have discovered that artistic skills lie behind apparent inconsistencies.

The poetic effect of Achilles' fate

There are also larger poetic effects that result from the overall development of the topic. Most obviously, Achilles' short life serves to stress the poem's theme of human mortality, an important theme in the *Iliad* (see Griffin 1977: 42-43). Achilles' discussions of his fate sometimes evolve into a consideration of the frailty and senselessness of human existence. We see this most significantly in his reply to the embassy in book 9. Eventually he seems not so much an unusual hero with a special fate as a symbol of the mortal nature in us all. Achilles himself makes this point when he says to his "φίλος" Lycaon at 21.106 that no one, not even he, will escape death. Lycaon's reference to himself at line 84 as μινυυθάδιος underscores the equation of normal mortals with Achilles in the passage. It is true that the adjective is only once associated with Achilles (1.352) and is also used of other characters (notably Hector at 15.612-13), but the similar adjective ώκύμοπος is used exclusively and repeatedly of Achilles (1.417, 505; 18.95, 458).³⁹ It should therefore be regarded as significant that Lycaon calls himself "short-lived" when confronted by the short-lived Achilles. Griffin's comment about the killing of Lycaon by Achilles is also worth quoting: "He [Achilles] sees his action on the perspective of human life and death as a whole, the perspective of slayer and slain on a

³⁹ On these adjectives see further King 4-6; Slatkin 34-38.

level, so that it is more that a mere colloquialism that he calls Lycaon 'friend' as he kills him."

I demonstrated above that Achilles knows that he will die young from the start of the poem. Yet Homer is interested in having Achilles do more than calmly accept his fate. When we trace the development of Achilles' attitude, we can feel some sympathy with the common misperception that Achilles does have a choice in the *Iliad*. His early death is addressed just vaguely enough in the first book to be overlooked. In book 9 Achilles pretends that he can still choose to live. It is after the death of Patroclus he finally seems not only certain of his death, but indeed impatient for it. And it is then that references to his fate become more numerous and more specific.

Scholars who think that Achilles had a choice over his fate until book 18 are wrong to overlook or explain away the evidence that he knows he will die from the start (e.g. Pope; see n.11 above). But many scholars have sensitively discussed how Homer, though acknowledging that Achilles is fated to die from the start, nevertheless portrays Achilles undergoing a process of growth and decision about his fate within the time frame of the *Iliad*.⁴⁰ It is not strictly logical that Achilles should only now wrestle with the implications of his fate in the tenth year of the war. The dishonor of Achilles by Agamemnon and the death of Patroclus, however, are major events that provoke Achilles to undergo contemplation and eventual acceptance of his fate. Though Homer consistently portrays Achilles as certainly fated to die, he includes the illusion of choice and decision within the issue of Achilles' fate as a way of furthering the depth of his characterization of Achilles. Slatkin insightfully remarks (34) that what really changes in the course of the *Iliad* is the value Achilles places on being honored by Agamemnon. He knew he was short-lived, and so at first thought that Agamemnon's slight of him undercut his choice for glory; later after deeper contemplation of his fate he realizes that honor from Agamemnon is not of great significance.

⁴⁰ Schadewaldt 1965: 260-263; Whitman 188; Kullmann 1968: 31-34; Frame 120ff.; Rutherford 146, 152ff. are especially notable.

Frame has brilliantly demonstrated how fate and free-will coexist in book 18. At 59ff. Thetis announces to the Nereids that she will not receive Achilles at home, implying it is his irrevocable fate to die. She then speaks, as she often does, of her frustration in not being able to prevent his unhappiness. The sequence of thought in the words of Thetis at 59ff. is (the following is Frame's analysis, with slight changes): a) Achilles will not return home because implicitly b) that is his fate; then she adds c) Achilles grieves while he is alive. At 89 ff. Achilles tells his mother she will not receive him at home, explaining the cause of his death not as fate but his unhappiness. Achilles has changed his mother's sequence of thought to a) I will not return because b) my heart bids me to die (though I will kill Hector first); then he hears Thetis rather anticlimactically say c) you are fated to die after you kill Hector. As Frame says (122), "The change in sequence of ideas makes it appear that Achilles himself has chosen what had already been fated for him." Since Achilles asserts he will die after he kills Hector before his mother speaks, the words of Thetis are more confirmation than revelation, and in fact do not have much of the "oracular" quality often seen in them.⁴¹

In the later books Achilles is not learning the details of his death for the first time. I do not think that the ancient audience would be unaware of them either. Why is his death so repeatedly mentioned in the later books but mentioned only infrequently at first? Homer has carefully controlled the pace with which this motif is developed. The initial vagueness on the topic allows Achilles to seem to come to terms with his fate. As a result, his destiny almost appears to develop after, not before, Achilles has decided upon it. His belated insistence on his fate underscores his new mood following the death of Patroclus. His attitude in the early part of the poem has allowed some scholars (e.g. Morrison 98ff.) to compare him to Hector in self-delusion. His very clear-sighted acceptance of his death in the later books directly contrasts with the continuing self-delusion of Hector.⁴² It

⁴¹ The quote is of R. Frazer 1989: 385. The passage may allude to an oracle related in the *Aethiopsis*, however, see pp. 125-126 below.

⁴² Griffin 1980: 163; Rutherford 157.

explains if it does not justify his acts of cruelty in the later books (Griffin 1980: 191). And it is also the *leitmotiv* of the ransom of Hector's body in book 24. There it is Achilles' certainty of his fate that allows him to compare the grief of Priam with the grief to come of his own father.

The early death of Achilles was a traditional event in myth about the fall of Troy. Homer does not try to inform his audience about it in a clear and direct manner. We are never specifically told all of the essential details about the hero's death in one passage. We never witness Thetis deliver a full and complete prophecy to her son. Homer instead uses the motif of Achilles' early death as the general setting for various poetic effects. The term *ad hoc*, we have seen, frequently crops up in discussion of these passages. At times the term is incorrectly used to suggest that Homer feels no qualms about treating the subject inconsistently. That is not a necessary conclusion, but in another sense the term correctly notes a certain aspect of the passages. The *topos* of Achilles' fate is evoked for a variety of effects that serve the special poetic needs of a scene. And there is an overall development of the *topos* that is intertwined with the overall development of Achilles' character. Homer features Achilles' confrontation with his mortality as he travels from hesitation to a fierce acceptance of it. It should not be overlooked how the audience participates in this process.⁴³ Undoubtedly the ancient audience would know full well that Achilles will die at Troy, and alert modern readers should realize that Achilles' fate is irrevocable. In some ways the audience has god-like powers in its knowledge of the future of the story, just as Achilles is almost divine in his knowledge of the future (Scully 114). Yet Homer forces the mortal side of Achilles to undergo doubt and growth as he considers the future. Out of sympathy the audience experiences Achilles' intense contemplation of his destiny. In so doing we contemplate the mortality of the human race.

⁴³ See Duckworth 116-117 on the audience's susceptibility to a character's emotions; and Morrison 80, 113 more specifically about the audience's reaction to Achilles' musings about his future.

3. Prophecy of Achilles' Fate in Pre-Homeric Myth

Even though Achilles' fate is insistently evoked in the poem, the clarity of it is obscured by Homer's diffuse treatment of its details throughout a variety of passages. One might argue that this imprecision is very Homeric.⁴⁴ We never see Thetis give Achilles a complete prophecy, and in fact Homer suggests she never did, but rather frequently discussed his fate with him throughout his life. It seems that the poet rejected the supernatural, marvelous possibilities of one climactic prophecy and instead suggested that the mother and son continually discussed Achilles' future. The cyclic poems, on the other hand, featured dramatic moments when complete prophecies of momentous import were presented.⁴⁵ I am inclined to think that this was common in pre-Homeric myth; prophecy would be useful in setting out the plot, and the wonder of its supernatural aspects would have had popular appeal. We might suspect that in pre-Homeric myth Thetis also told Achilles about his fate in a very striking fashion.

At what point in pre-Homeric myth would Thetis have told Achilles such a prophecy? We find only one example of a prophecy from Thetis to Achilles in the summary by Proclus of the poems in the epic cycle. That occurs in the *Aethiopsis* just before Achilles' fateful meeting with Memnon (what Thetis said is discussed at p. 141 in chapter three). There may be some relationship between that prophecy and the pronouncement by Thetis in book 18 that Achilles will die soon after Hector. That possibility has been explored by neo-analysts and will be discussed in chapter four (242ff.). I think that it is unlikely, however, that all references to prophecy by Thetis in the *Iliad* are reflections of the prophecy in the *Aethiopsis*. Homer suggests that Achilles

⁴⁴ Taplin 1992: 48-49, in a discussion of Homer's vague treatment of Agamemnon's role as king, labels imprecision a Homeric "motif." J. Kakridis 1971: 28 n.10 has compared the varying degree of Achilles' free will and destiny to Clytemnestra's hazy role in the *Odyssey* as accomplice/main perpetrator of Agamemnon's murder. The thesis of Morrison's book is that the poet is deliberately imprecise about the future.

⁴⁵ For a collection of scenes of prophecy in the epic cycle, see Kullmann 1960: 221-223; Fenik 1964: 10. See also Kullmann 1960: 310, 313-314; Schadewaldt 1965: 192-193; Griffin 1977: 48 for discussion about Homer's more general, diffuse treatment of prophecy.

learned his fate sometime in the past, and in fact that makes more sense than that Achilles would learn of it late in the war.

Perhaps Achilles' knowledge of his fate through Thetis was just assumed, and no single moment of prophecy was portrayed. Perhaps myth of the Trojan war was not concerned with the details of Achilles' childhood or not coordinated with early myth about the childhood of Achilles. But key elements about the death of Achilles in the *Iliad*, namely Apollo and Paris as slayers, the gates of Troy as the place, and the bow as the weapon, would well fit a single prophecy from Thetis to Achilles. It is true that there seems little hope of establishing with certainty that such a prophecy ever existed in the pre-Homeric tradition. The summary of the epic cycle by Proclus gives no indication of it, and art obviously could not portray it. There is some evidence in early Greek literature that might imply an early prophecy to Achilles, but the evidence is only suggestive and not conclusive. Sometimes in later literature there is an early prophecy, but it is never certain whether it is based on early tradition. It will be worthwhile, however, to explore the possible nature of a traditional prophecy from Thetis to Achilles. No conclusions can be reached, but a better understanding of the possible background behind an important motif in the *Iliad* can be gained.

How Thetis would know Achilles' fate

Thetis may simply know of her son's fate through divine knowledge. But since we cannot assume that (see discussion at pp. 106-107 above), I will therefore consider who could tell her if she did not know. Stories about Zeus's sexual interest in Thetis before her resulting marriage to Peleus may strengthen the indications in the *Iliad* of a special relationship between them (for which see p. 107 above). In some accounts Zeus is angry with Thetis after being rejected by her, in other accounts Zeus bestows her to Peleus in fear of a prophecy which reports that her son will be greater than his father.⁴⁶ Perhaps in

⁴⁶ Both are reported at Apollodorus *Bibl.* 3.13.5. See M. Edwards *ad* 18.429-435 for a brief and J. Frazer 2: 66-67 nn.3-5 for a more thorough survey of ancient literature about the topic. Slatkin is especially

this type of story Zeus would tell Thetis about Achilles' fate in anger over his rejection (at *Il.* 8.470ff. and 15.49ff. Zeus gives his most thorough predictions of the poem after scenes of angry confrontation). Alternatively, he might provide her with information in pity over her unhappy marriage, of which she bitterly complains at *Il.* 18.429ff. In Pindar Themis foretells Achilles' death when warning Zeus and Poseidon against marrying Thetis (βροτέων δὲ λεχέων τυχοῖσα υἱόν εἰσιδέτω θανόντ' ἐν πολέμῳ, *Isth.* 8.35-36), and so it is conceivable that this information would be passed on to Thetis. The scholia at *Il.* 1.417 (quoted by Bernabé p. 56) report that Zeus told Thetis of Achilles' fate, but long after her marriage to Peleus. At Statius *Achill.* 1.64ff. a worried Thetis, forewarned vaguely by Proteus, seeks Zeus out before the Trojan war; Zeus omits the unpleasant truth and talks only of Achilles' future glory in war. At Quintus Smyrnaeus 3.617-618 Thetis says that Zeus promised to her that her son would be mighty as recompense for her prospective marriage to a mortal. There is no indication that he told her about his death. None of this is reliable evidence of the pre-Homeric tradition.

Surprisingly enough, Apollo, the slayer of her son, could also have told her of her son's future death. He would have his opportunity at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, where it is possible that he sang of the future. At *Il.* 24.62-63 Hera reports that Apollo held his lyre at the wedding feast, though there is no indication that he sang. At Pindar *Nem.* 5.23ff. the Muses sing (but of the past) while Apollo plays. A fragment of Aeschylus (350 Radt, quoted in Plato *Rep.* 383a-b) indicates that Apollo then sang of Achilles' future. At Catullus 64.303ff. there is a song of the future at the wedding, but it is the Fates that sing it. The evidence concerning a song of the future and Apollo's relationship to it is varied, but perhaps sometimes in early Greek myth Apollo's musical and prophetic skills were combined on this occasion.

Some have concluded that a passage in the *Iliad* reflects a prophecy by Apollo on that occasion. Scodel has focused Hera's term of abuse, "ἄπιστε," in the passage of the

interested in considering the past relationship between Zeus and Thetis an important part of pre-Homeric myth.

Iliad where Hera recalls Apollo's playing at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. Since in the fragment of Aeschylus Thetis complains that Apollo untruthfully sang of Achilles' happy future and long life and then killed her son, Scodel states it is "self-evident" that Homer alludes to this story.⁴⁷ Scodel further supposes that the fragment of Aeschylus reflects a traditional scene, and suggests (55-57) that in the *Aethiopsis* (as one example within a tradition) Thetis might have had such bitter recollections.

However, I find the passage in Homer to be uncertain evidence for such a tradition. Hera had been speaking of the unequal parentage of Achilles and Hector before she recalls the wedding. She may be citing it as an obvious proof of Achilles' divine parentage, a proof which the gods would all know well. Her abuse of Apollo could refer to his implication that Hector and Achilles are equals despite the fact that Apollo himself had witnessed the father of Achilles marry a goddess.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, if a tradition of Apollo falsely predicting Achilles' future at the wedding *did* exist, it would contain two aspects relevant to our inquiry: 1) that Thetis, if she is indeed to be fooled, had not been told the truth before the wedding, and 2) that Apollo did not tell her about Achilles' fate. The second raises a troubling point. Did Aeschylus mean to imply that no one disabused Thetis of her belief in Apollo's false prediction until Achilles' death? If this is so, it would imply that Thetis did not know of her son's fate before it happened.

March argues (8-23) that a fragment of the Hesiodic *Catalogue* (212 MW) implies that Apollo did tell the truth about Achilles' future at the wedding. The fragment seems to refer to a death at the Scaean gates and its subsequent fame, and March persuasively argues that it must refer to Achilles (Merkelbach and West suppose that the one dying is Patroclus, arguing that the letters "μέν" come from the word Menoitides). Then she argues that the fragment belongs to a prophecy at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, and

⁴⁷ Scodel 1977: 56; she adds that the idea is downplayed by Homer by the very obliqueness of the allusion. Cf. Davies 1981: 60, who does not refer to the fragment of Aeschylus but suspects that Hera is here alluding to Apollo's future slaying of Achilles.

⁴⁸ Macleod *ad loc.* thinks that she means that Apollo after dining at the wedding should not now be betraying his hosts by taking the Trojans' side. Scodel 1977: 55 notes with justified dismay that Leaf 1900-1902 *ad loc.* had claimed only "feminine logic" underlay Hera's words.

suggests Apollo as the one who gives the prophecy. But the wedding seems an inappropriate scene for a prophecy of Achilles' death. It is true that in Catullus the Fates imply (but do not relate) the death of Achilles by referring to the slaughter of Polyxena at his grave. Though Pindar does not describe a prophecy (true or false) in his various descriptions of the wedding, March manages to argue (22) that a tradition of a true prophecy is actually reflected in *Pyth.* 3 when Pindar narrates Achilles' death (100ff.) after stating that the Muses sang at the wedding (88ff.). Scodel, on the other hand, argues (1977: 55) that the absence in Pindar of the false prophecy in which she is interested does not imply Pindar's ignorance of it. Neither argument is especially convincing; it is simply not clear whether Pindar knew of a prophecy by Apollo at the wedding.⁴⁹ In sum, we have tantalizing evidence for both a false prophecy given by Apollo at the wedding and a true one given by Apollo, but it is difficult to feel confident that either belonged to the pre-Homeric tradition.

Ancient literature sometimes portrays Thetis learning the fate of her son from other sources. I mentioned above that the Fates sang of the future at the wedding of Peleus and Thetis in Catullus 64. They are also present at the wedding on two early Greek vases, including the François vase (*LIMC* "Moirai" nos. 24, 25). A Roman mural shows them with Thetis and the infant Achilles, and we might suppose they informed her of her child's fate then.⁵⁰ Nereus would have the special prophetic abilities of a sea divinity, and at Statius *Achill.* 1.32 and Ovid *Met.* 11.217ff. he tells his daughter of the future. Apollonius of Rhodes pictures Hera giving such information to Thetis when she asks her to assist the Argonauts. Hera tells Thetis that Achilles (at that moment being raised by Chiron) will go to the Elysian fields to live with Medea (*Arg.* 4.869ff.). That implies the

⁴⁹ A true prophecy would not be mentioned by Pindar in the description of the wedding at *Pyth.* 3.88ff., nor would Apollo, the slayer of Achilles, be mentioned, because Pindar is using the wedding as an example of Peleus' happiness in life (see Robbins 1990b: 315 n.37). Yet a prophecy (true or false) is also absent at the wedding scene of *Nem.* 5.23ff. (Apollo is present), where no such motive is present.

⁵⁰ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no.3; see Kossatz-Deissmann (1981a) under no. 3 and at p. 54 (she also thinks a woman who appears to be proclaiming over the infant at no. 4 could be one of the Fates). See also Alcman fr. 70b *PMG*, which Page (repeated by Davies in *PMGF*) interpreted as "te (Achillem) Paridi domandum tradidere fata."

death of Achilles, though no information about his death is given. If there is any traditional basis to Hera's claim at *Il.* 24.59-60 that she raised Thetis, she obviously would have much opportunity to inform Thetis of the future.

Chiron is a possible source of information to Thetis, for he is occasionally portrayed as having prophetic abilities (e.g. at Pindar *Pyth.* 9.38ff. he foretells the future to Apollo, wryly noting the irony of Apollo being the *recipient* of prophecy). At Euripides *I.A.* 1062-75 centaurs attending the wedding of Peleus and Thetis report Chiron's vision of the future. Only positive things are mentioned. At Statius *Achill.* 1.143ff. Chiron has fears that he relates to Thetis after having tutored Achilles for some time, but they are no more than fatherly intuitions (*patria omina*). Alternatively Chiron might repeat to Thetis information gained from the gods, since he is central to early accounts of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. In Pindar he "married off" Thetis (νύμφευσε...Νηρέος θύγατρα, *Nem.* 3.56-57) after receiving a message on the matter from the gods (*Isth.* 8.41-42). Note that traditionally the marriage takes place in his cave (at Pindar *Nem.* 5.24 the wedding is ἐν Παλλίῳ; at Alcaeus 42.9 L-P it is at "Chiron's home").

Calchas is a final, if unlikely, source of information for Thetis. At Apollodorus *Bibl.* 3.13.8 it is reported that Calchas proclaimed that Achilles was needed to take Troy, and so Thetis, foreseeing that Achilles would die in that case, hid him in Scyros. The text seems to indicate that Calchas' words contained nothing about Achilles' *death* and that Thetis had foreknowledge of that through some other means. Compare the scholia at *Il.* 1.417 (quoted at Bernabé p. 56), which report that Zeus's bestowal of information to Thetis leads to this action of hers, and the story given by the scholia at 19.326 (*Cypria* fr. 19 Bernabé), where it is Peleus who foresees (προγιγνώσκων ὅτι μοιριδίον...) that his son will die at Troy and thus hides him at Scyros. Here the oracle (χρησμός) of Calchas about the need for Achilles is subsequent to the foreknowledge and action of Peleus. It is

not said how Peleus knows of the future (from Thetis?). Yet is clear that his source of information is not Calchas.

These, then, are some of figures who may have told Thetis of the future in early Greek myth. Perhaps there was no consensus about who told her. And it is entirely possible, as I pointed out at the beginning, that it was simply assumed that Thetis had told Achilles of his fate at some time in his past.

The time of the prophecy

The implication of the *Iliad* that Achilles has long known of his fate may be based on tradition. When could Thetis have told him? This would first of all depend on how she knew of his fate. Some of the scenarios discussed above about how she found out about her son's fate would result in her being able to tell him from the start of his life. There are early Greek stories about Thetis trying to make her baby immortal by dipping it into fire or boiling water (see pp. 263ff. in chapter five), and these may suggest that she does know his fate from the time of his birth. It is also possible that the Fates tell her of his fate at this time, as I noted above (see p. 129). In some of these stories, however, she does not seem to know of a fated *early* death for her child, and is just trying to change his mortal nature.

Thetis could tell Achilles of his fate when he was a child, if one assumes that Thetis raises him or visits him. Alternatively, Thetis could withhold the information until circumstances demanded revelation, as Croesus delays telling his son Atys that he is destined to be short-lived (ὀλιγοχρόνιος) at Herodotus 1.38.⁵¹ The mustering of the Greek troops would be a likely time for such a revelation. Perhaps she even tried to persuade him to stay by presenting him with a choice of fates. I argued above that Achilles' talk of this "choice" in book 9 of the *Iliad* is not really credible at the time it is

⁵¹ Cf. the mantic father at *Il.* 5.148-50 who withholds his knowledge of his sons' fated death from them (and never tells them of it).

spoken (see p. 111ff.). It was not clear, however, whether traditionally a choice of fates was never associated with Achilles or whether it existed for him before the war began.

Kullmann has suggested (1960: 309) that a choice might naturally occur at the time of Achilles' departure for Troy. The choice that Euchenor had (13.663-670) was also given to him before departure. There are two main traditions about Achilles' actions at this time. One tradition has Thetis (or Peleus) hide Achilles, dressed as a girl, on Scyros in order to prevent his participation in the war.⁵² We might suppose that in this version Achilles would need to be told why the donning of feminine garb is necessary, so here is potentially a scene of Thetis explaining to Achilles his fate.⁵³ A second tradition pictures Achilles recruited at home. This is the situation we find indicated in the *Iliad* at 7.125ff., 9.252ff. and 11.765ff. The *Iliad* does assume that Achilles was at Scyros and fathered Neoptolemus there, but on a later raid.⁵⁴ The *Cypria's* version apparently follows this second tradition (but see p. 38 in chapter one). In Proclus' summary Achilles arrives at Scyros after being blown off course following his run-in with Telephus in the first campaign. There he marries Deidameia (also his lover in the draft-dodging version). There is no mention of a raid. There is also evidence that the *Ilias parva* followed this tradition. Eustathius quotes two lines indicating that Achilles was blown to Scyros and says they belong to the writer of the *Ilias parva*.⁵⁵

This second tradition also offers an opportunity for Thetis to tell Achilles his fate. That could happen on the eve of his departure to the army. The *Iliad* does not mention her presence when he is recruited, but Thetis claims she saw him off (18.439-40) after giving him gifts (16.222-224), perhaps including divine armor (see pp. 14-15 of chapter one).⁵⁶

⁵² Sources can be found at J. Frazer 2: 73 n.2.

⁵³ The scholia at *Il.* 1.417 (repeated at Bernabé p. 56) tells of a version in which Zeus reveals the "choice" of fates to Thetis just before she sends Achilles to Scyros (noted above at p. 130).

⁵⁴ See 19.326ff., 9.666-668. Cf. 24.467.

⁵⁵ *Iliades parvae* fr. 24 Bernabé (listed under "incerti operis"). Whether the *Ilias parva* narrated this incident or merely alluded to it when Neoptolemus was fetched from Scyros was discussed at pp. 68-69 in chapter one.

⁵⁶ Would Thetis have given him the amphora destined to contain his ashes, of which the ghost of Patroclus speaks at *Il.* 23.92, at this time of departure? Leaf 1900-1902 *ad* 23.92 notes that this would be an "act of incredible ill-omen." See further about this amphora at pp. 172ff. in chapter three.

In any event, if this tradition of his leaving for the army from home contained a scene of a meeting between him and Thetis, that would be a likely time for a prophecy about his fate. If Achilles was presented with a choice of fates, his decision to go might have motivated the bestowal of magical armor, a desperate attempt by Thetis to prevent the fated consequence of his choice.

Another opportunity for Thetis to tell Achilles about his fate would occur at Tenedos as the Greeks proceeded to Troy. In Proclus' summary of the *Cypria* this place is notable only as the spot where Philoctetes was bitten. Kullmann has suggested that the *Cypria* contained an episode reported at Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.26, in which Thetis warned her son that if he killed Tenes Apollo would slay him.⁵⁷ The reason behind Thetis' concern here is probably that Tenes, reputed son of Cycnus, was actually a son of Apollo, as the scholia report *ad* Lycophron 232. Thus this story serves to explain Apollo's motivation in killing Achilles.

Sometimes the slaying of Troilus is also considered a cause of Apollo's anger against Achilles, either because Troilus was killed at Apollo's altar or because he was the son of Apollo.⁵⁸ It is not apparent that such motivation is necessary. Apollo's slaying of Achilles can simply be explained as a result of his role in defending the city from being taken before its fated time (thus Achilles to Patroclus 16.89ff.). That at least suffices to understand Homer's references to the matter. But there are other explanations that may have prevailed outside of Homer. It has been argued that because Achilles resembles Apollo in many ways, it is only fitting for Apollo to be his slayer.⁵⁹ And the presence of an altar in depictions of the death of Troilus is persistent from an early date (seventh century onward). Apollo's anger over the incident may therefore have always been part of

⁵⁷ Kullmann 1960: 213-214. M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 18.95-96 mentions the idea as a possibility. For other versions of the story, see Halliday 37-44. He considers the tale to be of late origin.

⁵⁸ For sources, see J. Frazer 2: 201 n.3. The notion that he was the son of Apollo can be found at scholia *ad* Lycophron 307-13 and is reported at Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.12.5.

⁵⁹ See Burkert 1985: 147, 1992: 147; G. Nagy 1979: 62 (esp.), 120-121, 142-144, 289ff., 1990a: 11-12; Rabel 1990 (esp. 430); Robbins 1993: 19-20. Versnel 49-50 traces the idea of ritual identification between mortal and god back to the last century.

his motivation to kill Achilles.⁶⁰ The anger of Athena over the treatment of Cassandra at her altar provides a parallel;⁶¹ perhaps such explicit motivation for a divinity's behavior was common in the poems of the epic cycle, and therefore (according to my analysis in chapter one) common in the general tradition of the Trojan war. Of course, this motivation for Apollo could be parallel to his role in protecting the city or to any other motivation. The *Iliad* does show Apollo resenting Achilles' treatment of Hector's body (24.32ff.), and Hector warns that failure to ransom his corpse would be a θεῶν μῆνιμα, a cause for the gods to be angry (22.338). Richardson says (1993 *ad* 22.358), "It looks as if Akhilleus' death may be seen as retribution for his behavior towards Hektor's corpse." Yet this motivation is removed by the eventual ransom of the body.⁶²

The story that Protesilaus leapt first to shore when the Greeks arrived at Troy and was immediately killed is undoubtedly pre-Homeric (see *Il.* 2693ff.). Some versions of the tale say that there was an oracle which stated that the first to go ashore would meet this fate.⁶³ Apollodorus reports that Thetis warned Achilles not to leap ashore first (*Epit.* 3.29). This story certainly fits in with the general concept of Thetis playing a protective role towards Achilles, but it could be just a late development of the story about an oracle given to all the Greeks.

Finally the prophecy given to Achilles just before his death in the *Aethiopsis* (see p. 125-126 above) should be considered. As initial prophecy to Achilles it comes rather late in the story. That is not impossible. Yet it would more naturally occur as a warning

⁶⁰ *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 359ff.; cf. Kemp-Lindemann 118-126 and see esp. Ahlberg-Cornell 55, 187. Kullmann 1960: 321 accepts the death of Troilus as a traditional motivation for Apollo to kill Achilles; M. Edwards 1987: 304 thinks it is possible. Davies 1981: 60 thinks Homer may have transformed this motivation into Apollo's anger towards Achilles in *Il.* 24, "something frightening and inexplicable." Much remains obscure, however, e.g. what the presence of Polyxena in early art about her brother's death implies about her story in early Greek myth (see further at n.44 of chapter five), and whether Achilles was sexually interested in Troilus at an early date (a rooster, a love offering in Greek culture, is on the altar in "Achilleus" no. 377; see Kossatz-Deissmann p. 94; Kemp-Lindemann 119). In the *Cypria* there is no connection to Apollo mentioned when Troilus' death is related. Apollodorus is the first certain testimony that Troilus was slain in Apollo's temple (*Epit.* 3.32). Vatican mythographer 1.210 Bode is the first testimony of the prophecy that Troy could not be taken if Troilus saw his twentieth year.

⁶¹ In the summary of the *Ilii excidium* by Proclus; other sources can be found at J. Frazer 2: 238 n.1.

⁶² See Macleod 10 and *ad* 24.54; Taplin 1992: 246.

⁶³ See J. Frazer 2: 198 n.1 for a survey of the sources.

that follows an earlier prophecy, perhaps with more details. A major element of Achilles' fate is that he is to be killed beneath the walls of the city. If Thetis knew this, she might speak out when she recognizes that Achilles is likely to advance that far.

Consideration of pre-Homeric myth on this issue is frustrating because of the limited evidence. Most of the sources for my speculation are various accounts of prophecy by Thetis in later literature that are not clearly based on the cyclic, i.e. pre-Homeric, tradition. But at least through this examination we have sensed a difference between Homer's poetry and the epic cycle on the nature of prophecy. In the *Iliad*, prophecy about Achilles' death lacks clarity. Information from Thetis to Achilles is continuous and varied. One momentous, dramatic prophecy about the death of Achilles does not seem to be of interest to Homer. Instead, the destiny of Achilles provides the poet with a topic that he manipulates in many ways for a variety of effects. The results—subtle characterization, emphasis on humane themes—is indicative of what we have come to expect in his poetry in general. It is apparent that Homeric poetry is at once thoroughly aware of the tradition upon which it is based and transcendently different from it in tone and purpose. It seems that simple and direct myth has been changed into a complex and dramatic type of poetry that allows characters to develop recognizably human, not simply heroic, characteristics. The Achilles of the *Iliad* is a mortal with whom we can identify and sympathize.

Chapter Three: The Death of Achilles

This chapter will explore the nature of myth about the death of Achilles. In the last chapter it proved difficult to reach firm conclusions concerning the prophecy of the death of Achilles in pre-Homeric myth because the available evidence did not clearly reach back that far. There is evidence available, however, that allows us to gain a sense of the story of Achilles' death as Homer would have known it. We saw in chapter two that the *Iliad* provides some information about the death of Achilles: that Apollo and Paris will be the agents of his death, that they will use bow and arrow to effect it, and that Achilles will die near the wall of Troy. Additional information from the "cyclic" tradition supplements what the *Iliad* itself tells us. Chapter one demonstrated that the "cyclic" tradition, as known to us through art and literature, represents the pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan war, and that even late art and literature based on sources belonging to the cyclic tradition may reflect the pre-Homeric tradition. Thus it is justifiable to reconstruct the pre-Homeric story in which Achilles died shortly after slaying Memnon.

I will call this story the Achilles-Memnon episode, for the events of the duel between the two heroes are closely bound with the death of Achilles. My goal is to gain a sense of myth about Achilles' death as it was *generally known* in Homer's day, not to attempt to reconstruct specific texts, for specific texts would not have been influences on Homer. The *Aethiopis* will play an important role in our investigation, however, for that poem narrated the death of Achilles. In addition, later sources about the death of Achilles more probably reflect the influence of the *Aethiopis* than that of a living tradition about the Trojan war.

In chapter one I argued that knowledge of Aethiopians and the concept of immortality for heroes, prominent aspects of the *Aethiopis*, are not post-Homeric (see pp.

79ff., 87ff.). We should also recognize the pre-Homeric nature of the characters Eos and Memnon. In the *Odyssey* Odysseus mentions that Memnon was the most handsome man he has seen (11.522), and Homer must be referring to Memnon when he reports that the "son of Eos" killed Antilochus (4.188). Homer also knows that Eos had married Tithonus (*Il.* 11.1=*Od.* 5.1), and that Tithonus was the brother of Priam (*Il.* 20.237). Memnon is thus the nephew of Priam, which explains his willingness to defend Troy. Hesiod *Theog.* 984-985 says that Eos bore Memnon to Tithonus, and describes Memnon as χαλκοκορυστής. Perhaps the adjective is a reference to his famous armor, though the use of this adjective in the *Iliad* is unremarkable, appearing once in reference to Sarpedon and eleven times in reference to Hector. Proclus states this armor was made by Hephaestus and that Memnon wore it when he came to Τροίη. The fame of this armor in antiquity is indicated by *Aeneid* 1.489 and 751.¹ This armor is parallel to the divine armor which Achilles wears. Each hero also has a divine mother to assist him, and thus they resemble each other.

The allusions to Eos and Memnon by Homer and Hesiod should eliminate any suspicions that Memnon and Eos are post-Homeric.² In fact the two characters probably have proto-Indo-European roots. There seems to have been a dawn goddess which prefigured the Indic Uṣas and the Greek Eos.³ Marriage to a mortal and protection of a semi-divine son are aspects of the dawn goddess. These characteristics are recognizable in Eos, notably in her assistance of her semi-divine son Memnon at Troy. In Greek myth

¹ Cf. Servius *ad* 751 (quoted by Bernabé p. 68). Aristophanes *Frogs* 963 may also be an allusion to the armor of Memnon.

² The fact that Memnon is not mentioned in the *Iliad* is of little significance when one realizes that e.g. Hector, Paris, and Aeneas are not mentioned in the *Odyssey*. Monro's law (1901: 325: that the *Odyssey* never refers to events in the *Iliad*) demonstrates how carefully Homer could suppress and exclude details. I will argue in chapter four that mention of Memnon is purposefully avoided in the *Iliad* as part of that poem's foreshortening of time. The neo-analysts discussed there most conspicuously consider Eos and Memnon pre-Homeric; Scheliha 393 does also, notably so since she finds much in the epic cycle post-Homeric. Cf. Reinhardt 350ff., who argues that the poet of the *Iliad* does not know of Memnon.

³ Most thoroughly demonstrated by Boedeker, whom G. Nagy 1979: 205 section 42n3; S'atkin 28ff. follow.

Aphrodite especially and even Thetis have developed some aspects of the dawn goddess.⁴ They have not evolved from a dawn goddess prototype, and it would be wrong to think that the figures of Eos and Memnon inspired the invention of Thetis and Achilles, but if we had to choose one pair of mother and son as primary in the aspects shared by both pairs, we would probably choose Eos and Memnon.⁵ Neo-analysts have even been tempted to suppose that the gift of divine armor to Achilles by Thetis is derived from the bestowal of similar armor by Eos to Memnon.⁶ This argument might seem a mere guess, yet Boedeker argues persuasively that the motif belongs to the dawn goddess figure and that it passed from Eos to Thetis.⁷ That does not mean that Homer was the first one to describe Thetis obtaining divine armor for her son. Whatever the origins of this and other motifs that Eos/Memnon and Thetis/Achilles share, their similarities were probably long traditional. We should probably conclude that the characters of Eos and Memnon reach back into Indo-European myth and that the two pairs of mother and son developed as counterparts to each other early on in myth about the Trojan war.

What I present below is a number of motifs that I believe were part of the Achilles-Memnon episode. In effect, I offer a summary of the principal elements that

⁴ Slatkin stresses Boedeker's inclusion of Thetis among goddesses sharing the motifs of the dawn goddess. At 31 she points out that Thetis is often associated with dawn in the *Iliad* (e.g. she seeks out Zeus at dawn in bk. 1, and returns from Hephaestus with armor for Achilles at dawn in bk. 19). Cf. Fenik 1964, who compares the Muse and her son Rhesus to Thetis/Achilles and Eos/Memnon, arguing that many of the aspects shared by them are typical motifs. He focuses especially on the *Rhesus* by Euripides(?), which provides many parallels to myth about Thetis/Achilles and Eos/Memnon. The work is commonly suspected to be not by Euripides; see Ritchie for a defense of the attribution.

⁵ Cf. Pestalozzi's complicated (and I think unlikely) notion at 34-35 that the traditional figures of Thetis and Achilles inspired the invention of Eos and Memnon by the poet of a pre-Homeric "Achilleis," and that this poem in turn inspired the *Iliad*'s portrayal of Thetis and Achilles.

⁶ E.g. Pestalozzi 43. Some neo-analytical ideas concerning the priority of Memnon's armor clearly go too far: Pestalozzi 30, followed by Schoeck 106, links Memnon's Hephaestus-made armor with the Hephaestus-made urn for the ashes of Patroclus and Achilles (which is discussed below); Schadewaldt 1965: 171; suggests that a description of Memnon's armor inspired the description of the armor of Achilles and Agamemnon in the *Iliad*; Schoeck 53-54 thinks all arming scenes, commonly considered typical scenes in epic, are ultimately derived from the arming of Memnon. Fenik 1964: 34 argues that splendid armor for heroes like Achilles, Memnon, and Rhesus is a typical motif. See n.66 in chapter five below for speculation that Penthesileia possessed divine armor.

⁷ Boedeker 83-84; she adds that the account of divine armor given by Aphrodite to Aeneas in the *Aeneid*, though a literary imitation of the bestowal of armor to Achilles by Thetis in the *Iliad*, derives as a concept from early myth about Eos and Memnon.

would be commonly found in countless versions of the story. My reduction of a narrative to a series of motifs owes much to the work of Propp, who demonstrated the possibilities of a structuralist approach to folk tale.⁸ As Propp did, I am looking for the basic parts of narrative that make it function, not for hidden, archetypal meanings lying beneath the narrative in the manner of Lévi-Strauss. In so doing I stress the chronological sequence of these events, which is anathema to the method of Lévi-Strauss. In narratological terms I am outlining the *fabula*, the essential plot of a story, not a specific poem's version of that *fabula*.⁹ I should emphasize, however, that whereas Propp determined the typology of motifs and stock characters in a type of Russian folk tale, I am setting forth an untypical story that featured particular characters in Greek myth. Thus I explore typology in the sense that I am looking for the motifs shared by various accounts of a traditional story, the Achilles-Memnon episode. Some of the events in this story commonly occur when a hero dies, but I am interested in the specific arrangement of them in the story of Achilles' death, as well as untypical events that only apply to Achilles.¹⁰

The elements in the Achilles-Memnon episode did not belong to one poem but to myth in various and innumerable forms. Evidence for this story comes from ancient art, epic and lyric poetry, and mythographers. The most complete accounts of Memnon's duel with Achilles and Achilles' subsequent death and funeral are the summary of the *Aethiopsis* by Proclus, a similar summary of events by Apollodorus (*Epit.* 5.3), and Quintus of Smyrna books 2-4. Pindar is also very interested in Memnon and the death of

⁸ The collection of his work cited in the bibliography includes his most famous essay, "Transformations of the Wondertale," and contains a critique of Propp by Lévi-Strauss with reply by Propp. Burkert 1979: 5ff. discusses the structuralism of Propp and Lévi-Strauss. Hoelscher 55 and M. Edwards 1987a: 62 apply Propp's theories to scenes in the *Odyssey*. Cf. the establishment of patterns in studies of Homeric typical scenes (e.g. eating, arming), and in studies of ring composition (e.g. Stanley). Hansen 1972 takes a structural approach to repeated narrative patterns.

⁹ See de Jong xff. on this terminology. I will not employ this terminology, and in particular I should note my use of the term "story" is closer to the use by narratologists of "fabula" and not to their term "story," by which they refer to a particular text.

¹⁰ Cf. Garner 1993: 153ff., who sometimes cites heroic typology in his reconstruction of the death and funeral of Achilles (e.g. a fight over a corpse, an elaborate funeral). The degree of typology in Achilles' death will be discussed more thoroughly in chapter four, where I argue that the story of Achilles' death as a whole belongs to Achilles alone, not just to any hero.

Achilles, and recently found papyrus fragments suggest that Stesichorus composed about the death and funeral of Achilles.¹¹ Representations in art provide us with valuable information about many of the events in the Achilles-Memnon episode.¹² These are the main sources I will use in my reconstruction. I will discuss other evidence when I consider it relevant. It does not really matter whether the non-epic evidence is derived from epic poetry, for I am not trying to reconstruct epic poetry. Only direct references in the Homeric poems to the Achilles-Memnon episode are considered here; possible indirect reflections of it in the *Iliad* will be explored in chapter four. When the evidence disagrees we must accept that there were variants to the story, or try to find the underlying pattern that lies beneath the variants. Evidence from the Archaic Age, such as the *Aethiopsis* and early art work, is most valuable, but later evidence that might be based on the early tradition can provide us with important clues.

In the heading of each section below I will describe what I consider to be an important element of the Achilles-Memnon episode as concisely as possible. Beneath these headings I will provide and discuss the relevant evidence. In one section I break the discussion into three parts because of the complexity of the issues involved. I cannot claim that this series of motifs represents *the* myth of the death of Achilles, as if there was one completely standard version of it. What I offer is not, and cannot be, a best or ideal version of the story. It is rather a composite of evidence from art and literature that I think is worthy of consideration. The goal is to gain a sense of the story as it would have been

¹¹ Garner 1993 brilliantly demonstrates this through close examination of a series of these fragments. The new fragments can be found in the appendix of *PMGF*, "ineditorum Stesichoreorum;" Garner prints the fragments most relevant to his argument. We do not know of any title by Stesichorus which refers specifically to these events, but I do not see why his *Persis* might not have covered them. It is generally agreed that Stesichorus is the author of the fragments.

¹² For art work I cite the numbers of all relevant articles in the *LIMC*, not just the one on Achilles (note, however, that the articles on Patroclus and Thetis are not yet available). Comparison between articles is useful because the authors of these articles often differ in interpretation and arrangement of the scenes. Cross-reference is often provided there, as well as full bibliography. I also routinely cite Kemp-Lindemann, since his clear and smoothly continuous study of art about Achilles offers a nice counterbalance to the *LIMC*, and Ahlberg-Cornell, because her study of myth in early Greek art is too recent to be cited by the *LIMC* articles.

commonly understood in the Archaic Age, and specifically as it would have been known to Homer. I recognize that others might present a different number of elements or describe them differently. But this composite of the death of Achilles will at least provide us with a means in chapter four to consider whether there are reflections of the death of Achilles in the *Iliad*. I list the elements without discussion of the evidence in Appendix A, and this should be consulted for a concise overview of the whole reconstruction.

The basic story: Achilles meets Memnon in battle and kills him, attacks Troy, and is killed by Apollo and Paris. The divine mothers Thetis and Eos are often present and obtain a special afterlife for their sons after they are slain

A) Memnon arrives to defend Troy, and before battle, Thetis predicts to Achilles that he will die shortly after Memnon's death

Proclus in his summary of the *Aethiopsis*, Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.3, and Quintus of Smyrna 2.1ff. tell of the arrival of Memnon to help in the defense of Troy. After Proclus reports the arrival of Memnon, he adds, καὶ Θέτις τῷ παιδὶ τὰ κατὰ Μέμνονα προλέγει. Unfortunately, the summary by Proclus does not provide us with further details. I agree with the general view of neo-analysts, following Welcker, that the phrase of Proclus suggests more than an announcement of Memnon's arrival.¹³ Thetis probably warned Achilles about his own death. She would either know that the death of Achilles is linked by fate with the death of Memnon, or suspect that the battle would provide an opportunity for his destined death to occur. But interpretation of her remarks is difficult, since the vague reference by Proclus is the only evidence of the incident.¹⁴

¹³ Welcker 2: 173; Pestalozzi 9; Schadewaldt 1965: 156, 159; Kullmann 1960: 37-39; Schoeck 8. Whitman 201; M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 18.95-96; Vian 31 agree with this position. Huxley 145 thinks that Thetis only told Achilles about Memnon's fate, but that "lacks point," as Edwards says. Kullmann summarizes and responds to criticism of the neo-analytical interpretation of the prophecy.

¹⁴ Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a (*LIMC* "Achilleus") under no. 801 doubts the interpretation of a vase scene as Thetis giving this warning. Of course, a vase could not indicate what she said anyway.

B) Memnon kills Antilochus when he rescues his father Nestor from Memnon

Nestor at *Od.* 3.109ff. includes his son Antilochus in a brief list of those who died at Troy. At 4.187ff. Peisistratus weeps at the memory of the death of his brother Antilochus, whom the poet explains had met his fate at the hands of the "son of Dawn." Proclus in his summary of the *Aethiopsis* briefly notes that Memnon killed Antilochus; Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.3 does not tell us much more than that; it may be significant, however, that Apollodorus relates that Memnon killed many Greeks, not just Antilochus. Pindar *Pyth.* 6.28ff. gives a more complete picture of this story: Nestor's chariot becomes disabled and the life of the old man is saved by the intervention of his son, who is then killed by Memnon. At 2.243ff. Quintus of Smyrna provides a somewhat unlikely dramatization of the story found in Pindar. There the death of Antilochus is only one of many deaths caused by Memnon, as in Apollodorus. Epigram 11 of the *Peplos* (Diehl 2: 171ff.), which purports to be the epitaph of Antilochus, features his rescue of his father. In art, there is only one certain scene that shows Antilochus fighting Memnon, a scene of the *Aethiopsis* on an Iliac table.¹⁵ Sometimes, but not always, Antilochus appears as a corpse on the ground between Achilles and Memnon in early representations of the duel between those two great heroes.¹⁶

Our evidence seems to suggest that Memnon was successful on the battlefield, killing several Greeks, including Antilochus, before he encountered Achilles. The slaying of Antilochus became especially famous because Antilochus saved his father Nestor from certain destruction at the hands of Memnon.

¹⁵ *LIMC* "Antilochos I" no. 26="Memnon" no. 12. See Sadurska 56-57 (pl. xi); the inscriptions are cited at *Aethiopsis* test. 9 Bernabé. An Attic hydria that shows one warrior rushing towards two dueling warrior has been interpreted as Achilles assisting Antilochus, but has no inscriptions (*LIMC* "Antilochus I" no. 25). Ahlberg-Cornell 70 thinks an unidentified figure attacking Antilochus (identified by an incision) is Memnon, but Kossatz-Deissmann 1981b (*LIMC* "Antilochus I") under no. 7 denies that this is so. At 1992 (*LIMC* "Memnon") p. 460 she stresses that the Iliac Table is the only certain representation of the duel between Antilochus and Memnon.

¹⁶ *LIMC* "Antilochus I" nos. 27-32 (no. 30 shows the corpse of Antilochus on the ground as Greeks chase Aethiopians). Less certain representations of Achilles dueling Memnon with the corpse of Antilochus between them can be found among the duel scenes gathered in other *LIMC* articles, for which see n.22 below.

C) Achilles duels with Memnon and kills him; the divine mothers observe the use of divine scales to signify the outcome

The artistic representations that show the corpse of Antilochus on the ground between the dueling Achilles and Memnon imply that Achilles attacked Memnon immediately after the death of Antilochus. It is possible that synopsis is employed on them; i.e. two events that actually occur at different times are joined together in one picture. But the run of the narrative in Proclus¹⁷ and at Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.3 suggests that Achilles attacked Memnon soon after Memnon killed Antilochus. Of course, these are quickly moving summaries that may not give precise temporal information of the story. In Quintus of Smyrna Achilles attacks Memnon the day after the death of Antilochus. In addition, Philostratus *Heroicus* 168.26.18-19 and Philostratus (the other one) *Imag.* 2.7 describe Achilles attending a funeral for Antilochus.¹⁸ Since Achilles is killed soon after his attack on Memnon (see element E and F below), these accounts imply that Achilles did not immediately attack Memnon after the death of Antilochus but rather held a funeral for his friend first. But these three sources (Quintus and the two Philostrati) do not reliably preserve the early tradition.¹⁹ On the whole the evidence indicates that Achilles killed Memnon soon after Memnon killed Antilochus.

Literary sources rarely give much detail about the duel between Achilles and Memnon, and usually the encounter is only briefly mentioned (e.g. at Proclus, Pindar *Ol.* 2.82, *Nem.* 6.52-55, *Isthm.* 3.61-63, 5.39-41, 8.54, Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.3). Quintus of Smyrna 2.395 ff. provides a lengthy version of it that seems to be greatly embellished.

¹⁷ Bernabé's punctuation of Proclus implies that the death of Antilochus is a separate episode from the duel of Memnon and Achilles, for he gives a full stop between them and starts a new paragraph before the duel. But Evelyn-White, Allen, Severyns, and Davies join the two episodes with a comma. Perhaps Bernabé has been influenced by neo-analysis (Kullmann prints Allen's punctuation but has separated the two incidents in the numbering system he employs for Proclus).

¹⁸ Philostratus *Imag.* 2.7 is listed at *LIMC* "Antilochus I" no. 35="Memnon" no. 13.

¹⁹ On Quintus and Philostratus author of the *Heroicus* see p. 54 in chapter one. The descriptions of paintings by the other Philostratus may be flights of fancy, perhaps even not based on real art work; see Browning/W. Edwards (*OCD* "Philostratus") 825; Fairbanks xx-xxi, xxvi. J. Kakridis 1971: 120-121, following Lesky, says that Philostratus "takes the liberty of changing the meaning of real works of art."

Both he and Pindar *Nem.* 6.52-55 (the longest mention of the encounter by Pindar) specify that they met on foot, as indeed art work always represents the scene.

Art provides us with further details. The duel was popular among artists from the sixth century onward and was probably depicted in a seventh-century work (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 846). This shows two warriors flanked by women, which is the schema of Achilles dueling Memnon. There are no inscriptions, however, and the armor lying on the ground between the warriors has led some critics to suspect it depicts Ajax and Diomedes dueling over Sarpedon's armor at the funeral of Patroclus in *Il.* 23, or Odysseus and Ajax dueling over the arms of Achilles.²⁰ But Friis Johansen is surely right to recognize that the schema of women flanking warriors insures that this is Achilles and Memnon, as in fact the work is "generally, and with the greatest feasibility" interpreted.²¹ I might add that since I consider the elaborate games of Patroclus a Homeric invention I doubt they would be reflected in art at this early date, when Homer would not have been greatly influential. The armor on the field instead of the corpse of Antilochus is no major problem for the interpretation of this scene as the duel between Achilles and Memnon, for I do not think Antilochus played an essential part in the Achilles-Memnon episode (an issue discussed further in chapter four). Perhaps the artist has depicted armor that has been stripped off Antilochus or another warrior by Memnon.

On the certainly identified scenes of Achilles dueling Memnon Thetis and Eos often stand behind their battling sons and sometimes charioteers await the warriors on each side.²² Artists also commonly depicted the use of divine scales to signal the outcome of the duel. This scene is sometimes represented on the same artifact on which the duel is

²⁰ E.g. Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a (*LIMC* "Achilleus") under no. 846 doubts Achilles and Memnon are depicted; at 1992 (*LIMC* "Memnon") p. 460 she hesitates to identify any work before the sixth century as Achilles and Memnon duelling.

²¹ Friis Johansen 1967: 279-280; Gantz 623 has recently agreed with this opinion. Cf. Ahlberg-Cornell 70-71, who thinks the artist has conflated the duel over Sarpedon's armor with the duel between Achilles and Memnon.

²² Cf. *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 807-847; "Achilleus" nos. 122-124; "Memnon" nos. 14-60 (see also no. 98); "Eos" nos. 300-316; "Eos/Thesau" no. 35; Kemp-Lindemann 209-217; Ahlberg-Cornell 70-71.

represented. The two scenes can even be mixed, e.g. the scales held between the fighting warriors. On some vases the divine mothers plead with Zeus for the lives of their sons. On others the mothers anxiously watch the divine scales or rush away after the scale has indicated the outcome, Eos in distress and Thetis triumphant.²³ Though this scene was popular in art, it is rarely found in our literary sources. There are some dim reflections of it in Quintus of Smyrna, and the lost *Psychostasia* by Aeschylus featured the scene.²⁴ The lack of such a scene in Proclus and Apollodorus may result simply from their brevity. In art Hermes holds the scales, though in Aeschylus Zeus performed this function (as he does when divine scales are used in the *Iliad*; the possible significance of the agent is discussed at pp. 246-247 in chapter four).

I conclude that Achilles killed Memnon soon after the death of Antilochus. It seems that the use of divine scales to decide their fate was a famous part of the episode. It is difficult to tell from our sources exactly how the use of scales proceeded, but it seems safe to conclude that the mothers watched the weighing intensely, and probably rushed to the battlefield once the outcome was signaled.

D) *Eos requests immortality for Memnon; his corpse is then removed from the field by divine intervention and buried*

Proclus reports that in the *Aethiopsis* Eos obtained permission from Zeus to give her son "ἀθανασία." Similarly Lactantius Placidus reports (Hesiod "*fragmenta dubia*" 352 MW) that Eos asked Zeus for a special honor for Memnon (the request results not in immortality for Memnon, but in the transformation of his ashes into the birds called Memnonides).²⁵ Philostratus *Imag.* 1.7 (*LIMC* "Memnon" no. 92) reports that Eos asked

²³ Cf. *LIMC* "Eos" nos. 293-299; "Eos/Thesau" nos. 33-34; "Hermes" nos. 622-629; "Achilleus" nos. 797-806; "Memnon" nos. 14-25 (scenes of the psychostasia are joined to some of these depictions of the duel; see also no. 98); Kemp-Lindemann 204-209.

²⁴ Quintus of Smyrna 2.507ff., 540-541; Radt 3: 374ff. (the scales used to determine the literary duel of Aeschylus and Euripides at Aristophanes *Frogs* 1364ff. may also be an allusion to it).

²⁵ Myths about these birds which arose out of Memnon's ashes or metamorphosed from Memnon's followers (e.g. Ovid *Met.* 13.576ff., Quintus of Smyrna 2.642ff.; see Pley 644-645, Holland 2668-2669) are

Zeus for permission to take her son from Troy (an unreliable source, however, as I pointed out above at p. 143). Apollodorus does not state what happens to Memnon. At Quintus of Smyrna 2.550ff. the winds bear the corpse of Memnon to the banks of the river Aisepos, where he is mourned by Eos. Eventually (2.642ff.) the Aethiopians bury Memnon, and Quintus rather vaguely adds that he enjoys an afterlife in Hades or in Elysium.

The ancient world certainly believed that there was a grave site for Memnon, which was usually placed in the East.²⁶ Would Memnon normally have had both a burial and immortality, as Quintus narrates the story, or is his burial inconsistent with his "ἀθανασία," as many scholars assume?²⁷ It is first necessary to define what the term means. It might be thought to be "a state of being without death." In Memnon's case, that cannot mean that he never dies, for he has been killed by Achilles. I do not think it means that the body of Memnon is revived either.²⁸ The ancient belief that there was a grave site for Memnon was probably consistent with early Greek myth.²⁹ That would mean that though Memnon was granted "immortality" his body was considered buried, not

extraneous to my concerns here. The myth is probably late, though Holland suggests it could have been part of early Greek epic, and Weiss at *LIMC* "Eos" p. 787 states that depictions of birds in art about Memnon could reflect this myth (e.g. in "Memnon" nos. 30, 51, 58, 63, 96).

²⁶ Hesiod fr. 353 MW (Lactantius Placidus; listed under "*fragmenta dubia*") and Simonides fr. 539 *PMG* are early reports of an eastern grave site. See further Pley 641-642; Holland 2654-2655; Robert 1184. One vase scene may show Eos bringing an urn with the ashes of Memnon to Tithonus (*LIMC* "Memnon" no. 78="Eos" no. 332). Myth about the Memnonides usually involves a grave site of Memnon; that aspect may be based on older traditions, even if the Memnonides are late.

²⁷ E.g. Robert 1184; Vian 26; Boedeker 83; Weiss at *LIMC* "Eos" p. 785 (cf. p. 780). Weiss thinks two varying traditions were awkwardly joined in early Greek myth; Vian thinks Quintus is acknowledging a variant tradition when he mentions the burial; Robert thinks a grave site contradicts the epic story. We shall see below that a similar issue arises in the case of Achilles.

²⁸ Rohde 64 believes Eos carried the body to the East and revived him there, an idea apparently generated from his overstrict conception of translation, discussed at pp. 167-168 below.

²⁹ Holland believes that the *Aethiopsis* told of an eastern grave site for Memnon, as well as his "immortality." Pley 641-642; Pfister 182 find no discrepancy between burial and immortality for Memnon. Cf. G. Nagy 1979: 208. Ritchie 80-81 seems to agree with my interpretation when he cites the examples of Memnon, Sarpedon, and Rhesus in his argument that it was a typical motif for a slain hero to be brought back to his homeland by divine intervention. At Euripides *Rhesus* 962ff. Rhesus also receives a special afterlife after his mother the Muse brings his body back to Thrace, apparently to bury him.

regenerated. Therefore I think that the term "ἀθανασία" refers here to a special afterlife for some immortal form of Memnon after the burning and burial of his body.

Admittedly it is difficult to understand what this immortal form of his body would be, but I will reserve discussion of this and related issues for my examination of Achilles' afterlife below. It might prove illuminating now, however, to examine Proclus' use of the term "ἀθανασία" in his summary of the *Cypria*. Proclus reports that Zeus granted it to Castor and Pollux to share on alternate days (καὶ Ζεὺς αὐτοῖς ἑτερήμερον νέμει τὴν ἀθανασίαν). Pollux, as the son of Zeus, was considered immortal by birth (*Cypria* fr. 8 Bernabé). According to Apollodorus (*Bibl.* 3.11.2), at least, Pollux could have been translated to Olympus directly without a death. So it is possible for a hero to possess his body in his immortality. And apparently this phenomenon did occur in the epic cycle. Proclus uses the term "ἀθάνατος" to describe the fate of Iphigeneia in the *Cypria* and of Telemachus, Telegonus, and Penelope in the *Telegony*; all of whom apparently become immortal without dying. More examples of immortality without death will be provided below when these issues are discussed in reference to Achilles. The question remains whether in every instance a hero had to possess his body to enjoy immortality. After Castor was killed, the story usually goes, Pollux chose to share death and immortality with his brother. The two are said to exist alternatively underground and in Olympus with Zeus.³⁰ Shall we take this to mean that the body of Castor is regenerated on alternate days? Pollux has chosen to share death with Castor. Is his immortal body returned to him on alternate days? I do not think that myth about the immortality of these twins suggests the regeneration of bodies. I hasten to add that an ancient Greek would probably have difficulty explaining what it does mean, at least in terms used today. It will become clear in my discussion of these issues below in reference to Achilles that ancient Greek conceptions of the soul and the afterlife were very confused and contradictory. What I do

³⁰ See Pindar *Nem.* 10.55ff., *Pyth.* 11.66f., *Od.* 11.66ff. Cf. *Il.* 3.243. J. Frazer 2: 32 n.1 lists these and other sources. See also now the full discussion by Gantz 327ff.

not think we can conclude is that the ἀθανασία of Memnon, to return to him, precludes the burial of his body.

I might add that my discussion above may have placed too much weight on the diction of Proclus. He was writing a concise summary, after all, and his use of the terms "ἀθανασία" or "ἀθάνατος" cannot be expected to define precisely what happened to Memnon or to Iphigeneia or to Castor and Pollux. We also cannot assume that the same word or a similar word was used by the poet of the *Aethiopsis* to describe Memnon's fate. At least since the time of Plato (*Phaedrus* 246a) ἀθανασία was used in reference to the immortal soul. I did not cite this above when first discussing the definition of the term because the Platonic conception of the soul is often different from that of earlier ages. But Proclus would have known this meaning of the term, and we should therefore not hesitate to conclude that he could use it to describe a non-corporal afterlife for Memnon in the *Aethiopsis*.

We have no indication of where Memnon would enjoy this afterlife. Perhaps this was because non-Greeks did not fit easily into Greek myth of the afterlife; as Vermeule says, "The Greek poet does not ask: Where do all the dead barbarians go? Where are Priam and Antenor, Sarpedon and Memnon and Penthesileia?"³¹ One might suppose he went home to the land of the Aethiopians (G. Nagy 1979: 213-214). They live at the ends of the earth (a regular feature of paradises) and associate with the Olympians. The Aethiopians in their otherworldliness are comparable to the Hyperboreans, a people who also dwell in a paradise-like location.³² But note that at Pindar *Nem.* 6.52 it is specified that because of Achilles Memnon did not return home. The question of whether or not Memnon possessed his body in his immortality further complicates this issue. But

³¹ Vermeule 36. At 37 she notes that in the fifth century Polygnotus portrayed Memnon and other barbarians in the underworld (*LIMC* "Memnon" no. 93). A. Edwards 1985: 221 n.15 points out that this is odd.

³² Besides Nagy see Vermeule 134-135; Romm 60.

wherever Memnon went, the burning of his body and the "immortality" of his spirit need not be mutually exclusive and were probably both part of his story in early Greek myth.

In art, Memnon's corpse is depicted being handled by Aethiopians, Eos, and Sleep and Death.³³ Either there were variants of the story or different agents performed different functions at different times. The functions could include removing the corpse from the field of battle, attending to the body, mourning over the corpse, taking his corpse eastward to a place of burial, and translating him to a place of immortality. Sometimes the background of the pictures identifies the scene as Troy, but not always, and so some scenes could portray funerary activity in the East. It is impossible to categorize conclusively the place and temporal sequence of the scenes, though attempts have long been made.³⁴

Only one vase scene shows Aethiopians handling the corpse of Memnon.³⁵ Sometimes an unidentified corpse in the hands of Thanatos and Hypnos has been considered Memnon; at times a female is also present who is accordingly considered Eos. However, interpretation of these vases has been controversial because inscriptions are absent and the iconography of Eos is uncertain. Sarpedon and Europa could possibly be the corpse and female. I will discuss this issue thoroughly in chapter four at pages 226ff. Now I merely observe that it is generally agreed that one Greek vase does depict Thanatos, Hypnos, and Eos with the corpse of Memnon, as do Etruscan gems.³⁶ More frequently Eos is shown with the body of her son without Sleep and Death. Some vases

³³ Cf. *LIMC* "Memnon" no. 61-92; "Eos" nos. 317-333; "Eos/Thesan" nos. 36-45.

³⁴ See Pley 641-642, following Gruppe; cf. the arrangements of the *LIMC* articles. Vermeule 165 suggests that Eos cannot lift Memnon and has to yield to Sleep and Death, but Eos is commonly thought capable of snatching up attractive young men. Since all art scenes seem to show the corpse of Memnon, they may show scenes only prior to translation. But a hero's immortal manifestation may appear to be corporal, as we shall see below in discussion of the immortality of Achilles.

³⁵ *LIMC* "Memnon" no. 61 (not listed in the "Aithiopes" article). Philostratus *Imag.* 1.7 ("Memnon" no. 92) describes the Aethiopians mourning their dead leader.

³⁶ The vase is *LIMC* "Eos" no. 320="Memnon" no. 69, dated to the early fifth century. Bothmer also shows it at fig. 82; at 78 (figs. 85, 86) he identifies two Etruscan gems as Eos with Thanatos or Hypnos and the corpse of Memnon. Many Etruscan gems and a mirror are mentioned as possibly such under "Eos/Thesan" no. 42.

show her with the body of her son on the ground, and others show Eos carrying it while flying through the air.³⁷

I conclude that in the usual version of the tale Eos asked Zeus for a special afterlife for her son after his death. The body of Memnon was taken from the battlefield and removed to a place of burial through divine agency. Eos probably handled the body at some point, but Thanatos and Hypnos may also have been involved, as may Aethiopians. Quintus of Smyrna 2.550ff. is apparently diverging from tradition when he relates that the winds carried off Memnon, though they might naturally fulfill this role since they are, like Memnon, children of Eos (Hesiod *Theog.* 378-380). The "immortality" that Memnon received must have occurred after his burial, and probably means that his spirit enjoyed an afterlife in some paradisiacal setting. Since what happens to Memnon after his death is essentially a digression in the story of the death of Achilles, accounts of his translation and afterlife may have been short and vague. That would explain the paucity of information in our sources on these issues, and it is probably misguided to reconstruct the details concerned with them too precisely.

E) Immediately after killing Memnon, Achilles routs the Trojans and attacks Troy

Proclus in his summary of the *Aethiopsis* and Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.3 report that Achilles routed the Trojans, chasing them as far as the walls of Troy. I think these sources imply the rout occurred immediately after the death of Memnon. Quintus of Smyrna 3.1ff. has Achilles wait until the day after Memnon's death before attacking, but Quintus tends to expand and embellish the story, and his account is probably untraditional (as Vian 30-31 believes). It makes more sense for Achilles to take immediate advantage of the death of Troy's champion while the Trojans are still out on the field. And one would

³⁷ Cf. *LIMC* "Eos" nos. 317-319, 322-326, 328-333; "Eos/Thesan" nos. 36-45; "Memnon" nos. 62-89; Bothmer 75-76; Clark/Coulson 71. *LIMC* "Eos" no. 327="Memnon" no. 91 may show Eos mourning over the body of her son. Fenik 1964: 32 n.4; Ritchie 80-81 suggest that a goddess mourning over her slain mortal son is a typical motif (both cite the example of the Muse and her son Rhesus at the end of the *Rhesus*).

think that Thetis would not warn Achilles of his impending death before his duel with Memnon (as I believe she does) if the two events were not closely linked in time.

Art work tends to ignore this rout. The earliest possible scene of the death of Achilles, which shows an warrior about to be struck in the shin, depicts a static battle of two groups of opposing warriors.³⁸ Another art scene pictures Paris shooting at Achilles as he is about to kill a wounded adversary.³⁹ If the adversary is Memnon, which is the usual interpretation, then this scene precludes time for a rout, for the death of Achilles would be portrayed as immediately following the death of Memnon. Another art scene shows Paris shooting at Achilles while Achilles chases another man.⁴⁰ If the opponent who is being pursued is Memnon, then this picture also provides no time for the rout. But it is possible that the artists of these vases were employing synopsis; i.e. were joining two temporally separate incidents together in a single artistic scene. And it is not certain that the opponent in these pictures is Memnon; I suspect these scenes actually portray Achilles attacking an anonymous Trojan at the end of his rout, just before his death.

That Achilles reached the city of Troy is implied by the usual place of his death, the Scaean gates. We saw in chapter two that the *Iliad* specified this as the place of Achilles' death. Proclus suggests he was fighting his way through them (εἰς τὴν πόλιν συνεισπεσών). That would indeed be a natural consequence of Trojans rushing through the gates and leaving them open too long after the rout (cf. *Il.* 21.531ff.). Vian stresses (31) that Achilles' penetration of the gates is an idiosyncrasy of the *Aethiopsis*, but the idea seems consistent with the general agreement of our sources that Achilles died menacing the city. A fragment of Stesichorus (S137 *PMGF*) which contains "πόλιν" and "τείχος" in subsequent lines after earlier mentioning Achilles may also be referring to the hero's

³⁸*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 848="Alexandros" no. 93. Ahlberg-Cornell 72 doubts that it shows the death of Achilles because it does not depict a rout. This vase and other representations of the death of Achilles are discussed more thoroughly in chapter five.

³⁹*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 852="Alexandros" no. 91.

⁴⁰*LIMC* "Alexandros" no. 97="Achle" 126. Cf. Kemp-Lindemann 220-221. Hampe/Krauskopf under "Alexandros" no. 97 and Kemp-Lindemann identify the chased man as Aeneas, but that is not certain.

death at the wall. Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.3 specifies that as the place of his death. Quintus of Smyrna 3.26ff. says Achilles would have broken the gates if he had not been slain (though he seems to be only near the walls when wounded). Horace *Ode* 4.6.3ff. stresses the threat Achilles presented to Troy by characterizing him as the "near-victor of Troy" who "shook the Dardanian gates." Early art does not give any indication of the location of Achilles' death, but the walls of Troy are frequently depicted as a background to the scene in later art.⁴¹ The temple of Thymbraean Apollo is also depicted as the scene of his death in later art,⁴² but that story is probably of Alexandrian origin (see further at n.44 in chapter five). The general consensus that the death of Achilles occurred beneath the walls of Troy seems to confirm that Achilles had routed the Trojans and then attacked the city.

I conclude that Achilles attacked the Trojans immediately after killing Memnon, and was so successful that he pushed them right up to the gates of the city.

F) *Achilles is killed by Apollo and Paris by bow and arrow at the Scaean gates*

In chapter two, I demonstrated that the *Iliad* looks forward to these three aspects of the death of Achilles: the wall of Troy as the place, Paris and Apollo as the agents, and the bow as the weapon. The evidence cited under element E seems to confirm that the wall (sometimes more specifically the Scaean gates) was indeed the location. Proclus in his summary of the *Aethiopsis* and Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.5 both state that Paris and Apollo killed Achilles. However, many literary sources report that either Paris or Apollo acted alone.⁴³ For example, a fragment of Aeschylus (350 Radt=Plato *Rep.* 383a-b; discussed at

⁴¹ All three Iliac tables which show Achilles lying on the ground (listed together at *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 854; see Sadurska 27, 52, 56 [pl. i, x, xi]) picture the walls in the background. So do *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 856, 896.

⁴² Cf. *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 855="Alexandros" no. 99; "Achilleus" no. 857="Alexandros" no. 101; "Achilleus" no. 858="Alexandros" no. 100; Kemp-Lindemann 219, 221-222. Kemp-Lindemann 221-222 notes that the Tensa Capitolina (one scene on which is *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 857) illogically shows the corpse of Achilles on a battlefield after depicting Paris shooting at him inside the temple of Thymbraean Apollo.

⁴³ See J. Frazer 2: 214 n.1; Escher 238-239; Fleischer 47-48. *LIMC* "Achle" no. 127, which shows Amphiaraus killing Achilles(!), must be the result of random assignation of heroic names to a heroic scene (see Camporeale at *LIMC* "Achle" p. 213).

pp. 127-128 in chapter two) and Sophocles *Philoct.* 334-335 imply Apollo killed Achilles by himself, but Euripides *Androm.* 655, *Hecub.* 387ff. mentions only Paris.⁴⁴ The fragmented *Paean* 6 of Pindar apparently stated that Apollo was disguised as Paris when he slew Achilles. Art work rarely shows Apollo at the death scene, and never without Paris.⁴⁵ Authors and artists who mention or portray Apollo alone do not necessarily follow a divergent tradition; they could be emphasizing the slayer of their choice for their own narrative purposes.⁴⁶ I prefer to think that usually in this story Apollo guided arrows that Paris shot, as art often represents and Virgil *Aen.* 6.56-58, Ovid *Met.* 12.597-609 narrate the action. This issue will be explored more thoroughly in chapter five (see pp. 277-278) when I discuss the myth of Achilles' heel.

I conclude that in myth about the death of Achilles the hero was killed at the wall of the city by bow and arrow through some sort of cooperative effort between Paris and Apollo; probably Paris shot arrows with the help of Apollo.

G) *There is a battle over the corpse of Achilles (in which Glaucus is killed by Ajax), and Ajax carries the body to safety as Odysseus defends*

Odyssey 24.36-42 reports that this battle lasted all day. Odysseus at *Od.* 5.308-310 wishes he had died in the fight. The battle is briefly mentioned by Proclus in his summary of the *Aethiopsis* and by Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.4. Garner believes (1993: 159-160) on the basis of a number of recently found fragments (see n.11 above) that Stesichorus described

⁴⁴ Cf. Alcman fr. 70b *PMGF*, which Page (repeated by Davies in *PMGF*) interpreted as "te (Achillem) Paridi domandum tradidere fata." In a new Simonides fragment (11.7-8 West) Apollo alone is credited with the death of Achilles, if we accept West's reconstruction. Garner 1993: 159 thinks that Apollo is mentioned at l. 2 of the recently found fr. 69 of Stesichorus (see n.11 above) as "the direct murderer of Achilles or as Paris' assistant."

⁴⁵ *LIMC* "Apollon" no. 882="Achilleus" no. 851; "Apollo/Apollon" no. 497="Achilles" no. 857 (in the Thymbraean temple of Apollo). "Achilleus" no. 855 may also show Apollo at the death scene (also, apparently, in the temple). Cf. "Apollon" no. 880="Achilleus" no. 565, which shows Apollo significantly displaying an arrow as Achilles kills Hector.

⁴⁶ Thus Gantz 625, who also thinks Homer implies Apollo merely guided the arrows of Paris. Vian 31-32 suggests that some authors spoke of Apollo alone because it made the death of Achilles seem more glorious.

the body of Achilles lying in the dust as some Greeks debated whether to flee from the battle. Quintus of Smyrna describes this battle at length at 3.204ff.

Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.4 specifies that Ajax killed Glaucus in the fighting over Achilles' corpse. At Quintus of Smyrna 3.278ff. Glaucus is killed by Ajax, but only as one of many. A Chalcidian vase pictures Ajax wounding Glaucus at the very moment Glaucus is attempting to attach a cord to Achilles' ankle.⁴⁷ It is tempting to conclude that the artist has chosen to illustrate a well-known event in myth. Another Etruscan work from the second or first century B.C. probably represents Glaucus grasping Achilles by the foot as Ajax begins to lift him.⁴⁸ Both Quintus of Smyrna and the Chalcidian vase give further names of those who participated in the battle. Some have supposed that these details come from the *Aethiopsis*, since both the vase and Quintus may have used that poem as a source.⁴⁹ But I am not interested in reconstructing the *Aethiopsis*, and I doubt that such details would have been uniform in myth about the battle over the corpse. A few other works exist in art besides the Chalcidian vase about this battle, often showing Ajax about to lift the corpse.⁵⁰

The intense fighting in this battle that Odysseus recalls at *Od.* 308-310 may reflect his defense of Ajax while Ajax carried the corpse to safety. Those are the roles that Proclus and Apollodorus report Odysseus and Ajax played in this battle.⁵¹ The actions by Ajax and Odysseus at that time apparently became an issue later when they quarreled over Achilles' arms.⁵² Quintus of Smyrna 3.212ff. gives Ajax a prominent role in the

⁴⁷ *LIMC* "Glaukos V" no. 9="Achilleus" no. 850 (*LIMC* "Aias I" simply directs the reader to the *LIMC* "Achilleus" article for the battle over the corpse and the rescue of it).

⁴⁸ *LIMC* "Alexandros" no. 98; which apparently is also "Achle" no. 135, though it is not cross-referenced.

⁴⁹ E.g. Kossatz-Deissmann at "Achilleus" no. 850. Vian 33 stresses that there are differences between the vase and Quintus.

⁵⁰ Cf. *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 849 (perhaps), 853c, 854 and 854a, 859 (perhaps); "Achle" nos. 134, 135; Kemp-Lindemann 218-223 *passim*.

⁵¹ Cf. the Homeric scholia collected at *Aethiopsis* fr. 3 Bernabé, which speak of the cyclic poets or the neoterói giving these roles for Ajax and Odysseus.

⁵² See Bernabé p. 69, and *Iliades parvae* fr. 2 Bernabé with Bernabé's comment at p. 76. Surprisingly, Odysseus carries the corpse and Ajax defends in a papyrus fragment of an unknown poem (*Iliades parvae* fr. 32 Bernabé ["*fragmentum dubium*"]). On the question of the date of this fragment, see n.80 above in

battle, but the rescue of the corpse is accomplished by a nameless group of Greeks. Agamemnon in *Od.* 24.43 also neglects to specify the usual roles of Ajax and Odysseus; he simply states that "we" carried the corpse back to the ships. But the antiquity of the rescue of the corpse by Ajax cannot be doubted, for there are numerous representations of Ajax carrying the corpse of Achilles in art from as early as the late eighth century.⁵³ Some scholars are skeptical (e.g. Kemp-Lindemann; T. Carpenter 206-207) of certain identification of the schema before the sixth century because of a lack of inscriptions and because the corpse on one early example is identified as someone other than Achilles (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 863). But most scholars consider the earliest examples of the schema to be of Ajax and Achilles.⁵⁴

I might add that some are surprised that the corpse of Achilles can be depicted naked when it is carried, for his armor is featured in the subsequent quarrel between Ajax and Odysseus.⁵⁵ But consider the following: a) for aesthetic reasons artists often depicted warriors naked even when this contradicted realism (Ajax sometimes appears naked when carrying Achilles out of battle), b) artists often ignored later elements of a story when concentrating on one episode, and c) Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.4 reports that Ajax sent Achilles' armor back to the Greek camp before rescuing the corpse. That detail in Apollodorus most easily explains why the corpse of Achilles need not have armor when it is rescued.⁵⁶

chapter one. The scholiast to *Od.* 5.310 also reports this reversal of roles, perhaps simply in error (thus Severyns 330). But cf. J. Kakridis 1986, who argues (unpersuasively, I think) that the apparent role reversal in the scholia and in the papyrus fragment pre-dates both the epic cycle and Homer.

⁵³ Cf. *LIMC* "Achilleus" 860-896; "Achle" 136-146; Kemp-Lindemann 223-227; Ahlberg-Cornell 35-38, 71-72.

⁵⁴ E.g. Fittschen 179ff.; Friis Johansen 1967: 30; Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a (*LIMC* "Achilleus") p. 192 (see especially); Ahlberg-Cornell 35ff.

⁵⁵ Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a (*LIMC* "Achilleus") under no. 860 and at p. 192; Kemp-Lindemann 223.

⁵⁶ Ahlberg-Cornell 36-37, 187 considers the version in Apollodorus to be the earliest tradition, specifically criticizing Kossatz-Deissmann on this issue at 36 n.48.

It can be concluded that myth about the death of Achilles usually related that there was a long battle over his corpse. Ajax protected the body during the battle and eventually carried the body to safety with Odysseus defending. Perhaps an attempt by Glaucus to drag off the body, leading to his death by Ajax, was also commonly included in the story.

H) 1. *There is an elaborate funeral ceremony for Achilles that Thetis, the Nereids, and the Muses attend; 2. Thetis takes Achilles from the pyre to a paradise; 3. the Greeks bury his ashes in a conspicuous funeral mound at Troy*

H) 1. *There is an elaborate funeral ceremony for Achilles that Thetis, the Nereids, and the Muses attend*

The funeral for Achilles is fully reported at *Od.* 24.43ff., which relates that the Greeks mourned over the laid-out corpse of Achilles, and then that Thetis, the Nereids, and the Muses arrived and participated in an elaborate ceremony that lasted seventeen days. In the summary of the *Aethiopsis* by Proclus the Greeks lay out the body of Achilles and Thetis arrives with the Muses and her sister Nereids to mourn over it. Garner thinks (1993: 160) that a number of recently found fragments of Stesichorus (see n.11 above) describe the preparation of the corpse for burial, the Nereids rising from the sea, and speeches during the ceremony. Pindar at *Pyth.* 3.100-103 mentions the grief that the Greeks felt when the body of Achilles burned on his pyre; at *Isth.* 8.56-60 he describes how the Muses sang in his honor by his pyre and burial mound. Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.5 simply notes that the Greeks grieved for Achilles at his funeral, but Quintus of Smyrna 3.525ff. gives a long description of the funeral, including the attendance of Thetis, the Nereids, and the Muses at the ceremony.

It may be significant that the grief of the Achaeans is stressed by Homer (*Od.* 24.45-46), Pindar (*Pyth.* 3.100-103), Apollodorus (*Epit.* 5.5), and Quintus of Smyrna

(3.665ff.). G. Nagy has extensively defended the etymology of "Achilles" from ἄχος and λαός.⁵⁷ Etymologies can be difficult to accept with certainty, and this one is no exception.⁵⁸ But if it is correct, it is apposite to my discussion of the funeral of Achilles. Nagy suggests a number of explanations for this etymology, including the grief of the Greeks at the death of Achilles.⁵⁹ He further points out that this etymological theory presupposes that myth about Achilles is very old. The grief expressed for Achilles at his funeral may well be one of the oldest aspects of his story.

The subject of Achilles' funeral is rare in art, but one work from the early sixth century apparently provides a vivid depiction of Thetis and the Nereids with the laid-out body of Achilles.⁶⁰ A number of women surround a corpse on a bier, tearing their hair and scratching their cheeks, some inscribed with names commonly used for Nereids. The unidentified woman who holds the head of the corpse in her hands must be Thetis mourning over her slain son. The armor that lies on the ground by the bier has no significance for the funeral, but probably alludes to the famous quarrel between Ajax and Odysseus over Achilles' arms. The only other depictions of the funeral in art can be found on two Iliac tables; one shows Thetis, a Muse, and probably one Nereid with the corpse of Achilles, while the other seems to show Thetis by her son's corpse.⁶¹

H) 2. *Thetis takes Achilles from the pyre to a paradise*

Proclus continues his summary of the *Aethiopsis* by stating that Thetis took Achilles off the pyre and brought him to Leuke: ἐκ τῆς πυρᾶς ἢ Θέτις ἀναρπάσασα τὸν παῖδα εἰς τὴν Λευκὴν νῆσον διακομίζει. The description of Achilles' funeral in *Od.* 24, however, makes no mention of a translation of Achilles to a paradise. Indeed, the

⁵⁷ Nagy 1979: 69-117 (see esp. 70 section 2n1), following Palmer. At 70 section 2n1 Nagy adds that the etymology of Penthesileia's name can be similarly explained.

⁵⁸ Hommel 38 doubts this etymology of the name "Achilles." Cf. McLeod 1987b: 363.

⁵⁹ He primarily cites the grief that the Greeks felt both when Achilles withdrew from the Greek confederation and when Achilles was killed, but adds that the grief of the Trojans caused by Achilles and the grief of Achilles at the death of Patroclus may also be of significance.

⁶⁰ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 897; cf. Kemp-Lindemann 227.

⁶¹ Cf. *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 898-899; Kemp-Lindemann 227- 228; Sadurska 29, 51 (pl. i, x).

shade of Achilles is present in Hades at both *Od.* 24 and 11, and that obviously precludes an account of his pleasant afterlife in a paradise. In this respect the *Odyssey* seems to agree with the *Iliad*, which stresses the finality of Achilles' death. But we may suspect that the *Aethiopsis* follows pre-Homeric myth in narrating that Thetis obtained a special afterlife for her son. As I argued above in chapter one (see pp. 87ff.), Homer seems to suppress the option of immortality for heroes though he is clearly aware of it. His attitude is probably divergent from the norm of pre-Homeric and post-Homeric poetry. One can hardly find another source from the ancient world that agrees with Homer in placing Achilles in Hades after his death rather than at a paradisiacal setting.⁶²

The condensed report of Proclus does not specifically state that Achilles was given *ἀθανασία*, as Memnon was, but it is natural to conclude that Achilles received it. As Eos asked Zeus for permission to give her child immortality, so Thetis probably did also. Pindar *Ol.* 2.79-80 relates that Thetis asked Zeus for permission to take Achilles to the Isles of the Blessed, and he may have taken this detail from myth about Achilles, perhaps from the *Aethiopsis*.⁶³ Note that Pindar states he went to the Isles of the Blessed, not Leuke. Variation in the paradise named for Achilles is not uncommon. A number of sources do agree with the *Aethiopsis* that the hero went to Leuke. The fragment of Alcaeus that refers to Achilles as lord of Scythia (*Ἀχιλλεύς ὁ τὰς Σκυθίας μέδεις*, 354 L-P) seems to refer to his immortality in the Black Sea area, if not specifically at Leuke. Pausanias 3.19.11ff. might be interpreted as indicating that Stesichorus mentioned Leuke in his palinode. Pindar at *Nem.* 4.49-50 places Achilles on a "bright" island in the Euxine. Euripides at *Andr.* 1260-1263, *IT.* 427ff. refers to a *λευκή ἀκτὴ* as his dwelling place,

⁶² See especially A. Edwards 1985 on this issue. A lost art work by Polygnotus described at Pausanias 10.30.3 (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 900) is the only other certain reference to Achilles in Hades, unless one wants to include Lucian *Dial. Mort.* 6, 26. A. Edwards 1985: 221 n.15 points out that Polygnotus oddly also places Memnon in Hades. "Achle" no. 147 (cf. Kemp-Lindemann 228-229, 231) may show Achilles in Hades, though I find that interpretation dubious.

⁶³ Cf. Pestalozzi 28; A. Edwards 1985: 221 n.14; Vian 34-35. Solmsen 20-21 unconvincingly suggests that Pindar is inspired by the request from Thetis to Zeus in *Il.* 1. Fenik 1964: 30 considers a request by a goddess for the immortality of a son typical, citing besides Eos and Thetis the Muse who requests a special afterlife from Persephone for her son Rhesus at Euripides *Rhesus* 962ff.

and there is an obscure reference to Leuke at Lycophron 188. In Quintus of Smyrna there is no indication that Thetis took her son from the pyre but there is undoubtedly an allusion to Leuke when at 3.766ff. Poseidon promises to Thetis that Achilles will inhabit an island in the Euxine. A possible reference to Leuke in art work is a vase that may show the soul of Achilles, winged and armed, flying over the sea (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 901). But there is no direct reference to Leuke on it, and so if this is Achilles, he could be flying to any paradise at the end of the sea. Or perhaps this depicts Achilles flitting about the Black Sea in general, since the whole area encompassed the realm of his worship.⁶⁴

Other sources agree with the placement of Achilles in the Isles of the Blessed at Pindar *Oi.* 2. Garner thinks (1993: 162) that the letters "μακα[ρ-" in a recently found fragment of Stesichorus (65.7; see n.11 above) refer to Achilles' afterlife in such a place. Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.5 also reports that Achilles lives on the Isles of the Blessed (after a disputed passage in which Leuke is mentioned; see p. 172 with n.97 below). The same paradise is specified for Achilles at Plato *Symp.* 179E-180b and in an Attic *skolion* (fr. 894 *PMG*). Hesiod *Erg.* 156ff. describes the Isles of the Blessed as a paradise for heroes who died in the Theban and Trojan wars, and perhaps this would include Achilles (interpretation of the passage is disputed; see p. 166 with n.97 below).

Many named Elysium instead as the paradise for Achilles: Ibycus and Simonides (scholia to Apollonius Rhodes 4.418=fr. 291, 558 *PMG*), Apollonius of Rhodes 4.811, scholia *ad* Lycophron 174, and Quintus of Smyrna 14.223ff. It also seems that there is mention of a paradise for Achilles that could be Elysium in a papyrus fragment of an unknown poem.⁶⁵ Though there is much variance on the actual setting of Achilles'

⁶⁴ Hommel 25 proposes that different traditions of Achilles as sea divinity and epic warrior are mixed in this representation.

⁶⁵ *Iliades parvae* fr. 32 Bernabé ("fragmentum dubium"). The name of the paradise is not actually given, but in the context of the death of Achilles a divinity speaks of Rhadamanthus in phraseology similar to *Od.* 4.564; see J. Kakridis 1986: 64. At n.80 above in chapter one I noted the date of this poem is disputed, and at n.52 above I discussed its role reversal of Ajax and Odysseus in the rescue of the corpse of Achilles.

paradise, all of the above sources agree that Achilles existed after his death somewhere other than Hades.⁶⁶

It is often thought that there is a contradiction in the summary of the *Aethiopsis* by Proclus because Achilles is translated to Leuke yet the Greeks raise a burial mound for him in Troy. Some have pointed out that no discrepancy exists if the mound was simply a cenotaph.⁶⁷ This explanation would solve the perceived problem, but I think an explanation is unnecessary. As we saw above in the case of Memnon (see pp. 145ff.), translation of a hero need not contradict the burial of his ashes.⁶⁸ I think that in Greek myth the translation of Achilles to a paradise and the burial of his ashes in a funeral mound at Cape Sigeion coexisted.⁶⁹

Myth about the funeral of Achilles frequently narrates the burial of Achilles' ashes at Troy, as we shall see when we examine that issue below (section 3 of element H). Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.5 speaks of Achilles as buried at Leuke, but if we accept Frazer's excision of the reference to Leuke (see n.97 below), then that passage actually refers to a burial of his ashes at Troy. That would be significant, for Apollodorus then reports that Achilles lives on at the Isles of the Blessed. Quintus of Smyrna 3.719ff. similarly specifies that Achilles' bones were gathered and buried in Troy, then at 3.770ff. alludes to Black Sea worship of Achilles (though he gives no indication of a translation of Achilles during the funeral). Pindar refers to an afterlife for Achilles, both at the Isles of the Blessed (*Ol.* 2.79-80) and at Leuke (*Nem.* 4.49-50), but at *Pyth.* 3. 100-103 he mentions

⁶⁶ Frequently Achilles was thought to live with a consort, often Medea, sometimes Helen, or even Polyxena, an issue that does not need to be explored here. See J. Frazer 2: 217 n.2; Escher 240-241; Fleischer 56; Robert 1195; Rohde 564 n.99. Hommel 27 ff. finds evidence of Achilles as an ancient ruler of the dead in these reports. Vermeule 74 oddly thinks this aspect developed after the Persian wars.

⁶⁷ Rohde 84 n.29, Dihle 17-18; A. Edwards 1985: 224 n.23. Davies 1989a: 59-60 thinks this is a possible explanation. Rohde 65 and Dihle think that the translation was first used in the *Aethiopsis*, Edwards thinks it was traditional. See *Od.* 1.289ff. and 4.584 for a Homeric description of a cenotaph.

⁶⁸ Cf. also Euripides *Rhesus* 962ff.: the Muse apparently plans to bury her son and then obtain a special afterlife for his spirit (he is to live as a *daimon* in an underground cave).

⁶⁹ Robert 1193-1194; J. Frazer 2: 216 n.1; Pfister 182 explain the story in this manner. Davies 1989a: 59 apparently follows this position. It will become clear below that I have found useful the provocative argument of G. Nagy that burial and afterlife in paradise for heroes are compatible, though I differ with him on some points.

the burning of Achilles' corpse, and at *Isthm.* 8.56-60 he portrays the Muses singing by the pyre and burial mound of Achilles. It is difficult to imagine that honor occurring if the corpse of Achilles had been removed from the pyre and the mound was just a cenotaph. And as I pointed out in chapter one (see n.221), the poems in the epic cycle sometimes pictured the ghost of Achilles appearing at his Trojan grave site. One would think that his spirit would be more likely to appear at the place where his ashes are buried than at a cenotaph. These sources apparently indicate that there is no inconsistency between an afterlife for Achilles in paradise and a burial of him at Troy. This suggests that the two were not as mutually exclusive as modern critics believe. I conclude that myth about Achilles conceived of some immortal manifestation of him going to Leuke, while his corpse remained to be burned and buried.

Sometimes critics have supposed that worship of Achilles at the island(s) called Leuke in the Black Sea region implies a belief that Achilles was buried there. That might suggest that myth did usually indicate a removal of the corpse of Achilles from Troy. But there is no reason to think that worshippers of Achilles believed that a grave site existed on an island or anywhere else in the Black Sea region. I think G. Nagy has gone astray in his assumption that the grave sites and the paradises for heroes are at the same location. At one point (1979:189-192) he uses rather unconvincing arguments to link Elysium and the Isles of the Blessed with burial sites for heroes. At another point (1992b: 272) he claims that in Archaic hero cult "the hero's abode is visualized simultaneously as 1) a cult place where his corpse is buried and 2) a paradise-like setting at the edge of the world, where he has been immortalized." This statement might be harmonious with my argument, but at 71 Nagy specifies Leuke as an example of this duality. Pinney also insists that worship of Achilles at the Black Sea Leuke presupposes a grave site there, basing this conclusion on the common understanding of hero cult as a hero's power

emanating from the grave.⁷⁰ But these scholars are unjustified in assuming that Black Sea worship was that type of hero cult. As I pointed out in chapter one (see p. 88 with n.218), it is not certain that all hero cults involved a grave site. And no grave site (or temple or sanctuary) has been found on the islands called Leuke. A couple of late reports do speak of a grave for Achilles on Leuke, but this conception probably arose at a late date.⁷¹ It is probable that originally worship of Achilles in the Black Sea region never included the belief that he was buried there. What could Greek explorers have found on an uninhabited island that would lead them to conclude it was the grave of an hero from the distant past?

The place where the ancient world believed Achilles was buried was actually Cape Sigeion, and rituals appropriate for hero cult based on a grave site were carried out there.⁷² G. Nagy extensively remarks (1979: 120, 340-343) on the hero cult for Achilles at the Hellespont tomb site, but suggests at 343 that the Hellespont tomb somehow signified the cult at Leuke.⁷³ Yet the cult of Achilles at the Hellespont cannot be ignored or subsumed under worship of Achilles in the Black Sea region. It must have arisen out of the belief that the hero was buried at Troy. Of course Achilles could be and was worshipped elsewhere. Leuke was one center of worship because it was believed to be the

⁷⁰ Pinney 133. Her point, if I understand her correctly, is that the worship of Achilles occurred after Milesian colonization. On the alleged importance of grave sites for hero cult, see p. 88 with n. 218 in chapter one.

⁷¹ Cf. Robert 1194, esp. nn.3, 5; Escher 240; Fleischer 54. Robert describes the conception of a burial of Achilles at Leuke as a type of rationalism. Escher 240 thinks that a grave at Leuke is inconsistent with the story of Achilles' translation. If he means the place of burial, then I agree, but if he means that Achilles cannot be both translated and buried, then I obviously do not agree.

⁷² See Escher 223; Fleischer 59; Kemp-Lindemann 244; Heubeck 1992 *ad Od.* 24.84. Perhaps the most famous example is the offering made on the tomb of Achilles by Alexander the Great (Arrian *Anabasis* 1.12). Heubeck supposes that the poet of the *Odyssey* may have known of a tomb of Achilles at that site as a well-known landmark and cult site (cf. G. Nagy 1979: 338-343, who argues the same about the poet of the *Iliad*). In citing the fragment of Alcaeus about Achilles as lord of Scythia (354 L-P) as the earliest evidence for this Achilleion Heubeck apparently follows Hommel's suggestion (9-10) that the fragment was part of a hymn that Alcaeus composed to be sung at the grave of Achilles there, an interesting if uncertain idea. Cf. Hector's daydream about the tomb of a Greek defeated by him becoming a landmark to sailors (*Il.* 7.84ff.). Ford 160 compares the tomb of Achilles to the fame of a fixed text of the *Iliad*.

⁷³ A similar temptation to conflate the Hellespont grave site with Leuke apparently underlies Vermeule's hesitant suggestion (230 n.67) that Leuke was near Cape Sigeion, though ancient testimony, which she cites, surely contradicts this.

location of his afterlife.⁷⁴ It seems that a misconception of this cult at Leuke has engendered the assumption that he was buried there. But it seems that according to ancient thought the spirit of Achilles lived on at Leuke and his ashes were buried in a tomb on the Hellespont.

Nagy has done much to explain how this could be so with his argument that burial and immortality are compatible for heroes like Achilles and Memnon.⁷⁵ Where he is misguided is in his insistence that Achilles' grave site and his paradise are the same place. Worshippers apparently thought that an immortal hero lived in some far-off paradise but visited and affected the mortal realm through his grave site. Worshipers did not travel to Elysium or the Isles of the Blessed to perform rituals at graves. It is true that in Greek myth a hero could travel to the realm of paradise. Heracles and Perseus visit the Hyperboreans, as I pointed out in chapter one (n.196). The Aethiopians might be thought to be an example of living inhabitants of paradise crossing over into the earthly realm (see p. 148 above). A *katabasis* to Hades by living heroes is a comparable concept. The historical island Leuke in the Black Sea was unusual in that it was a paradise that mortals in real life could visit; apparently geographical expansion had overrun what was once considered the end of the world and thus an appropriate location for a paradise. In any event we may conclude that it was not a cenotaph for Achilles which was raised at the Hellespont in the *Aethiopsis*. In fact it seems that the ancient world believed that Achilles was buried at Troy. Such a burial need not contradict the translation of Achilles if we conceive of Thetis taking some manifestation of his spirit to Leuke while his mortal part remained on the pyre to be burned.

⁷⁴ For the full range of places in the Hellenic world where Achilles was worshipped, consult the bibliography listed at n.193 in chapter one.

⁷⁵ See esp. Nagy 1979: 205-209. His argument extends to cases where the immortality after burial does not specifically involve a paradise; cf. 1979: 189-190, 1990: 85ff., 132ff.

We do possess some evidence that supports my interpretation. Philostratus *Heroicus* 208.53.10 quotes the following Thessalian hymn to Thetis, which was sung at the grave site of Achilles at Troy:

Γέτι κυανέα, Θέτι Πηλεία,
 τὸν μέγαν ἄ τέκες υἷὸν Ἀχιλλέα, τοῦ
 θνατὰ μὲν ὅσον φύσις ἤνεγκε,
 Τροία λάχε· σὰς δ' ὅσον ἀθανάτου
 γενεᾶς πάις ἔσπασε, Πόντος ἔχει.

Philostratus is a late and unreliable source, but the hymn he quotes may be quite ancient.⁷⁶ Note that the word "ἀθάνατος" used in the hymn was discussed above, along with the word "ἀθανασία," when we investigated cyclic references to immortality (pp. 145ff.) Here it is clearly understood that Achilles is both buried and translated. The following title of two epigrams about Achilles in the pseudo-Aristotelian *Peplos* supports that conception: 'Ἐπὶ Ἀχιλλέως κειμένου ἐν Τροίῃ, τιμωμένου δὲ καὶ ἐν Λευκῇ τῇ νήσῳ.⁷⁷ And the art scene in which an armed *winged* warrior flies over the sea, interpreted as being Achilles on his way to Leuke (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 901; see pp. 158-159 above), suggests that the soul of Achilles went to Leuke, not his corpse.

This evidence demonstrates that a translation and a burial of Achilles are compatible. Critics have resisted this explanation because they have tried to impose

⁷⁶ Hommel 41 n.125 cites opinions on the date of it, which vary widely. At 42 she suggests that its content, at least, is much older than Philostratus.

⁷⁷ The title of the two epigrams is quoted by Hommel 42-43; see Diehl 2: 171 for the epigrams (nos. 4, 5) and title. Hommel notes that these words may not be as old as the epigrams (the *Peplos* did originally contain prose, however). One epigram apparently speaks of Achilles as buried at Troy, the other states that Leuke "holds" him (cf. the language of the Thessalian hymn quoted above). Epigram 6 (on Patroclus) reports that the ashes of Patroclus were mixed with those of Achilles. On the *Peplos*, which is dated from the fourth to second century B.C., see *RE* "Peplos" and Cameron 388-393, who thinks that the two epigrams contradict each other on the grave site of Achilles but considers them written by one author, perhaps compiling different sources. If we follow the title's interpretation (and my interpretation), it is unnecessary to regard the epigrams as contradictory.

logical strictures on the story. Admittedly it is difficult to provide a thorough explanation of how the translation would be accomplished. Schadewaldt suggested that Thetis took an *eidolon* of Achilles off the pyre, but Kullmann in reply wondered how an *eidolon* could be grasped.⁷⁸ And if one supposed instead that an *eidolon* was left, no ashes would result from its burning to bury. The verb "ἀναπαύειν," with which Proclus describes the action of Thetis, seems to imply the removal of something tangible.⁷⁹ But its range of meaning is more flexible than the common translation of it as "to snatch." One can find in *LSJ* that the verb was used to describe evaporation of dew by the sun. Proclus states she grasps her "child," not the soul of her child, but his conciseness may have obscured the true nature of this translation (as his use of the term "ἄθανασία" cannot be expected to express completely what happened to Memnon; see p. 148 above). More detailed information about the translation might explain the matter to our satisfaction, though we must remember that Greek religious ideas about burial and the afterlife were often vague and contradictory.⁸⁰ Poets tended to focus only on the needs of the narrative, not on eschatological consistency. One needs simply think of the illogical portrayal of the shades in Hades at *Od.* 11; or the surprising use of *eidola* of Aeneas at *Il.* 5.449ff. and 512ff., of Heracles at *Od.* 11.601ff., and of Helen at Stesichorus (fr. 192-193 *PMGF*) and in the *Helen* by Euripides;⁸¹ or the sudden twist to the story of Iphigeneia's sacrifice in the *Cypria* (wherein a stag suddenly appears when Iphigeneia disappears); or of accounts in which Heracles is burned on a pyre yet lives on in heaven, to realize that these matters can be narrated in an inventive manner. As Vermeule says (118), "logic is not fruitful in

⁷⁸ Schadewaldt 1965: 162 n.2; Kullmann 1960: 41.

⁷⁹ Cf. its use by Proclus to describe the rescue of Iphigeneia by Artemis in the *Cypria*. The verb is also used by Pollux 4.130 to describe the removal of Memnon by Eos in Aeschylus (by means of a crane); see Radt 3: 375.

⁸⁰ See Burkert 1985: 190; Vermeule 28ff., 118ff.

⁸¹ See further at J. Frazer 2: 175 n.3. Note that this *eidolon* is supposed to have conjugal relations with Paris for years. Ixion was supposed to enjoy a sexual encounter with an *eidolon* of Hera (see J. Frazer 2: 148 n.1). These are *eidola* of a very corporal nature.

the sphere of death and was scarcely applied to it by any Greek before Lucian." Critical worries about how Achilles was "snatched up" by Thetis are largely unnecessary.

The apotheosis of Heracles is very relevant to the translation of Achilles. Myth usually implies that the spirit of Heracles was immortalized after his corpse was destroyed by his funeral pyre.⁸² It is true that Apollodorus *Bibl.* 2.7.7 might suggest that the body of Heracles ascended to heaven, but that passage is not clear. In some accounts, like that found at Diodorus Siculus 4.38.5-39.1 and at Ovid *Met.* 9.229ff., no bones of Heracles are to be found, but that is because fire or lightning has completely destroyed his body, not because the body of Heracles was removed and immortalized. At Theocritus 24.83-84, Lucian *Herm.* 7, and Quintus of Smyrna 5.644ff. it is stated that Heracles dwells in Olympus after his pyre destroyed his mortal nature. Quintus states that the bones of Heracles were buried after his apotheosis, and Servius *ad Aen.* 3.402 tells a story in which Philoctetes swore to Heracles he would not reveal where his remains were buried. Thus it was generally agreed that the soul of Heracles was separated from his mortal body on the pyre and that his body was left behind on the pyre. Apparently a gravesite was unknown, but it is either thought that his body was completely destroyed or that the place of burial was a secret. Certainly the puzzling account in *Od.* 14 of two forms of Heracles, one in Hades and the other at Olympus, does not shed much light on the matter. But I do not conclude from this passage that the body of Heracles lives in a regenerated state at Olympus (*pace* Nagy 1979: 208). On the whole the example of Heracles confirms my conclusion that some immortal manifestation of Achilles was separated from his body on the pyre and that bones remained to be buried.

The separation of the mortal from the immortal parts of a body with fire must have been a common motif. We shall see in chapter five that the burning away of the mortal parts of Heracles is often compared to the motif of a goddess attempting to

⁸² Cf. A. Edwards 1985: 222, who misleadingly ignores the separation of Heracles' body and spirit in such myth.

immortalize an infant in her care by burning away his mortal nature. Often versions of this motif featured Thetis and Achilles. It seems that the funeral pyre finally accomplished for Achilles what Thetis was not able to effect.

One can find examples in Greek myth of the translation of the body. Above I mentioned that this was at least thought possible for Pollux (see p. 147). At Bacchylides 3.48-62 Croesus is rescued from his pyre and removed alive (with his daughters) to the land of the Hyperboreans, a paradisiacal setting. The seizure of the living by winds or divinities (see pp. 87-88 in chapter one) is comparable, and the immortality offered to Odysseus by Calypso (*Od.* 5.209) and the immortality for Menelaus predicted by Proteus (*Od.* 5.563ff.) do not require death.⁸³ But my argument is not that only the souls of heroes were translated. I am arguing that the conception of translation varied and that there was room in Greek myth for the translation of both spirits of slain heroes and the bodies of living heroes who never suffer a death.

There is much evidence for this in myth. Hesiod *Erg.* 161ff. states that all heroes who died at Thebes and Troy went to the Isles of the Blessed, according to what I feel is the most natural interpretation.⁸⁴ A fragment of the *Catalogue* (204.99ff. MW) also places the dead heroes in a paradise. Rohde has gathered a number of stories about heroes who died before they went to a paradise (he claims that they could only originate in a post-Homeric age that was less restrictive about eligibility for paradise).⁸⁵ Some of the

⁸³ I do not think depictions in art of the removal of Memnon's corpse, which undoubtedly show the grasping of Memnon's corpse, are relevant, because I think these represent not a translation to a paradise but to a burial site (see pp. 148ff. above). The Muse holds the body of her son Rhesus in her arms at Euripides *Rhesus* 962ff., but apparently she also is also planning to bury her son before obtaining a special afterlife for him. The removal of the corpse of Sarpedon in *Il.* 16 is not parallel because his destination is also a place of burial, not a paradise. Apollo takes the corpse of Glaucus off his pyre at Quintus of Smyrna 4.4ff., but again the destination is a place of burial, not a paradise.

⁸⁴ I consider line 166, bracketed in the Solmsen's edition, spurious. The admittedly obscure syntax of Hesiod must have inspired the interpolation of 166. Solmsen 1982: 23 explains why the evidence of manuscripts, papyri, and scholia do not support it. West includes it in his edition, but his justification *ad loc.* (1978) is poor: epic (Homer?) insists that the dead go to Hades, and only the select who do not die (e.g. Menelaus at *Od.* 4.) go to a paradise. This viewpoint is reminiscent to that of Rohde, who also interprets this passage as referring to survivors only (68). A. Edwards 1985: 217 n.6 follows West, but Burkert 1985: 198, 204; Vermeule 72 implicitly interpret the passage as referring to the dead (though Burkert 198 describes afterlife at the Elysian fields as an avoidance of death).

⁸⁵ Rohde 536-537, 564 n. 99.

heroes in these stories may not have received an afterlife in early Greek poetry, but the belief that underlies all of them, i.e., that the dead can go to paradise, is probably long-standing. The idea that spirits of heroes do not live in paradises can often be traced to Rohde. This notion is obviously contradicted by the fact that Achilles dies before his translation, and so Rohde proposed that his corpse was revived by Thetis.⁸⁶ But there is no evidence for the revival of Achilles' corpse so that it may proceed to a paradise. There is no evidence that any hero's corpse was revived so that it could subsequently proceed to a paradise, for that matter.⁸⁷ On the other hand, it was often thought that the soul separated from the body before going to a paradise. Rohde himself notes that this was commonly asserted in antiquity.⁸⁸

Accounts of paradise do emphasize corporal pleasures like eating, and stories of Achilles in the afterlife often depict him as acting like a living entity. Some may wonder if a spirit could be conceived of acting in this way. It is true that in Homer a soul can be described as a very insubstantial and witless thing. But Odysseus finds the shades of heroes acting very much like their living selves in book 11 of the *Odyssey*. Those who wonder how a spirit could enjoy paradise should ask themselves how shades like Tantalus or Sisyphus are punished in Hades. The best reply to such questions is that the questions

⁸⁶ See esp. Rohde 55-56, 119, and 65 on Achilles specifically. His views on the translation of Memnon were similar (see n.28 above). A. Edwards 1985: 224 n.23, 225 n.25 insists that translation involves the body, not the spirit. G. Nagy 1979: 208 also accepts this view, though it is very awkward for his general position.

⁸⁷ G. Nagy 1979: 209 cites an (obscure) story about the regeneration of a dismembered Dionysus. We might also consider the regeneration of Osiris in Egyptian myth or Pelops in Greek myth. But these examples are not very applicable, and we still lack examples of the regeneration of a hero's body for immortality in a paradise. The phrase οὐ τί πω τέθνηκας in the skolion to Harmodius (fr. 894 *PMG*) could not mean that Harmodius never died or that he has been revived. M. West 1978 *ad* 166 misleadingly compares the fate of Harmodius to that of Odysseus, and cites them both as evidence of an "alternative to death" enjoyed by a select few at a paradise. That description is accurate for Odysseus, but Harmodius merely enjoys what I would describe as an "alternative state of death." The song must merely mean that his afterlife (as a spirit) is so pleasant that he has seemed to overcome the state of death.

⁸⁸ Rohde 537, 567 n.103. I do not think that the "popular" stories he gathers in opposition to "educated" belief, such as the sea yarns about Achilles on Leuke related at Philostratus 211.54.1ff., necessarily involve living, corporal shades. They are dubious evidence of common ancient thought anyway. Rohde 80 n.5 also reveals another crack in his argument when he doubts the ancient etymological explanation of Elysium as from λύειν (in reference to souls being "loosed" from the body). The etymology may indeed be late and incorrect, but whoever concocted it may have been following a long-standing belief that souls separated from the body before proceeding to Elysium.

should not be asked; conception of the soul varies with the needs of poets.⁸⁹ Perhaps it is even wrong to stress a distinction between the immortal spirit of Achilles and his mortal body. That is largely a modern distinction, or rather a post-Platonic one. As Vermeule has shown, at times mortals in Greek myth are thought to have two bodies: one that dies and is buried, another that precedes to the afterworld.⁹⁰ Myth about Achilles may have implied that there are two bodies for Achilles, one that was burned on the pyre, another that was immortal and traveled to a paradise (this might best explain the hymn sung to Achilles quoted on p. 163 above). Perhaps Thetis did indeed "snatch up" a body of Achilles from the pyre, leaving a second body behind.

If in early Greek myth the body of Achilles was burned at Troy while an immortal manifestation of him (whether spirit, *eidolon*, or second body) went to Leuke, what would be the role of Thetis in the translation? She could, with the approval of Zeus, summon the spirit of Achilles from the body as it was consumed, or perhaps actually grasp an immortal "body" that was a double of the mortal body left behind. However this was conceived, she could then act as the conveyer or guide to Leuke. If Hermes was needed to guide souls to Hades, we may suppose that a divinity could direct an immortalized hero to paradise. If we have trouble explaining this story exactly, we should not try to impose a false order upon it, as Rohde did; eagerness to organize the manifold, flexible nature of Greek religion and myth in a systematic manner is certain to lead one astray.

As a final thought about these complex issues, I might add that it may be misguided to stress the difference between an afterlife in Hades and an afterlife in a paradise for heroes.⁹¹ Homer stressed the dreariness of Hades, and in the modern world we make sharp distinctions between heaven and hell. But even in Homer there is no

⁸⁹ See Vermeule 212 n.12 on the flexibility of the *psyche*.

⁹⁰ Vermeule 7-8; see also her remark at 118-119: "The terminally damaged body and the persistent soul were neither fully split apart at death, nor really well coordinated after it." Dietrich 1965: 345ff. describes paradises as places where heroes, after death, retain the appearance of the living.

⁹¹ On the two, see Burkert 1985: 195-199, who indeed notes their difference.

consistent portrayal of Hades, which suggests that there were a variety of popular ideas about it at an early date. Though some figures in myth are punished in Hades (e.g. at *Od.* 11.576-581), it is not designed to hold wrongdoers. At Pindar *Ol.* 2. 56ff., where one's afterlife is linked with one's behavior on earth, it seems that the good can enjoy a paradise-like existence in Hades. There the Isles of the Blessed are apparently not so much diametrically opposed to Hades as an especially pleasant locale for afterlife reserved for some figures and, in Pindar's conception, the particularly deserving. The potential compatibility of Hades with a paradise may help explain the odd portrayal of Heracles as both in Hades and Olympus at *Od.* 11, a conception that so troubles critics. I noted in chapter one (n.195) that some have linked the name of Leuke with Hades because the color white was commonly associated with the underworld. That suggests that there is some connection between these two forms of the afterworld. G. Nagy's argument (1979: 208) that Hades could be a transitional state for a hero before he reaches paradise is also worthy of consideration. His thought is forced by the contradictions of his arguments, for as I mentioned above, at various times he has suggested that a hero's burial is compatible with his immortality, that the place of burial for a hero is the same location as his paradise, and that a hero's body is regenerated before it goes to paradise. Those ideas do not all work well together, and his conception of Hades as a stage before paradise is an awkward attempt to patch them together, but he may be moving in the right direction. Perhaps in Greek thought there was not a strong polarity between Hades and paradise, but rather a continuum of afterlife locations that varied in pleasantness. Hades was the least attractive, and so served Homer well in his stress of the unmitigated tragedy of death, especially the death of Achilles (also many shades can be conveniently gathered together there, a prime purpose of the underworld scenes in books 11 and 24 of the *Odyssey*). Other afterlife locations were more pleasant, and so served the more common thought that the tragedy of death can be transcended.⁹²

⁹² Cf. Euripides *Rhesus* 962ff., where the Muse plans to obtain a release for the spirit of Rhesus from

The evidence for this is admittedly slim, but comparison with conceptions of the afterworld in ancient Mediterranean cultures suggests that the Greek Hades had both paradises and underworlds as prototypes.⁹³ It is notable that in the *Odyssey* Hades seems underground but is reached by Odysseus sailing westward over water. In the epic of Gilgamesh, Gilgamesh travels over the waters of death to Ut-napishtim, a Noah figure who alone has eternal life. The goddess Siduri gives advice to Gilgamesh before his crossing, as Circe advises Odysseus in book 10 of the *Odyssey*.⁹⁴ In Egyptian thought, islands of the blessed exist in waters that were beneath the earth, and a boatman comparable to Chiron ferries the soul there.⁹⁵ These types of paradises have locations that are comparable with Hades. Of course, there are also unpleasant underworlds in ancient Mediterranean cultures that undoubtedly served as precedents for Hades.⁹⁶ But perhaps the Greek concept of Hades was broad and flexible enough to contain aspects of both types of afterlife. Thus the common contrast of Hades with places of paradise may be too simplistic. Whether in Hades as in paradise, after all, a hero would have an afterlife. Homer's depiction of Achilles in Hades may not have been completely different from other portrayals of him in a paradise.

H) 3. *The Greeks bury his ashes in a conspicuous funeral mound at Troy*

In any event, a translation of Achilles need not mean the end of his funeral. The translation, whatever its nature, was probably not thought of as something visible to the

the underworld. He will not go to a paradise but will live on as a *daimon* in an underground cave. This demonstrates two important things for our purposes: 1) that a spirit, not just a revived body, can be rewarded an afterlife, and 2) a special afterlife need not be limited to the diametrically opposed choice of Hades or paradise (see Gantz 327ff. for other examples). This account of the afterlife of Rhesus apparently refers to a local hero cult (see Ritchie 260-361), but I believe the concepts within it would be consonant with early Greek myth.

⁹³ In general, see Jackson Knight 32ff., 49ff., 57ff. for comparative discussion of ancient paradises and underworlds.

⁹⁴ See Gardner/Maier 214.

⁹⁵ See Vermeule 69ff. At 74-75 she argues that the Homeric punishment of Tantalus in Hades reflects motifs of the Egyptian afterworld.

⁹⁶ See Kirk 1974: 260-261; Burkert 1985: 197.

mourners. Some of the sources cited in section 1 of this element above indicate that the funeral ceremony continued as the pyre burned down. The bones of Achilles were gathered and mixed with those of Patroclus, and the ashes were finally buried in a funeral mound. Expressions of grief and honor for Achilles by Greeks and divinities present throughout this time can be found at *Od.* 24.68ff., Pindar *Pyth.* 3.100-103, *Isth.* 8.56-60, and Quintus of Smyrna 3.710ff. It is not specified in these sources that Thetis has somehow taken Achilles from the pyre, but I think that traditional accounts of the funeral could have narrated such ceremonies after Thetis had spirited (so to speak) Achilles off to a paradise.

Achilles himself speaks of the mixing of his ashes with those of Patroclus and the raising of his funeral mound at *Il.* 23.243ff., where he gives instructions to the Greeks on what to do when he dies. He specifies the mixing of his ashes with those of Patroclus in response to a request by the shade of Patroclus at 23.83ff. At *Od.* 24.71ff. the funeral of Achilles is said to have ended with the burial of his ashes with those of Patroclus in a tomb. Proclus in his summary of the *Aethiopsis* merely states that the Greeks raised a funeral mound, inspiring multiple interpretations of what that actually means, as we saw above. Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.5 says that the Greeks buried the ashes of Achilles together with those of Patroclus. The text states that they buried them at Leuke, but Frazer excises that detail as corrupt.⁹⁷ Quintus reports the gathering of Achilles' ashes and burial of them in a tomb at 3.719ff. In the *Iliad* the mound of Patroclus, the future site of the ashes of Achilles, is made by the sea. In the *Odyssey* the place of burial is specified as by the Hellespont. Garner thinks a newly discovered fragment of Stesichorus (67; see n.11 above) is part of a narration of the funeral of Achilles by the sea. In addition, he suggests

⁹⁷ He brackets ἐν Λευκῇ νήσῳ; see n.1 of 2: 216. Burial at Leuke does not fit the story at all. How would the Greeks get to Leuke? What would be the role of Thetis? Why would Apollodorus subsequently say Achilles is on the Isles of the Blessed? He does not present that paradise as an alternative tradition. The reference to Leuke must be a late addition engendered by the type of confusion on this issue that modern scholars display.

that Stesichorus referred to future observation of this tomb by sailors on the Hellespont.⁹⁸ Quintus of Smyrna 3.739-471 also says the tomb of Achilles was by the Hellespont.

Sometimes it is said that the ashes are placed in a golden amphora. At *Od.* 24.73-79 the bones of Achilles were mixed with the bones of Patroclus in a golden amphora received from Thetis. The shade of Patroclus at *Il.* 23.91 requests of Achilles that the two of them be buried together in a σορός, which line 92 identifies as a golden amphora received from Thetis. Both the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* would thus seem to agree that the ashes of the two friends were buried together in a golden amphora received from Thetis.⁹⁹ However, Aristarchus condemned line 92 of book 23 of the *Iliad*, and many modern scholars also reject it.¹⁰⁰ If it is inauthentic, it is still possible that the golden amphora was traditionally a part of the burial of Achilles, even if not specified by the *Iliad*. If the line is genuine (it is included in Allen and Monro's edition), it seems that the two poems differed on the time at which Thetis gave this amphora. Line 92 of book 23 of the *Iliad* indicates that Achilles has already received the amphora while still alive. In the *Odyssey*, it seems Thetis gives it to the Greeks at the scene of the funeral. At Quintus of Smyrna 3.735ff. apparently Thetis gives the amphora at the moment the ashes of Achilles have been gathered, which indeed would be the most natural time for her to do so. On the other hand, δῶκε at *Od.* 24.73 could be considered a pluperfect, referring to a present¹⁰¹ of the amphora by Thetis at some time in the past.¹⁰¹ The passage in the *Odyssey* is very

⁹⁸ Garner 1993: 159, 162-163. He notes G. Nagy's argument (see n.72 above) that the *Iliad* alludes to the future significance of the tomb.

⁹⁹ This is sometimes cited (e.g. Schein 44 n.79) as the breaking of Monro's law (1901: 325: that the *Odyssey* avoids referring to events of the *Iliad*). Cf. G. Nagy 1979: 20-21, who argues that Monro's law is not actually broken because the mixing of ashes is not an event within the *Iliad*. Ford 158-159 views the amphora as a metaphor for a fixed text in his discussion of this issue in the terms of intertextuality.

¹⁰⁰ Richardson 1993 *ad* 23.92; Janko 1992: 28; Haslam 36, who adduces several arguments against it at n.3 of that page. Heubeck 1992 *ad* 24.72-75 notes that its authenticity has been defended. See n.170 in chapter four for acceptance of it by neo-analysts.

¹⁰¹ As Pestalozzi 29 suggests, apparently thinking she would have brought and presented the amphora at the beginning of the funeral. The François vase might portray Dionysus bringing it to the wedding of Peleus and Thetis (see p. 175 below), which at least would indicate she possessed it previous to the funeral. One might wonder how she could give the amphora after she has taken Achilles off the pyre to Leuke. But since she is present to oversee the funeral games, perhaps we should allow that she could return from Leuke

brief and does not preclude that interpretation and perhaps the reference to the amphora of Thetis in the *Odyssey* is completely compatible with *Il.* 23.92 after all. It is easy to understand, however, why the *Iliad* would not mention the golden amphora specifically (if line 92 is inauthentic) or choose to change the time of its reception (if line 92 is genuine and the *Odyssey* implies Thetis presented the amphora during the funeral). The funeral of Achilles occurs long after the events of the *Iliad*, and it would be too awkward and distracting for the shade of Patroclus to explain a detail of it, or at least explain it with precision. Either the *Iliad* omits to mention it altogether or rather elliptically alludes to the golden amphora (and perhaps ignores temporal accuracy).

If Patroclus is a pre-Homeric figure, as I think he is (the issue will be examined at pp. 203ff. in chapter four), then the mixing of his ashes with those of Achilles may well be traditional. Of course Homer stressed the closeness of the two figures, and one might understandably conclude that the mixing of their ashes was a Homeric invention designed to underscore their bond. Yet the *Iliad* is more than just interested in the concept of their shared burial, it is fussily and repeatedly concerned with minor details of it. It is hard to understand why this is so, and perhaps the answer is that these details were a familiar part of tradition. Many of our sources report a mixing of the two heroes' bones (see pp. 171-172 above), and this may not be caused simply by the influence of Homer. It is even possible that the report in Proclus that Antilochus was buried before Achilles was buried is compatible with the report at *Od.* 24.78 that Antilochus was buried near Achilles and Patroclus. Antilochus and Achilles would both have been buried around the same time after the same battle, according to my reconstruction of events above.¹⁰² Heubeck explains the text of the *Odyssey* (1992 *ad Od.* 24.76-79) as meaning that the ashes of

in time to present the amphora at the burial of the ashes. On the bad omen of presenting Achilles with an urn for his ashes while he is still alive, see n.56 in chapter two.

¹⁰² See p. 143 above. Vian 30-31 argues that both Antilochus and Achilles were buried after the same battle in which they had both been killed.

Antilochus were placed in a separate jar. Perhaps in the *Aethiopsis* a jar containing the ashes of Antilochus was buried in the same tomb in which the mixed ashes of Achilles and Patroclus were later buried.¹⁰³ It is not surprising that there is no mention of Antilochus' inclusion in this funeral mound in the *Iliad*, for the death of Antilochus is not foreseen at the dramatic time of that poem.

It must be admitted, however, that our sources provide us with little on which to base such speculation. Proclus and Apollodorus do not mention the amphora. Proclus does not mention any mixing of ashes, or nearby burial of ashes; Apollodorus does state that the ashes of Patroclus and Achilles were mixed, but corruption in the passage obscures his meaning (see n.97 above). Perhaps the lack of information is the result of the conciseness of their summaries. Quintus of Smyrna 3.719ff. does mention the amphora but does not report that the ashes of Achilles and Patroclus were mixed in it or that it was buried nearby the ashes of Antilochus.

However, Stesichorus did compose about the amphora, apparently relating that Dionysus gave it to Thetis in thanks for comfort of him after being chased by Lycurgus (fr. 234 *PMGF*). And Garner thinks (1993: 162-163) that a recently discovered fragment of Stesichorus (67; see n.11 above) may have mentioned this golden urn, decorated with silver, in the context of the funeral of Achilles. In addition, Dionysus is pictured carrying a container as he approaches the wedding Peleus and Thetis on the François vase (*LIMC* "Dionysus" no. 496), and some have supposed this is the amphora in which Achilles will be buried.¹⁰⁴

Haslam argues (37ff.) that such references to the amphora are based not on traditional myth, but on Homer. *Od.* 24.74-75 specifies that Dionysus gave the amphora, which had been made by Hephaestus, to Thetis, and *Il.* 6.135-137 reports that Thetis

¹⁰³ It is worth noting that locals made offerings at the μνήματα of Patroclus and Antilochus (Strabo 13.1.32 p.596C). Again, this may not simply be the result of Homer's influence.

¹⁰⁴ Haslam 44-45 is tempted to think it is an allusion to the amphora in which Achilles was buried. He doubts that Stesichorus is the source for Kleitias, as some have maintained.

comforted Dionysus after Lycurgus chased him. Haslam suggests these passages are *ad hoc* invention, and that later accounts of Dionysus giving an amphora to Thetis are ultimately based on them, not genuine myth. He thinks that in Stesichorus Dionysus carried the amphora under water to Thetis and presented it to her upon his rescue, and that this absurdity arose through the joining of Homeric *ad hoc* passages together. But it is not at all certain that Stesichorus narrated an underwater presentation of the amphora by Dionysus to Thetis, and indeed the assumption is rather unfair to Stesichorus. A larger question is whether the Homeric passages are *ad hoc* invention. I think it is most natural to assume that allusive, incomplete stories in Homer are based on pre-Homeric myth, unless there seems to be a purpose for their invention (*ad hoc* invention was discussed at pp. 11-12 in chapter one). It is difficult to explain why Homer would invent the story of the comforting of Dionysus by Thetis or why he would invent the details of the provenance of the amphora. I therefore suspect that in traditional pre-Homeric myth the golden amphora was made by Hephaestus, given by Dionysus to Thetis sometime (not immediately) after her rescue of him, and given by her to the Greeks. It is impossible to reconstruct myth so as to explain fully the history of this amphora, but the story of Dionysus and Thetis at *Il.* 6 may well have been somehow connected, as in Stesichorus.

I conclude that book 24 of the *Odyssey* accurately reflects pre-Homeric myth about the funeral of Achilles with the exception that it omits the translation of Achilles. In traditional pre-Homeric myth Achilles would have been burned and buried in a conspicuous mound after some manifestation of his spirit was brought to a paradise by Thetis. The use of a divinely made urn, given by Thetis at the funeral, may also have been a feature of the burial. In addition, I think that the mixing of the bones of Patroclus with those of Achilles is traditional, as may be the burial of the ashes of Antilochus nearby in the same mound.

D) *Games are held in honor of Achilles*

At *Od.* 24.85ff. it is stated that Thetis obtained prizes from the gods for games in honor of Achilles. The summary of the *Aethiopsis* by Proclus merely reports the occurrence of funeral games as the setting for the quarrel over the arms of Achilles that arose between Ajax and Odysseus. Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.5-6 reports the winners of the contests but does not indicate that Thetis oversaw the games. Quintus of Smyrna 4.88ff. gives the lengthiest version; all the contests are described and Thetis is said to preside. These games do not seem to have been represented in early art, though an immediate result of them, the suicide of Ajax, was a popular theme at an early date (from the early seventh century; see *LIMC* "Aias I" nos. 103ff.).

I conclude that funeral games were an important element in myth about Achilles. Thetis was apparently considered the overseer of them. One contest was certainly famous in myth, the contest over the arms of Achilles. Those interested in re-constructing the *Aethiopsis* would do well to compare the contests as reported by Apollodorus and Quintus of Smyrna, but myth in general probably did not consider this information important to the narrative (unless the winners were meticulously recorded in the manner that catalogues in epic can preserve data).

These elements are the ones I believe constituted the story of the death of Achilles as it was commonly narrated in pre-Homeric myth. My conclusions cannot be regarded as certain, but I have cited and discussed the evidence which I have used to reach them. Though details may be disputable, my arguments in chapter one about the place of Homer and the epic cycle in the tradition of the Trojan war justify my assumption that some story similar to the one I have reconstructed existed in pre-Homeric myth. In the next chapter my reconstruction will prove to be useful in examining the neo-analytical argument that the traditional death of Achilles is reflected in the *Iliad* through the actions of Achilles and Patroclus.

Chapter Four: The Death of Achilles in the *Iliad*

Chapter two examined direct references to the death of Achilles in the *Iliad*, and chapter three established how the death of Achilles could have been narrated in pre-Homeric myth. Now it is time to search for indirect reflections of this story in the *Iliad*. Adherents to the school of thought known as neo-analysis have most thoroughly explored this possibility, and consideration of their proposals will be essential to this endeavor. The first section of this chapter will focus on issues related to neo-analysis. The following section will examine how neo-analysts have thought the Achilles-Memnon episode is reflected in the *Iliad*. In the final section of this chapter I will build upon neo-analytical theory to present a new explanation of how the actions of Patroclus and Achilles foreshadow the death of Achilles in the *Iliad*.

Neo-analysis refers to a unitarian approach to Homer that employs analyst techniques.¹ Like analysts, neo-analysts look for discrepancies in the text of Homer, but only discrepancies in the poetic narrative, not discrepancies of language, *realia*, or logic in the discredited manner of analysis. Also like analysts, neo-analysts have often spoken of hypothetical poems, using the terms inherited from analysts (e.g. "Memnonis" or "Achilleis").² Whereas analysts theorized that the *Iliad* was a compilation of material from such various sources, neo-analysts believed that Homer was strongly influenced by earlier poems when he composed the *Iliad*. Analysts believed that many authors

¹ J. Kakridis and Pestalozzi, who reached their conclusions independently (see Kakridis 1949: 65 n.1), are considered the originators of the school. Kakridis 1949: 1ff. first coined the term "neo-analysis" and defined its method. For concise summaries of its arguments see Willcock 1976: Appendix D, "The *Aethiopia* Theory," 285-287; Kullmann 1960: 26-28. For more complete bibliography and explanation see Heubeck 1974: 40-47; Clark; Kullmann 1981, 1991.

² Combellack 1949: 54 memorably spoke of the Homeric "fairyland" that is "peopled by the *Meleagergedicht*, the *Zorngedicht*, the *Memnongedicht*, and other fabulous creatures."

contributed to the composition of the *Iliad*, but neo-analysts have always assumed that one poet is responsible for the *Iliad*.³

Neo-analysis can be generally described as a willingness to explore the influence of pre-Homeric material on the Homeric poems. In this respect theories concerning the effect of folk tales or Near Eastern motifs on the Homeric poems are comparable.⁴ But neo-analysis has been especially concerned with the pre-Homeric tradition of the Trojan war as it is represented by the epic cycle. In chapter one, I noted that the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* often contain direct references to such a tradition (see nn.9-11). Neo-analysts believe there are also indirect reflections of this cyclic tradition within the Homeric poems. It has long been noticed that the *Iliad* and the epic cycle share certain motifs that seem to belong more naturally to the latter. Analysts sometimes thought that "late" parts of the *Iliad* had incorporated "late" myth of the epic cycle. Other scholars in the past have explored these similarities from a more unitarian point of view, and thus can be considered prototypical neo-analysts.⁵ Building on this research, neo-analysts have argued that Homer extensively re-used cyclic material in a highly original manner. Much of their focus has been on events told in the *Aethiopis*, for neo-analysts suspect that the *Iliad* is modeled on a story of Achilles killing Memnon to avenge the death of Antilochus. This idea I shall call the "vengeance theory." In pursuing this theory, neo-analysts have argued that there are reflections of the death of Achilles in the *Iliad*. In this chapter I will accept and explore that concept, though I will dispute the main tenets of the vengeance theory.

³ Modern analysts have sometimes referred to neo-analysts as "neo-unitarians" (see Clark 389). Kullmann now suggests the term "motivgeschichtliche Forschung" as a replacement for the term "neo-analysis;" see his remarks at 1991: 425-426. I doubt this will catch on in the English-speaking world, but a more aesthetically pleasing term that indicates recent developments in neo-analysis and better distinguishes it from analysis would certainly be welcome.

⁴ See nn.7-8 in chapter one. In fact Kullmann includes these topics in his recent overview (1991) of "motivgeschichtliche Forschung."

⁵ See Kullmann 1960: 1ff., 1981: 6-7, 1991: 428-429; Schoeck 10; Heubeck 1974: 40ff. for earlier scholars who influenced neo-analysts. Davison 1962: 254ff. and Kullmann 1986: 118ff. discuss Mulder and Welcker respectively as prototypical neo-analysts.

The bold and provocative arguments of neo-analysis have been controversial.⁶ Many of the suggestions from this school of thought have in fact seemed unlikely. However, neo-analysis has profited from criticism of it, and is now practiced in a more credible manner (though problems still remain).

1. General Issues in Neo-analysis

Pre-Homeric texts

In earlier manifestations of neo-analysis, its practitioners spoke of the influences on Homer as written texts that Homer had "before his eyes" (e.g. Kullmann 1960: 349). They assumed that hypothetical poems like an "Achilleis" existed in written form and tried to reconstruct their contents. Perhaps the most memorable example was Schadewaldt's extensive reconstruction of a "Memnonis." He provided an outline and graph for no less than twenty scenes in four books. Sometimes neo-analysts even argued that the poems of the epic cycle were pre-Homeric poems.⁷ These views were widely and

⁶ Reviews include (of Pestalozzi) Davison 1947; (of Kullmann 1960) Page 1961, Combellack 1962; (of Schoeck) Page 1963, Ramage. Neo-analytical theory is assessed at Lesky 1967: 71-78; Hainsworth 1969: 11-12; Nagler 24-25; Jouan 1980: 95ff., Clarke 211-14; Jensen 30ff.; G. Nagy 1990: 130; especially important are the critiques of Reinhardt 349ff. (though Willcock 1973: 10 n.26; Heubeck 1978: 9 n.28; Kullmann 1981: 9-11, 1991: 440-441; Clark 388-389 describe him as fundamentally a neo-analyst); Fenik 1964 *passim* (also fundamentally a neo-analyst here), 1968: 229-240; Dihle 9-44. See also Kullmann's summary and reply to criticism of neo-analysis at 1960: 29ff. Many scholars have dismissed neo-analysis only in passing, e.g. Wade-Gery 80 n.91, 85 n.114; Huxley 124 n.2; Lloyd-Jones 1973: 118-119; Griffin 1977: 39 n.5; Davies 1989a: 4-5; Taplin 1992: 164 n.18.

⁷ For an overview of this line of argument, see Jouan 1980: 96; Kullmann 1991: 428-430. Some predecessors of neo-analysts proposed that the *Aethiopsis* was prior to the *Iliad* (for example, Kullmann 1981: 6, 1991: 428-429 identifies Gruppe as one). J. Kakridis 1949: 90ff. at least wondered if the cyclic poems were prior to Homer. At times Pestalozzi seemed to equate his reconstructed "Achilleis" with the *Aethiopsis* (as Davison 1947: 28 complains), and the same criticism can be leveled at Schadewaldt 1965 (at 158 he implies his "Memnonis" is the second half of the *Aethiopsis*). Kullmann 1991: 429 associates Pestalozzi and Schadewaldt with the theory that the *Aethiopsis* was prior to the *Iliad*. Schoeck also spoke of a "Memnonis," but took an agnostic stance about priority between the *Aethiopsis* and the *Iliad* (thus Hainsworth 1969: 11-12; Jouan 1980: 96 wrongly criticize him on this issue). Kullmann 1960 suggested that some poems in the epic cycle preceded the *Iliad*, which he dated at 650 (381-382; at 1981: 30 he favors the early seventh century), but was careful to insist that the arguments of neo-analysis do not depend on this view (e.g. 29-50 *passim*) and presented it as only one of many possible theories (360ff.; cf. 1968: 19 n.18). At 1981: 33 n.76, 1991: 429 n.24 he complains that he has been misunderstood on this issue. Recently Kopff has claimed priority for the *Aethiopsis* over the *Iliad*, but this type of argument is now rare in neo-analysis.

often criticized. Though the question of whether Homer was literate is a subject of on-going debate, few today would claim that his predecessors wrote their compositions. Most scholars also consider the poems of the epic cycle to be later than Homer (often for the wrong reasons, as I pointed out in chapter one). Regrettably, controversy over the neo-analysts' proposals concerning pre-Homeric texts and the priority of the epic cycle have often distracted scholars from what is otherwise valuable in neo-analytical research.

Today the leading practitioners of neo-analysis do not argue that poems in the epic cycle preceded Homer or that written texts were available to Homer. The change is the result of the influence of oral theory, which scholars have increasingly recognized as compatible with neo-analysis.⁸ After all, the Parry/Lord school of thought believes that a long pre-Homeric tradition lies behind the compositional techniques it observes in the Homeric poems. Neo-analysts also assume there was a strong pre-Homeric tradition, but whereas oralists focus on the poetic craft of this tradition, neo-analysts are interested in the contents of the tradition. Acceptance of this tradition as oral removes the need to regard specific texts (real or imagined) as the sources for Homer. Instead, pre-Homeric oral poetry can be regarded as the influence on Homer. Of course, this oral poetry is lost, but neo-analysts argue that its contents can be discerned from post-Homeric poetry that continued its traditions, like the poems of the epic cycle.⁹ Now neo-analysts tend to speak not of pre-Homeric poems but rather of pre-Homeric traditional motifs—ideas, episodes,

⁸ The compatibility has been briefly noted by Notopoulos 41; Willcock 1967: 63, 1973: 6; Heubeck 1974: 47-48, 151; Jensen 31; Garner 1993: 154 n.7. Heubeck 1978; Kullmann 1984 most thoroughly compare the two fields of research. Schoeck was the first neo-analyst to extensively employ oral theory (see 12ff. especially); Fenik 1964 is an early mixture of ideas from both schools of thought. Kullmann 1960: 2 n.3, 372 nn.2, 3 criticized some aspects of oral theory, yet at times resorted to it in his arguments (e.g. 29-50 passim, 152 n.2) and included oral traditions in his survey of possible models of the pre-Homeric tradition (360ff.). M. Edwards has remarked (1990: 323) that his acceptance of neo-analytical conclusions is "in accord with the results of the studies of Milman Parry and Albert Lord."

⁹ A. Edwards 1985: 219-220; Dihle 149-150; Davies 1989a: 5 intelligently discuss the possibilities of "cyclic" poems in the pre-Homeric oral tradition. I do not think there were single oral prototypes of each poem in the epic cycle, or even enclosed traditions (e.g. an "Aethiopia tradition"). Nor do I consider the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* as being from a distinct "Iliad tradition" or "Odyssey tradition," as is sometimes supposed (see p. 4 above in the introduction). I prefer to think that poets who knew the tradition of the Trojan war could draw on all of the material in it.

and plots—which had an influence on the Homeric poems.¹⁰ Scholars who have been influenced by neo-analytical arguments often are careful to point out that they are following this more sophisticated conception of the pre-Homeric tradition.¹¹

The new focus on pre-Homeric motifs, not texts, seems to have eliminated a practice once common in neo-analysis, the attempt to find in the *Iliad* word-for-word quotations of pre-Homeric texts. If Homer did not have texts open before his eyes when he composed, he could not have quoted lines or passages from them. Exploration of pre-Homeric traditions as opposed to texts also demands a respect for the flexibility of tradition, but it is not clear that neo-analysts have yet appreciated this. Sometimes they seem to be simply applying new terminology to the same rigid and over-detailed reconstructions of the past. It is more justifiable to explore the general nature of pre-Homeric myth as it would have been known to Homer in its basic outlines. I have tried to take this approach in my reconstruction of the death of Achilles in the preceding chapter.

Typology

Neo-analysis has had to confront another issue that stems from oral theory, that of typology. Oralists tend to think of motifs in oral traditions as adaptable to any story, much as formulas and type scenes can be employed in different situations. They therefore question the view of neo-analysts that some motifs belonged in the cyclic tradition before they existed in the Homeric poems. This argument is a serious challenge to neo-analysis: if one cannot decide which of two forms of a motif is original, then much of neo-analytical theory is undercut.¹²

¹⁰ Homer himself may have composed other songs than the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, as Woodhouse 242-243; Lord 151; Willcock 1976: 287; M. Edwards 1990: 316, 1991: 17-18 suppose. Thus any "cyclic" influence on the Homeric poems may actually be from other works in his repertoire.

¹¹ Cf. remarks by e.g. Whitman 342 n.48; Rankin 41 n.15; Willcock 1973: 6, 1987: 185; Scodel 1977: 56; de Romilly 10; Schein 28; A. Edwards 1985: 219-20; Thalmann 50; Thornton 10 n.8; Singor 404; Slatkin 10 n.13; M. Edwards 1991: 15-19; Janko 1992: 312-13.

¹² See Page 1963: 23; Fenik 1964 (esp. 32-33), 1968: 231ff. (esp. 236-39); Nagler 25-26; G. Nagy 1990: 130. Cf. Lord 159.

Kullmann acknowledges that typical motifs exist, but argues that there are also "more specific motifs or specific nuances in general motifs" whose adoption by the Homeric poems can be recognized.¹³ His argument is undeniably true to some extent. For example, the fact that Agamemnon returned home from the Trojan war is not idiosyncratic; the *nostos* may be regarded as a general motif shared by a number of heroes in myth. But the murder of Agamemnon upon his arrival is an aspect of his return that can be said to belong to him. We would be shocked by a narrative in which Penelope and a lover ambushed Odysseus upon his return (though the circumstances for Odysseus and Agamemnon are similar enough for comparisons to be repeatedly made between them in the *Odyssey*). It may be helpful to think of the story of the death of Agamemnon as a specific motif that was passed on "vertically" down through the ages in traditional myth about him. In other words, the story of his death was repeated continually through successive generations, but only applied to him. Typical motifs, on the other hand, are readily applied to different contexts and so have a free-floating "horizontal" movement.

Oral theorists have correctly noted that there are typical motifs that do not belong to one character or one story, but that does not mean that all motifs are "building blocks...with which the oral poets could create an endless variety of scenes using the same basic materials."¹⁴ The definition of a motif as "typical" or "specific" often depends on the scope of focus. The *nostos* of Agamemnon is a typical motif in its basic underlying pattern. Yet one can consider details closer to the "surface" of its story to be specific motifs. Though Lord claimed that the movement of motifs is so fluid that they cannot belong to a tradition (159), he repeatedly traces the transference of specific motifs to new contexts in the Homeric poems. Certainly the essential pattern of withdrawal, devastation, and return that he discusses (186ff.) is typical, and neo-analytical methodology should not be applied to it. But Lord employs "neo-analytical" arguments when he discerns the

¹³ Kullmann 1984: 312. Cf. 1991: 426; Heubeck 1978: 12.

¹⁴ Fenik 1964: 33. But at 1968: 237 he admits that it is too bold to label the plots of myths typical.

influence of folk tales, proto-*Argonautica* epic traditions, and proto-*Nosti* epic traditions featuring Menelaus, Agamemnon, and Odysseus on the *Odyssey*; he does this too when he sees the influence of Near Eastern epics, a "Patrocleis" tradition, and an "Achilleis" tradition on the *Iliad*.¹⁵ Often he cites discrepancies as evidence for such phenomena, as neo-analysts frequently do. Whether or not all of Lord's arguments are correct, the assumption underlying them is valid, i.e. that there are motifs that belong to one context, and their transference to the context of the Homeric poems is discernible.

Neo-analysts have pointed out that the transference of specific motifs is not so much a contradiction of the typology of oral poetry as an extension of it.¹⁶ Both phenomena involve the manipulation of traditional elements so that they can be used in different contexts. Of course, most recurrent elements are largely generic, and one cannot therefore label one example of them primary and another derivative. But recurrent elements in Homer do not always function in an automatic, insignificant manner.¹⁷ Typology can be limited, and sometimes there are only two examples of a motif in the Homeric poems. One variant may serve to foreshadow or prepare for the second one in what is called an "anticipatory doublet."¹⁸ An example is the flame that burns around Diomedes' head at 5.4ff. that seems to anticipate the flame that burns around Achilles' head at 18.205ff. Reflection of post-Iliadic myth within the *Iliad* might be considered a type of anticipatory doublet; what is anticipated lies outside the poem (McLeod 1987a: 35). Perhaps the transference of specific motifs from one context to a new one within the *Iliad* or even from extra-Iliadic contexts into the context of the *Iliad* is a further development of the typology in oral poetics. An ambitious poet such as Homer, familiar

¹⁵ Lord 158-197. Reinhardt more thoroughly explores the theory that separate "Patrocleis" and "Achilleis" traditions influenced the *Iliad*. The *Odyssey* is neglected in neo-analytical research, but see M. Edwards 1990: 321; Kullmann 1991: 446ff.

¹⁶ Heubeck 1978: 8-9; Kullmann 1981: 14ff., 1984: 311ff., 1991: 426. Cf. Slatkin 3-6.

¹⁷ Cf. Mueller 7ff., 148ff; Kullmann 1981: 14ff. I do not necessarily agree with all of their arguments, especially that the use of writing is necessary for the phenomena they examine. M. Edwards 1987a: 62ff., 1987b: 47-60, 1990: 311-312, 1991: 11ff. extensively discusses significant use of repeated elements, often in reference to neo-analysis. Cf. Andersen 1987 on the phenomenon of "mirroring" in repeated elements.

¹⁸ Fenik 1968: 213-214 ; M. Edwards 1987b: 50-51, 1991: 19ff.

with the possible effects of recurrent elements, might have first experimented with the transference of special motifs. The phenomenon of typology needs to be kept in mind when evaluating neo-analytical arguments, but it does not preclude the possibility of significant adaptation.

A couple of further examples should indicate that the phenomenon of motif transference is an undoubted tool of Homer's poetical craft. Many scholars have noticed that Phoenix's parable of Meleager in book 9 of the *Iliad* resembles Achilles' situation.¹⁹ If the parallel was only that two heroes withdraw from battle, that would be of little significance, for withdrawal from battle is a typical motif.²⁰ But the withdrawal of Meleager is not very compatible with other aspects of his story that seem traditional, and Phoenix's account contains details that belong to the story of Achilles. It seems that the poet has manipulated a traditional story so that its circumstances reflect those of the *Iliad*.²¹ It is especially notable that the name of Meleager's wife, "Cleo-patra," corresponds to the name "Patro-clus."²² The parable may even foreshadow Achilles' later decision to rejoin the fighting and perhaps even his death.²³ Similarly, the scene at

¹⁹ C.f. J. Kakridis 1949: 13ff.; Scheliha 247-248; Webster 1958: 248-250; Reinhardt 20-21; Willcock 1964: 147ff., 1978-1984 ad 9.550-599; Heubeck 1974: 74ff.; Rosner 322ff.; G. Nagy 1979: 103ff.; Macleod 141; Thornton 108-109; Andersen 1987: 3ff.; March 29-46; Kullmann 1991: 443; Morrison 119-124; Garner 1993: 163-164; Hainsworth 1993a: 130ff.; Gantz 328ff. For further bibliography about earlier scholars who discussed this issue see March 30 n.6.

²⁰ Besides its association with Achilles and Meleager, the motif is mentioned briefly in the *Iliad* in connection with Paris (6.325) and Aeneas (13.459ff.). Diomedes at 5.600ff., Hector at 11.200ff. (cf. 542) and 20.375ff. withdraw from direct engagement on the advice of a god; cf. the suggestion by Nestor and Patroclus that Achilles' withdrawal is inspired by a prophecy from Thetis (discussed at pp. 115-116 above in chapter two).

²¹ Kakridis argued differently that a "Meleagris" inspired the *Iliad* (and another story about Paris, citing the evidence of 6.325). Kullmann 1986: 118-119 traces this idea to Welcker; Jouan 1980: 95 to Müller. Willcock 1964: 152 n.4 collects further bibliography on scholars who have held this view; recently M. Edwards 1990: 322 has considered it possible. The idea is comparable to the neo-analytical argument that a "Memnonis" inspired the *Iliad*, but Heubeck 1974: 74ff.; Kullmann 1991: 443 reject it.

²² Rosner 323 n.22 traces this observation to a 1924 article by E. Howald (who unusually thought the name of Patroclus was derived from Cleopatra's name); Scheliha 395 and March 32 n.15 to a 1925 German dissertation (they credit Schadewaldt with popularizing it). Scheliha 247-248; Rosner 323; Macleod 141; March 32 accept this correspondence; Willcock 1978-1984 ad 9.556; Hainsworth 1993a ad 9.561-3; Morrison 147 n.4 entertain it as a possibility; J. Kakridis 1949: 29ff.; Willcock 1964: 150 n.4 are skeptical.

²³ Cf. Scheliha 249; Page 1959: 312-313; Macleod 141; Andersen 1987: 4-5; de Jong 85; Thalmann 201 n.52; Hainsworth 1993a: 120; March 33; Morrison 121ff. The death of Meleager is naturally omitted by Phoenix, but is so inevitable that it may be evoked by the narrator. Scholars do not always indicate whether the poet or Phoenix is responsible for the parallels; G. Nagy well distinguishes between the

Scheria in the *Odyssey* seems to reflect the later experiences of Odysseus on Ithaca. The reception of Odysseus is pleasant and welcoming for the most part, but some unsettling details serve to foreshadow the trials of his homecoming.²⁴ These examples involve the manipulation of one situation to reflect another, both of which are portrayed or narrated within the same poem. Two different situations are thereby compared and contrasted in an interesting manner; in addition foreshadowing can be effected. Neo-analysts seek to identify correspondences between motifs outside the *Iliad* and within the *Iliad*, and in this chapter I will argue that these correspondences sometimes serve to foreshadow post-Iliadic events. This phenomenon would simply be an extension of Homeric composition illustrated by these two examples.

The criticism of neo-analysts by oralists on the issue of typology is often valid. Sometimes neo-analysts have wrongly considered typical motifs to be the property of one character, as will frequently be pointed out below. But the assertion that all myth consists of typology is too extreme. After all, there must be a stable center of gravity around which traditions about specific characters and plots arise. If all details in Greek myth were typical, there would be nothing distinctive about characters. Every poet would be free to gather together a new and idiosyncratic collocation of motifs each time he composed. Achilles could wear a lion skin and brandish a club, Odysseus could command the *Argo*, and Agamemnon could put out his eyes after marrying his mother. It is obvious such was not the case in Greek myth. Typology does not overwhelm the distinctiveness of individual characters and their stories. There are specific motifs or specific details in typical motifs, and these make it possible to trace the influence of one story on another. Even the same collocation of a number of typical motifs in the stories of two different characters would seem more than coincidence and suggest transference.

"message" that Phoenix gives to Achilles and the "code" that the audience perceives (cf. Andersen 1987: 4-7 on "argument" and "key").

²⁴ See M. Lang 1969: 163; Miller 59ff.

Priority of motifs

Much of the debate over the theories of neo-analysis has focused on the issue of establishing the priority of one of two examples of a motif, one of which occurs within the *Iliad*, the other in the cyclic tradition. Of course two examples of a typical motif that was commonly used in different situations may be entirely unrelated. But if the motif is not typical, it seems natural to conclude that either the *Iliad* influenced the cyclic tradition or *vice versa*.²⁵ How can one tell which version of a motif is original, which secondary? Critics have often complained about the lack of objective criteria in neo-analytical thought about this issue.²⁶ The argument that one example of a motif is original because it is somehow better (or more dramatic, or more aesthetically pleasing) than another can be very unconvincing. Scholars have sometimes accepted neo-analytical premises about correspondences between the *Iliad* and cyclic myth, only to argue that the motifs originated in the *Iliad*, not in the cyclic tradition.

When a "doublet," to use Fenik's term, is long-standing, there seems little point in trying to ascertain which version is original. It is clear that there are long-standing repeated motifs in myth and in the tradition of the Trojan war.²⁷ For example, we often find the motif of a condition to be met before Troy can fall (e.g. the stealing of the Palladium, or the summoning of Philoctetes), and a number of foreign allies defend Troy (Penthesileia, Memnon, Eurypylus).²⁸ Even Achilles and Memnon share certain motifs, as I pointed out in the last chapter (see pp. 137-138), and Fenik has established that there

²⁵ Interdependency or contamination of traditions is also possible; cf. Reinhardt; M. Lang 1983, A. Edwards 1985: 219-220. However, since I consider the *Iliad* idiosyncratic and not part of an ongoing "*Iliad* tradition," and since I also do not think that the *Iliad* influenced the cyclic tradition in the early Archaic Age, it is difficult for me to conceive of mutual influence between Iliadic and cyclic motifs at an early date.

²⁶ E.g. Page 1963: 22; Lesky 1967: 75; Dihle 11ff.; Nagler 24ff. This issue lies at the heart of the criticism to which Kullmann replies at 1960: 29ff. Research about priority in folk tale traditions seems to support this criticism; see Olrik 99ff., Krohn 99ff.

²⁷ Cf. Welcker 2: 13; Olrik 96ff.; Pestalozzi 34; Kullmann 1960: 224; Fenik 1964: 10, 38-39; 1968: 237-238.

²⁸ I agree with Fenik 1964: 35 n.2 that one cannot confidently view Memnon as the model for all of the foreign allies of Troy (as e.g. Pestalozzi 44 suggests).

are typological correspondences between Rhesus, Achilles, and Memnon.²⁹ The Teuthranian expedition itself is a doublet of the campaign against Troy.³⁰ No certain method exists to ascertain priority in these examples.

The situation is different if Homer transferred a motif to a new context for the first time. There may well be something unusual about the use of a motif in Homer that indicates it is secondary. The most persuasive argument by neo-analysts employs the essential method of neo-analysis, that of demonstrating inconsistency or oddness in the *Iliad's* version of the motif. Neo-analysts use such evidence to argue that the motif has been imperfectly adapted to a new context. Sometimes the nature of the inconsistency or oddness is debatable, but peculiarities in several key passages seem to support many neo-analytical arguments. Of course, an example of a motif that seems more appropriate than another is not necessarily prior in time to it, but the more appropriate version may indicate the original nature of the motif. The problem is that this type of argument does not apply to every situation that neo-analysts examine. Some Homeric versions of a motif seem as appropriate as an extra-Iliadic version. In these cases certain identification of the normal use of a motif is impossible. That is not always recognized by neo-analysts, who tend to assert priority with unjustified confidence.

The nature of motif transference

It may fairly be said that neo-analysts have been more energetic in establishing correspondences between motifs in the *Iliad* and outside the *Iliad* than in explaining exactly how and why a motif is re-used by Homer.³¹ It will be worthwhile to attempt to define the nature of the phenomenon that we have been calling the transference of motifs.

²⁹ Fenik 1964: 8ff., 34-35 (whose argument Dihle 34ff. challenges). Schoeck 14 n.6 had earlier noted correspondences between Rhesus and Memnon.

³⁰ Usually considered secondary to the campaign against Troy, but see n.62 below.

³¹ Kullmann 1981: 24ff. does discuss some of the issues I address in the following analysis.

There are two major ways in which a motif may be transferred to the *Iliad*. In one a specific motif that normally belongs to one character is transferred to another character. The resemblance of the death of Patroclus in the *Iliad* to the traditional death of Achilles is an example (discussed at pp. 230ff. below). In the other type a specific motif is applied to the same character with whom it was originally associated but transferred to a new chronological time in his story. The reflection of Achilles' funeral in book 18 of the *Iliad* is an example (discussed at pp. 237ff. below). A traditional event in his story has been chronologically displaced. Necessarily, both types of motif transference involve the reflection of a different time in the Trojan war saga, and so the main difference between the two types is whether or not the motif is transferred to the same character to whom it originally belonged.

It should also be recognized that the transference of a motif may not be complete. Neo-analysts usually assume that motifs transferred into the *Iliad* mimic their original context in a very exact manner. They tend to believe that the more detailed the correspondence, the more persuasive their argument. This premise might be valid if Homer was influenced by certain written texts, but it seems misguided to look for detailed correspondences when motifs have been transferred from traditional myth in general. I doubt that minor details in mythical stories would remain uniform. And often the new context cannot allow the complete adoption of even the major elements in a myth. In addition, we may suspect that Homer desires to do more with his poetry than simply reflect other stories, and so would not allow extensive correspondence to overwhelm his own narrative.

Schoeck has usefully spoken of a transferred motif having a "pivot," or central element, which is most significant (101). The pivot of a transferred motif is that element of a traditional motif which is emphasized. Other elements in the traditional motif, though important to the original context, may be omitted in the transference. This concept well describes the lack of completeness which one often finds in transferred motifs.

One can also make a distinction between transferred motifs that are isolated and transferred motifs that occur in a series. Sometimes the reflection of a non-Iliadic motif is brief and separated from other transferred motifs. At other times, however, a number of transferred motifs follow one another in a series. For example, the *Iliad* seems to gather a number of direct and indirect allusions to pre-Iliadic and post-Iliadic events of the war in its opening and closing books (an issue discussed at 212ff. below). They strengthen one another and produce an effective portrayal of the whole war. Transferred motifs that exist in a series are of greater importance and impact than isolated transferred motifs. The distinction is especially important when it is not clear whether a motif in the *Iliad* is secondary or primary in relation to the occurrence of the same motif in extra-Iliadic myth. If some motifs in a series found in the *Iliad* are clearly secondary, we can conclude with greater confidence that all motifs in that series are based on pre-Homeric myth.

The exploration of motif transference should involve more than discovering similarities between two characters. If that were the sole requirement, then the process would become infinitely open-ended (as it sometimes seems to be in neo-analysis). I have noted that there exist a number of apparently long-standing motifs that are comparable in myth about the Trojan war. For example, Achilles is similar to Memnon, and there are comparable aspects shared by the various foreign allies of Troy. One might even argue that Penthesileia is a feminine counterpart of Achilles, since Amazons were sometimes said to come from various areas in the Black Sea region where Achilles was worshipped as a god, and since the names of Achilles and Penthesileia can be similarly explained as signifying "ἄχος" for the "λαός" (see pp. 156-157 above in chapter three). And in the *Iliad* scholars have found similarities not only between Achilles and Patroclus but between Achilles and Diomedes, Achilles and Hector, Achilles and Euchenor, Achilles and the Myrmidon Menesthios, Achilles and Asios, Achilles and Hippothous, and Achilles and the man in the trial scene who refuses compensation in the *ecphrasis* of

Achilles' shield. Furthermore, the death scene of Patroclus that neo-analysts compare to the death of Achilles can also be compared to the deaths of Sarpedon and Hector.³²

Some of the above similarities are probably long-standing in the pre-Homeric tradition (as I suspect in the case of Memnon-Achilles). Some probably were created by Homer for his own poetic purposes. Some may exist in the deep structure of typology, or closer to the surface in the functional phrases of oral poetics. Some of these perceived similarities may be simply coincidental. Faced with this array of possibilities, we might well wonder if some of the correspondences that neo-analysts observe are only illusory, or if valid, not of special significance.

It is therefore necessary to distinguish between similarity in general and the Homeric transference of motifs from one character to another. We are looking for motifs that recognizably belong to one character and are not simply shared by two, and we are looking for transference of them that arose in the composition of Homer, not in the dim past of tradition. In fact not all of the correspondences favored by neo-analysts meet these requirements, as we shall see below. But I will argue below that Homer portrayed Patroclus as an Achilles figure in the *Iliad*. His death contains a series of motifs also present in myth about Achilles. At least some of the motifs originated in the story of Achilles' death; that suggests that the whole series of motifs did also. The typical motifs that the two share are more appropriate for Achilles, and the motifs are arranged in a similar pattern that seems more than coincidental. It is true that there are doublets, to use Fenik's term, in myth and notably in the epic cycle whose relationship should not or at least cannot be determined. But it is inconceivable that traditionally Patroclus died in the same manner in which Achilles did, as if the *therapon* of Achilles should casually or

³² See p. 221-222 below for Achilles-Diomedes and Achilles-Euchenor. See A. Edwards 1984: 72ff. for Achilles-Hector; Schoeck 54 for Achilles-Menesthius; Lowenstam 1981: 115 for Asius as Achilles (and as Patroclus); Rabel 1991 for Achilles-Hippothous. King 239 n.30 reports that L. Muellner has compared Achilles with the man who refuses compensation on the shield. Rutherford 152-153 compares the death of Patroclus with the death of Hector. Thalmann 50-51; Taplin 1992: 186-188, 243 are particularly good on the "chain" of the deaths of Sarpedon, Patroclus, Hector, and Achilles; cf. Mueller 98ff.

coincidentally or unintentionally become a doublet of Achilles. The resemblance must be the result of conscious composition, and must have been manufactured by Homer as part of his expansion of the traditional character of Patroclus.

2. The Vengeance Theory

So far I have discussed general issues related to the practice of neo-analysis. It is time to focus more closely on the vengeance theory, a concept that is shared by all the leading neo-analysts. This theory proposes that there existed a pre-Homeric story in which Memnon killed Antilochus and then was killed by Achilles, who was acting in vengeance for his friend. It further proposes that this story was the model for the plot of the *Iliad*, in which Hector kills Patroclus and then is slain by Achilles, who acts in vengeance for his friend.³³ I have no doubt that in pre-Homeric myth Memnon killed Antilochus and Achilles killed Memnon, as my reconstruction of the Achilles-Memnon episode indicates. I also have no doubt that Homer knew of these events. Nonetheless I believe that the neo-analysts have greatly exaggerated the element of vengeance in the Achilles-Memnon episode. This has led to an incorrect perception by them of use of the Achilles-Memnon episode in the *Iliad*.

The motif of withdrawal

One idea intrinsic to the vengeance theory is that Achilles had withdrawn from battle before the death of Antilochus. For example, in Schadewaldt's reconstructed "Memnonis" Achilles withdraws from battle because of a prediction from his mother.³⁴

³³ Kullmann summarizes this concept and provides bibliography for it at 1981: 7-8, 1984: 309-310, 1990: 429, 440ff. Note that the arguments of J. Kakridis are almost free of it, though at 1949: 94-95 he hesitantly asked questions that lead to it. The theory is often neglected by scholars otherwise interested in neo-analytical research, but Schein 27; Slatkin 21-22; M. Edwards 1991: 18; Janko 1992: 312 have indicated an interest in it.

³⁴ Schadewaldt 1965: 159 (bk. 1, scene 2), following Welcker 2: 173-174. The withdrawal of Achilles is often an unexplained assumption of the vengeance theory (Pestalozzi 11 is an exception, for he thought Achilles was on the field and immediately killed Memnon after Antilochus' death). Monro 1884: 15, 1901:

We should first note that the motif of withdrawal seems to be a typical one, and thus priority would be difficult to establish between two instances of it (see n.20 above for its status as a typical motif). But a more pressing question is whether Achilles did withdraw from battle in the Achilles-Memnon episode. Though the summary of the *Aethiopsis* by Proclus seems to indicate that Thetis gave a prediction to Achilles, it says nothing of a withdrawal. In fact there is no evidence that Achilles was holding back from battle with Memnon. Of course, Proclus and Apollodorus provide us with summaries only, and these might have omitted Achilles' withdrawal. In the expansive narration of Quintus of Smyrna Achilles is at some distance away from Antilochus when Antilochus is killed by Memnon; Achilles is only subsequently informed of his friend's death. But Achilles does seem to be on the battlefield, and so Quintus does not suggest that Achilles has withdrawn from battle. It is likely that Achilles was fighting in a different area and had been unaware at first that his friend was in trouble (as well as unaware of the threat to Nestor). The *Iliad* certainly contains battle scenes that are so wide that warriors in one area can be unaware of developments in another.

Schadewaldt can cite only Welcker when listing evidence for Achilles' withdrawal.³⁵ When he describes the scene of his "Memnonis" in which Achilles learns of the death of his friend, renounces his withdrawal, and announces his intention of vengeance (scene 5 of book 1), it is significant that he feels compelled to add brackets around it (159; in his graph at 173 he also brackets this scene, entitled "Achills Entschluss zur Rache"). The only other element bracketed is his suggestion that Thetis advised withdrawal (in scene 2 of book 1; 159). Schadewaldt also includes in his reconstruction a battle over the corpse of Antilochus (scene 4 of book 1; 159), which would further

355-356 also thought that Achilles withdrew from battle in the *Aethiopsis*, but he much differently assumed that this was derivative from the *Iliad*. Cf. Reinhardt 366.

³⁵ Page 1963: 22-23 complains it is merely a guess.

suggest that Achilles was not on the battlefield. But again there is simply no evidence for a such a scene.³⁶

Neo-analysts wish to include a withdrawal in the Achilles-Memnon episode for two reasons. First, they want to establish a correspondence to the withdrawal of Achilles in the *Iliad*. But even if Achilles did withdraw in the Achilles-Memnon episode, the correspondence would be weak, as I will demonstrate below (see 217ff.). The second reason why neo-analysts wish to establish a withdrawal in the Achilles-Memnon episode is that it would make the element of vengeance more important. According to the neo-analytical interpretation, Achilles would not have fought Memnon if his anger over the death of Antilochus had not led him to renounce his withdrawal. Achilles would also have had time to dwell on his feelings of revenge as he prepared for battle and sought out Memnon, just as he dwells on his anger toward Hector in the *Iliad* while impatiently waiting for his new armor and for battle to begin again.

Since vengeance is a great theme of the *Iliad*, neo-analysts imagine it must have been a great theme of the story that influenced the *Iliad*, despite a lack of evidence. This reasoning suffers from the circular logic that is often present in the thought of neo-analysts. A full and detailed description of a "prior" motif is developed from only the evidence of its "secondary" manifestation in the *Iliad*. Then wonder is expressed over the similarities between the reconstructed motif and its reflection in the *Iliad*.

The motif of vengeance

The essential proposal of the vengeance theory is that Achilles' vengeance for Patroclus is modeled on Achilles' vengeance for Antilochus. Available evidence does suggest that Memnon killed Antilochus shortly before Achilles killed him (see elements B and C of my reconstruction of the Achilles-Memnon episode). But there is little

³⁶ Schadewaldt claims an amphora shows this scene, but *LIMC* "Antilochus" includes no such work. In his graph (173) he confusingly links both this battle over a corpse and the battle over Achilles' corpse with the battle over the corpse of Patroclus in the *Iliad*.

evidence that the death of Antilochus was the primary cause of the duel between Achilles and Memnon, or that the theme of vengeance was even stressed in the Achilles-Memnon episode.³⁷ This severely reduces the alleged correspondence between the vengeance for Antilochus and the vengeance for Patroclus.

We may be sure that Achilles was angered by the death of his friend Antilochus, but the main role Antilochus plays in this story is that of faithful son, not that of friend. The *Odyssey* fails to refer to Achilles when the death of Antilochus is mentioned. Proclus does not explicitly link the death of Antilochus with the duel between Achilles and Memnon. There is no mention of Achilles at Pindar *Pyth.* 6.28ff., a vivid description of the rescue of Nestor by Antilochus. Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.3 describes the killing of Antilochus by Memnon as one of many deaths caused by Memnon and does not link it with the duel between Achilles and Memnon. Epigram 11 of the *Peplos*, which features the rescue of Nestor by his son, does not mention Achilles. Quintus of Smyrna in his depiction of the death of Antilochus at 2.243ff. stressed the grief of Nestor and of Thrasymedes, a brother of Antilochus. Achilles is actually not on the scene; when he finds out (388ff.), he certainly is angered over the death of Antilochus and sets out to meet Memnon. But he is described as motivated not only by the death of Antilochus but also by the many other Greeks killed by Memnon (2.400-401). In art, the temporal proximity of the death of Antilochus and Achilles' attack on Memnon is suggested by a number of works that depict the corpse of Antilochus lying between Achilles and Memnon (see p. n.16 in chapter three above). But on two vases the corpse lying on the ground between Achilles and Memnon is inscribed with a name other than Antilochus.³⁸

³⁷ Reinhardt 353-354 similarly argues that vengeance was not an essential theme in the traditional story of the death of Antilochus. He concludes rather differently that the *Aethiopsis* did (inappropriately and untraditionally) stress Achilles' vengeance of Antilochus because it was influenced by the *Iliad*.

³⁸ *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 822 (= "Memnon" no. 37), 833 (= "Memnon" no. 45). Each contains another surprise; no. 822 places Hector in the scene, no. 833 has Athena, not Thetis, stand behind Achilles. Cf. Kemp-Lindemann 212-213. It may be significant that of the three Iliac tables that depict the duel between Achilles and Memnon only one shows the corpse of Antilochus. All three are listed at "Achilleus" no. 845 (Sadurska 27, 31, 51-52, 56-57; pl. i, x, xi). Cf. Kemp-Lindemann 216. "Achilles" no. 845a = "Antilochus" no. 32 (Sadurska 27, 31; pl. i) is the one that shows the corpse of Antilochus.

This may suggest the relative insignificance of the role of Antilochus for the duel between Achilles and Memnon. And on the whole Antilochus is neglected in depictions of the Achilles-Memnon episode. As Kossatz-Deissmann concludes, "Allerdings sind diese Darstellungen weniger auf A[ntilochus] bezogen als auf die Aristie des Achilleus."³⁹

Most accounts of the rescue of Nestor by Antilochus are too brief to reveal the exact function that the incident had in the Achilles-Memnon episode. But when the rescue of Nestor is narrated at length (by Pindar and Quintus of Smyrna), it is Antilochus the son, not Antilochus the friend, that is stressed. And the grief of Nestor, not Achilles, is the consequence that became famous in the ancient world. Antilochus is named as especially deserving of the term "Philopater" at Xenophon *Kyn.* 1.14. Propertius 2.13.45ff. and Juvenal *Sat.* 10.246ff., which describes Nestor's grief at the death of his son, may be based (perhaps indirectly) on a scene of Nestor's mourning in the *Aethiopsis*.⁴⁰ *LIMC* "Antilochus" nos. 33-34 may show Nestor mourning his dead son. The death of Antilochus seems to have been a tangent to the overall story of the Achilles-Memnon episode, an incident that seems to have focused more on the relationship between Antilochus and his father than on that of Antilochus and Achilles.⁴¹

It is true that there is some evidence which suggests that Achilles' grief for Antilochus was central to the Achilles-Memnon episode. The Philostratus who described ancient paintings waxes eloquently at *Imag.* 2.7 on a painting in which Achilles is pictured mourning Antilochus at his funeral while Memnon mockingly looks on. Philostratus specifically compares Achilles' feelings of sadness and vengeance to his similar feelings after the death of Patroclus. This testimony should be regarded with

³⁹ Kossatz-Deissmann 1981b (*LIMC* "Antilochus") pp. 837-838. See also Kemp-Lindemann 202.

⁴⁰ The passages are quoted by Allen 1912: 126-127; he adds, "Haec ex Arcino, seu recta seu obliqua via, videntur provenisse."

⁴¹ Reinhardt 353 on the death of Antilochus: "An sich, nach ihren eigenen, in ihr selbst ruhenden Konsequenzen, ist diese Geschichte weit eher eine tragische Vater-Sohn-Geschichte als ein Hobelied auf die Exklusivität der ins höchste gesteigerten Hetairia."

skepticism; the descriptions of paintings by Philostratus are flights of fancy and may not be based on real art work (see p. 143 with n.19 of the last chapter). I suspect that Philostratus based his description on a scene that actually depicted the funeral of Patroclus in the *Iliad*.⁴² In the *Heroicus* by (the other) Philostratus there is a brief comparison between Achilles' vengeance for Patroclus and his vengeance for Antilochus (203.48.19). In addition, it is stated that Achilles held a funeral and games for Antilochus (168.26.18-19); this is reminiscent of the funeral and games for Patroclus. And Quintus of Smyrna briefly has Achilles compare his desire to avenge Antilochus with his vengeance for Patroclus (2.447-448). But I have pointed out that these authors are also unreliable about traditional material; indeed, their accounts clearly contradict the usual narration of the Achilles-Memnon episode (see p. 143 of the last chapter). It seems that they have transferred the Iliadic conception of Achilles' vengeance for Patroclus onto the story of the death of Antilochus (thus anticipating neo-analysts).

Consideration should also be taken of the importance of the theme of vengeance in each story. One aspect of Achilles' motivation for killing Memnon could be described as anger over the death of Antilochus. But Achilles and Memnon would have met in battle whether or not Antilochus had been killed, for each was champion of his side. And it seems that in the Achilles-Memnon episode Achilles' anger over Antilochus' death ends with the death of Memnon, almost as soon as it arises. It may even be too much to say that there was a theme of vengeance in the Achilles-Memnon episode. In the *Iliad* the death of Patroclus causes Achilles to renounce his withdrawal (an aspect I have demonstrated was absent in the Achilles-Memnon episode) and seek out Hector. His quest for vengeance becomes a terrifying theme over several books. As a result of Achilles' overwhelming anger over his friend's death, he kills indiscriminately and refuses

⁴² Lehmann-Hartleben 89-90 reports that a similarity between Philostratus *imag.* 2.7 and fifth c. B.C. scenes of Achilles mourning *Patroclus* has been often noticed. Reinhardt 351-353 shows that this description is only appropriate for the mourning of Patroclus, not of Antilochus; differently from me, however, he thinks Philostratus, despite liberties, is reflecting a contamination of the stories of Antilochus and Patroclus in the *Aethiopsis*.

to take prisoners. Even after he kills Hector, he continues his vengeance, sacrificing human victims and abusing the corpse of Hector. It is as if the *menis* he held at the beginning of the poem against Agamemnon has been transformed into a *menis* against Hector, or even the world in general. His emotion is fueled by a sense of guilt for ultimately being the cause of the death of his friend. All of this is greatly disproportionate to the vengeance of Antilochus by Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode.

One might object that an act of vengeance occurs in both the Achilles-Memnon episode and in the *Iliad*, however disparate in extent and importance. But the motif of vengeance for a fallen friend is a typical motif, not a specific one. It could readily arise in any poetry about battle. We find it constantly in the battle scenes of the *Iliad*,⁴³ and this suggests that the motif was common in the epic tradition that Homer knew, not simply in one story that Homer knew. Neo-analysts themselves have classified revenge for a fallen friend as a typical motif.⁴⁴ Surprisingly, though, they have not noticed the implications of this admission. It means that the fact that some form of vengeance exists in both the Achilles-Memnon episode and in the *Iliad* is of little significance.

Let us suppose that I am wrong, however, and that there is a relationship between the vengeance for Patroclus and the vengeance for Antilochus. Which would we then view as prior, and which secondary? The motif of vengeance is more emphatic and intense in the *Iliad* than in the story of Memnon. Neo-analysts have commonly argued that motifs transferred to the *Iliad* are narrated in a less forceful manner than usual.⁴⁵ They reason that Homer often lowers the tone of the exaggerated action of myth in his concern for characterization and sophisticated nuances. If we followed standard neo-analytical practice, we would award priority to the more intense version of corresponding motifs, in this case the version in the *Iliad*. In fact many scholars who accept the basic

⁴³ E.g. at 402ff., 581ff., 660ff. in bk. 13 alone; cf. Quintus of Smyrna 1.23 ff., 2.247ff. See further Mueller 98-101.

⁴⁴ Schadewaldt 1975: 31-31; Heubeck 1978: 8-9; Kullmann 1984: 312.

⁴⁵ Kullmann, 1960: 31 ff., 1981: 11, 25, 1984: 317-318 most succinctly presents this type of argument as a criterion in establishing priority.

neo-analytical premise that there is a relationship between the two acts of vengeance have either awarded priority to the *Iliad*, or concluded that priority is impossible to ascertain.⁴⁶

Thus the foundation of the vengeance theory, the alleged transfer of the motif of vengeance from the Achilles-Memnon episode to the *Iliad*, must be doubted from a number of perspectives. I prefer to think that vengeance for Antilochus, if we should call it that, was only a minor incident in the Achilles-Memnon episode, and that this was not metamorphosed into the story of Achilles' vengeance for Patroclus.

The correspondence between Patroclus and Antilochus

As part of their advocacy of the vengeance theory neo-analysts believe that Antilochus and Patroclus are similar and that Patroclus is based on the character of Antilochus.⁴⁷ I will argue below that Patroclus was not invented by Homer, but that does not preclude the possibility that his portrayal in the *Iliad* is based on traditional myth about Antilochus. Let us first observe that both are friends of Achilles. The *Iliad* obviously conceives of Patroclus as a friend of Achilles, and it also emphasizes the friendship of between Antilochus and Achilles (e.g. in book 18 and 23). In the *Odyssey* the closeness of both Patroclus and Antilochus to Achilles is suggested when the shades of all three are together in the underworld at 11.467-470 and 24.15-18 (cf. 3.109-112), and when the ashes of Patroclus were buried together in an urn with Achilles with the ashes of Antilochus placed nearby at 24.76-79.

⁴⁶ The *Aethiopsis* is considered to be derivative from the *Iliad* in the theme of vengeance by Monro 1884: 15, 1901: 359-360; Evelyn-White xxx; Schelha 90 (it must be for this reason alone that neo-analysts have not considered her one of their own, for she considers the basic story of the *Aethiopsis* pre-Homeric and Patroclus a Homeric invention). Reinhardt 349ff. speaks of separate "Antilochie" and "Patroklië" traditions whose very different contents were contaminated in the *Aethiopsis*. Similarly Fenik 1964: 32 n.6; Willcock 1973: 5ff., 1983: 483-484 (but cf. 1987: 191), who are heavily influenced by him. Page 1963: 22 suggested the parallelism may be independent or long interdependent.

⁴⁷ See Kullmann 1981: 19-20, 1984: 310, 312-313, 316-317, 1991: 440 for summary and bibliography. Kullmann 1986: 119 notes that Welcker compared Antilochus to Patroclus (2: 13; but note this comparison is in a long list of doublets for which there is no suggestion of relationship). Sinos 30, 58; G. Nagy 1992a: 211-212 seem to have incorporated neo-analytical thought when they describe Antilochus as a "therapon" of Achilles.

What are we to conclude from this similarity between the two? That both are friends of Achilles is not remarkable, for a hero may have more than one friend. Indeed, Ajax was also apparently a good friend of Achilles in myth. His shade is also near that of Achilles in the underworld scenes of the *Odyssey*. In a very popular scene in early art, he plays a board game with Achilles (an episode unknown in literary sources).⁴⁸ His rescue of the body of Achilles is also well known in both literary and iconographical sources (see element G of my reconstruction in the previous chapter). It should also be noted that the *Iliad* stresses the closeness between Antilochus and Patroclus when Antilochus learns of Patroclus' death (*Il.* 17.694ff.). Reinhardt compares (357) the pathos of his reaction to that of Andromache when she learns of Hector's death; both grieve profoundly upon the belated discovery of a loved one's death (cf. the comparison at pp. 117-118 in chapter two between the initial ignorance of Andromache and Achilles concerning the deaths of Hector and Patroclus respectively). Greek and non-Greek literature often featured the grief of a hero upon losing a close friend; indeed, one looking for a precedent for the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus might do better to consider the relationship between Gilgamesh and Enkidu.⁴⁹

Let us also note that Patroclus is a much closer friend to Achilles than Antilochus is. If we were forced to choose one as the model for the other (a choice I do not think we need to make), we might well suppose, following neo-analytical criteria for priority (see p. 198 with n.45 above), that the closer friend is primary, i.e. Patroclus. As a childhood companion of Achilles and his constant attendant, he would be more important to Achilles.⁵⁰ And *Od.* 24.77-79 specifically states that Patroclus was closer to Achilles than was Antilochus. One could argue that the perspective of the *Iliad* is maintained here, but neither poem is interested in suppressing Antilochus as the friend of Achilles. That suggests that there is no manipulation of the received tradition about the relationship

⁴⁸ LIMC "Achilleus" nos. 391-427.

⁴⁹ See M. Edwards 1987a: 63; Janko 1992: 314.

⁵⁰ Reinhardt 353; Willcock 1983: 483.

between Antilochus and Achilles. Probably in the pre-Homeric tradition both Patroclus and Antilochus were friends of Achilles, with Patroclus the closer friend.

Antilochus and Patroclus are also both avenged by Achilles after their deaths. Yet I have already pointed out that the motif of vengeance is a typical one, and that the scale of it in the Achilles-Memnon episode and the *Iliad* is vastly different. So the two only resemble each other in general ways. Both were friends of Achilles; in addition, Achilles kills their slayers. These similarities are not enough to suggest that one is modeled on the other. If we look for untypical motifs that Antilochus and Patroclus share, we will find none.⁵¹

It seems safe to conclude that Homer has not made Patroclus play the role of Antilochus in the *Iliad*. I acknowledge that the friendship between Antilochus and Achilles is pre-Homeric, as is the slaying of Antilochus by Memnon. I also believe that many motifs in the *Iliad* are derived from the Achilles-Memnon episode. But this does not necessarily lead to the conclusion that Homer has modeled Patroclus on Antilochus. It is quite possible that in pre-Homeric myth two friends of Achilles were slain and then avenged.

Once we eliminate the possibility that Patroclus reflects Antilochus, neo-analytical arguments become much less complex. Patroclus does not need to reflect both Antilochus and Achilles at the same time when he is slain (see further at pp. 230ff. below). We are no longer faced with such predicaments as deciding whether the battle over the corpse of Patroclus reflects the battle over the corpse of Achilles or a supposed

⁵¹ I do not see that both Antilochus and Patroclus die in a "sacrificial" manner, a notion common in neo-analysis (e.g. Kullmann 1981: 24 on the "motiv des gegenseitigen Eintretens für den Freund"). Antilochus may sacrifice himself for his father, but Patroclus cannot be said to sacrifice himself for Achilles. Even if Patroclus could be said to do so, the beneficiary of his actions, his friend Achilles, fails to correspond to the beneficiary of the sacrifice of Antilochus, his father Nestor.

battle over the corpse of Antilochus, or whether the funeral of Patroclus reflects the funeral of Antilochus or the funeral of Achilles.⁵²

In accordance with the comparison between Patroclus and Antilochus and with the vengeance theory in general, Hector is assumed to be modeled after Memnon when he kills Patroclus.⁵³ What is the justification for this proposition? There is not much of an argument to make beyond observing that as Memnon killed a friend of Achilles, so did Hector. In fact the comparison tends not to be discussed thoroughly but rather to be assumed as part of the vengeance theory. Hector in fact does not seem to resemble Memnon when he kills Patroclus, though I will argue below that there is some justification in viewing him as a Memnon figure when he battles Achilles.

Invention in Homer

A central tenet of the vengeance theory is that though Homer re-used traditional material, he was also very inventive. Since neo-analysts usually stress the indebtedness of Homer to his tradition, this aspect of neo-analysis can be awkward and contradictory. When stressing the originality of Homer, neo-analysts remind one of earlier unitarians like Scott who were eager to portray Homer as creative. For instance, the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon in book 1 of the *Iliad* is believed by neo-analysts to be an invention of Homer.⁵⁴ It is almost impossible to assess such an assertion, but I think it is doubtful. In chapter one I argued that the *Cypria* may lead up to such a traditional episode without regard to the *Iliad*, indeed, that it may have narrated the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon (see p. 64). Obviously I therefore disagree with the neo-analytical view

⁵² Kullmann 1960: 333 feels compelled to assert that the funeral of Patroclus does not reflect the funeral of Antilochus but that of Achilles. How does one decide this, if he is really an Antilochus figure and an Achilles figure at once? See also n.36 above.

⁵³ E.g. Schadewaldt 1965: 171ff., esp. 176; Kullmann 1960: 318, 1981: 42; Schoeck 23, 26ff., *passim*. Schein 27 finds this line of argument attractive, but many scholars interested in the vengeance theory fail directly to compare Hector to Memnon in this scene.

⁵⁴ Schadewaldt 1965: 182ff. (cf. 454 n.2); J. Kakridis 1971: 4, 23, 59, 65ff.; Heubeck 1978: 13; Kullmann 1984: 316. See Reinhardt 20 for an opposing view.

and prefer to believe that the *menis* of Achilles toward Agamemnon was a traditional episode that Homer greatly expanded. We do know of other quarrels between heroes in myth (cf. the quarrel at *Od.* 8.72ff. between Odysseus and Achilles, and the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles in the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus), and this suggests that it was a typical motif. Therefore no relationship should be traced between different instances of the motif,⁵⁵ and the *menis* of Achilles should not be considered to be based on some extra-Iliadic quarrel. In fact there is not even a quarrel in the Achilles-Memnon episode that could serve as its model anyway. Whether it is likely that Achilles' alleged withdrawal after a prophecy in the Achilles-Memnon episode inspired his withdrawal in the *Iliad* will be considered below (see pp. 217-218).

Sometimes neo-analysts believe that the *Iliad* has transformed the traditional characters of Memnon and Antilochus into the newly invented characters Hector and Patroclus.⁵⁶ That Homer invented these characters has long been a controversial proposal.⁵⁷ Neo-analysts have championed the theory in order to argue that Hector and Patroclus re-tell the story of Memnon slaying Antilochus. But there is too much evidence that the characters Hector and Patroclus were part of pre-Homeric myth.

It is certainly difficult to believe that Patroclus was a Homeric invention, despite Scheliha's well-argued thesis that he was. The *Iliad* introduces him at 1.307 simply as the "son of Menoetius," which suggests that the poet assumes that the audience knows who

⁵⁵ See G. Nagy 1979: 22ff. I noted above at n.20 that withdrawal of a hero, the consequence of Achilles' anger, is also a typical motif.

⁵⁶ Schadewaldt 1965: 177 thinks both Hector and Patroclus are Homeric inventions (but on page 454 n.1 he admits that formations of the name Patroclus in the oblique cases are pre-Homeric, and adds that he means the "gestalt" of Patroclus, not the name). Kullmann 1960: 42-44, 182ff. argues that Hector is an Homeric invention (but cf. 358-359); he does not think Patroclus is (see 59-60, 131, 152, 193-9). Clark 382 incorrectly reports their views.

⁵⁷ See esp. Scheliha 220ff. (on Hector), 233ff. (on Patroclus), who is frequently cited by neo-analysts on this issue; at 388-399, 391-392 she provides further bibliography of previous scholars who discussed the issue. Dihle 159-161 presents a recapitulation of Scheliha's views on Patroclus. See also Scott 206ff.; Bassett 185ff. (Hector only); Wade-Gery 36. For opposing arguments see Combellack 1944 (on Hector; at 1962: 195-196 he called Kullmann's argument on Hector "peculiarly unsatisfactory;" Whitman 156; Reinhardt 19ff. (on Patroclus), 359ff. (on Hector, followed by Fenik 1964: 32 n. 6); Schein 14, 27-28 (who provides further bibliography at 42 n.57); Janko 1992: 313-314 (on Patroclus).

this is.⁵⁸ Patroclus is sometimes present in non-Iliadic myth, and that could indicate he was a mythical figure independent of Homer. Apollodorus *Bibl.* 3.10.9 includes him among the suitors of Helen, admittedly an unlikely scenario because his status is not as high as that of most of the other suitors. *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 466 and 467 show him at Phthia with Achilles before the Trojan war (cf. Nestor's remembrance of Patroclus being present when he came to recruit Achilles at *Il.* 11.765-784).⁵⁹ The *Cypria* mentions that Patroclus sold Lycaon. Patroclus is not mentioned in connection with the selling of Lycaon at *Il.* 21.34ff., but he is at *Il.* 23.746-747: υἱὸς δὲ Πριάμοιο Λυκάονος ὄνον ἔδωκε Πατρόκλῳ ἥρωϊ Ἰησονίδης.⁶⁰ It is difficult to understand why Homer would want to invent this detail.⁶¹ Pindar *Ol.* 9.70ff. describes Patroclus sharing exploits with Achilles on the Teuthranian expedition.⁶² And a vase depicts Achilles bandaging Patroclus, an incident that is not described in the *Iliad*; perhaps the wounding of Patroclus occurred during the Teuthranian expedition.⁶³

The main point of Scheliha is that Patroclus is hardly ever present in extra-Iliadic myth. But this is not surprising, for I suspect that he was not a major character in pre-Homeric myth. The indications that he was in extra-Iliadic myth are therefore very significant (of course we should not wonder at the absence of Patroclus in post-Iliadic myth, for his death before the fall of Troy is probably traditional). I do not think that we

⁵⁸ As Leaf 1900-1902; Kirk 1985; Willcock 1978-1984 *ad loc.* all agree. Reinhardt 21-22 effectively stresses this point. See also de Jong 95, who states that as a rule Homer does not elaborately introduce traditional characters whom the audience knows. See Scheliha 252-253 for an opposing view.

⁵⁹ See Willcock 1964: 46ff.; Andersen 1990: 40-41 for the opinion that this passage (11.765-784) and Phoenix's account of the same episode (9.253-259; cf. 18.58, 437) are *ad hoc* invention; de Jong 173-175 is more moderate. In my view, some of the details of Nestor's and Phoenix's accounts are *ad hoc* invention, but that does not mean that the recruitment of Achilles at Phthia was not traditional (see Kullmann 1960: 259ff.). Perhaps the presence of Patroclus at that time was also traditional.

⁶⁰ See Combellack 1944: 238-239, 1976: 46; Kullmann 1960: 194 n.2.

⁶¹ *Pace* Andersen 1990: 36-37, who challenges Combellack and Kullmann on this issue.

⁶² Kullmann 1960: 189ff., 265 argues that this expedition was pre-Homeric. R. Carpenter 56 ff. argued that it was based on Aeolic expansion and prior to story of the fall of Troy.

⁶³ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 468, c. 500 B.C. Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a (*LIMC* "Achilleus") under no. 468 supposes that it illustrates a scene from the *Cypria* (a view earlier held by R. Carpenter 55). Cf. Robbins 1993: 6, who discusses this vase scene as part of his thesis that Achilles learned the skill of medicine from Chiron in pre-Homeric myth.

can explain every instance of his presence in non-Iliadic myth as derivative from Homer. For all these reasons I believe that Patroclus was not an invention of Homer. A more persuasive argument is that his heroic actions in the *Iliad* and Homer's characterization of him are new developments.⁶⁴

Scheliha argues with less conviction that Hector was also an invention of Homer. The *Iliad* is noticeably casual in its first references to him, a fact that both Scott and Kullmann never quite manage to explain away. One may well doubt the old hypothesis that Hector originated on the Greek mainland, as Scott effectively does.⁶⁵ However, Hector, like Patroclus, enjoys an existence in extra-Iliadic mythology. The most noticeable example is his slaying of Protesilaus.⁶⁶ Kullmann challenged the pre-Homeric nature of this incident in *Die Quellen der Ilias* by pointing out that Homer refers (*Il.* 2.701) to Protesilaus' killer vaguely as a "Dardanian man" (1960: 273-274). He suggested that the idea of Hector killing Protesilaus is derived from the firing of the ship of Protesilaus at *Il.* 15.705 (remarkably, for if he followed his usual line of reasoning he would view Hector's firing of Protesilaus' ship as an allusion to his slaying of him). He could not claim that the *Cypria*-poet was inspired by the *Iliad*, for he argued at this time that this poet (among other cyclic authors) did not know the *Iliad*.⁶⁷ Instead, he vaguely suggested that the detail of Hector killing Protesilaus has somehow been mistakenly placed in the summary of Proclus. But as I demonstrated in chapter one (see pp. 38-39), Proclus has rarely been shown to be incorrect on details within the cyclic poems (as opposed to their extent). Kullmann has no reason to doubt Proclus on this detail except that it is inconvenient for his belief that Homer invented Hector. If the death of

⁶⁴ See e.g. Bowra 1930: 12; Heubeck 1954: 93ff., 1974: 165ff.; Whitman 156; de Romilly 36; Kullmann 1991: 11; Janko 1992: 313-314.

⁶⁵ Scott 218ff. For bibliography on this hypothesis see Scheliha 388-399, who also doubts it. M. West 1988: 159 n.62 notes it is a difficult argument to maintain, but Murray 235ff. and Janko 1982: 92 accept it.

⁶⁶ Thus in the *Cypria*, according to Proclus, and at Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.30, Sophocles fr. 497 Radt. Sometimes in myth the slayer is said to be someone else; see J. Frazer 2: 198 n.1.

⁶⁷ Kullmann 1960: 204 ff., 358ff. proposed that all the poems of the epic cycle except for the *Ilias parva* are pre-Homeric.

Protesilaus is pre-Homeric, as I think is likely, it would not be surprising if a famous Trojan was said to be his slayer. Homer may have known Hector as the slayer and simply not bothered to spell out the details of the story, as is his wont with allusions. Focus of attention on Hector is probably avoided when the death of Protesilaus is mentioned because Hector will be featured later on in book 2 (at 802ff.). Or perhaps, as Stanley has recently suggested (290), an "obtrusive note of historical irony in the (alleged) obscurity of the killer" is at play here; in other words, the poet is ostentatiously distancing himself from a well-known detail in myth.

There is also evidence from art about Hector in non-Homeric myth. Friis Johansen's suggestion that a pre-Homeric geometric vase represents the duel between Hector and Ajax may be doubtful (see p. 13 above in chapter one), but if correct it would indicate that Hector was not invented by Homer. On two early Greek vases Hector is portrayed coming to the aid of Troilus when Troilus is ambushed by Achilles.⁶⁸ The ambush of Troilus is a favorite subject of early art work and probably pre-Homeric (we cannot be certain that Hector's involvement is also early). Other art work of a later date that also portrays Hector in this and other non-Homeric incidents can be found in the *LIMC* article. Touchefeu, its author, believes Hector is pre-Homeric (p. 482), and further notes that even pictures of Hector in Iliadic scenes are often not in accord with the *Iliad* (p.497). That might indicate that these settings, and Hector as well, are actually traditional, not "Homeric."

There are additional arguments to consider. Page claims that the formulaic nature of epithets referring to Hector means that he has a long-standing existence in tradition.⁶⁹ In chapter one I pointed out that Sappho's knowledge of Trojan material, including some about Hector (44 L-P), may be based on pre-Homeric tradition (see p. 50). Others think

⁶⁸ *LIMC* "Hektor" no. 50 (the François vase) and "Achilleus" no. 365 both show Hector, inscribed, in this scene. Both are from the early sixth century.

⁶⁹ Page 1959: 248 ff. Combellack 1962: 195-196; Schein 27 agree with him. Page 1963: 22 also cites oral theory in faulting neo-analytical arguments about Homeric invention. Cf. Whallon, who assumes a pre-Homeric Hector in discussing the development of his epithets.

that Paris and Hector represent a primitive motif of unequal brothers or even are evolved from a long-standing motif of twins in Indo-European myth.⁷⁰ Willcock adds that Hector seems more intrinsic to the story of the war than his alleged model Memnon and thus might be considered older than him, rather than based on him.⁷¹ And a persistent tradition that Hector was dragged to death by Achilles' chariot may be pre-Homeric.⁷² These arguments are all debatable, but the cumulative weight of them leads me to believe that Hector belongs to the pre-Homeric tradition.

Whether Andromache and Astyanax were pre-Homeric is a related issue. If the wife and son of Hector are pre-Homeric, then so is Hector. For this reason Kullmann has tried to prove that they were invented by Homer and that their appearance in extra-Iliadic myth is derivative from the *Iliad*.⁷³ The argument he used in *Die Quellen der Ilias* is highly questionable. He acknowledged that in a fragment of the *Ilias parva* Andromache is taken captive and Astyanax killed by Neoptolemus (*Iliades parvae* fr. 21 Bernabé), but maintained that this poem is post-Homeric and derivative from the *Iliad*. The argument is surprising for he also proposed at that time that the *Ilii excidium* (among other cyclic poems) was pre-Homeric (see n.67 above). Yet the summary of the *Ilii excidium* by Proclus indicates that Andromache and Astyanax were also in that poem. Kullmann nowhere overtly noted that this contradicts his argument. He did place a question mark in parentheses next to his citations of the report by Proclus that Astyanax and Andromache were in the *Ilii excidium*, and added enigmatically that this passage actually belongs to the *Ilias parva*, not the *Ilii excidium* (352-253). In the same work Kullmann had briefly mentioned that he does not think that Proclus is always accurate in assigning data to the proper poem (50-51); apparently this suspicion underlies his doubts about Proclus'

⁷⁰ Cf. Scheliba 388-399; Reinhardt 360; Clarke 215; Friis Johansen 1967: 229-30; Robbins 1994: 33-34.

⁷¹ Willcock 1983: 483. Even if this were so, both characters could be pre-Homeric.

⁷² See Murray 145; Bowra 1930: 107ff.; Vermeule 95; Kopff 59.

⁷³ Kullmann 1960: 186-188, 351-353. See also 1968: 31 n.39.

accuracy concerning the contents of the *Ilii excidium*.⁷⁴ The edition of the cycle that he then promised (50-51) might have provided a clearer demonstration of his argument, but he has never completed this project. Thus ultimately he has failed to explain why he thinks Andromache and Astyanax are wrongly mentioned in the *Ilii excidium* section of the summary by Proclus.

It would be a very difficult argument to pursue. First of all, a *testimonium* confirms that the poet of the *Ilii excidium* did indeed include the death of Astyanax (*Ilii excidium* fr. 5 Bernabé). Kullmann never explained why this *testimonium* does not further contradict his argument.⁷⁵ Secondly, the two poems apparently disagreed over who killed Astyanax, as I pointed out in chapter one (see pp. 39-40). The fragment of the *Ilias parva* that mentions Andromache and Astyanax (*Iliades parvae* fr. 21 Bernabé) indicates that Neoptolemus killed Astyanax. But Proclus in his summary of the *Ilii excidium* reports that Odysseus killed Astyanax. The two poems must have varied on who the killer was.⁷⁶ Therefore the statement by Proclus that Odysseus killed Astyanax cannot be somehow re-assigned from the *Ilii excidium* section of his summary to the *Ilias parva* section. In addition, a *testimonium* (*Cypria* fr. 33 Bernabé, discussed in chapter one at pp. 63-64) suggests that the death of Astyanax was at least mentioned in the *Cypria*, another poem that Kullmann then argued was pre-Homeric. He provided no explanation for why this does not contradict his argument either. It should by now be clear that Kullmann's argument was incomplete and inconsistent. It was linked with a controversial proposal, subsequently abandoned, about the pre-Homeric status of some but not other poems in the epic cycle. His proposal that Andromache and Astyanax are post-Homeric should be rejected.

⁷⁴ It is true that the order of events at the end of the summary of the *Ilii excidium* is odd. See pp. 41-42 above in chapter one.

⁷⁵ At times in the ancient world confusion arose over the titles of the *Ilias parva* and the *Ilii excidium*, but though Davies in his notes to *Iliupersis* (his title) fr. 3 reports that Robert attributed this *testimonium* to the *Ilias parva*, Davies as well as Bernabé, Allen, and Bethe all assign it to the *Ilii excidium*.

⁷⁶ Kullmann's denial of this at 50-51 and 217 n.3 is very inadequate.

Actually the cyclic tradition concerning Andromache and Astyanax seems pre-Homeric. The death of Astyanax in particular may have been well-known before Homer's time.⁷⁷ The evidence of art suggests that his death was present in myth about the fall of Troy at an early date, perhaps as early as the late eighth century.⁷⁸ And as many scholars have seen, Andromache's foreboding of his death at *Il.* 24.734ff. is probably an allusion to pre-Homeric myth.⁷⁹ Astyanax, like Hector, has a Greek name, and the name denotes Hector's role as defender of the city (as Hector's may), but that hardly proves that Andromache and Astyanax are inventions of Homer.⁸⁰ According to Homer, Astyanax also has a second name, "Skamandrios" (*Il.* 6.402), and that suggests he is a figure in myth of long-standing. It is a desperate argument to suppose that this character was originally the son of a different royal figure at Troy.⁸¹

Andromache's name might be interpreted as an Amazonian name, and it is doubtful that Homer would choose such a name for her if he was inventing her character. We do not hear much about Andromache in Greek myth, but perhaps the details in the *Iliad* concerning her life before her marriage to Hector (e.g. the tragedy that befell her family, 6.371ff.; the headdress given to her by Aphrodite, 24.462ff.) are based on pre-Homeric myth. They may be *ad hoc* invention, but the other details in the *Iliad* about

⁷⁷ As even Scheliha 110-111 admits, apparently not realizing it contradicts her argument that Hector is a Homeric invention (though see the end of the paragraph with n.81).

⁷⁸ See *LIMC* "Astyanax" nos. 7-36. Touchefeu, the author of the article, takes a cautious stance towards the earliest (uninscribed) representations, but the *communis opinio* is that they signify the death of Astyanax, including now Ahlberg-Cornell 82.

⁷⁹ See discussion of this issue at Severyns 1928: 365ff; he is skeptical, but notes that many believe the death of Astyanax is pre-Homeric. Macleod 151 (see especially); M. Edwards 1987a: 29, 32, 211, 299, 314; Schein 190; Taplin 1992: 281; Ahlberg-Cornell 82 think that Andromache's foreboding of her son's death is an allusion to the death of Astyanax. Davies 1989a: 72-73; Gantz 612 suggest that the death of Astyanax is foreshadowed in *Il.* 6 when Astyanax shrinks back from Hector's armored presence (466ff.; cf. the phraseology of 1.467 with *Iliades parvae* fr. 21.3 Bernabé). M. Edwards 1987a: 211; Taplin 1992: 122 find Hector's prayer for his future well-being in this scene ironic and even ominous (see also Kirk 1985: 212). Cf. 22.63-64, where Priam envisions that infants will be dashed to the ground when Troy falls. See Monro 1884: 25, 1901: 369, 376; Kullmann 1960: 186-187, 352-353, 1968: 31 n.39 (a reversal of his usual methodology); Richardson 1993 *ad* 24.734-739 for the argument (which dates back to Aristarchus, and is typical of that scholar's attitude) that the cyclic poets derived the death of Astyanax from the *Iliad*.

⁸⁰ Combaliack 1950: 351, 1976: 47-48 stresses that Greek names have no decisive bearing on this issue. Clarke 215 calls the evidence of the names "equivocal."

⁸¹ As Scheliha 364; Kullmann 1960: 187 n.4 suppose.

Thebe and Eetion imply that her father and her hometown at least were part of pre-Homeric myth.⁸² That suggests she was too. Sappho's poem about the marriage of Andromache to Hector (44 L-P) could be based on pre-Homeric myth, if a non-Homeric tradition was known to the poets of Lesbos (as I suggested in reference to Hector at p. 206 above). Sometimes the evidence is uncertain, but on the whole I think it is reasonable to conclude that Andromache and Astyanax, as well as Hector, are pre-Homeric characters.

In fact, I consider all major characters and events in the *Iliad* to be traditional.⁸³ Certainly Homer is not incapable of major invention—Calypso in the *Odyssey*, for instance, may be an invented character,⁸⁴ and Odysseus' "Cretan" tales in the *Odyssey* demonstrate the ease with which plausible-sounding stories can be created. But I think the tradition of the Trojan war was so well-developed that extensive invention would have been quite unnecessary for Homer. Of course, Homer's expansiveness and sophisticated artistic purposes would require the invention of much minor detail. The most important and radical invention was probably a widening of Patroclus' traditional role (see p. 205 above). His friendship with Achilles and his death at the hands of Hector could easily be traditional, but two aspects of the *Iliad's* depiction of Patroclus are probably Homer's invention: the tragic link between the wrath of Achilles and the death of Patroclus, and the use of Patroclus' death to reflect the death of Achilles.

I should stress once again (see pp. 11ff. above in chapter one) that though the phenomenon of *ad hoc* invention undoubtedly exists in Homer, one need not suspect that everything in Homer is invented. *Ad hoc* invention is usually thought to occur in the *details* of a traditional myth. The myth as a whole, though manipulated for the needs of a passage, is not invented out of whole cloth. The basic conclusion to draw about the

⁸² See p. 173 in chapter one. Kullmann 1960: 186 acknowledges that this argument is probable, but thinks that Andromache was not necessarily part of such myth.

⁸³ See Combella 1950, 1976 for a skeptical view on Homeric invention.

⁸⁴ Thus e.g. Woodhouse 44, 46-53. Combella 1950: 343ff. is skeptical. Clarke 217-218 reviews the issue.

phenomenon of *ad hoc* invention is that Homer has made some novel modifications or additions to traditional myth when it suits the purposes of his narrative. This conclusion does not lead to the further conclusion that Homer invents major events or characters.

Let us return to the claim by some neo-analysts and others that Homer invented Hector and Patroclus. Though this suggestion may initially seem attractive (the poet does take special interest in the characters), it does not withstand scrutiny, and in fact I am skeptical about the possibility of large-scale invention in the *Iliad*. The vengeance theory may still be followed despite this conclusion. But if there are resemblances between events in the *Iliad* and events in the Achilles-Memnon episode, these resemblances probably result from Homer's manipulation of traditional characters and material, not from his invention of new material and characters.

The effect of motif transference

Why would motifs from non-Iliadic myth be transferred into the Homeric poems? Unfortunately, this question has not been adequately addressed by neo-analysts. There seem to be three main views on this issue, which are often embraced and dropped at will in neo-analytical theory as it suits the argument at hand, or even held simultaneously though they are incompatible (as Reinhardt 349-350 complains). The first view suggests that Homer looked for traditional material available to him to re-use in the creation of a radically innovative narrative. At times he was unsuccessful in transferring the traditional material to its new setting, and these instances allow us to discover the sources he chose to employ in his composition. This view is best exemplified by Schadewaldt, who speaks of looking over the poet's shoulder and discovering the secrets of his composition (1965: 155).⁸⁵ The second view is similar, but suggests that Homer was so thoroughly influenced by traditional material that he unconsciously slipped into it when he made his

⁸⁵ E.g. Fenik 1964: 8; Clarke 213-215; Willcock 1976: 287; M. Edwards 1990: 19 consider this the essential attitude of neo-analysts (which I think is correct, on the whole, as far as the vengeance theory is concerned).

own compositions. His inappropriate use of this material allows the critic to discover influences on the poet, influences which the poet would not even have consciously recognized as he composed. This view is best exemplified by Schoeck.⁸⁶ A third view suggests that traditional material used in a new context is meant to evoke the original context. Inappropriateness results not from unskillful composition, but rather is meant to force recognition of the context in which the material is usually set. In this way the poet achieves a sophisticated type of allusion. It is well exemplified by Heubeck.⁸⁷ I think that all three explanations of motif transference may be valid, and all may exist in the Homeric poems. The first or second may well explain the use of folk tale or Argonautic myth in the *Odyssey*, for instance. But I think the third one best explains most instances of motif transference from the Achilles-Memnon into the *Iliad*.

There is much material in the *Iliad* that does not belong to its dramatic time. Especially notable are scenes in books 2-7 of the *Iliad* that seem more appropriate for the beginning of the war. The catalogue of ships reflects the situation at Aulis, the marshaling of troops seems to be in preparation for the first battle, the duel between Paris and Menelaus would more sensibly occur at the beginning of the war, and the inability of Priam to recognize the Greek leaders from the wall of the city suggests he is seeing them for the first time. Analysts found in such temporal discrepancies evidence of multiple authorship, and so sometimes unitarians have felt compelled to deny, rather unpersuasively, that they exist at all.⁸⁸ A different approach has been to consider these

⁸⁶ In this he is influenced by oral poetics, though in repeatedly considering one extra-Iliadic motif the prototype of multiple similar passages in the *Iliad* he ignores the issue of typology. Note, however, that one could argue that Homer sometimes creates his own typology that would not represent the typology of his tradition (see Austin 17; Hoelscher 65; cf. Schoeck 30-31).

⁸⁷ Heubeck 1991, 1954. Significant allusion is also a feature of Slatkin's employment of neo-analytical methodology. E.g. Jensen 31; A. Edwards 1984: 78ff. seem to think this is the essential attitude of neo-analysts.

⁸⁸ See esp. Scott 167ff. on "temporal contradiction." As Jamison 6 says, the *ad hoc* arguments of unitarians on this issue have a "desperate, patched-together air." The argument of Tsagarakis that the *teichoskopia* belongs in the tenth year of the war is based on three points that I think are obviously mistaken: a) that Trojans had been prevented by Achilles from being on the tower for the first ten years of the war, b) that when Priam asks what he already knows, he is comparable to omniscient divinities who do

temporal peculiarities mistakes made by one poet immersed in his tradition. Bowra considered the abuse of chronology "fundamentally a fault."⁸⁹ It was the practice of a traditional poet, he explained, to focus only on the passage before him, and such inconsistency would not bother him. Lord in discussion of the scenes (187-188) remarked that it would be natural for an oral poet to go "off the track." Mueller thinks (173) these books contain traditional material that had become so "solidified" that smooth adaptation of it proved impossible. Kirk explains the *teichoskopia* similarly (1985: 286-287), stating that "the apparent anomaly could be overlooked or tolerated in the name of tradition." These scholars think that the material has often been employed effectively, but nonetheless they suggest that Homer was somehow essentially mistaken in his use of it.

I find it difficult to believe that Homer repeatedly "went off track" when he composed the series of remarkable scenes in the opening books of the *Iliad*. It seems more reasonable to recognize that the early stages of the war are evoked by the use of motifs that obviously belong to a different chronological setting. Some of these scenes may not be as traditional as the catalogue of ships seems to be, but they at least belong most naturally to the beginning of the war.⁹⁰ These are not mistakes that the audience need tolerate, but recognizable allusions to the early years of the war.⁹¹ That effect would be part of the general evocation of the whole Trojan war that scholars have noticed in the

this, like Thetis at 1.365 or Apollo at 6.423ff. and c) that some references to the length of the war in the scene make the whole scene appropriate for the tenth year.

⁸⁹ Bowra 1930: 110-112, 1952: 311-312. Cf. 1955: 40, however.

⁹⁰ There is no duel between Menelaus and Paris or a *teichoskopia* in the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus, which does not necessarily mean that they were not in that poem (see Kullmann 1960: 368) or that they were never part of pre-Homeric myth. J. Kakridis 31ff. and Jamison ascribe these scenes to a typology of bridal abduction independent of the Trojan war; Jamison is particularly enlightening on an "Indo-European narrative pattern that has its roots in a particular societal institution—the fine line between legal and illegal abduction in the typology of Indo-European marriage"). Nonetheless, in this context the beginning of the Trojan war in particular is evoked, as these scholars see.

⁹¹ Perhaps the audience would react to this phenomenon unconsciously. Leaf 1900-1902, 1: 87; Owen 18ff.; Robbins 1994: 35; Jamison 13 suggest that the audience would naturally experience the beginning of the work as the beginning of the war. I think Morrison 43ff., 58-59 is wrong to view these scenes as disruptions of the audience's expectations about the future.

Iliad since ancient times.⁹² It may have been easier for the ancient audience, familiar with the whole story of the war, to appreciate this function of the *Iliad* (and I hasten to add it is only one function; scenes reflecting extra-Iliadic time obviously serve Homeric concerns also). The modern audience has not easily sensed this effect of the *Iliad* because it is dismissive of the traditional myth on which Homer has built his poem; indeed, critics have been often hostile to extra-Iliadic myth about the Trojan war as a threat to Homer's originality. But the chronological inappropriateness is actually a brilliant manipulation of time. By narrative sleight of hand the poet has succeeded in telling the story of the whole war. The *Iliad* is justly titled; the complete story of the war is suggested by the narration of one incident in the war. As Young says (1983: 163), "The whole *Iliad* is in the *Iliad*."

This effect is often recognized by neo-analysts when they are discussing extra-Iliadic motifs in the *Iliad*.⁹³ But they have viewed the *Iliad*'s use of motifs from the Achilles-Memnon episode much differently. Adherents of the vengeance theory argue that Homer found the plot of the Achilles-Memnon episode appealing but wished to tell it in a new manner and so transferred its motifs to a newly invented setting; sometimes they view Homer as so steeped in the Achilles-Memnon episode that he unconsciously repeated its motifs in his own composition (the first and second views outlined at pp.

⁹² Cf. Owen 184; Else 585-586 (with further bibliography); Griffin 1980: 27-28; Young 1983: 163ff.; Schein 19-25, 168; Mueller 64ff.; Taplin 1992 (esp. 83-109, 257-284). On the reflection of pre-Iliadic material alone cf. Murray 184-186; Owen 18ff., 188-189; Whitman 267-268; M. Edwards 1987a: 188-97, 1987b: 56-57; Robbins 1990a: 4, 9 n.26. On allusions to the fall of Troy see Whitman 39ff.; Macleod *passim*; Haft. On the description of Achilles' shield as a microcosm of the *Iliad*, the whole war, or even life itself, see summarizing remarks with bibliography at Taplin 1980; King 239 n.30; and see now Stanley *passim*, esp. 3ff., 294ff. See also n.252 below on foreshadowing of future events through the funeral games of Patroclus. Cf. Aristotle's comment in chapter 23 of the *Poetics*, νῦν δ' ἐν μέρος ἀπολαβῶν ἐπεισοδίοις κέχρηται αὐτῶν πολλοῖς, ὅλον νεῶν καταλόγῳ καὶ ἄλλοις ἐπεισοδίοις οἷς διαλαμβάνει τὴν πόλιν (Else 586 comments: "Aristotle saw what modern scholarship has rediscovered: that Homer selected episodes from the whole course of the war and incorporated them into a story which, chronologically speaking, is incompatible with them) and scholia *Il.* 2.494-877=Eustathius *Il.* 262.43, θαυμάσιος ὁ ποιητῆς μὴδ' ὅτι οὐκ ἀπολαβῶν τῆς ὑποθέσεως, πάντα δ' ἐξ ἀναστροφῆς, κατὰ τὸν ἐπιβάλλοντα καιρὸν διηγούμενος, τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἔριν, τὴν τῆς Ἑλένας ἀρπαγὴν, τὸν Ἀχιλλέως θάνατον (quoted at Severyns 1928: 154-155). Young 1983: 163 n.26 reports (citing Richardson) that there are frequent comments about the *Iliad*'s narration of the whole war in the scholia.

⁹³ Besides Heubeck (see n.87 above), see J. Kakridis 1949: 89ff., 1971: 32, 62; Pestalozzi 39-41, 46ff.; Kullmann 1960 (esp. 5 n.2, 364ff., 386); 1968: 17-18, 1981: 42; Schoeck 117-120; Schadewaldt 1975 *passim* (esp. 12).

211-212 above). They suggest that sometimes Homer was not careful or the material was intractable, and so as a result we can trace the re-use of motifs. J. Kakridis and Kullmann have even stated that the poet did not feel obliged to adapt completely because the audience of his time was rather forgiving.⁹⁴

I believe that motif transference from the Achilles-Memnon episode into the *Iliad* is a form of foreshadowing.⁹⁵ The reflection of material in the Achilles-Memnon episode is a tool of allusion that helps to broaden the scope of the *Iliad*. It serves to evoke the death of Achilles and is thus part of the *Iliad's* general evocation of the whole war. What neo-analysts consider mistakes discernible only to the critic are actually important signposts that the audience is meant to recognize. Clarke's conclusion on this issue (214) largely parallels my own. He states that if the anomalies that neo-analysts observe are present in the text as allusions to other stories, then neo-analysts "will have succeeded in showing how Homer preserved the power and the associations of the epic tradition" to give the *Iliad* "added resonances." He then adds that it is much less likely that Homer "borrowed from specific poems and somehow neglected to cover his tracks."

The vengeance theory contains a number of valuable observations but is based on some untenable assumptions. The existence of the motif of Achilles' withdrawal in the Achilles-Memnon episode has been fabricated out of thin air; the motif of vengeance in it has been greatly exaggerated. These motifs are typical and so their existence in both the Achilles-Memnon episode and the *Iliad* would be of no significance. The claim that Patroclus and Hector have been invented is very doubtful, and the alleged correspondences between Antilochus and Patroclus are either illusory or unimportant. Neo-analysts have also failed to see that motifs from the Achilles-Memnon episode in the

⁹⁴ J. Kakridis 1971: 17-18; Kullmann 1981: 23. At 1960: 29-50 passim Kullmann repeatedly speaks of a traditional or oral poet as unaware of his errors.

⁹⁵ As do most of the scholars cited in the notes below as agreeing with neo-analysts about certain correspondences.

Iliad are probably allusions to that story, not mishandled borrowings. It is clear that the vengeance theory as a whole cannot stand. A minor occurrence of the typical motif of vengeance in one episode of the Trojan war should not be considered the model for the basic plot of the *Iliad*.

On the whole, though, I find neo-analytic research stimulating. I believe it has established that there are similarities between motifs in the *Iliad* and in the extra-*Iliadic* tradition of the Trojan war, and that at least sometimes the Homeric employment of them is secondary. That alone has greatly increased our understanding of Homer's use of myth. The most recent practice of neo-analysis has wisely adopted aspects of oral theory and as a result can provide a more credible picture of pre-Homeric traditions. M. Edwards has pointed out (1990: 322-323) that though the speculation of neo-analysts may seem unrestrained, its procedure is nevertheless acceptable as a "working hypothesis." Rejection of the vengeance theory does not invalidate all neo-analytical research. It will be apparent below that I agree with many of the neo-analytical arguments developed in support of the vengeance theory.

3. The Achilles-Memnon Episode in the *Iliad*

According to the vengeance theory

Below I will list motifs in the poem that adherents to the vengeance theory commonly believe reflect motifs in the Achilles-Memnon episode. My presentation is necessarily a summary of their views, but I think it accurately portrays the major arguments shared by the leading neo-analysts. Notes and discussion will indicate more clearly the opinions of individual neo-analysts. I shall list motifs alleged by neo-analysts to be transferred into the *Iliad* from the Achilles-Memnon episode as they occur in our *Iliad*. Identification of their correspondence to the Achilles-Memnon episode will be made through the system of letters I employed to reconstruct that story in the last chapter.

In the heading for each motif discussed I shall place in parentheses the letter of the element in my reconstruction of the Achilles-Memnon episode that corresponds to the motif at least partially. In Appendix B a list of the motifs without commentary can be found, and this should be consulted for an overview of the vengeance theory as it applies to passages in the *Iliad*.

The correspondence of characters: Patroclus~Antilochus, Patroclus~Achilles, Sarpedon~Memnon, Hector~Memnon, Achilles~Thetis, Achilles prefigures himself

bk. 1: *Achilles withdraws from battle after a quarrel with Agamemnon (~A).*

This withdrawal is thought to correspond to a supposed withdrawal by Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode after Thetis has given him a prediction. I think this comparison is very misguided. First of all, I have argued that Achilles probably did not withdraw from battle in the Achilles-Memnon episode (see p. 192ff. above). Secondly, withdrawal from battle by a hero is a typical motif (see n.20 above). We find it in the *Iliad* associated not only with Achilles, but also with Meleager, Paris, and Aeneas. There is some justification to suppose that the withdrawal of Meleager mimics that of Achilles, but only because of more specific details that make the situations of the two heroes correspond (see pp. 185-186 above). One could not link Paris and Aeneas, for example, with Achilles simply because they share a typical motif with Achilles.⁹⁶ So even if Achilles did withdraw from battle after his mother's prediction in the Achilles-Memnon episode, it would be wrong to think that his withdrawal in the *Iliad* was inspired by that incident. Thirdly, if we look for further correspondences between Achilles' withdrawal in the *Iliad* and the alleged withdrawal in the Achilles-Memnon episode, we find that there are none. In fact the two situations are quite dissimilar. In one withdrawal results from anger arising in a quarrel (another typical motif, see p. 203 above); in the other, it is

⁹⁶ *Pace* J. Kakridis; see n.21 above.

supposed to result from a prophecy about the future. The circumstances are so different that it is difficult to see how one could inspire the other. Schadewaldt attempts to portray the disparity as a mark of Homer's great creativity (1965: 182-183), but this explanation (despite Schadewaldt's impressive rhetorical skills) is ultimately unconvincing.

A fundamental assumption of the vengeance theory, that the withdrawal of Achilles in the *Iliad* is modeled on a withdrawal of Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode, is thus very unlikely. Neo-analysts seem to recognize that there are some problems with the correspondence, for though all adherents to the vengeance theory at least implicitly believe in it, arguments for it are seldom openly made. Schadewaldt briefly makes the comparison (1965: 171), and on his graph of corresponding motifs between the *Iliad* and the "Memnonis" (173) he connects the scene of his "Memnonis" in which Achilles withdraws to book 1 of the *Iliad* (using a dotted line, apparently a hesitant version of the usual line of dashes). Schoeck provides the clearest expression of the correspondence (see esp. 9, 14), not without some embarrassment, for he has to note repeatedly the differences between the cause of withdrawal ("...allerdings aus einem völlig andern Grunde," 9).

A variant of this argument focuses on a brief statement by Nestor at *Il.* 11.794-795. The old man suggests to Patroclus that Achilles might be abstaining from battle on account of a prophecy. Patroclus repeats his words to Achilles in book 16 when requesting to be sent out in Achilles' armor (on these passages see discussion at pp. 115ff. above in chapter 2). Neo-analysts have sometimes argued that Nestor's suggestion is abrupt and unmotivated, and so must be a reflection of a pre-existing motif, namely, the supposed withdrawal of Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode.⁹⁷ But Nestor's remark need not be considered so unusual. The old man could honestly not understand the reasons for Achilles' withdrawal because he only received a second-hand report of the

⁹⁷ Kullmann 1960: 309-310, 313. Cf. Schoeck 87; Schadewaldt 1965: 167. Monro 1901: 359 n.15 also considered this a correspondence, but under the assumption that the *Aethiopsis* was derivative from the *Iliadic* passage.

words Achilles expressed with so much difficulty in book 9. Alternatively, one could suppose that Nestor is provocatively misrepresenting Achilles' motivation. In either interpretation, Nestor's comments can be viewed as naturally arising from the situation of the *Iliad*, and therefore they need not be linked with some pre-existing motif. But the main problem with this argument is the circular logic to which neo-analysts sometimes fall prey. It is methodologically unsound to reconstruct a withdrawal in the Achilles-Memnon episode from a passage of the *Iliad* with no other evidence, and then conclude that the passage of the *Iliad* is a reflection of that reconstruction.

bk. 8: Nestor is saved by Diomedes from Hector (~B)

At *Il.* 8.80ff. Nestor's chariot becomes disabled and Hector approaches threateningly; the life of the old man is saved by the intervention of Diomedes. Neo-analysts compare this scene to the rescue of Nestor from Memnon by Antilochus in the Achilles-Memnon episode.⁹⁸ It is supposed that a famous event in Nestor's life has been transferred chronologically to an earlier time.

The two scenes are remarkably similar; in both a horse of Nestor is wounded by an arrow shot by Paris, in both a champion of Troy attacks the helpless old man, in both a younger Greek arrives to ward off the danger. But a difficulty with the neo-analytical argument is that there is nothing inappropriate about the rescue of Nestor in the *Iliad* which might reveal that it is secondary. And the story of the rescue of Nestor by Antilochus is more dramatic and compelling than the episode in book 8. A son dies after saving his father; in book 8, it is not Nestor's son but Diomedes who intervenes, and no one dies. Neo-analysts explain the difference with the argument that Homer often

⁹⁸ Pestalozzi 9ff.; Schadewaldt 1965: 163; Kullmann 1960: 314, 1981: 19-20, 1991: 441-442; Schoeck 20ff. Cf. J. Kakridis 1949: 94. Analysts preceded them in this opinion, but argued that this revealed the passage was a late addition to the *Iliad* (see J. Kakridis 1949: 94; Heubeck 1974: 42; Kullmann 1981: 7). For a contrary view, see Dihle 11ff. See also Kullmann's summary of and reply to criticism of the neo-analytical position on this issue at 1960: 31-32. Cf. the typically idiosyncratic argument of Reinhardt 363-364 (followed by Fenik 1964: 32 n.6; but at 1968: 223-224 he is uncertain).

weakened the effect of a motif which he had adopted (see p. 198 with n.45 above). This is a debatable proposal, but neo-analysts can also point out that the slaying of Antilochus by Memnon is certainly pre-Homeric, since it is mentioned in the *Odyssey*, and argue that the rescue of Nestor must have been part of this pre-Homeric story. That argument is not certain, but it has persuaded many scholars that a story about Antilochus rescuing Nestor inspired the passage in book 8 of the *Iliad*.⁹⁹

A question that remains is why Antilochus could not have rescued his father in book 8 of the *Iliad*. Of course, Homer could not portray the death of Antilochus in this scene, for that would contradict tradition. But Antilochus could have survived, as Diomedes does. Whitman suggests (166) that Antilochus is well enough portrayed by Diomedes, for he views Nestor as a father-figure to Diomedes, citing Nestor's adoption of a fatherly tone towards him at 9.53-59. But it is difficult to consider the great warrior Diomedes as a stand-in for Antilochus (he is usually compared with Achilles; see next element). A more plausible argument may be that Nestor is the "pivot" of an incomplete transference that does not try to recreate the original context exactly (see p. 189 above). If a famous event in the old man's life is meant to be evoked, this could be done without the presence of Antilochus.

I am therefore inclined to suppose that the two scenes at least partially correspond and that the motif originated in the Achilles-Memnon episode. Let us consider the implications of this for the vengeance theory. Adherents of it believe that this scene was central to the Achilles-Memnon episode, for they think that the death of Antilochus inspired Achilles to renounce his withdrawal and take vengeance on Memnon. I have already established that there would not have been a withdrawal to renounce. The death of Antilochus thus could not be as important as neo-analysts believe, and so the passage

⁹⁹ Willcock 1973: 6ff. well summarizes the arguments for and against and agrees with the neo-analytical position. Scheliha 400; Whitman 166; Ramage 293; M. Edwards 1990: 313, 1991: 18; Janko 1992: 379 find it attractive. I think theories about other passages in the *Iliad* reflecting the death of Antilochus (e.g. Reinhardt 364-365; Schoeck 20ff.; Kullmann 1991: 441-442; Janko 1992 *ad* 16: 470-475) much less compelling.

in book 8 is not reflecting a central aspect of the Achilles-Memnon episode. There is nothing about Hector in this scene that corresponds to Memnon, other than that both are the threatening opponent. Diomedes does not obviously correspond to Antilochus, and Diomedes survives his rescue of Nestor. Because the transferred motif is incomplete, the death of Antilochus is not even represented. Homer may indeed be alluding to a famous moment of helplessness in the life of Nestor, but he does not seem especially interested in evoking Memnon's killing of Antilochus. In addition, the scene is isolated from other motifs in the *Iliad* which are possibly transferred from the Achilles-Memnon episode and thus does not seem to be linked significantly to them. If this is a transferred motif, why is it so fleeting, isolated, and incomplete? The explanation may be that the rescue of Nestor was in fact not central to the duel between Achilles and Memnon, but rather detachable and self-contained. The important aspects of it were the threat to Nestor's life and the fidelity of his son Antilochus (see p. 142 in chapter three). Neo-analysts may have correctly argued that this passage reflects pre-Homeric myth, but they have over-stressed its importance and misinterpreted its significance. The scene does not evoke a story of vengeance, and not even the Achilles-Memnon episode, but only a tangent to that story.

bk. 11 *Diomedes is shot in the foot by Paris (~F)*

Neo-analysts have sometimes argued that the wounding of Diomedes by Paris reflects the lethal wounding of Achilles by Paris.¹⁰⁰ The idea seems plausible because Diomedes takes the place of Achilles in the middle books of the *Iliad*, as is commonly recognized.¹⁰¹ Fenik challenged the neo-analytical interpretation of the passage by noting

¹⁰⁰ Pestalozzi 17; Schoeck 76-77; P. Kakridis 293 n.1; Heubeck 1974: 46; Kullmann 1984: 313-315, 1991: 441 n.65. Mueller 53; M. Edwards 1987a: 63-64, 1991: 18; McLeod 1987a: 35; Janko 1992: 409; Stanley 421 n.158 find the idea attractive.

¹⁰¹ Schoeck 75ff. well discusses Diomedes as an Achilles figure; cf. Nagy 1979: 30-31. Schein 81, however, doubts this interpretation, preferring to see the resemblance as the result of *aristeia* typology; Mueller 97-98 disputes this type of argument. Besides Diomedes' replacement of Achilles as champion of the Greeks, a flame appears round his head in an anticipatory doublet of the same occurring to Achilles (see p. 184 above), and Trojans explicitly compare the two at 6.96ff. Their prayer that Diomedes will fall at the Scaean gates at 6.305 would seem to be an allusion to Achilles' fate. At 8.195 Diomedes wears a breastplate

that though a foot wound is unparalleled in the *Iliad*, the structure of the scene is similar to scenes in book 5 (cf. 102ff., 280 ff.) in which Pandarus encounters and wounds Diomedes. He therefore concluded that the wounding of Diomedes in book 11 was composed of typical motifs and could not be a reflection of the wounding of Achilles.¹⁰² Kullmann accepted his findings, but argued that the unusual wound was a special motif that belonged to Achilles even if it was in the midst of a typical narrative sequence. Therefore, he proposed, the wounding of Diomedes still reflected the wounding of Achilles. I find his reasoning compelling, but the correspondence could not exist unless such a wounding of Achilles, apparently linked to the concept of a uniquely vulnerable heel, was known in pre-Homeric myth. That is an uncertain and difficult issue that will be explored in chapter five. In the meantime I will merely observe that if this is a transferred motif, it is incomplete and isolated. Diomedes does not die from this wound, and I do not think that the focus on Odysseus and Ajax in following scenes can be viewed as a reflection of their rescue of the corpse of Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode.¹⁰³ It would also be an isolated motif: there are no other possible motifs from the Achilles-Memnon episode immediately before or after it. Thus this incident could only be a passing reference to the Achilles-Memnon episode.

bk. 16: *Achilles warns Patroclus before battle (~A)*

I noted in my reconstruction that the brief report by Proclus about the prophecy by Thetis to Achilles in the *Aethiopsis* is unclear, and that Proclus is the only source for this incident. However, I tentatively concluded that it was part of pre-Homeric myth about Homer, not exclusive to the *Aethiopsis*, and that the comments of Thetis were about the

made by Hephaestus (cf. Achilles' Hephaestan armor), but well-made artifacts are commonly ascribed to this divinity.

¹⁰² Fenik 1968: 234ff. Taplin 1992: 164 n.18; Hainsworth 1993a *ad loc.* consider his argument conclusive.

¹⁰³ See Fenik 1968: 232-233.

impending death of Achilles. Neo-analysts have sometimes compared this situation with the beginning of *Il.*16.¹⁰⁴ As Thetis apparently speaks to Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode before he goes into battle, Achilles speaks to Patroclus before he goes into battle. Achilles offers no prediction, but he does offer a warning to Patroclus. He tells him, among other things, to return after routing the Trojans (87) and not to lead the troops toward Troy (92), lest a god oppose him (93). He then goes on to specify Apollo as the god who favors the Trojans (94) and again urges Patroclus to turn back in time (95-96).¹⁰⁵ In general, these words would fit a warning from Thetis to Achilles in which he was urged not to attack Troy lest he find Apollo opposing him. She might make this warning because it is Achilles' fate to be killed by Apollo near the city walls.

At 16.85 Achilles also claims to be concerned about losing the gifts offered by Agamemnon if Patroclus is too successful. The passage is notorious because some interpret it as a discrepancy with Achilles' previous refusal to accept the gifts. I will not enter that controversy here other than to observe that the comment can easily be viewed as a contribution to the characterization of Achilles. One might suppose that though he refused the gifts, he is still under the sway of their attraction and perhaps belatedly has taken the moral of Phoenix's tale about Meleager to heart: the offer of gifts may be withdrawn. Alternatively, one might suppose that Achilles is embarrassed over his affectionate concern for Patroclus or embarrassed by his implication that Patroclus is not up to the task, and so offers a selfish motive for the warning.

It should also be noted that at 18.14 Achilles claims he warned Patroclus not to fight Hector. Nothing like this can be found in his words in book 16. Perhaps Achilles in book 18 either consciously or unconsciously has made his previous warning seem more presentient than it actually was. But there may be no mention of Hector in the warning by Achilles at the beginning of 16 because his words reflect a well-known warning by Thetis

¹⁰⁴ See Pestalozzi 45; Schadewaldt 1965: 195; and especially Schoeck 85ff. Whitman 199, 201; Lowenstam 1981: 112ff., 124; Janko 1992: 313, 315ff. have found this argument persuasive.

¹⁰⁵ Cf. Poseidon's advice to Achilles at 21.293ff. to turn back from the walls once he kills Hector.

to her son. She would have focused on Apollo, not Memnon, since according to fate Apollo presented the real danger to her son. Achilles in book 16 should be concerned about the possibility of Hector, not Apollo, harming Patroclus. His focus on Apollo and neglect of Hector is more understandable once the extra-Iliadic scene between Thetis and Achilles is taken into consideration.

If Patroclus represents Achilles in this warning scene, does that mean Achilles represents Thetis? I have noted that a motif may be transferred incompletely (see p. 189 above). Patroclus may be considered the pivot of an incomplete motif transference; correspondence between him and Achilles does not necessitate a correspondence between Achilles and Thetis. Yet there is reason to picture the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus as a mother-son relationship.¹⁰⁶ Achilles refers to himself as a mother bird at 9.323-24, and at 16.7-10 he compares Patroclus' confrontation of him to a daughter's pestering of her mother. It is therefore tempting to suppose that Achilles represents Thetis in this scene. At the very least I think that the scene at the beginning of book 16 reflects a meeting between Thetis and Achilles before his duel with Memnon.

Some neo-analysts ignore this correspondence or mention it only in passing, for the vengeance theory demands that Patroclus correspond more to Antilochus than to Achilles. In addition, an allusion to element A of the Achilles-Memnon episode in book 16 might seem to compete with the neo-analytical argument that Achilles' withdrawal in book 1 reflects an alleged withdrawal in the Achilles-Memnon episode (see pp. 217-219 above). It would be awkward for neo-analysts to argue that there is a reflection of a withdrawal of Achilles in book 1 of the *Iliad* and then much later in book 16 a reflection of the warning of Achilles that supposedly caused it. Admittedly such an argument is possible if one supposes that Homer is borrowing from extra-Iliadic myth in a disorganized manner. But another concern is that since Patroclus does not withdraw after the warning by Achilles, the scene at the beginning of book 16 poorly reflects the neo-

¹⁰⁶ See remarks made by Janko 1992: 315-317 *passim*.

analytical conception of what happened in the Achilles-Memnon episode. If we reject the supposition that Achilles did withdraw after the warning by Thetis, then these problems vanish. The withdrawal of Achilles in book 1 need not correspond to anything in the Achilles-Memnon episode, and the scene at the beginning of book 16 corresponds well to the warning of Achilles by Thetis in the Achilles-Memnon episode.

Patroclus kills Sarpedon (-C).

Neo-analysts commonly think that Patroclus corresponds to Achilles when he kills Sarpedon, and that accordingly Sarpedon is a Memnon figure.¹⁰⁷ Like Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode, Patroclus meets a foreign ally of Troy and defeats him. It is difficult to believe that Patroclus, as the attendant of Achilles, traditionally accomplished this feat. Patroclus seems quite capable of performing chores faithfully, as he does in book 9, and perhaps fighting beside Achilles, but he should not normally perform the heroic deeds of book 16.¹⁰⁸ I therefore suspect that they are the heroic deeds of Achilles transferred to the character of Patroclus. In general the correspondence of Patroclus to Achilles seems convincing.

That correspondence would seem to imply that Sarpedon corresponds to Memnon. But there is not much in the narration of Sarpedon's death that specifically corresponds to Memnon's death. The famous use of scales during the duel between Achilles and Memnon is not present here. Scales are mentioned at 16.558 to describe Hector's recognition that the tide has turned, but that is some time after Sarpedon's death, and hardly comparable.¹⁰⁹ It is notable, however, that there is a scene in Olympus before Sarpedon's death in which his fate is at least said to be in doubt. That might be thought to

¹⁰⁷ Pestalozzi 13ff., 44-45; Heubeck 1991: 463-464; Schadewaldt 1965: 169; Kullmann 1960: 318; Schoeck 15-16, 23ff., 58ff., passim. Fenik 1964: 34 n.5; Schein 26; Janko 1992: 313 also see Sarpedon as a Memnon figure.

¹⁰⁸ Thus Whitman 200, who concludes he is playing the part of Achilles. McLeod 1987a: 37 stresses the surprising transformation of Patroclus in the second half of the poem.

¹⁰⁹ Pace Schoeck 25, 60; Clark/Coulson 65ff.; Janko 1992 ad 16.658.

be generally comparable to the use of scales at Olympus in the Achilles-Memnon episode.¹¹⁰ I doubt that Homer invented the character of Sarpedon to provide a Memnon for Patroclus to kill, but the poet may well have been the first to have Patroclus kill this traditional Lycian hero.¹¹¹

*Sarpedon's corpse is removed from the field by Thanatos
and Hypnos (~D)*

The comparison between the removal of Sarpedon's corpse and the removal of Memnon's corpse is standard in neo-analytical research.¹¹² The view that the motif of translation by Thanatos and Hypnos originally belonged to Memnon, not Sarpedon, arose in the nineteenth century on the evidence of art.¹¹³ Sometimes in early Greek art Thanatos and Hypnos are depicted carrying the corpse of Sarpedon in apparent illustration of *Il.* 16.681-683, where it is stated that they took his corpse to Lycia (See Bothmer 63ff.). However, other art work shows Thanatos and Hypnos with Memnon, as I noted in my reconstruction of the Achilles-Memnon episode (see p. 149 above in chapter three). The issue thus has centered on some early vases without inscriptions that can be interpreted as depicting either Memnon or Sarpedon with Thanatos and Hypnos.¹¹⁴

¹¹⁰ I would hesitate to stress detailed correspondences, for example between Zeus and Eos (e.g. Schoeck 25).

¹¹¹ See Scheliha 262, 397; Heubeck 1974: 166; Janko 1992: 313-315 for bibliography and discussion of the idea that Homer imported Sarpedon as a traditional Lycian hero into myth about the Trojan war.

¹¹² Pestalozzi 13 ff., passim; Heubeck 1991: 463; Schadewaldt 1965: 160, 165; Kullmann 1960: 318-320; Schoeck 8, 16, 23-25, passim. Fenik 1964: 30-31; Clarke/Coulson 67ff.; A. Edwards 1985: 223; Schein 26 (cf. 48) follow the neo-analytical interpretation; Janko 1992: 313 and *ad* 16.666-683; M. Edwards 1990: 313, 1991: 18 think it is possible. For a contrary view, cf. Reinhardt 343, 376-377; 388-390; Dihle 17ff.; Nagler 43 n.25; Davies 1989a: 57. See also Kullmann's summary of criticism with reply at 1960: 34-36.

¹¹³ The development of the issue in the past is well traced by Bothmer 72, 76-77; see Holland 2676ff. for an older and more complete description. Kullmann 1981: 6 n.3, 7 n.6 and Schadewaldt 1965: 450 n.2, 165 note previous scholars who influenced neo-analysis on this matter.

¹¹⁴ Clark/Coulson and Weiss (*LIMC* "Eos") tend to favor identification of Memnon with Hypnos and Thanatos on the uncertain vases, Bothmer and Kossatz-Deissmann 1992 (*LIMC* "Memnon") are skeptical of this. Clark/Coulson 71 list four possibilities (also listed at Bothmer 77 [figs. 74-76, 82]); Bothmer 80 proved one of these (fig. 74) was of Sarpedon through discovery of an inscription on it. Two other of the remaining three are *LIMC* "Eos" no. 320="Memnon" no. 69 and "Eos" no. 321. See Weiss under "Eos" no. 329 and Kossatz-Deissmann 1992 under "Memnon" no. 69 for two additional possibilities.

Neo-analysts and their predecessors have usually thought that this art work gave ample testimony of the removal of Memnon by Thanatos and Hypnos. They therefore assumed that art commonly associated the motif with both heroes and concentrated on the question of priority. Numerous arguments have been advanced on this question, most of them unpersuasive. Kullmann rather cleverly argued (1960: 34) that the combination of Thanatos and Hypnos is especially appropriate for a hero who will receive immortality (i.e. Memnon, not Sarpedon), because they signify that he will awaken from his death. Davies argued quite differently (1989a: 57) that it is illogical for Thanatos to transport the immortalized Memnon (but he has died, after all; and note that in the previous chapter [see p. 146ff.] I proposed that his translation is to a place of burial, not to a paradise). Some neo-analysts have tried to argue that Thanatos and Hypnos are brothers of Eos, and thus would have originally been associated with her son, not with Sarpedon.¹¹⁵ This genealogy, however, is very questionable. Clark/Coulson argued (70 ff.) that since some depictions of Sarpedon with Thanatos and Hypnos on vases do not literally follow the *Iliad* (e.g. other characters are added to the scene), they must be modeled on myth about Memnon. This is a good point, though we might wonder if myth about Sarpedon's translation existed independently of Homer. In that case, these vases could simply be more evidence of non-Homeric traditions surviving the supposedly overwhelming influence of Homer in the Archaic Age. But if Homer was the first to place Sarpedon in the setting of the Trojan war, as is sometimes supposed (see n.111 above), then his translation would have originated in the *Iliad*, not in tradition. Seen in this light the argument of Clark/Coulson is very persuasive.

The neo-analytical argument may be undercut, however, by recent doubts whether Memnon should be identified as the corpse with Hypnos and Thanatos on many of the early unidentified vases. The lack of inscriptions and questions over the iconography of

¹¹⁵ Schadewaldt 1965: 165; Kullmann 1960: 35, 36. Thanatos and Hypnos are said to be children of Nyx at Hesiod *Theog.* 758-759. Eos is said to be child of Nyx at Quintus of Smyrna 2.625-627, but not elsewhere (e.g. not at Hesiod *Theog.* 371ff.).

Eos on these vases have led to this skepticism.¹¹⁶ If indeed these vases are depicting Sarpedon and not Memnon, that would mean that Thanatos and Hypnos are almost exclusively associated with Sarpedon in surviving art work. The relatively few certain scenes in which Memnon is definitely carried by Thanatos and Hypnos might then easily be considered imitations of Sarpedon's translation. It is also possible that translation by Thanatos and Hypnos was a typical motif, applicable to any hero.¹¹⁷

Therefore one cannot claim with confidence that the handling of the body of Sarpedon by Thanatos and Hypnos is derived from the Achilles-Memnon story. The evidence of art does not clearly establish that the motif of Memnon's removal by Thanatos and Hypnos inspired Homer's portrayal of Sarpedon's translation. Perhaps Thanatos and Hypnos were not originally even involved in early Greek myth about the translation of Memnon. There is no literary evidence that they were, and art more commonly depicts Eos with the body of Memnon (see p. 149 above in chapter three). What is certain is that the body of Memnon was somehow removed from Troy through divine intervention, just as the body of Sarpedon is removed through divine intervention in the *Iliad*. Sarpedon might be said to correspond generally to Memnon in this respect.

Patroclus routs the Trojans and attacks Troy (~E)

Neo-analysts compare the attack on Troy by Patroclus with the one made by Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode.¹¹⁸ After Patroclus successfully routs the Trojans, he attacks Troy at 16.698ff. The poet remarks that Patroclus would have taken

¹¹⁶ See Bothmer *passim*, Kossatz-Deissmann 1992 (*LIMC* "Memnon") pp. 448, 456, 460-461. Kossatz-Deissmann's skepticism is significant because she favors neo-analytical research. However, Weiss (*LIMC* "Eos") pp. 784, 786, 789 rightly notes that the absence of wings is no criterion for doubting the identification of Eos, though Kossatz-Deissmann assumes that it is (undoubted depictions of Eos without wings occur in other circumstances; even Hypnos and Thanatos can appear without wings [see Bothmer 67, 74, figs. 70, 79]).

¹¹⁷ Fenik 1968: 237; Dihle 19-20.

¹¹⁸ Pestalozzi 45; Schadewaldt 1965: 195; Schoeck 68ff, *passim*. See also Whitman 201, 345 n.55; Schein 26; Janko 1992: 399. Other neo-analysts and scholars at least imply this correspondence when comparing the deaths of the two, a correspondence discussed immediately below.

the city if Apollo had not prevented him; Thetis at 18.454-456 makes the same claim when speaking to Hephaestus. Apollo convinces Patroclus to retire, but it seems that he does not retire far. At 17.404ff. it is reported that the battle over his corpse is beneath the walls. In the same passage Achilles is said to have believed Patroclus would turn back from the wall, which implies that the opposite occurred. Perhaps Patroclus himself provides the best testimony that he died beneath the city walls. At 23.80-81 the words "καὶ δὲ αὐτῷ μοῖρα, θεοῖς ἐπέκελ' Ἀχιλλεῦ, / τεύχει ὑπο Τρώων εὐφενέων ἀπολέσθαι," spoken by the shade of Patroclus, may essentially mean, "You *also* (besides me) must die under the city wall." In his attack on the city Patroclus is acting exactly as Achilles seems to have done when he died. Indeed, the poet seems to invite us to think of Achilles' later attack on the city at 16.707-709, where Apollo says to Patroclus that Troy is not fated to be taken by either him or Achilles.

It should be stressed that this attack on Troy is very unusual. Andromache recalls a joint attack on the walls of Troy by a group of Greek leaders (6.433ff.), but there is no account in myth of a single hero besides Achilles attacking the walls of Troy. And once again it is surprising that someone who is normally the attendant of Achilles should perform such heroics (see p. 225 with n.108 above). I think this attack on Troy can be considered a specific motif, belonging to Achilles, which has been transferred to the Patroclus of the *Iliad*.

*Patroclus is killed by Hector (-B); Patroclus is killed by Apollo,
Euphorbus, and Hector (-F)*

Nothing is more unwieldy in the vengeance theory than its proposal that one passage in the *Iliad* reflects two scenes in the Achilles-Memnon story at once. The death of Patroclus is compared to the slaying of Antilochus by Memnon and also compared to the slaying of Achilles by Apollo and Paris. Patroclus is thus thought to correspond to

Antilochus and to Achilles at the same moment. This is an untenable proposal, and no amount of ingenuity by the neo-analysts can make it convincing.

First, let us examine the proposal that the death of Patroclus corresponds to the death of Antilochus.¹¹⁹ There is no detail in this passage that one can link with the death of Antilochus. Antilochus dies while defending Nestor; nothing in the death scene of Patroclus corresponds to that situation. The comparison depends entirely on accepting Patroclus as an Antilochus figure. That both Patroclus and Antilochus are friends of Achilles and that both their slayers are killed by Achilles is the evidence for this correspondence. I have demonstrated above that this is an insufficient argument (see pp. 199ff.).

Let us examine the argument that the death of Patroclus corresponds to the death of Achilles. The correspondence is noted by all the leading neo-analysts and has gained wide acceptance outside of their school of thought.¹²⁰ Like Achilles, Patroclus is attacking Troy, and, also like Achilles, Patroclus dies at the walls of Troy. Furthermore, the role of Apollo in the slaying of Patroclus is reminiscent of his role in the slaying of Achilles. At 16.721ff. Apollo approaches Hector in the guise of a mortal and urges him to kill Patroclus, and adds that Apollo will grant him the glory of the deed (cf. 18.456). He subsequently makes Patroclus helpless with a stunning blow that knocks off his armor.

The fact that Apollo is involved in the death of Patroclus seems to be certain evidence that this scene imitates the death of Achilles, for the famous participation of Apollo in the slaying of Achilles is undoubtedly a specific motif that belongs to that

¹¹⁹ See especially Pestalozzi 45; Heubeck 1991: 464-465; Schadewaldt 1965: 176; Kullmann 1960: 314-316, 1981: 42; Schoeck 45, *passim*.

¹²⁰ J. Kakridis 1949: 85-88; Pestalozzi 16, 45; Heubeck 1991: 465, 1954: 93-94, 1974: 40ff.; Schadewaldt 1965: 169, 194-195; Kullmann 1960: 321, 1981: 9, 19, 1984: 310, 1991: 440; Schoeck 15-16, 68ff, *passim*. Kullmann points out (1981: 9) that this proposal has met with much agreement. See e.g. Scheliha 264; 397-398; Whitman 201, 345 n.52; Reinhardt 354; Ramage 293; Fenik 1964: 34 n.5; G. Nagy 1979: 63, *passim*; Mueller 53; Lowenstam 1981: 116-117; Schein 26, 155; de Romilly 33ff.; A. Edwards 1984: 76ff.; Janko 1992 *ad* 16.777-867; Garner 1993: 153-154. Scheliha and Garner provide bibliography of scholars who preceded neo-analysts in observation of the correspondence.

hero's story.¹²¹ Surprisingly, some critics have argued that the participation of Apollo in a heroic death is a typical motif.¹²² It is true that in one version of the death of Meleager Apollo is said to kill him. Pausanias 10.31.3 reports it was in the Hesiodic *Catalogue* and in the *Minyas*; and two papyrus fragments specify Apollo as the slayer of Meleager.¹²³ This is sometimes called the "heroic" version as opposed to the "folklore" version involving the firebrand that contains Meleager's life force.¹²⁴ I agree with those scholars who view the folklore version as primary.¹²⁵ Pausanias can trace it no farther back than Phrynichus' *Pleuroniae*, but that is no proof that it is late. In fact, Pausanias states that Phrynichus mentions this version as if it was well known throughout Greece.¹²⁶ And as Pausanias states, the *Iliad* narrates a different version from the one in which Apollo kills Meleager.¹²⁷ That would suggest Homer knew the folklore version and the curse of Meleager by his mother in book 9 of the *Iliad* is Homer's variant of it, since in both the death of the son is brought about by his mother.¹²⁸ Homer's use of this variant is necessary, for Phoenix must preserve the traditional element of Althaea's anger towards her son (caused by Meleager's slaying of his mother's brothers, surely pre-Homeric) to

¹²¹ Heubeck 1978: 12 makes this claim.

¹²² Notopoulos 34-35; Fenik 1968: 238; Thalmann 50-51. Fenik 1968: 217 also compares the death of Patroclus to the death of Alcaeus at 13.434ff., where Poseidon is said to blind and immobilize Alcaeus before Idomeneus slays him. But Poseidon is not actually portrayed as striking Alcaeus. In fact, at 351ff. it is made explicitly clear that Poseidon, fearful of Zeus, limits his activity to rousing the Greeks in the form of a man. Poseidon is simply used in this passage to express the state of mind in Alcaeus poetically.

¹²³ Fr. 25, 280 MW. Fr. 25 is ascribed to the *Catalogue*, 280 to a lost poem about the descent of Perithous to Hades (but see March 34; Hainsworth 1993a: 132).

¹²⁴ J. Frazer 1: 64-65 nn. 4-5; Willcock 1964: 153-154; Hainsworth 1993a: 119-120 well survey the variants of this story. Bacchylides 5, Ovid *Met.* 8.445ff. best illustrate the folklore version.

¹²⁵ J. Kakridis 1949: 14; Webster 1958: 248-250; Willcock 1964: 151; Rosner 324; Hainsworth 1993a: 131 (cautiously).

¹²⁶ March recognizes this, but argues that Stesichorus invented and immediately popularized the folklore version (44). Young 1979: 10 similarly argued that a "near-Phrynichus" invented the folklore version; cf. his equally dubious argument that a "near-Stasius" invented the motif of Achilles' heel, an idea discussed at pp. 266ff. in chapter five.

¹²⁷ Willcock 1964: 152 stresses that this is significant; March 40 n.61 takes issue with him. At 34ff. she unpersuasively argues that the curse was invented by Homer but is meant to suggest Meleager's death through Apollo, which she thinks is pre-Homeric. Thalmann 201 n.52 also thinks the curse and a death by Apollo are compatible. Note, however, that Apollodorus *Bibl.* 1.8.3 finishes Homer's version (with the curse) by simply stating Meleager fell in battle; there is no mention of Apollo.

¹²⁸ Thus Hainsworth 1993a: 132; Murnaghan 247; Macleod 142 ("[the curse] is close to the usual version of the story whose essence is that the anger of Meleager's mother causes his end").

motivate the withdrawal of Meleager (newly added to the story by Homer, I believe), but yet avoid an immediate death for Meleager (the result of burning the brand).¹²⁹ An immediate death for Meleager would be too harsh an evocation Achilles' fate and would also preclude the embassy to Meleager which so strongly parallels the embassy to Achilles. The curse is the perfect substitution for the fire brand. Therefore the primary version, which Homer would have known, is the folklore version (in which a firebrand is featured), and the heroic version (death by Apollo) is a unlikely variant that ruins the basic premises of the whole story. It should not make us regard Achilles' death by Apollo a typical motif.

J. Kakridis argued (1949: 13-14) that the variant in which Apollo killed Meleager arose under the influence of the *Iliad*, where the two heroes are made to seem so similar.¹³⁰ I do not agree, for I demonstrated above in chapter one that influence of the *Iliad* on its tradition is unlikely at an early date. But I do suspect that the "heroic" version of Meleager's death was uncommon. Apollodorus *Bibl.* 1.8.3 does not seem to know of it; he tells the folklore version and then as an afterthought essentially summarizes Homer's version (not identifying it as such). He does not conclude this Homeric-seeming version with Meleager dying by Apollo; apparently Meleager dies in fighting as a result of Althaea's curse. This is essentially a variant of the folklore version, with the curse substituted for the firebrand, as I have demonstrated. For Apollodorus the heroic version that told of Meleager's death by the hand of Apollo does not even deserve mention. We have a few hints that it existed at an early date, but we cannot assume that it was dominant or even common. In addition, the manner in which Meleager died in the heroic version may have been quite different from the manner in which Achilles died. It appears

¹²⁹ Reinhardt 21 proposes that originally the Meleager story featured the wrath of Meleager's mother and that in Homer the focus shifts to Meleager's wrath, in imitation of Achilles. Willcock 1964: 150 demonstrates that Meleager's slaying of his uncles is pre-Homeric. If that is true, it suggests that Althea must have traditionally caused her son's death in response to the death of her brothers. March 35-36 argues unpersuasively that Homer added Meleager's slaying of his uncles to the story.

¹³⁰ Cf. Garner's belief (1993: 163-164) that Bacchylides associated Achilles with Meleager and that there is a hint of this association in fragments of Stesichorus.

as if Apollo killed Meleager by himself, a concept that does not normally apply to Achilles' story (see pp. 152-153 in chapter three). But even if I am wrong, and the motif of heroic death through Apollo was a "doublet" associated with two characters in early Greek myth, Achilles and Meleager, that does not mean that it would be unremarkable if Achilles' *therapon* died in a manner famously associated with Achilles. The participation of Apollo in the slaying of Patroclus must evoke the death of Achilles.

The death of Patroclus does not exactly reflect the death of Achilles, however. Achilles is slain by bow and arrow, Patroclus by spears. Instead of Paris, here Euphorbos and Hector are the mortal agents of the slaying. Do these differences negate the correspondence? I do not think so. Homer need not, and should not, preserve all of the details in extra-Iliadic material when he re-uses it. If Homer had exactly reproduced the death of Achilles in book 16, he would have to jettison much of the *Iliad* as we know it. Paris would have killed Patroclus, and the *menis* of Achilles would have to be directed at him, an unsuitable recipient of it. And the requirements of tradition need to be taken into consideration. Apparently Paris is usually killed by Philoctetes (as in the summary of the *Little Iliad* by Proclus), and Patroclus may have been traditionally killed by Hector, for all we know. In addition, Euphorbus adds to the correspondence between the death of Achilles and the death of Patroclus, for Euphorbus is similar to Paris.¹³¹ Thus the differences between the death of Patroclus and the death of Achilles are necessary for the story of the *Iliad*, and the similarities are so strong that an audience familiar with the tradition of the Trojan war would recognize them.

The real difficulty with the neo-analytical position is that it would like to have Patroclus correspond to both Antilochus and Achilles at once. As Schoeck admits, the double layer of correspondence is too complex to be recognized by the average reader.¹³²

¹³¹ See Paton 3; Lowenstam 1981: 122ff.; M. Edwards 1991: 18, 64; Janko 1992: 312, 410, 414-415 (H. Mühlstein is often cited by these scholars as an exponent of the idea). Cf. the different interpretation by Kullmann 1960: 316; Schoeck 121ff.; neo-analysts tend to ignore this correspondence because they are more interested in Patroclus as Antilochus.

¹³² Schoeck 16-17. See also Heubeck 1991: 472.

Neo-analysts might justify their argument by supposing they are uncovering not allusions to extra-Iliadic events, but borrowings that Homer made in a disorganized manner. In my opinion, however, most of the motifs transferred into the *Iliad* from the Achilles-Memnon episode are meant to function as allusions (see pp. 211ff. above). If Patroclus cannot represent two other characters at once, which would we choose, Antilochus or Achilles? Neo-analysts focus on the alleged correspondence between Patroclus and Antilochus, and so tend to slight the correspondence between Patroclus and Achilles.¹³³ But sometimes they have been forced to acknowledge that there is more evidence for a correspondence between Patroclus and Achilles than between Patroclus and Antilochus.¹³⁴ I have demonstrated that the alleged correspondence between Patroclus and Antilochus is more illusory than real. The death of Patroclus, on the other hand, contains many details that are special motifs belonging to the character of Achilles. We have already seen that Patroclus seems to reflect Achilles even before his death, and we shall see below that the correspondence continues in the following books of the *Iliad*. If we need to choose between Antilochus and Achilles as the one character whom Patroclus reflects, as I think we must, then the answer is obvious: Patroclus represents Achilles, and not Antilochus.

Bk. 17 *There is a battle over the corpse of Patroclus, which is eventually rescued (~G)*

Most of book 17 describes a battle over the corpse of Patroclus, and neo-analysts compare it with the similar battle over the corpse of Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode.¹³⁵ The general similarity is obvious, but battles over corpses are common in the *Iliad*, and it is probable that such scenes occurred frequently in epic poetry. The evident

¹³³ Kullmann 1984: 310; Schadewaldt 1965: 169 are remarkable instances.

¹³⁴ Schoeck 15; Heubeck 1991: 465.

¹³⁵ Pestalozzi 17 ff., 45; Heubeck 1991: 465; Schadewaldt 1965: 170; Kullmann 1960: 80-81, 328-330, 1981: 18-19, 1991: 441 n.65; Schoeck passim. Scheliha 264, 398; Whitman 170; Willcock 1987: 192ff. (see especially); Schein 26; M. Edwards 1990: 312, 1991: 62, 132 share this position. For earlier scholars who made this comparison, see Kullmann 1981: 6 n.3, 7 n.5, 1991: 428. For a contrary opinion, see Combellack 1962: 195; Ramage 293.

desire in heroic society to strip the armor off opponents or even mutilate their corpses would insure that. This motif, battle over a slain warrior, is typical, and it may be no more than a coincidence that it occurs in the *Iliad* with the corpse of Patroclus and also in the Achilles-Memnon episode with the corpse of Achilles.

There may be, however, untypical details that occur in both. First, at *Od.* 24.41 it is specified that the battle over the corpse of Achilles lasted a very long time, in fact all day. It is apparent that the battle over Patroclus is also very long. In fact, at *Il.* 17.384 the battle over the corpse of Patroclus is said to last all day. The duration of these battles may be exaggerated, but it is clear that both are unusually long. Other battles over corpses in the *Iliad* do not share the intensity and duration of these two. Secondly, in both battles Ajax kills a Trojan who has tried to tie a thong to the ankle of the corpse in order to drag it off.¹³⁶ A Chalcidian vase that pictures the battle over the dead Achilles (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 850) presents this very moment: Ajax stabs Glaucus, who is trying to attach a thong to the ankle of Achilles. No other source specifies this detail, but many indicate that Ajax killed Glaucus (see element G in my reconstruction of chapter three). At *Il.* 17.288ff., Ajax kills Hippothous as he tries to drag off the corpse of Patroclus with a thong. The Trojan killed is different, but Homer could not have represented the death of Glaucus in this scene if myth required him to live on to be killed later by Ajax in the battle over the body of Achilles. The location of the wound of Glaucus on the vase is different from the location of the wound of Hippothous in the *Iliad*, but we need not seek correspondence in minor details. The correspondence is remarkable enough.

Another possible correspondence is the general role of Ajax. In both battles, he is the prime defender of the corpse. However, Ajax is often pictured making a brave stand against attacking Trojans the *Iliad*. Schoeck's attempt to categorize all such scenes as

¹³⁶ See Pestalozzi 19-20; Schadewaldt 1965: 170; Kullmann 1960: 328, 1981: 19; Schoeck 64-65, 129ff.; Rabel 1991: 129-130; M. Edwards 1991: 90. Fenik 1968: 233 is uncertain, describing the dragging off of a corpse as typical (the use of a thong is not, however). Interestingly, Rabel, Edwards, and Kemp-Lindemann 220 link the attempt to drag off Achilles' corpse with Achilles' mutilation of Hector's corpse by dragging (a thong is also used then).

reflections of the battle over Achilles is very dubious.¹³⁷ Neo-analysts have also compared the storm-wind that ends the battle at *Od.*24.42 to the mist that Zeus spreads over the sky in *Iliad* 17.¹³⁸ The correspondence does not seem strong. A storm-wind is not very similar to mist. Mist is present at other times in the *Iliad* than during the battle over the corpse of Patroclus (notably at 16.567ff. during the battle over the corpse of Sarpedon, certainly not an Achilles figure). And whereas the storm-wind in the *Odyssey* ends the battle over Achilles' corpse and helps the Greeks, in the *Iliad* mist is present throughout the battle and is a hindrance to the Greeks. At 16.567ff. Zeus sends mist to intensify the battle, not to end it, and at 17.644 Ajax famously pleads for Zeus to clear it up. The suggestion that the two battles are linked by the presence of a storm-wind in one and mist in the other should be rejected.

In their denouement the two battle scenes are notably different. Ajax traditionally carries the corpse of Achilles to safety, but in *Il.* 17 Menelaus and Meriones carry the corpse while Ajax and the Locrian Ajax defend. If the battle in the *Iliad* reflects myth about the battle over Achilles' corpse, why would the number of defenders participating be changed and why would Ajax have a different role? Odysseus, who traditionally defends while Ajax carries the corpse of Achilles, may be excused from this scene, for he has been wounded. Neo-analysts also suggest that Homer typically (see p. 198 with n.45 above) weakens the dramatic intensity of a prototype by depicting two warriors carrying the corpse of Patroclus, whereas only one carries that of Achilles. That interpretation may be possible, but it does not explain the change of the role of Ajax. In this matter one is not impressed by the similarities between the two battles, and one might even argue that the *Iliad's* conception of the role of Ajax makes better sense.¹³⁹

¹³⁷ Schoeck 34ff., 49ff., 81ff., *passim*.

¹³⁸ Pestalozzi 20-21; Schadewaldt 1965:170; Kullmann 1960: 327-329; Schoeck 32 ff., 66, *passim*.

¹³⁹ See pp. 154-155 in chapter three. Fenik 1964: 33 n.2 says that neo-analytical criteria for priority could lead to the conclusion that the *Iliad's* account of Ajax's role is primary. But art work makes it clear that the carrying of Achilles by Ajax was famous at an early date.

What should one conclude about the alleged correspondences between the two battles? There are a few specific motifs that suggest that there is a relationship between these two examples of a typical motif, a battle over a corpse. There are also differences between the two. On the whole I think the evidence suggests that one battle is the model for the other. One might wonder whether such a battle would traditionally arise over the corpse of Patroclus. It is much more fitting for a hero of Achilles' stature. In addition, the *Iliad's* portrayal of Patroclus clearly contained motifs associated with Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode earlier in book 16, and one might naturally expect it to continue to do so here. I conclude that neo-analysts are correct to think that the battle over the corpse of Patroclus is derived from the battle over Achilles' corpse.

Bk. 18 *Thetis and the Nereids mourn, then visit a prostrate Achilles (~H)*

The correspondence between the behavior of Thetis and the Nereids in book 18 and their mourning of the dead Achilles at his funeral is frequently noted.¹⁴⁰ The fundamental methodology of neo-analysis, that discrepancies suggest re-use of traditional material, works especially well in this scene. Perhaps the slave women might be expected to mourn Patroclus after his death has been announced (27-31), but it is remarkable that they run up to Achilles to mourn. And Thetis and the Nereids perform mourning rituals in their cave in the sea for no other reason than that Achilles has cried out (35ff.). Remarkably, they do not even know why he is upset. Then Thetis quite naturally goes to her son, but the Nereids oddly accompany her (65ff.). They do not participate in the private conversation that follows and have to be rather awkwardly dismissed at the end of

¹⁴⁰ J. Kakridis 1949: 65ff. is exceptionally persuasive on this issue. Other neo-analysts who have pursued this argument include Pestalozzi 26, 32, 42; Heubeck 1991: 465; Schadewaldt 1965: 166; Kullmann 1960: 331-332, 1984: 310, 1991: 441; Schoeck 43-44. Many have agreed, e.g. Scheliha 266; 398; Whitman 202-203, 346 n.60; Webster 252; Reinhardt 362, 368ff.; Nagler 156; Griffin 1980: 28; Mueller 58; Sinos 71ff.; Lowenstam 1981: 175; Schein 130ff.; de Romilly 29ff.; A. Edwards 1984: 78ff.; M. Edwards 1987a: 270, 1990: 312; McLeod 1987a: 37; Van Nortwick 67; Stanley 290-291. Cf. G. Nagy 1979: 113; Rutherford 145-146. Scheliha 398; Kullmann 1981: 6 n.3, 7 n.5, 1991: 428; Schadewaldt 1965: 166 cite scholars who preceded neo-analysts in observation of the correspondence.

the scene. We know that in Greek myth Thetis and the Nereids attended the funeral of Achilles (see pp. 156-157 above in chapter three). Apparently this motif has been incorporated into book 18 of the *Iliad*. Reinforcing this impression is a gesture of Thetis that is characteristic of funerals: she cradles her son's head in her hands (71). Andromache makes the same gesture with the corpse of Hector at 24.724, and Thetis holds her dead son's head in the same way on a vase that depicts the funeral (*LIMC* no. 897; see p.157 above in chapter three).¹⁴¹

Neo-analysts tend to suggest that Homer failed to adjust traditional material to a novel context, but a better explanation is that the funeral of Achilles is intentionally evoked. That would support the tone of the whole passage, for subsequently Achilles and Thetis talk as if the death of Achilles is imminent. In this scene it seems that actions sublimely represent a future that words then foretell and discuss. Time has been foreshortened, and the future lies behind the present. Homer has transferred motifs from the traditional funeral of Achilles to achieve this dramatic and moving effect.

Some scholars have suggested that Homer has simply employed typical elements of a funeral at a sorrowful moment, and that the scene therefore need not reflect the funeral of Achilles in particular.¹⁴² That argument seems very strained to me. What is typical of funeral scenes should not be inspired by Achilles at this point. And not all is typical; the mourning of Thetis and the Nereids belongs to one situation only, the famous funeral of Achilles. In book 1 Thetis similarly comes to her son, but she does not break into mourning while under the sea and she certainly does not bring the Nereids with her. The evocation of Achilles' funeral in book 18 is undeniable.

One might adduce the mourning of Hector by his household at *Il.* 6.500 in an argument that mourning of the yet-living is not inappropriate. But there is no indication

¹⁴¹ For this gesture in funeral rite see Alexiou 6. Schein takes note of other phrases used of Achilles in the scene that are indicative of the dead.

¹⁴² Cf. Fenik 1964: 31ff.; Dihle 20ff.; Clarke 213-214. Kullmann 1960: 36-37 summarized and responded to earlier examples of such criticism.

of other funeral rituals in that passage, and the grief is properly motivated by the certainty of Andromache that Hector, by returning to battle, will die. The household consciously grieves for the anticipated death of Hector, as the poet explicitly points out (501-502). In contrast, the unusual behavior of Thetis and the Nereids is more than grieving and actually mimics the rituals of a funeral. It is not motivated, for it precedes the conclusion of Thetis that Achilles will soon die. Thetis and the Nereids never even seem to realize the significance of their actions, though the audience may appreciate them.

One phrase in this scene has gained much attention. At 18.26-27, Achilles is described lying in the dust, αὐτὸς δ' ἐν κονίησι μέγας μεγαλωστί τανυσθεῖς/ κείτο. A similar phrase is used at *Od.* 24.39-40 to describe the corpse of Achilles in the midst of the battle over him, σὺ δ' ἐν στροφάλιγγι κονίης/ κείσο μέγας μεγαλωστί, λελασμένος ἵπποσυνάων. This version of the phrase, with a change of person for the verb, is also used to describe the corpse of Cebriones at 16.775-776. On the basis of these Homeric passages, neo-analysts have argued that the phrase belongs to Achilles, specifically to a description of his corpse as a battle rages over it. They conclude that in the midst of the "funeral" of book 18 is a quotation from the battle over Achilles' corpse.¹⁴³ Further evidence that might support this is provided by Garner, who as I noted in my reconstruction argues that a number of recently found fragments of Stesichorus relate the battle over the corpse of Achilles. He believes (159-160) that the letters στροφάλιγγι present in one fragment (74.4; see n.11 of chapter three) is part of a description of the corpse of Achilles lying in the dust (cf. the word στροφάλιγγι at *Od.* 24.39).

There are problems with the neo-analytical viewpoint, however. The use of the phraseology in *Il.* 16 for Cebriones needs explanation. Critics have noted that the mention of horsemanship there and in the example at *Od.* 24 is very appropriate for the charioteer

¹⁴³ Pestalozzi 18; J. Kakridis 1949: 84-85; Schadewaldt 1965: 168; Kullmann 1960: 330, 1991: 441 n.65; Schoeck 43, 68-69. de Romilly 26-28 well discusses the issues involved.

Cebriones. Kullmann counters by demonstrating that Achilles is closely linked with his divine horses,¹⁴⁴ but does not explain why a phrase "belonging" to Achilles would also be used for Cebriones. Schoeck is not convincing when he attempts to argue that the death of Cebriones is associatively linked with the death of Achilles.¹⁴⁵ Dihle idiosyncratically argues (22-23) on grounds of syntax that the phrase is incorrectly used in both *Il.* 17 and *Od.* 24 but correctly used in *Il.* 18. He concludes it must have originated there.

The phraseology in question is obviously fluid in its application, and probably should not be regarded as belonging strictly to any single character or passage. Yet let us notice that in the three examples outside of *Il.* 18 (accepting Garner's hypothesis) the phrase is used of a corpse, and that in two of these it is the corpse of Achilles that is described. In the very least we can conclude that since the phrase was commonly associated with corpses, its use in book 18 contributes to the foreshadowing of Achilles' approaching death.¹⁴⁶ In addition, it may be possible that the phraseology was commonly if not exclusively associated with the corpse of Achilles. Though we should not suppose that Homer has quoted a phrase from a single pre-Homeric text, we may wonder if he here used phraseology traditionally used in descriptions of the slain Achilles. In that case the resonance of its use in *Il.* 18 would be very powerful indeed.

In any case, at the beginning of book 18 one gains an unmistakable impression that Achilles is already dead. It is appropriate that after this scene in which Achilles mimics a corpse the hero and his mother will focus on the hero's approaching death (their words are analyzed immediately below in the next section). Thereafter, in the final books of the *Iliad*, the approaching death of Achilles will be frequently mentioned, as we saw in

¹⁴⁴ Kullmann 1960: 38-39. Note that at *Il.* 10.401ff. Odysseus claims that only Achilles is skilled enough to handle his immortal horses. Xanthus is even on speaking terms with Achilles (19.408ff); cf. the suggestions by M. Edwards 1990: 322, 1991: 18-19, 104, 283 (see also Heath 396ff.) that the mourning of the horses for Patroclus at 17.426ff. is based on a traditional scene in which they mourn Achilles, and that the prophecy to Achilles at 19.408ff. is based on a traditional scene in which Achilles was warned by a horse shortly before his death.

¹⁴⁵ Schoeck 68-69. He further proposes that the use of the phraseology in bk. 18 is secondary because dust is only appropriate in the context of a battle. But Achilles has just poured dust on his head.

¹⁴⁶ Schein 130 follows this more cautious interpretation.

chapter two. And his fate will be stressed not simply by direct references to it. There will be indirect yet profound intimations of the death of Achilles. In fact Achilles will be portrayed as dead already, as having a death-in-life. For example, ambrosia and nectar are given to him by the gods when he refuses to eat (19.347-8, 353-4). This seems suspiciously reminiscent of the use of these substances to preserve corpses.¹⁴⁷ And in book 24 Priam journeys through the night to Achilles with Hermes as his guide. This is reminiscent of a *katabasis* to the underworld.¹⁴⁸ That would place Achilles in the midst of Hades, where we find Homer places him after his death in the *Odyssey*. These intimations and allusions continue the sense of collapsed time in book 18. The future is foreshadowed so strongly that it seems to have merged with the present. Patroclus has died in a manner that is reminiscent of the death of Achilles, and accordingly Achilles himself is portrayed as dead even while still among the living.

Thetis tells Achilles that he will die soon after Hector's death (~A).

At 18.95-96 Thetis says to Achilles, ὠκύμορος δὴ μοι, τέκος, ἔσσεαι, οἷ' ἀγορεύεις/αὐτίκα γάρ ται ἔπελτα μεθ' Ἕκτορα πόντος ἑτοῖμος. Neo-analysts compare this prediction to the prophecy Thetis gives to Achilles before his encounter with Memnon.¹⁴⁹ As I noted in my reconstruction of the Achilles-Memnon episode (p. 141 above in chapter three), they suspect that Thetis predicted to Achilles that he would die after his battle with Memnon. Acceptance of this correspondence depends on one's interpretation of a phrase in the summary of the *Aethiopsis* by Proclus. But it is clear that

¹⁴⁷ Cf. Onians 292-299; Richardson 1974: 238-239; Nagler 156 ff.; Vermeule 127; McLeod 1987a: 38; Garner 1993: 155, 161-162; M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 19.352-354. For the use of these substances as an embalment cf. *Il.* 16.666ff. (Sarpedon), 19.37ff. (Patroclus), 23.184ff., 24.18-21 (Hector), and Quintus of Smyrna 3.533-43, 697-8 (Achilles). Note the possible connection between nec-tar and nec-ros; cf. the use of ambrosia in attempts to immortalize the infants Demophoon and Achilles in stories that are discussed on p. 264 of chapter five.

¹⁴⁸ See esp. Frame 153 ff.; and also Whitman 217; Nagler 184ff.; Nethercut 5; McLeod 1987a: 35; M. Edwards 1991: 15-16; Rabel 1991: 129 n.13.

¹⁴⁹ See Pestalozzi 9; Heubeck 1991: 473; Schadewaldt 1965: 167; Kullmann 1950: 311, 1981: 8-9, 1991: 440; Schoeck 38ff. de Romilly 22; Janko 1992: 313; M. Edwards 1990: 322, 1991 *ad* 18.95-96 are attracted to the idea. Kullmann 1981: 6 n.3, 1991: 428 notes that Gruppe had earlier developed this view.

the statement by Thetis here in book 18 is unusual. What does Hector's death have to do with that of Achilles? Is it simply fated that Achilles must die if Hector dies? That does not seem to be the implication of her words.¹⁵⁰ Furthermore, Achilles' death does *not* immediately follow Hector's. It certainly does not in the *Iliad*, and myth about the Trojan war indicates that many incidents are to pass before Achilles will be slain. Of course, it is true that Achilles' death does occur sometime in the future after Hector's death, but Thetis' words imply a direct link to the death of Hector.

The link is not made elsewhere in the *Iliad*, either temporally or causally, though there are many references made to Achilles' death. No one else ever says that Achilles will die because of Hector's death. Likewise, no other reference to his death implies that it will occur directly after Hector's death, though sometimes his death is spoken of as close at hand. Hephaestus does not specify a time when he speaks of Achilles' death (18.464ff.). Xanthus says that Achilles' death is "near" (ἐγγύθεν, 19.409), but he does not mention Hector. Hera says it will occur "later" (ὕστερον, 20.127). Achilles at 21.111 speaks of it in vague temporal terms. Hector in his prophecy at 22.358-60 does not specify a time. Finally, Thetis at 24.132, after Hector's death, says that it is "near" (ἀρχι). This last word is used by the dying Patroclus in reference to Hector's death (16.853). In that case Hector did indeed die the next day. However, already more than a day has passed after Hector's death at the moment Thetis speaks in *Il.* 24, and much more time will pass, by any reckoning, before Achilles' death.¹⁵¹ In many of these passages the nearness of Achilles' death is stressed, but only Thetis maintains that it will follow Hector's death.

¹⁵⁰ Reinhardt 361 asserts that the two deaths were magically linked together traditionally, much as the theft of the Palladium doomed Troy. Rather, Homer seems to have inserted the idea that Achilles must die if Hector dies into his poem without recourse to tradition, magic, fate, or logic. Cf. Mueller 30-31, who argues that Homer, not tradition, is responsible for the link between Hector's death and the fall of Troy (thus the suppression of the theft of the Palladium, the wooden horse, etc., by Homer).

¹⁵¹ Cf. the poet's use of τάχα in bk. 2 to refer to Achilles' return to battle (694; Achilles will indeed return) and for the return of Philoctetes (724; the return is not forthcoming in this case).

Let us look at Achilles' words in book 18 and see whether he connects his death with Hector's. In lines 88-93 he tells his mother that she will not receive him at home, since (ἐπεὶ) he no longer wishes to live except to take vengeance on Hector. She then makes her pronouncement. In reply, he accepts her statement with the words, "αὐτίκα τεθναίην" (98-99). He repeats his mother's word "αὐτίκα" in a manner that suggests he is not concerned with the exact time of his death, as long as he is to die.¹⁵² He wishes to die because (ἐπεὶ) he did not defend Patroclus. Then (101ff.) he says that since (ἐπεὶ) he is not returning home and did not save Patroclus and the other Greeks, he will go out and kill Hector (114-15, after a long digression). He does not in this scene reject Thetis' assertion that his death will follow Hector's, but he does not seem to think of Hector's death as causing his own (see pp. 122-123 in chapter two on how Achilles seems to choose his fate in this passage). Also, as he continues, he speaks of his death in this scene not as following Hector's, but as happening sometime in the future. He eventually says that he will accept it whenever the gods will it (115-16), a statement he repeats to Hector (22.365-66).

Achilles' words in book 18 are characteristically emotional. He ignores the issue of his fate and refuses to be concerned with the time of his death. Instead, he is consumed by vengeance and guilt, the latter becoming an almost suicidal anger towards his own self.¹⁵³ It is striking that his words do not support Thetis' connection between his death and Hector's, a connection not made anywhere else in the poem. In fact, the connection is untenable, and that is why neo-analysts speak of the words of Thetis as a discrepancy. Her words would make better sense if Achilles did indeed fall in battle after killing

¹⁵² M. Edwards 1991 *ad loc.* thinks that by this second αὐτίκα Achilles means "now." I think Achilles is simply refusing to be concerned over the time of his death. His repetition of his mother's word "αὐτίκα" is petulant and almost derisive, and signals his rejection of his mother's implied warning.

¹⁵³ See M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 79-83 and 98-100; Schein 134 for the emotion of his words. See Whitman 142ff. for his self-destructiveness in the later books.

Hector.¹⁵⁴ Since he clearly does not, perhaps her words reflect the story in which Achilles dies soon after Memnon's death.

Critics of the neo-analytical position have balked at the suggestion that Homer forgot which story he was composing.¹⁵⁵ Kullmann in reply invoked the findings of oral theory and argued that it was the type of brief mistake any poet of Homer's time could make. But though the words of Thetis are brief, they are very important, and it is hard to believe that Homer would nod at such a moment. A more persuasive interpretation is at hand, that the remark by Thetis is a purposeful allusion to the situation before the battle between Achilles and Memnon. Thetis does not directly mention Memnon, or Penthesileia for that matter, because reference to the numerous events to come before the death of Achilles would distract us and make the death of Achilles seem less impending.¹⁵⁶ With a few words Thetis briefly but ominously links Hector's death with the death of Achilles, reflecting her usual warning of Achilles before his battle with Memnon. Once again Homer daringly and effectively suggests the future behind the present.

I should add that I do not think the words of Thetis are a direct quotation of any text, with the name "Hector" substituted for "Memnon." They probably just evoke the final confrontation between Achilles and his mother shortly before his death, just as Achilles' words to Patroclus in book 16 seem to do (see pp. 223-224 above). Achilles' words to Patroclus warn more than they predict, for he does not possess the foreknowledge of his mother. The words of Thetis in book 18, on the other hand, do not offer any specific warning. It is possible that Thetis both predicts and warns in the

¹⁵⁴ Some analysts argued that the "original" version of the *Iliad* ended with the death of Achilles. See Schadewaldt 1965: 194; Schoeck 39. Reinhardt 376 similarly believed that Achilles died immediately after Hector's death in the source used by the poet of the *Iliad*.

¹⁵⁵ E.g. Dible 14 n. 10, 22; cf. Kullmann's summary of and reply to such criticism at 1960: 37-39.

¹⁵⁶ Reinhardt 350ff. much differently argues that the poet of the *Iliad* does not know of Memnon, as I noted at the beginning of chapter three (n.2).

Achilles-Memnon episode, and that her confrontation of Achilles there is evoked in different ways by her words in *Il.* 18 and by Achilles' words to Patroclus at *Il.* 16.

Bk. 22: *Achilles meets Hector in battle and kills him; scales are used to signify the outcome (~C)*

The correspondence between Hector and Memnon in this scene is a basic assumption of the vengeance theory. I think there is some justification for that view, though my interpretation varies considerably from that of neo-analysts. They stress a perceived similarity between Achilles killing the slayer of his friend Antilochus in the Achilles-Memnon episode and Achilles killing the slayer of Patroclus in the *Iliad*. I have argued that there is no significant correspondence of vengeance between the two poems. Since Patroclus never seems an Antilochus figure, and since Hector does not correspond well to Memnon when he slays Patroclus, it is misguided to portray Achilles' killing of Hector as a reflection of some other story of vengeance. To be sure, Achilles does kill Hector out of vengeance in the *Iliad*, but this act of vengeance arises out of themes that Homer has developed in the *Iliad*. Achilles is acting out his future duel with Memnon in this scene, and to this extent Hector is a Memnon figure. But he is only a Memnon figure on the periphery of a motif transference that focuses on Achilles, who is the pivot of the motif transference. In fact Hector does not reflect Memnon to the extent that Sarpedon earlier did.¹⁵⁷ He is the champion of the Trojan side, as Memnon will later be, and he does wear the divine armor that he stripped off Patroclus, just as Memnon wore divine armor when facing Achilles. Thetis had briefly conflated the duel between Achilles and Hector with the duel between Achilles and Memnon at the beginning of book 18 (see previous section), and in this sense Hector plays the role of Memnon. But he is more of a convenient stand-in for Memnon than a reflection of him.

¹⁵⁷ As Kullmann 1981: 10, 1991: 441 n.64 states in passing when replying to Reinhardt's arguments.

The most telling indication that this scene reflects Achilles' duel with Memnon is the use of divine scales to signal Hector's impending death (22.209ff.). Neo-analysts argue that this reflects the famous use of divine scales to signal the outcome of the duel between Achilles and Memnon.¹⁵⁸ They point out that the use of scales seems unnecessary for a duel in which the defeat of Hector is a foregone conclusion. Memnon, on the other hand, wears divine armor and is the son of a goddess. Since he is equally matched with Achilles, the outcome of his duel with Achilles might be considered in doubt. Thus, neo-analysts argue, the motif fits the duel between Achilles and Memnon better than it does the duel between Achilles and Hector and therefore existed in the Achilles-Memnon episode before it influenced the *Iliad's* description of the death of Hector.

Sometimes debate over this issue centers on the fact that in art Hermes usually holds the scales for the duel between Achilles and Memnon, whereas in the *Iliad* Zeus holds the scales. It is not clear to me why one or the other of these bearers should necessarily be prior to the other, and anyway the depiction of Hermes in this role may be simply a variant introduced by Attic artists.¹⁵⁹ A more damaging challenge to the neo-analytical position is the suggestion that this motif is typical and cannot be considered to belong to the duel between Achilles and Memnon.¹⁶⁰ If an Egyptian concept of using scales to weigh the souls of the dead is the origin of its use in Greek myth,¹⁶¹ it would be unlikely that Greeks would adopt the idea for only one story. In addition, the motif is

¹⁵⁸ J. Kakridis 1949: 94; Pestalozzi 11-13, 42, 45; Heubeck 1991: 463; Schadewaldt 1965: 164; Kullmann 1960: 316-318 (cf. 31-34), 1984: 318, 1991: 441 n.65; Schoeck 25ff, *passim*. Dietrich 1964 strongly defends this position; M. Edwards 1990: 313, 1991: 18; Janko 1992: 313; Richardson 1993 *ad* 22.208-213 think it is possible. Kullmann 1981: 6 n.3, 7 n.6, 1991: 428; Schadewaldt 1965: 164 cite earlier scholars who made this argument. For the view that the use of divine scales for Achilles and Memnon is secondary, see Severyns 1928: 318-320; Onians 397-398; Reinhardt 382ff.; Dihle 13ff. See also the criticism summarized and responded to by Kullmann 1960: 32-34.

¹⁵⁹ Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a (*LIMC* "Achilleus") p. 172. Note that Aeschylus apparently depicted Zeus as the bearer of scales for the duel between Achilles and Memnon (see element C of my reconstruction of the Achilles-Memnon episode in chapter three).

¹⁶⁰ Thus Fenik 1968: 119-120; Ramage 293.

¹⁶¹ Vermeule 76-77, 160-162; Dietrich 1964: 294ff. Cf. Kullmann 1960: 32-33. Onians 397-398; Reinhardt 386 downplay the possibility.

used repeatedly in the *Iliad* (besides in book 22, at 8.69ff., 16.658, 19.223-224). The frequency of its occurrence suggests that the motif was common in epic poetry. On the other hand, in art the use of divine scales was exclusively depicted in connection with the duel between Achilles and Memnon. Even if the motif was typical, its use in the duel between Achilles and Memnon became especially famous, so much so that artists commonly depicted it and Aeschylus was even inspired to compose a tragedy about it. It is possible that the especially famous use of scales for the duel between Achilles and Memnon did not first develop at a late date.

It should be noted that there is a major difference between the time of the duel in the *Iliad* and the time of the duel in the Achilles-Memnon episode. In the *Iliad* Achilles routs the enemy before he meets Hector, whereas in the Achilles-Memnon episode he apparently kills Memnon before he routs the Trojans. There are a number of reasons why Homer would want to make this change. The precedence of the long rout makes the duel seem especially climactic. The placement of the duel immediately before the city allows Hector's parents to address him from the wall, speeches of particularly effective pathos. And because Achilles cannot yet die, Homer must have Achilles desist from his rout. This is more easily done if the duel follows the rout, allowing Achilles to retire with his main goal completed. It would be difficult to explain why Achilles should suddenly stop and return if he first killed Hector before chasing the Trojans to the walls.

I might speculate that originally Achilles killed Hector (and Hector Patroclus) in a battle among the Greek ships at the shore. Tradition may lie behind the prediction of Zeus at 8.470ff. that Achilles will rouse himself during a battle over the corpse of Patroclus *among the ships*.¹⁶² That would answer a question raised by the proposition that both Hector and Memnon are pre-Homeric. In the *Iliad* Achilles does not attack the city after killing Hector (the abruptness of his decision not to do so will be discussed in the next

¹⁶² Mueller 179 discusses this passage as a discrepancy; for the history of this issue see further Kirk 1990 *ad loc.* Dares 19 also reports that Patroclus died in battle among the ships (in the first year of the war), but I doubt this is based on pre-Homeric tradition.

section). We must assume that traditionally Achilles did not then attack the city and die, if the participation of Penthesileia and Memnon in Trojan myth is traditional. But why would Achilles attack Troy after the death of Memnon but not after the death of Hector? If Achilles traditionally killed Hector among the ships, he would be quite far away from the city. But after conquering Memnon, he would be near Troy with the Trojans in disarray, a tempting opportunity to attack the city. The most radical motif transference in this scene may involve a change of circumstances: the duel between Achilles and Hector at the ships has been transferred to the plain before the city.

I conclude that the duel between Achilles and Hector does reflect the later duel between Achilles and Memnon. There are some motifs that seem to have been transferred from the Achilles-Memnon episode to this scene in the *Iliad* (e.g. the divine armor Hector wears, the use of scales), and it seems that Achilles is here continuing to act out later events in his life.

Achilles considers attacking Troy (~E)

After Achilles has killed Hector, he suggests to the Greeks present at *Il.* 22.378ff. that they attack Troy, then dismisses the notion abruptly. Neo-analysts have thought that there is a hint of Achilles' attack on Troy in the Achilles-Memnon episode here.¹⁶³ It is certainly odd that Achilles should raise the idea only to drop it.¹⁶⁴ Neo-analysts are wrong to think that this passage is somehow a seam, i.e. an abrupt transition in which borrowed material is put aside and the *Iliad* returns to its own story.¹⁶⁵ It seems likely, however, that the passage serves as a purposeful allusion to an event in the Achilles-Memnon episode, Achilles' attack on Troy. The effect is well prepared by earlier

¹⁶³ Schadewaldt 168; Kullmann 1960: 325, 1991: 441 n.65. Lesky 1967: 75 is especially impressed by this argument; M. Edwards 1991: 18 thinks it is possible; Richardson 1993 *ad* 22.376-394 agrees but is more skeptical. Kullmann 1960: 39-40 responds to criticism of the idea, to which Dihle 24ff. adds.

¹⁶⁴ It is also odd that the phraseology employed by Achilles normally occurs when characters are addressing themselves in private (cf. l. 385 with l. 122 of bk. 22).

¹⁶⁵ Cf. Schadewaldt 1965: 168; Kullmann 1960: 39-40.

passages: at 20.30 Zeus had feared that Achilles would now sack the city "beyond fate;" at 21.536 Priam fears that Achilles will leap onto the city wall (reminiscent of the account in the summary of the *Aethiopis* by Proclus that suggested Achilles was breaking through the gates); at 21.544-545 the poet states the Greeks would have taken Troy if Achilles had not been delayed. Macleod perceptively sees (28) that for a moment it seems that the *Iliad* will end with the death of Achilles in an attack on Troy. This is not because such an ending occurred in an "original" *Iliad* (see n.154 above), but because Homer is alluding to the future. The *Iliad* leads up to but pulls back from a conclusion in which Achilles dies, and in so doing ends with an unfinished air that is most suggestive of Achilles' coming fate.

Bk. 23: *There is a funeral for Patroclus (~H)*

Neo-analysts commonly compare the elaborate funeral for Patroclus with the funeral for Achilles.¹⁶⁶ Of course, a funeral is not a specific motif that belongs to Achilles. But neo-analysts have maintained that there are discrepancies in the *Iliad's* account of the funeral which suggest that material has been inappropriately re-used. The first issue concerns a phrase in line 14, when Achilles and the Myrmidons first mourn the slain Patroclus: μετὰ δέ σφι Θέτις γούυ ἡμερον ὤρσε. Some neo-analysts interpret this line to mean that Thetis was present among them. That would be surprising, for it has not been indicated that she joined them from her dwelling in the sea. Neo-analysts contend that Homer has momentarily confused this mourning for Patroclus with the funeral of Achilles, since Thetis certainly was later present at that event.¹⁶⁷ If that is true, then this would seem to be an example of unconscious conflation between mourning for Patroclus and mourning for Achilles, not purposeful allusion. But I prefer to understand

¹⁶⁶ J. Kakridis 1949: 83ff.; Pestalozzi 29ff.; Heubeck 1991: 465; Schadewaldt 1965: 170; Kullmann 1960: 331 ff., 1984: 310-311, 1991: 441 n.65; Schoeck 104ff. Scheliha 279; 399 (citing Müller); Reinhardt 362; G. Nagy 1979: 114; Sinos 61; Schein 26, 129, 155; Mueller 58 agree.

¹⁶⁷ J. Kakridis 1949: 83ff.; Schoeck 104. Richardson 1993 *ad loc.* doubts this interpretation, though he concedes it is possible.

the line to mean that the emotional state of the Myrmidons is inspired by a divinity, as often happens in Homer. Therefore it is not necessary to conclude that Thetis was actually present among the Myrmidons.

A second issue concerns the failure of the pyre of Patroclus to burn. J. Kakridis notes that this is unmotivated, and proposes that at Achilles' funeral the winds at first refused to rouse the flames.¹⁶⁸ He argues that since at Hesiod *Theog.* 378ff. the winds are born to Eos, they must have been brothers to Memnon (a relationship that may explain why at Quintus of Smyrna 4.1ff. the winds carry off the corpse of Memnon). He proposes that the winds would be angry at the slayer of their brother, and might therefore refuse to aid the burning of his pyre. He notes that at Quintus of Smyrna 3.665ff. Zeus sends Hermes to summon the winds to burn Achilles' pyre (a role played by Iris in the *Iliad*), and suggests that in pre-Homeric poetry this command followed the refusal by the winds to help. The argument is brilliantly constructed but is ultimately uncertain because there is no testimony that the winds did refuse to fan the flames on the pyre of Achilles.

It seems, therefore, that no specific motifs link the funerals. Nonetheless the funeral of Patroclus, though a typical motif, seems more appropriate for a hero of Achilles' status than for Patroclus (see p. 225 with n.108 above). And since it is emerging that a number of motifs in the *Iliad's* portrayal of Patroclus remarkably resemble motifs about Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode, we may suspect that Patroclus is also an Achilles figure here. In a general way, this correspondence makes Achilles again a Thetis figure, for he oversees the funeral as Thetis will his own.¹⁶⁹

In chapter three I argued that the mixing of the ashes of Patroclus and Achilles was traditional (see section 3 of element H in my reconstruction). Neo-analysts consider

¹⁶⁸ J. Kakridis 1949: 75ff. See also Kullmann 1960: 332-333 (cf. 35). Dible 27ff. criticizes the idea.

¹⁶⁹ See Schadewaldt 180. Alexiou 6 compares Achilles' placing of his hands on the chest of Patroclus at 18.317 and 23.18 with the gesture of cradling the head of a corpse (as Thetis does with Achilles; see element H, section 1, in chapter three); cf. Robbins 1993: 17, who discusses this "laying on of hands" as a gesture of healing associated with Chiron.

the golden amphora obtained from Thetis to be pre-Homeric.¹⁷⁰ However, since they sometimes do not think that Patroclus is a pre-Homeric figure, they have resisted the idea that the ashes of both Achilles and Patroclus were traditionally mixed in the amphora. They suppose that this concept originated with the *Iliad* and then influenced the account in *Odyssey* 24. They further argue that the burial of Antilochus near the mixed ashes of Achilles and Patroclus in *Odyssey* 24 is an acknowledgment of a traditional friendship between Antilochus and Achilles. The burial of Antilochus before that of Achilles in the summary of the *Aethiopsis* by Proclus has apparently prevented them from arguing that originally Achilles' ashes were mixed with those of Antilochus (as Reinhardt thinks, see n.171 below). They are also uncomfortable in explaining how the translation of Achilles could be consistent with his burial (see p. 164 of the previous chapter). Apparently in their line of argument the golden amphora is considered pre-Homeric, but only if it was used for Achilles' ashes alone (as at Quintus of Smyrna 3.719ff.) and only if it somehow coexisted with Achilles' translation. The *Odyssey* is thus thought to have awkwardly contaminated the *Iliad's* conception of the burial of Achilles with the traditional conception of it.¹⁷¹ This complex theory is not very satisfactory. It is easier to conclude not that the *Odyssey* indecisively conflated traditional material with the *Iliad*, but rather that it repeated a tradition of a burial shared by the three heroes (omitting the translation of Achilles, however).

¹⁷⁰ Pestalozzi 29; Schadewaldt 1965: 170; Kullmann 1960: 40-41, 333; Schoeck 106. Pestalozzi defends *Il.* 23.92, and the others at least seem to assume that it is genuine (on this issue see pp. 172-173 in chapter three).

¹⁷¹ See Schadewaldt 1965: 170; Kullmann 1960: 40-41, 333, 1991: 445-446; Heubeck 1992 *ad Od.* 24.76-79. Ford 159 provides a similar argument in the terms of intertextuality. Pestalozzi 24, followed by Schadewaldt 1965: 162 n.1, differently thinks *Od.* 24 76-79 is interpolated (as well as 50-57), an idea that Reinhardt 351, Heubeck 1992 *ad loc.* criticize. Cf. the idiosyncratic ideas of Reinhardt 351: traditionally the ashes of Antilochus were buried with those of Achilles in the amphora; and of A. Edwards 1985: 224-225 (see esp. 224 n.23, 225 n.25): traditionally the ashes of Patroclus were buried in the amphora without the ashes of Achilles (Achilles' corpse having been translated).

Games are held in honor of Patroclus (~I)

Neo-analysts also compare the games in honor of Patroclus to the games for Achilles.¹⁷² The motif of funeral games is typical and cannot be considered to belong to one character. We may wonder, however, if they are as appropriate for Patroclus as they are for Achilles.¹⁷³ In addition, some have suspected that the wrestling match between Odysseus and Ajax in book 23 foreshadows their contest over the arms of Achilles.¹⁷⁴ So though funeral games are a typical motif, the inappropriateness of them for Patroclus and possible allusions within them to the funeral games of Achilles encourage the view that the funeral games for Patroclus reflect the games for Achilles. Patroclus in death continues to represent Achilles as he has throughout the later books of the *Iliad*. Achilles again may generally correspond to Thetis, for he provides the prizes as she will for his games.¹⁷⁵

The Patroclus sequence and the Achilles sequence

It should be clear that the vengeance theory as it stands is questionable. It attempts to establish very many correspondences whose overall effect is very confusing. A major problem emerges in its interpretation of Patroclus at his death, for he must serve as both an Antilochus figure and an Achilles figure at once. I am also dissatisfied when I attempt to gain an overview of the correspondences alleged by neo-analysts. My survey above selected only the most commonly alleged correspondences, and yet no coherence can be established even from these. If we list the correspondences as we come across them in the *Iliad*, we find the following series, according to my lettering scheme: A, B, F, A, C, D, E,

¹⁷² J. Kakridis 1949: 88; Pestalozzi 29ff.; Schadewaldt 1965: 173 (in his graph), 180, 195; Heubeck 1991: 465; Kullmann 1960: 110, 333-335, 1981: 42, 1984: 310-311, 1991: 44 i n.65; Schoeck 15. Schein 26; de Romilly 33; and M. Edwards 1990: 321-322, 1991: 18 also make the comparison. Kullmann 1981: 7 n.6 notes that Löwy earlier developed this interpretation.

¹⁷³ Kullmann 1984: 310. See also p. 225 with n.108 above.

¹⁷⁴ E.g. Scheliha 65-66; Whitman 263-264; Kullmann 1960: 335; Willcock 1973: 5; Schein 25. Some of these scholars believe that other post-Iliadic events are also foreshadowed in these games.

¹⁷⁵ See Schadewaldt 1965: 180, 195.

B/F, G, H, A, C, E, H, J. We can accept such a jumble of motifs if we are satisfied that Homer simply re-used material from the Achilles-Memnon episode in a haphazard manner without regard to the sequence of the motifs. I do not think this would well serve as intentional allusion to the death of Achilles, however, a role for motif transference that I favored above (see pp. 211ff.).

I do not mean to assert that all motif transference occurs in a sequential pattern. Indeed, two examples that I found to be possible above, the rescue of Nestor in book 8 and the wounding of Diomedes in book 11, do not occur in any sequential pattern (they are actually isolated, for they do not even occur near other potential examples of motif transference). But I am inclined to believe that purposeful allusion is especially effected when there is a collocation of related transferred motifs following a recognizable sequence. We might compare the sequence of events evoking the early years of the war at the start of the poem (see pp. 212-214 above). Allusions or reflections of the early years of the war do not have to occur as part of this collocation of scenes or in a sequential order. Nevertheless, it is especially effective that a sequential pattern of such scenes does occur together in the early books. Similarly, reflections of the Achilles-Memnon episode do not have to occur together in a sequential pattern. But a number of them do, significantly in the last third of the book, as if the poet was then focused on post-Iliadic episodes. And if we discount the vengeance theory and examine the overall pattern of the more plausible correspondences, two major groupings become discernible. One is a series of related motifs in which Patroclus plays the role of Achilles, the other a series of related motifs in which Achilles prefigures later events in his life. These series I will call "sequences."¹⁷⁶

The sequence in which motifs belonging to Achilles have been transferred to Patroclus I shall call the "Patroclus sequence." In this sequence Patroclus is an Achilles figure. Sarpedon is probably a Memnon figure, but this correspondence need not be

¹⁷⁶ Cf. use of the term by Hansen 1972; Nagler 112ff.

stressed. Achilles in this sequence may represent his mother in general ways, but again the correspondence need not be stressed. If we join together the acceptable motifs in which Patroclus represents Achilles, we discover the following sequence from books 16 through 23: A, C, D, E, F, G, H, I. The motifs are in order, and that makes the sequence as a whole very recognizable. Some motifs are obviously from the Achilles-Memnon episode, even when considered alone (e.g. death through Apollo). Other motifs are typical (e.g. the funeral of Patroclus), and do not certainly reflect the Achilles-Memnon episode until one views the sequence as a whole.

This sequence evokes all but one of the elements in the Achilles-Memnon episode. I have shown that element B, the rescue of Nestor, is not essential to the narrative. As a tangent that focuses on the rescue of a father by his son, it is a self-contained incident that seems to be evoked by an isolated transferred motif in book 8. And of course, the aspect of immortality in element D and in section 2 of element H is absent, as the *Iliad* suppresses this concept.¹⁷⁷ Therefore there are not allusions to all details about the death of Achilles, but enough is done to make a reflection of it unmistakable.

The sequence in which motifs from the death of Achilles are chronologically transferred back onto the Achilles of the *Iliad* I shall call the "Achilles sequence." In this sequence Achilles prefigures himself. When he faces Achilles Hector seems to represent Memnon, but the correspondence need not be stressed. This sequence also presents a chronological order of elements: A, C, E. There is one element that is out of chronological order, H (and note that the rout of the Trojans precedes the duel with Hector, whereas it had followed the duel with Memnon; see p. 247 above). Why element H should be out of place will become apparent below when the two sequences are compared. It may also seem initially confusing that both Patroclus and Achilles reflect

¹⁷⁷ I doubt the suggestion of M. Edwards 1991 *ad* 18.463-467, crediting Richardson, that there is an allusion to Achilles' immortality at Leuke when Hephaestus wishes he might prevent Achilles' death.

the experiences of Achilles in the Achilles-Memnon episode, but I shall explain below how they do this in a cooperative and significant manner.

Let us turn to a schematization of the Patroclus and the Achilles sequences (reproduced in Appendix C). The two sequences are presented in parallel columns to demonstrate how they interconnect. The correspondences outlined below are only briefly described, but all have all been discussed and accepted in my analysis of the vengeance theory above.

Patroclus Sequence

(A, C, D, E, F, G, H, I)

*Patroclus~Achilles, Sarpedon~Memnon,
Achilles~Thetis*

Achilles sequence

(H, A, C, E)

*Achilles prefigures his own death,
Hector ~Memnon*

Bk. 16:

A. Achilles warns Patroclus before battle
(cf. the warning of Achilles by Thetis)

C. Patroclus kills Sarpedon (cf. the slaying
of Memnon by Achilles)

D. The corpse of Sarpedon is removed by
divine intervention (cf. the removal of the
corpse of Memnon by divine intervention)

E. Patroclus attacks Troy (cf. Achilles'
attack on Troy)

F. Patroclus is killed by Apollo and
Euphorbus by the walls of Troy (cf. the
slaying of Achilles by Apollo and Paris)

Bk. 17:

G. A battle rages over the corpse of Patroclus (cf. the battle over the corpse of Achilles)

Bk. 18:

H. Thetis and the Nereids mourn a prostrate Achilles (cf. their mourning of him at his funeral)

A. Thetis warns Achilles he will die after Hector's death (cf. her warning that he will die after Memnon's death)

Bk. 22:

C. Achilles kills Hector (cf. his killing of Memnon)

E. Achilles considers attacking Troy (cf. his attack on Troy)

Bk. 23:

H. A funeral ceremony is given for Patroclus (cf. the funeral for Achilles)

I. Games are held for Patroclus (cf. the games for Achilles)

The Patroclus sequence contains most of the elements used in my reconstruction of the Achilles-Memnon episode. For obvious reasons the Achilles sequence is not as

complete. The Achilles sequence does not reflect the final elements of the Achilles-Memnon episode, for Achilles does not actually die in the *Iliad*. It is through the Patroclus sequence that the death of Achilles is acted out within the *Iliad*. The Achilles sequence can be viewed as an *intermezzo* designed to fit into the Patroclus sequence in a significant manner. It interrupts it, beginning after the battle over the corpse of Patroclus (element G), and ends before the funeral for Patroclus (element H). Thus elements G and H in the Patroclus sequence are separated by many books in which the Achilles sequence begins and ends.

The Patroclus sequence is interrupted when Patroclus dies and his corpse is recovered. Then the *Iliad* jumps from the tracks of the Patroclus sequence to the tracks of the Achilles sequence. The Achilles sequence does not begin with element A. Instead, it begins with element H, exactly that element that follows the last element in the Patroclus sequence (G) before it is interrupted. Just after the corpse of Patroclus has been recovered, representing the recovery of the corpse of Achilles, Thetis and the Nereids mourn Achilles, representing his own corpse at his funeral. In addition, the description of Achilles lying μέγας μεγαλωστί may be a brief reflection of element G of the Achilles-Memnon episode. If this is so, then the Achilles episode may actually begin with the same element with which the Patroclus element ended. Either way we move from the corpse of Patroclus representing the corpse of Achilles to Achilles appearing like the corpse he will later be. Similarly, at the beginning of book 18 the mourning of Patroclus by slave women is simultaneous with the mourning of Achilles by Thetis and the Nereids. Patroclus and Achilles almost coalesce into one character, just as later their ashes will be mixed together in burial.

The Achilles sequence then starts at the beginning of the Achilles-Memnon episode with element A and proceeds through those elements that Achilles can appropriately foreshadow. The Achilles sequence must stop itself when an attack on Troy is considered (E), for Achilles does not die in the *Iliad*. Even so the death of Achilles,

already well acted out by Patroclus, seems portentously imminent as the Achilles sequence ends. At this point the *Iliad* jumps tracks again back onto the Patroclus sequence. With the funeral of Patroclus (H) it picks up where it had left off at the end of book 17. The Patroclus sequence proceeds to finish the story, though of course reference to the immortality of Achilles is avoided.

The two sequences effectively interlock to foreshadow the whole of the Achilles-Memnon episode. The Patroclus sequence contains most of the motifs, for Patroclus in his death can act out the death of Achilles. The Achilles sequence interrupts the Patroclus sequence so that the hero himself may evoke his oncoming fate in a striking and memorable manner. The run of the two sequences together thus proceeds in this manner: A, C, D, E, F, G [H, A, C, E] H, I.

The existence of these sequences should increase our confidence in the proposal that motifs in the Achilles-Memnon episode are prior to similar motifs in the *Iliad*. Some of the motifs thought to correspond between the Achilles-Memnon episode and the *Iliad* are typical. Considered by themselves these typical motifs do not imply a relationship between the situation of the Achilles-Memnon episode and the *Iliad*. But in their order of typical motifs the two Iliadic sequences separately correspond to the Achilles-Memnon episode in its order of typical motifs. We may suspect that the similarities are more than coincidence. And priority is revealed by specific motifs amidst the typical motifs, for these specific motifs undoubtedly originated in the Achilles-Memnon episode. Thus the two sequences, when viewed as whole units, must be secondary to the Achilles-Memnon episode. Consideration of the overall pattern of the motif sequences eliminates many of the doubts raised by typology concerning the priority of some of the correspondences.

Undoubtedly my analysis will not please everyone. I have been quick to anticipate one objection, that the Achilles sequence varies from the Achilles-Memnon episode in having Achilles rout the Trojans before he slays Hector. This change exists for good reasons, as I have demonstrated (see pp. 247 above). Some may also point out that since

Patroclus is mourned from book 18 onward, element H for him might be thought to begin much earlier than book 23. If one prefers to look at the sequence in that manner, then element H of the Patroclus sequence is suspended through many books while the Achilles sequence at first matches the H element, then goes back to the beginning of the story and proceeds as far as it can. This interpretation is attractive in many ways. One may also prefer to think that the motif of warning (A) recurs over several books. The prediction to Achilles by his horse Xanthus at 19.408ff. may reflect a traditional warning (see n.144 above), and Poseidon warns Achilles much as Achilles had warned Patroclus at 21.292ff. (see n.105 above). That also is a possible interpretation, and merely requires that we think of one motif-reflection extending while others also occur. Finally, it may also seem confusing that according to my interpretation Achilles corresponds both to his later self and to his mother, and both Sarpedon and Hector correspond to Memnon. Let us notice, however, that the two roles of Achilles do not occur at the same sequence. He plays Thetis in one sequence, and his later self in another. The same is true for Sarpedon and Hector as Memnon. In the Patroclus sequence Sarpedon is the Memnon figure; it is only in the Achilles sequence that Hector vaguely reflects Memnon. And the correspondence of Achilles to Thetis and Sarpedon and Hector to Memnon are only general and do not need to be stressed.

The exactitude implied by my analysis may seem over-rigid, but the general validity of the analysis does not depend upon every detail within it. I strive to assist our comprehension of Homer's allusions to the Achilles-Memnon episode. Any modification of my ideas that better serves that purpose is welcome. Certainly we should not imagine an ancient listener mapping out motif patterns on the back of envelope as he listened to the *Iliad*. Nevertheless, my arguments should make it clear that Patroclus and Achilles do recognizably prefigure the death of Achilles in a recognizable manner. To be sure, reflection of the death of Achilles is not the sole function of Patroclus and Achilles; they

are complex characters through whom quintessentially Homeric themes are developed. But reflection of the death of Achilles is part of Homer's arsenal of poetic skills.

Neo-analysts have demonstrated that motifs in the *Iliad* are sometimes comparable with motifs from what I have called the Achilles-Memnon episode. I think that adherents of the vengeance theory, to use another term of mine, have not realized the full significance of this phenomenon for two reasons. First, they have stressed a questionable comparison between Patroclus and Antilochus that obscures the correspondence between Patroclus and Achilles. Secondly, they have tended to view the correspondences as a borrowing of extra-Iliadic material. Once we reject the vengeance theory, we find that there still remain motifs in the *Iliad* that unmistakably correspond to the Achilles-Memnon episode. Most of these motifs can be organized into two groups, a Patroclus sequence and an Achilles sequence. A picture then emerges: the behavior of Patroclus and Achilles in the *Iliad* evokes the death of Achilles. This indirect narration of the death of Achilles through Patroclus and Achilles can be seen as a major part of the *Iliad*'s portrayal of the whole war, an effect of the poem that has long been recognized.

Chapter Five: Achilles' Heel

As I demonstrated in chapter two, it is made increasingly clear in the *Iliad*, most notably in the words of the dying Hector at 22. 359-360, that Paris and Apollo will kill Achilles by bow beneath the walls of Troy. I also argued in that chapter that Homer is following tradition in these details. But there is no indication that Homer knew of Achilles' uniquely vulnerable heel. How far back in Greek myth does that concept reach?¹

The story of how Achilles became almost completely invulnerable is familiar to everyone: when Achilles was an infant, Thetis dipped him in the river Styx to make his skin impenetrable. However, the place where she held him remained unaffected, and therefore became Achilles' sole vulnerable area. When he is struck there by an arrow, he is fatally wounded. In literature this story (henceforth referred to as the "motif of Achilles' heel") is not attested until the first century of our era, but there is some tantalizing evidence that it dates back to the Archaic Age: some early stories involve the dipping of the newborn Achilles in boiling water or fire, the *Aethiopsis* apparently related that Achilles was wounded on the ankle, and early art sometimes depicted Achilles wounded near the heel. Certainly Achilles is not portrayed as invulnerable in the *Iliad*; he is wounded on the arm at 21.166-167, and Agenor remarks about him later in this book (Il. 568-570), καὶ γὰρ θην τούτῳ τρωτὸς χρῶς ὀξεί χάλκῳ, / ἐν δὲ ἴα ψυχῆ, θνητὸν δὲ ἔ φασ' ἄνθρωποι / ἔμμεναι. But Homer could have suppressed the invulnerability of Achilles, and it is sometimes thought that the wounding of Diomedes

¹ This topic has been examined by Berthold 35-43; Thordarson; Young 1979; and Gantz 625-628. Robert 1186ff. and Drerup 231 n.3 offer brief but useful remarks. Artifacts are essential evidence for this issue, and I will be referring frequently to Kemp-Lindemann and Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a (*LIMC* "Achilleus").

on the foot by Paris at *Il.* 11.369ff. reflects the wounding of Achilles (see pp. 221-221 above in the previous chapter). For these reasons many scholars have occasionally concluded that the motif of Achilles' heel dates back to the Archaic Age, or is even pre-Homeric.²

The concept of invulnerability in general is common in world folklore.³ The motif of unique vulnerability (a sub-category of invulnerability) is present in Greek, German, and Celtic myth, and it has been supposed that it originated in the Indo-European past.⁴ Invulnerability is associated with such figures of Greek mythology as Ajax, Caeneus, Cycnus, and Talos the bronze man, and sometimes the evidence reaches back to the Archaic Age.⁵ It is possible that an invulnerable Achilles inspired the invulnerability of

² Cf. Welcker 2: 175-176; Drerup 231 n.3; R. Carpenter 74; Fenik 1964: 38; Thordarson 110; Kemp-Lindemann 3, 222; Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a passim, esp. 185; Schein 121 n.3 (the art work is wrongly cited there); King 271 n.68; Janko 1992: 409. Of these, Drerup, Janko, and Schein think that it may be pre-Homeric. Thordarson 124 allows that this it is possible. Most of the neo-analysts and other scholars who suppose that the wounding of Diomedes reflects the wounding of Achilles implicitly consider the motif of Achilles' heel pre-Homeric, but it is possible to suppose that a lower wound to Achilles does not entail this motif, as we shall see below.

³ See Thompson D 1344ff., 1840ff.

⁴ See Thompson Z 311ff. Siegfried, who was vulnerable only between his shoulder blades, is the famous example of German myth. Diarmid is a frequently cited example from Celtic myth because he was sometimes said to have been slain through a wound to his sole (cf. Bergin, Lloyd, and Schoepperle 157-179; MacCulloch 175ff.; Green 81). The motif of unique vulnerability does not actually seem to have been a part of his story, but it is present elsewhere in Celtic myth; see Cross Z 311ff. Soslan is an Iranian example of the motif, whose story is summarized at Thordarson 117-119. At 112-114 he argues that the motif is Indo-European (but at a rather late date in his interpretation), as did previously e.g. Drerup 231 n.3. The motif is also found in non-Indo-European cultures, as Thompson indicates.

⁵ For the question of the invulnerability of Ajax, cf. Radt under Aeschylus fr. 83; Berthold 6ff.; Severyns 1928: 325ff.; Shefton 207-208, esp. 207 n.4, 208 n.1; Robert 1045-1047, 1201-1202; Gantz 631-633. Aeschylus depicted Ajax as invulnerable (scholia Sophocles *Ajax* 833, scholia Lyc. 455, scholia *Il.* 14.404); for the possibility that he was earlier invulnerable cf. Lycophron 455 with Pindar *Isthm.* 6.36ff. and scholia *Isth.* 6.53=Hesiod fr. 250 MW. He was certainly considered invulnerable in art from the fifth century onward (see *LIMC* "Aias I" nos. 111, 112, 114, 117, 133); see also *LIMC* "Aias I" no. 120 (c. 600; his sword appears split; see Gantz 633). Severyns 1928: 328; Davies 1989a: 60-61; Barron/Easterling 66 speculate that Ajax was invulnerable in the *Aethiopsis*; Shefton 207 n.4 proposes he was invulnerable in the *Ilias parva*. Heracles kills the Nemean lion as early as *Theog.* 326ff. and apparently wore its skin in Hesiod (fr. 87 MW), but it is not clear if it was invulnerable at first (a question related to the invulnerability of Ajax, since his invulnerability was at least later thought to result from Heracles placing him in the lion skin when he was an infant). Early evidence of the invulnerability of Caeneus includes Hesiod fr. 87 MW; *LIMC* "Kaineus" no. 61 (7th c.; cf. Ahlberg-Cornell 128-129; he is beaten into the ground because he is invulnerable, a story first attested by Pindar fr. 128f Sn.-M.). Cycnus is first reported to be invulnerable at Aristotle *Rhet.* 2.1396.16-18, but cf. Sophocles fr. 500 Radt. At the scholia to Plato *Rep.* 337a it is reported that Simonides and Sophocles wrote of Talos. Less well known is Heracles' invulnerable opponent Asterus, featured in the lost epic poem *Meropis* (see Bernabé pp. 131ff.). Berthold (see especially 60-62) argued that invulnerability was a late development (post-epic) in Greek myth.

these figures, or vice versa.⁶ But the early existence of invulnerability in Greek myth does not prove that the motif of Achilles' heel originated at an early date. Nothing *necessarily* proves its early existence, and some early evidence is clearly incompatible with it. However, it does seem that a remarkable story about the wounding of Achilles, one which possibly involved invulnerable armor, was current in early Greek myth. The nature of this story should be investigated. There are two issues that need to be considered, one being what Thetis does to Achilles when he is a newborn baby, the other being how Achilles is killed at Troy.

1. Thetis with the Infant Achilles

Let us first examine accounts of the behavior of Thetis after Achilles' birth.⁷ The earliest known version apparently is the one reported in the scholia at Apollonius of Rhodes 4.816 (=Hesiod fr. 300 MW). We are told that in the lost epic poem the *Aegimius* Thetis had a number of children. Wishing to know if they were mortal, she tested their nature by throwing them into a pot of boiling water.⁸ The infants died. Thetis began to carry out this experiment on Achilles, but Peleus interrupted and saved Achilles from the same fate. Peleus was understandably angry and as a result Thetis left his home forever.

The fact that Thetis placed her infants in boiling water might at first be reminiscent of the motif of Achilles' heel. But it is important to realize what the motive of Thetis is, and also what the consequences of her actions are. She does not try to change the nature of her children, she simply tests it. Because she is uncomprehending or

⁶ Ajax is especially comparable, since he also had a uniquely vulnerable spot. Thordarson 112 and Davies 1989a: 60 suggest that the concept passed from Achilles to Ajax. Fenik 1964: 38 labels the invulnerability of the two a "doublet." Young 1979 prefers to view Achilles' invulnerability as derivative from that of others. Thordarson 120ff. proposes that the motif was transferred from a Scythian prototype of Soslai to Achilles (he stresses his cult in the Black Sea region) and then to other Indo-European cultures.

⁷ For the possibility that world-wide rituals involving infants lie at the root of this type of story, see J. Frazer 2: 311ff.; Berthold 39ff.; Richardson 1974: 231-232.

⁸ Young 1979: 21 n.32 points out that it is not explicitly stated that the water was boiling.

heartless, the result is death for all of her children except for Achilles. Achilles is saved, but his nature is not changed.

There are many reports in the scholia of similar stories in which Thetis kills many of her children, though in these Thetis usually kills them with fire, not with boiling water. In addition, the motive can vary. Sometimes Thetis is testing her children's mortality, sometimes she unintentionally kills her children while attempting to make them immortal by burning off their mortal nature. In one version Thetis kills her children because they are mortal and therefore unworthy of her. Achilles is always saved at the last minute when Peleus interrupts.⁹ The motive of Thetis in all these versions varies from that in the motif of Achilles' heel. Even when she wants to change their nature, her intention is to make them immortal, not invulnerable. She does not have the ability to achieve this intention anyway, and even if she did, the interruption of Peleus would prevent her from completing the process.

In a related variant, narrated at Apollonius of Rhodes 4.869ff. and Apollodorus *Bibl.* 3.13.6, Achilles is the only child of Thetis. Thetis tries to make Achilles immortal by using fire and ambrosia. She has the ability to make her son immortal, and is in the process of doing this, but Peleus stops her. A similar procedure and interruption occurs in myth about Demeter and her nursling Demophoon, most notably in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*.¹⁰ Some assume that Apollonius has simply adapted the story from the Homeric Hymn, but this explanation may be too simplistic. A common source could have influenced both, or similar traditions about Achilles and Demophoon could have influenced each other.¹¹

⁹ Cf. scholia *Il.* 16.37, scholia Pindar *Pyth.* 3.178, scholia Aristophanes *Clouds* 1068, and Lycophron 178-179 with scholia *ad loc.* Ptolemy Hephaestion's idiosyncratic tale of the death of Achilles (see p. 277 below) is based on the type of story found in these sources. In the scholia at Apollonius of Rhodes 4.816 (=Hesiod fr. 300 MW) it is noted that fire is employed in some (unspecified) versions.

¹⁰ Plutarch *De Isid. et Osirid.* 16 reports essentially the same tale about Isis and a nursling. Richardson 1974: 238 argues that the Greeks transferred the tale from Demeter to Isis because they identified the two with one another.

¹¹ See Richardson 1974: 69-70, 237-238; Young 1979: 12.

In any case, it is important that we again notice the motive of Thetis. Her purpose is to make Achilles immortal, not invulnerable. In Apollonius she does have the ability to achieve this intention (she did not in the accounts previously examined), but because she is interrupted the procedure fails. Sometimes in myth about Demeter, e.g. Apollodorus *Bibl.* 1.5.1, not only is the process interrupted but Demophoon actually dies.¹² Achilles must survive, of course, but it should be stressed that in all these stories about Thetis with the newborn Achilles the procedure is never completed.¹³ That is because these stories explain why Thetis left the home of Peleus, and his interruption of the procedure is necessary to motivate her anger towards him.

These stories are all incompatible with the motif of Achilles' heel, for in that story the procedure of immersing Achilles in the Styx is completed and Achilles is made almost completely invulnerable. In literature this motif is not attested until the use of it by Statius in the late first century of our era.¹⁴ But his references to a dipping of Achilles in the Styx are so incomplete and allusive that we need remarks by later mythographers and scholiasts to understand what he means.¹⁵ Since Statius seems to assume that his audience knows the story, it is clear that he did not invent it.

Let us turn to the evidence of art. Certain depictions of the dipping of Achilles in the Styx do not occur until after the time of Statius, in the second and third centuries of our era.¹⁶ However, Kossatz-Deissmann believes that the myth is depicted on a golden

¹² See Richardson 1974: 81, 242, 247; Foley 51.

¹³ But in myth about Soslan a similar procedure of heat and immersion is completed and succeeds in producing near-invulnerability. It is not impossible that the same occurred with Achilles in an unknown variant, as Thordarson 111-112 suggests. A Roman vase from the fourth century B.C. apparently depicts the successful combination of ambrosia and dipping in the Styx to change the nature of Ares (see pp. 266-267 below).

¹⁴ *Achill.* 1.133-34, 1.268-270, 1.480-81.

¹⁵ Lactantius at *Achill.* 1.134, 296, 480; Fulgentius *Myth.* 3.7; scholia Horace *Epode* 13.12; Servius at *Aen.* 6. 57; Vatican mythographers 1.36, 178, 2. 205, 3.11.24. Cf. Hyginus *Fab.* 107, who speaks of a uniquely vulnerable location in his description of Achilles' death.

¹⁶ *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 5-18; cf. Kemp-Lindemann 3ff. Depictions of Achilles' first bath (*LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 1-4) portray an entirely different scene (see Kemp-Lindemann 2), but Kossatz-Deissmann (the author of *LIMC* "Achilleus") thinks the figure identified as "Ambrosia" in no. 3 is an allusion to the dipping of Achilles in the Styx (see her comments there and p. 54). Under nos. 5-18 she occasionally suggests that the bath schema influenced depictions of the dipping of Achilles in the Styx.

ring from the Hellenistic period.¹⁷ The figures are not identified and the woman is using two hands on both legs of the child, which is not in accord with the usual version of the motif. Therefore this interpretation is not certain, and Kossatz-Deissmann may have been emboldened by her belief that the concept of Achilles' uniquely vulnerable heel is already present in early Greek art (see n. 2 above). As we shall see below, this is not necessarily so. But since Statius did not invent the motif of Achilles' heel, it may well have existed in the Hellenistic period.¹⁸

Young argues instead (1979: 14ff.) that the myth originated soon before the time of Statius. Tertullian *De anima* 50.3 vaguely refers to a poet who spoke of the Styx "washing away death," and adds that nonetheless Thetis mourned Achilles. Young identifies this poet as a "near-Statius" who was influenced by recent religious ideas from the Near East.¹⁹ In the first century of our era baptism as a death leading to rebirth and immortality gained popularity. Gnostic groups sometimes spoke of baptism in the Acheron, and perhaps in the Styx, as leading to immortality.²⁰ If that is true, it does not necessarily follow that they invented the concept out of whole cloth. It is more likely that they borrowed a well-known motif of dipping in the Styx from pagan myth to illustrate their ideas about baptism.²¹ That the concept of dipping someone in the Styx for a

¹⁷ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no.12, under which can be found the interpretation of Kossatz-Deissmann. *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 18 has been dated to the first century of our era and thus could precede Statius, but its authenticity has been doubted.

¹⁸ Robert 67, 1187 thought the myth began at that time; Weitzmann 54ff. proposed that Statius used a Hellenistic literary source.

¹⁹ Young 1979: 15; he quotes Tertullian's remarks at 25 n.49.

²⁰ Young 1979: 16 and 25 n.47 thinks that Menander Magus claimed to baptize in the Styx, on the basis of some obscure remarks by Tertullian (*De anima* 50.3-5; quoted at Young 31). Waszink says *ad loc.* that "it is quite possible that Menander 'the magician'...baptized his followers in water that he pretended to be (or to have come from) the Styx." But it is not clear that Menander spoke of the Styx, and I suspect that it is Tertullian who has linked Menander with the Styx for the purpose of ridicule (as Waszink also states, "It is impossible to define exactly the nature of the custom to which Tertullian alludes here").

²¹ In general see Tardieu; Pépin 1991a, 1991b. Cf. the suggestion of Hommel 39-40 that the dipping of Achilles in the Styx, though late, originates from a latent association of him with Hades (her thesis is that he originally was a god of the underworld). Sometimes it is thought that depictions of the dipping of Achilles in Roman art reflect Christian baptism (see Kemp-Lindemann 4; Young 1979: 23 n.39; Gantz 627-628), but that would not mean the myth is originally derived from the practice of baptism. In a discussion of the employment of water for a beneficial, supernatural purpose, Onians 289-290 compares baptism, elixirs of life, purificatory washing, and immersion in boiling water.

beneficial result had long existed is suggested by a Roman vase from the fourth century B.C. Many have believed it depicts Athena applying ambrosia to the mouth of Ares after he was dipped into the river Styx, represented as a cauldron with Cerberus above it.²² The vase tells us nothing about when the motif of Achilles' heel originated, but it does indicate that we should not look to the Near East for the concept of dipping in the Styx. If ritual from the real world did influence the concept, lustration in mystery religions is a more likely candidate.²³

How could the concept of dipping someone in the Styx, a burning river of death, ever be thought to lead to a beneficial result like immortality or invulnerability?²⁴ We have already seen that in stories about making a newborn child immortal a destructive element such as fire or boiling water was used to remove the mortality of the body.²⁵ In the motif of Achilles' heel, an infant is similarly dipped into a destructive element, the Styx.²⁶ Thus the dipping of Achilles in the Styx perpetuates an aspect present in earlier stories about Thetis and the infant Achilles. Yet let us be sure to recognize how the motif of Achilles' heel is different from the stories that we examined above about Thetis and Achilles. The underworld as the location necessarily makes the attempt to change Achilles' nature much different in its consequence. Now Peleus is not on hand to interrupt the process, and so Thetis' purpose can be realized. A second important new concept, not

²² LIMC "Ares/Mars" no. 11. Inscriptions identify the figures, and the other Olympian gods watch. Marx 169-179 first made this interpretation (of which Dieterich 198; Richardson 1974: 238 take note). Many aspects of Marx's argument can be doubted, but I find the completely different interpretation by Simon under LIMC "Ares/Mars" no. 11 very unconvincing.

²³ See Richardson 1974: 232-33, 236, 241, 247; Farnell 1916: 41ff. Cf. Ovid *Met.* 14.599-604, where Aeneas has his mortal parts washed away by the running water of a river. Young 1979: 13-14 downplays the possible influence of lustration in mystery religions, which could be a precedent for Christian baptism as well.

²⁴ For ancient references to the destructive properties of the Styx, *flumina flagrantia igne* (Seneca *Consol. ad Marc.* 19.4), see Waser 1574ff. M. West 1966 suggests *ad Theog.* 805 that Hesiod called the Styx ἀφθαρτός because it was considered an "elixir" of life, but this adjective probably refers to the river's immortal nature, not to its effect.

²⁵ Other examples in myth of fire or boiling water used to immortalize or rejuvenate (e.g. Heracles on a burning pyre, Aeson in Medea's cauldron) can be found at Marx 173 n.5; J. Frazer 2: 359ff.; Farnell 1916: 36-44; Onians 289-290; Richardson 1974: 238ff.; Vermeule 214 n.22.

²⁶ This is not appreciated by Young 1979: 14-15, but is correctly stressed by Marx 174; Dieterich 198; Waser 1577; and Richardson 1974: 238ff.

found in the older stories, is that the purpose is to make Achilles invulnerable. This is clearly the result in Statius, Servius, Fulgentius, and the Vatican mythographers (for sources, see n.15 above). The scholiast to Horace describes the sole vulnerable location as *mortalis*, as does Hyginus in his depiction of the death of Achilles, but this does not mean that they conceive of the rest of Achilles as immortal.²⁷ It simply means that intrinsic to the story is the idea that the wounding of the uniquely vulnerable spot, no matter where its location, is fatal. Of course, a wound in the heel should not be fatal, but similar tales in world folklore demonstrate that the wounding of any uniquely vulnerable spot is enough to cause death.²⁸ These aspects—invulnerability as the purpose, successful completion of the process, and a vulnerable area remaining that is fatal if wounded—allow the motif of Achilles' heel to unfold in the way we know it.

2. The Wounding of Achilles

The question of when the motif first developed cannot be decided until we examine evidence relating to the manner of Achilles' death. Proclus' summary of the *Aethiopis* does not indicate where Achilles was wounded. However, Apollodorus seems to have based his description of Achilles' death on this poem, and he states that Achilles was struck in the ankle (*σφυρόν*, *Epit.* 5.4). In addition, Quintus of Smyrna, who seems to have somehow used the *Aethiopis* as a source (see p. 54 with n.126 above in chapter one), also says Achilles was struck on the ankle (*σφυρόν*, 3.62). It is probable, therefore, that in the *Aethiopis* Achilles' ankle was wounded. Stesichorus may also have told of a wound to Achilles' ankle, for the letters "σφυρ" are present in one of the recently found

²⁷ Young 1979: 14 interprets these two sources to mean that Achilles is made immortal. Tertullian *De anima* 50.3-5 associates the dipping of Achilles in the Styx with immortality because it serves his case against gnostics (or he confused the admittedly similar concepts).

²⁸ See Berthold 64; Thompson Z 311ff. The anonymous author of a mediaeval *Excidium Troiae* who portrays Paris shooting Achilles in his uniquely vulnerable location with a poisoned arrow (see King 203) must not have understood this. The nearly invulnerable Soslan was fatally wounded in the knee. Sometimes the sole vulnerable location is arguably mortal; e.g. the armpit of Ajax, or the area between the shoulder blades on Siegfried.

fragments that Garner interprets as narrating the death of Achilles (43.ii.8; see n.11 of chapter three). He believes (1993: 159) that this fragment refers to the wounding of Achilles on the ankle.

It seems that a story in which Achilles was wounded on the ankle was current in the Archaic Age, and perhaps originated in pre-Homeric times (as I argued in chapter one, material in the cyclic tradition may be pre-Homeric). Does this mean that the motif of Achilles' heel was known in the Archaic Age, or even to Homer? That question hinges on whether an ankle wound is compatible with the motif of Achilles' heel. We need at this point to examine the location of Achilles' vulnerable spot. Many of the Roman literary sources for the Styx-dipping do not state where Achilles remains vulnerable. Fulgentius and Hyginus specify the ankle (*talus*) as the vulnerable spot. The Vatican mythographers also specify the ankle (2.205; 3.11.24), though once the sole of the foot (*plantula*) is said to be the vulnerable spot (1.178). As Gantz has pointed out (1993: 628), words for "heel" in the Romance languages are derived from the Latin word for ankle, *talus*, and this must have caused our common (mis)conception that it is Achilles' heel that is vulnerable. Roman art depicts Thetis holding Achilles by the ankle, or above the ankle. These representations are too clumsy to be reliable evidence, but they are compatible with the literary sources that specify the ankle or foot as the vulnerable location. In the motif of Achilles' heel (a designation I shall keep using, despite its inaccuracy, and by which I mean a dipping in the Styx with one vulnerable spot remaining), either the ankle is covered by the hand of Thetis when she dips her child into the river Styx, or she does not place her hand in the river at all, and thus the ankle and all of the foot remain vulnerable. The literary sources that speak of the vulnerable spot as the spot where Achilles was held (Servius, Lactantius, the Vatican mythographers; see n.15 above for sources) seem to suggest total immersion. The sources that simply speak of the spot as one where Achilles was not dipped (scholiast to Horace, Fulgentius) might mean that the vulnerable spot remained above the river. Statius and Hyginus do not offer any information relevant to

this issue. It is frustrating that despite the importance of this detail commentators on both literary and artistic evidence commonly speak of the wounding of the "heel" of Achilles, or of Thetis holding him by the "heel," though the heel is in fact hardly ever involved.

It may be the area behind Achilles' ankle that is wounded in the *Aethiopsis*. Homer in book 22 of the *Iliad* describes with exact precision how Achilles attaches a leather thong to the corpse of Hector in order to drag it (395ff.) He uses separate words for the ankle and for the heel (σφυρόν, πτέρνη), and states that the tendons that Achilles pierces runs between them. Yet Apollodorus is describing this same scene (*Epit.* 4.7) simply says that Achilles attached the thong to Hector's ankle (σφυρόν). His reference to the wounding of Achilles in the σφυρόν might therefore mean the tendon behind the heel. Perhaps references to the *talus* in accounts of a dipping in the Styx have this specialized meaning. An anonymous medieval poem *Excidium Troiae* describes Achilles' vulnerable spot as *in tali nervo* (see King 203ff.). The passage thus considers the tendon (*nervus*) of the ankle the vulnerable spot. On the other hand, that one specific location is not necessary for the story of the dipping in the Styx; as I noted, one Vatican mythographer specifies the sole (*planta*) as the location.

It is clear that the apparent wounding of Achilles on the ankle in the Archaic Age is compatible with the motif of Achilles' heel. We should not conclude yet, however, that this motif then existed. I have noted (see p. 265 above) that in Apollodorus Thetis fails to change the nature of Achilles when he was an infant. When later Apollodorus specifies that Achilles was shot in the ankle, he certainly is not thinking of the motif of Achilles' heel, which he does not seem to know. An ankle wound need not *necessarily* involve a uniquely vulnerable location, and in fact the evidence of Apollodorus suggests that it did not in early Greek myth about Achilles.

A Chalcidian amphora from the sixth century B.C. makes this very clear.²⁹ The artist has portrayed the scene immediately after Achilles' death with great skill and

²⁹ LIMC "Achilleus" no. 850="Alexandros" no. 90; cf. Kemp-Lindemann 220.

precision. The figures are identified, so there can be no doubt what the scene represents. Achilles lies on the ground. The fact that he is wounded near the heel has often been taken to mean that the motif of Achilles' heel existed at this time. Yet the location of the wound is actually in the back of the lower leg just above the ankle. This may be in accordance with a dipping in the Styx, but that is not certain. Another detail is of greater significance, a second arrow sticking out of the hero's flank.³⁰ Blood is streaming out of the wound. If the artist knew the motif of Achilles' heel, why did he depict Achilles wounded in two locations? If the wound to his lower leg was fatal, why would there have been a second arrow wound? This vase does not represent the mortal wounding of a single vulnerable area, and it cannot therefore represent the motif of Achilles' heel.³¹ Commentators who claim that it does usually ignore the second arrow, or at least fail to explain its significance. Pfuhl 19 explained the problem this way: "in naive contradiction to it [the motif of Achilles' heel] a second arrow is sticking in the dead man's chest." But this is an artist of much skill and sophistication, and it is clear that he has taken great pains to depict the story with as much precision as possible.

Other representations in art are also relevant to this issue. The earliest possible scene of Achilles being struck is on a proto-Corinthian lekythos from the seventh century B.C.³² Among the many warriors depicted is a kneeling archer on the left who has shot an arrow that is about to strike the front of a standing warrior's shin. The scene in general is unremarkable, but the arrow is of colossal size, as if the artist considered it to be especially significant. Usually this is thought to be a heroic scene; commentators are divided, however, on whether it is of Paris wounding Achilles or of Paris wounding

³⁰ The location of this wound is said to be in the flank by Hampe/Simon 48; Young 1979: 13; Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a under *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 850; in the back by Kemp-Lindemann 221; T. Carpenter under illustration no. 328; Gantz 326; in the shoulder by Schoeck 77, 129; Janko 1992: 409; and in the chest by Pfuhl 19.

³¹ As Berthold 35-36; Young 1979: 13 rightly insist.

³² *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 848="Alexandros" no. 93; cf. Kemp-Lindemann 219.

Diomedes.³³ Diomedes was struck by Paris on the foot at *Il.* 11.369ff., and that wound is not represented here. If this is Paris shooting Achilles, then it is questionable whether the location of the wound agrees with the dipping in the Styx. Of course, the cramped spacing may not have allowed the artist to make an accurate representation of the wound's location.³⁴

An Etruscan black-figure amphora from the 6th century B.C. seems to depict Paris about to shoot Achilles from behind as Achilles chases another warrior.³⁵ Perhaps Paris is aiming at Achilles' right front foot.³⁶ This would be in accordance with the motif of Achilles' heel. Yet other commentators suggest Paris is aiming at other locations, and these would be out of harmony with the motif of Achilles' heel.³⁷

An Attic red-figure vase from the fifth century BC shows an arrow in flight, shot by Paris, with Apollo guiding it downwards towards Achilles' lower leg (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 851="Alexandros" no. 92). This might illustrate the motif of Achilles' heel. But Paris has strung a second arrow and is about to shoot it. That suggests that there will be a second arrow wound, just as there is a second arrow wound on the Chalcidian vase. This vase therefore does not seem to narrate the wounding of one vulnerable location. It does give further evidence that a lower wound played an important role in the story.

A number of Hellenistic Etruscan and Roman gems show a lone warrior kneeling on the ground. Often no wound is shown, but sometimes there is an arrow stuck in his

³³ Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a provides a summary and bibliography on the issue under *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 848. See also now Ahlberg-Cornell 72, who notes that the scene does not suggest the usual story in which Achilles has driven the Trojans to the gates of the city.

³⁴ As Hampe/Krauskopf under *LIMC* "Alexandros" no. 93 point out.

³⁵ *LIMC* "Achle" no. 126="Alexandros" no. 97; cf. Kemp-Lindemann 220-221.

³⁶ Hampe/Simon 49 suggest Paris is aiming at the right front foot; Hampe/Krauskopf 254 specify the heel as the target (but see next note).

³⁷ Kemp-Lindemann 220-221 says the back is the target; Hampe/Krauskopf under *LIMC* "Alexandros" no.97 suggest the leg (apparently Krauskopf, who is credited for the Etruscan art work in this article); and Gantz 626 suggests the "buttock or thigh."

heel, ankle (back or front), or foot.³⁸ Undoubtedly the schema depicts Achilles. In addition, some gems that follow the common schema of Ajax carrying the corpse of Achilles depict an arrow stuck in the heel, ankle, or foot of the corpse.³⁹ Robert saw (1923: 1188 n.1) that these gems could either agree with earlier art work in which invulnerability is not suggested, or that they could signify the motif of Achilles' heel (which he thinks originated in the Hellenistic period; see n.18 above). But often Achilles is depicted kneeling and reaching to pull the arrow out, and I think this suggests that it is an aggravating wound he has received, and not a fatal one.

When we turn to art of the Roman Empire, we can be sure that the motif of Achilles' heel was known. Yet since an artist could choose to follow an earlier tradition in which invulnerability is absent, close observation of the evidence is required. A silver jug from the early Empire shows Achilles kneeling in the same manner that he does on Hellenistic gems.⁴⁰ An arrow is stuck in his heel, warriors battle around him, and the walls of Troy are in the background. As he often does in the Hellenistic gems, Achilles reaches for the arrow, which suggests to me that the wound is not mortal.⁴¹ Kemp-Lindemann says that the jug depicts a second arrow in Achilles' back, which would raise the same questions as the Chalcidian amphora (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 850), but the arrow does not seem to have actually struck Achilles, so far as I can tell.⁴² It is probably just one of numerous arrows flying in the background of this chaotic battleground scene. A

³⁸ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 853 (which apparently is "Achle" no. 133, though not cross-referenced) shows an arrow in the heel: "Achilleus" no. 853a shows an arrow in the back ankle; "Achilleus" no. 853b shows an arrow in the front ankle; "Diomedes" no. 114 shows an arrow in the foot (I think this is Achilles, not Diomedes). Cf. Kemp-Lindemann 221. Neither Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a (*LIMC* "Achilleus") nor Kemp-Lindemann can always be relied upon to describe the location of the wound accurately.

³⁹ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 891a shows an arrow in Achilles' front ankle; no. 891g shows it stuck in his foot; no. 891h in the heel; "Achle" no. 143 apparently shows an arrow stuck in the corpse's front ankle. Cf. Kemp-Lindemann 225-226.

⁴⁰ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 856; cf. Kemp-Lindemann 221.

⁴¹ Kossatz-Deissmann 1981a under *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 856 argues that the sinking of Achilles' head signifies his death, but we should take into consideration the phenomenon of synopsis. Hampe/Simon 49 point out that Achilles' posture on one vase where he is not even wounded yet (*LIMC* "Alexandros" no. 97) foreshadows his death.

⁴² Kemp-Lindemann 221. The work is not depicted in the *LIMC*; see Lehmann-Hartleben pl. XIV B for a clear photograph of it.

bronze pan from the early empire shows a warrior carrying a corpse, which is reminiscent of the commonly depicted scene of Ajax carrying the dead Achilles.⁴³ The corpse is wounded in the thigh and in the breast. These wounds make Kemp-Lindemann doubt that Achilles is depicted, but the evidence I have examined demonstrates that two wounds may have been in the early tradition, and that the lower wound need not be in the heel.

A fragmented wall painting from the first century of our era (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 855="Alexandros" no. 99) shows both Apollo and Paris equipped with bow and arrow, and most interpret it to represent the death scene of Achilles. The figures are static, and there is some indication that the scene is indoors, which suggests the late version of Achilles' death in which he is ambushed in the temple of Thymbraean Apollo when he goes there to marry Polyxena.⁴⁴ Two reliefs from the third century of our era more certainly depict this story.⁴⁵ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 857 shows Apollo pointing to Achilles' lower leg as Paris aims an arrow. Polyxena is not present, but the unarmored Achilles is before an altar. *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 858 narrates the story of his marriage to Polyxena in a series of scenes. Achilles is shown in one without armor, struck in the foot by an arrow; Paris significantly points toward the wound. In the tradition of Achilles' death in the temple of Apollo, the motif of unique vulnerability is sometimes but not always present. Since these two reliefs emphasize a lower leg wound, they must be evoking this motif (and *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 858 thus clearly demonstrates that the heel does not have to be the location of the uniquely vulnerable wound).

⁴³ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 895; cf. Kemp-Lindemann 226.

⁴⁴ For sources of this tradition, see J. Frazer 2: 214 n.1; Gantz 628. King 184ff. persuasively argues that the sacrifice of Polyxena, which is definitely early, gradually engendered a story about a romantic intrigue between Achilles and Polyxena that led to Achilles' death. She opposes the view that this element was present in the early tradition (as e.g. Rzach 2394 supposed, but the early evidence portrays Achilles dying on the battlefield, not in a temple), and favors the view that though sources for it are later it originated in the Hellenistic period (as e.g. Robert 1189; Scheliha 243; P. Kakridis 294 think). Eustathius cited Hellanicus on the spelling of Thymbraeus (fr. 135 Müller), but that is not certain evidence that Hellanicus knew this story. Remarkably, the work that presents the scene described at *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 857 also shows Ajax carrying the corpse of Achilles on the battlefield; the artist apparently mixed two traditions of Achilles' death (see Kemp-Lindemann 221-222).

⁴⁵ *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 857="Alexandros" no. 101; "Achilleus" no. 858="Alexandros" no. 100; cf. Kemp-Lindemann 221-222.

What do these numerous examples of art work tell us? A couple of late Roman reliefs that depict the death of Achilles in the temple of Apollo seem to portray the motif of Achilles' heel (*LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 857, 858). Earlier art also seems to portray the motif of Achilles' heel at first glance, but close examination raises doubts. Certainly a wound to Achilles' lower leg is common.⁴⁶ Yet there is more than one wound on the Chalcidian vase (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 850) and on a Roman bronze pan (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 895). Two wounds preclude the story of a uniquely vulnerable location. *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 851 shows Paris shooting a second arrow, and that may suggest there will be a second wound.⁴⁷ Two literary passages have been cited as indicating that there is more than one wound: Achilles states at *Il.* 21.278 that he will die from the "shafts" (βελέεσσιν) of Apollo, and Pindar *Pyth.* 3.101 speaks of the arrows (τόξοις) that kill Achilles.⁴⁸ I have also suggested that the schema found on various Hellenistic gems and on *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 856, which depicts Achilles kneeling on the ground and sometimes reaching toward an arrow stuck in his ankle, foot, or heel, may indicate an aggravating wound, not a mortal one. The variance of the lower wound is also significant. The wound is not always depicted on the ankle, the location preferred by early literary accounts of the death of Achilles as well as by later sources for the motif of Achilles' heel. It is sometimes on the ankle, but also in the heel, foot, lower leg, and thigh. The location of some of these wounds could be in harmony with the motif of Achilles' heel, since this need not involve the heel or ankle only (as the wound in the foot in *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 859 seems to confirm). Yet higher wounds to the shin (*LIMC* "Achilleus"

⁴⁶ See also Pinney 139ff., esp. 145 n.110, who thinks she has identified a schema of Paris, or Apollo in the guise of Paris, demonstrably holding an arrow, point down, toward Achilles (cf. *LIMC* "Apollon" no. 880="Achilleus" no. 565, which shows Apollo holding an arrow out to Achilles as Achilles kills Hector). If she is correct, I think the direction of the arrow may also reflect a lower wound.

⁴⁷ A second Attic red-figure vase, *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 852="Alexandros" no. 91, also shows Paris shooting more than one arrow, but there is no suggestion of a lower wound.

⁴⁸ Berthold 36-37; Pestalozzi 17; Hampe/Simon 49. It should be noted, however, that τόξα may be translated as "bow," that Quintus of Smyrna 3.419 uses a plural to refer to the one arrow that had killed Achilles, and that at *Il.* 21.112 Achilles talks vaguely of a single arrow (or spear) that will kill him.

no. 848) and thigh (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 895, and possibly "Alexandros" no. 97) do not seem to conform to the story of the dipping of Achilles in the Styx.

We may conclude that the motif of Achilles' heel was not known in early Greek myth, unless it was a unknown variant of a tradition that generally did portray Achilles as uniquely vulnerable. It may have originated in the Hellenistic period, but even thereafter it was at least sometimes ignored. Nonetheless, both early literature and art work about Achilles' death usually emphasize a lower leg wound. It is clear that this wound is not just incidental to the death of Achilles. Somehow it was essential to the sequence of events, so much so that authors and artists emphasized it. If this wound is not in reference to a uniquely vulnerable location, why is it stressed?

I think the best explanation is that Paris, with Apollo's help, shot Achilles in the lower leg to immobilize the hero. The wound would not be fatal; another wound would have to kill Achilles. Robert concluded (1923: 1187) from the Chalcidian vase that in early Greek myth Achilles was first wounded in the "Ferse" and then fatally wounded in the breast. This must be the correct sequence, for we often see depictions of Paris aiming his first shot downwards. Pestalozzi later briefly suggested (1945: 17) that the first wound was designed to immobilize Achilles. Hampe/Simon developed this idea (48) into a more thorough argument for the immobilization of Achilles (and pointed out that Pestalozzi was wrong to suggest, citing the wounding of Diomedes by Paris at *Il.* 11.377, that the lower wound to Achilles on the Chalcidian amphora nailed him to the ground).

This story may be what the Chalcidian vase and other early Greek art and literature are narrating. Apparently the ankle was commonly cited as the location of the lower wound because a wound there is so effectively immobilizing. It would not especially matter, however, where the wound was, as long as it incapacitated the hero. Even wounds to the shin and leg would serve the same purpose in the story. Therefore all the early evidence of the wounding we have looked at is compatible with this story, though some of it at least is not compatible with the motif of Achilles' heel. Why would a

tradition feature the immobilization of Achilles? It is clear from his epithets ποδάρκης and πόδας ὠκύς in the *Iliad* that the swiftness of Achilles was an essential, and traditional, aspect of his nature. It would be an enormous advantage to the hero, and make it very difficult for an opponent to shoot him. A wound to his leg, ankle, or foot would effectively remove the advantage of swiftness from the hero, and make a second, fatal shot easier.

Homer usually depicts only one wound to a victim; the victim then either dies or survives.⁴⁹ An immobilizing wound followed by a mortal wound is therefore unusual when compared to Homeric practice. However, we need not limit the possibilities of myth to the habits of Homer. And if an immobilizing wound is unusual, that is explainable as arising from the special circumstances of Achilles' famed swiftness. His swiftness also explains why authors and artists would focus on the non-lethal wound rather than the wound that actually kills Achilles. The first wound would be essential to the sequence of events, and thus most memorable.

A passage in Pindar might reflect the immobilization of Achilles. In the fragmented *Paeon* 6, Apollo in the form of Paris is said to have saved Troy by "constraining him with bold blood," θρασεῖ φόνῳ πεδάσαις (l. 86). The verb πεδᾶν originally had the connotation of shackling the feet. Of course it is commonly used in a more abstract manner, but Pindar's use of it in this context may be an allusion to a wounding of Achilles that took away his swiftness of foot. A reflection of this story may also be in the idiosyncratic version of Achilles' death that Ptolemy Hephaestion told in the first century of our era.⁵⁰ According to Ptolemy, Achilles' ankle had been burned up by Thetis when she placed her infant in fire, as she often does in early Greek myth. Chiron had provided a replacement, but it falls out when Apollo chases him at Troy. Achilles trips, and then is killed. This bizarre and idiosyncratic story may preserve an

⁴⁹ See Schein 76ff.; Redfield 36. Hainsworth 1993a: 253 provides a table of weapons and locations for wounds.

⁵⁰ Photius *Bib.* 190, quoted by Young 1979: 13.

essential pattern of an earlier tradition: that Achilles was immobilized first, and then killed (thus Robert 2: 1187 n.3).

Note that Pindar and Ptolemy portray Apollo as the slayer of Achilles. In chapter three I discussed the variance in our ancient sources about who killed Achilles (see pp. 152-153). Sometimes Paris alone is the slayer, sometimes Apollo acts alone, sometimes they join forces. The version in which Apollo merely guides the arrows of Paris (e.g. Virgil *Aen.* 6.56-58) is arguably the most reasonable. The ironic aspect of a great warrior slain by the bow, perhaps from behind, is best preserved if Apollo interferes in the smallest degree possible, i.e. simply by guiding the arrows. That would seem to be what Homer implies, and in art we usually see Paris shooting with Apollo merely guiding the arrows if he is shown at all.⁵¹ Such minimal interference on the part of a divinity is also consistent with how gods behave in Homer.⁵²

I therefore conclude that in early Greek myth Paris with the help of Apollo, who perhaps merely guided his arrows, first immobilized Achilles with a lower leg wound and then killed him with a mortal wound. But much different conclusions have been reached that are worthy of consideration. Some have evolved from the theory that Achilles wore invulnerable armor in the pre-Homeric tradition, a theory most thoroughly presented in recent times by P. Kakridis.⁵³ Evidence for this idea can be found within the *Iliad*.

⁵¹ E.g. Robert 1187 n.1; Pestalozzi 17; Hampe/Simon 47-48; Gantz 625 conclude that this would have been the normal version in tradition. Schoeck 77, 130, followed by Jouan 1980: 94 and Janko 1992: 409, argued that the large arrow near the ankle on the Chalcidian vase (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 850) was shot by Apollo, and the smaller by Paris (*LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 855 may show both about to shoot). J. Kakridis 1949: 85-86; followed by Schadewaldt 1965: 161 n.1, thought Apollo would do more than guide arrows, citing his active interference in the death of Patroclus; below I will note how P. Kakridis follows this line of thought. The later story involving an ambush in the temple of Apollo seems to have favored Apollo merely guiding; all literary sources for this story except Hyginus follow that conception, as do *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 857, 858, which depict this story.

⁵² See Mueller 128-129 on the limited contact in warfare between gods and mortals in the *Iliad*. Schein 63 points out that with the possible exception of Ares at 5.842 no god actually takes a human life. Guidance of weapons either to or away from their mark, on the other hand, is common; e.g. 4.132; 5.187, 290, 586; 8.311.

⁵³ It was commonly held earlier in the century, e.g. by Paton 1-4; Berthold 37ff.; Drerup 231 n.3. Recently the idea has been accepted by Griffin 1977: 40, 1980: 167; De Romilly 34; M. Edwards 1987a: 3-4, 68, 137, 236, 295-296, 1991: 140-141, 322; Janko 1992: 310-311, 334, 409.

Though Homer never explicitly expresses the concept, the invulnerability of divine armor seems to underlie the death scenes of Patroclus and Hector. Both of these heroes wear the first of two sets of divine armor that Achilles possesses in the course of the *Iliad*.⁵⁴ The *Iliad* says Achilles obtained this first set from Peleus, who received it from the gods at his wedding (17.194-97, 18.84-85). In Patroclus' death scene, the armor has to be knocked off by Apollo before Patroclus can be killed (16.791ff.). In Hector's death scene, Achilles does not try to break through the armor but searches for a opening (22.321ff.). Eventually Hector is mortally wounded in the neck. These scenes and the manner in which Homer describes divine armor, as well as comments by the scholia, suggest that the divine armor of Achilles was invulnerable in the pre-Homeric tradition. After all, it is made of gold, silver, and tin, all valuable metals but ineffective if not magically invulnerable. And the use of a magic aid by a hero is common in Greek myth (e.g. Jason's salve against the fiery bulls; the magic bridle that Bellerophon uses on Pegasus; or the moly given to Odysseus by Hermes at *Od.* 10.281ff.).

P. Kakridis suggests that Achilles was killed after Apollo stripped off his invulnerable armor, citing the death of Patroclus as a reflection of this (292-293). I do agree with the neo-analytical position that the death of Patroclus is a reflection of the death of Achilles, as I indicated in the last chapter. Indeed, this theory may support my conclusion that Achilles was immobilized, for Patroclus first stands stunned by the blow of Apollo (immobilized) before he is mortally wounded.⁵⁵ But I think Kakridis is wrong to assume that Apollo's role in the death of Patroclus must reproduce exactly his role in the death of Achilles (see p. 233 above in chapter four).⁵⁶ More dubiously still, he

⁵⁴ Traditionally Achilles would have had only one, since two would preclude the undoubtedly ancient quarrel over Achilles' arms by Odysseus and Ajax (see Petalozzi 51-52; P. Kakridis 288-290; M. Edwards 1991: 140-141. Kakridis 290 n.1 traces this conclusion back to analysts who considered the *Iliad's* two sets a mistake of a redactor).

⁵⁵ Poseidon is said to blind and immobilize Alcahous before Idomeneus slays him at *Il.* 13.434ff., a death comparable to that of Patroclus (Fenik 1968: 217; see further at n.122 in chapter four). This death further demonstrates the vulnerability of an immobilized warrior.

⁵⁶ And there are differences in the manner of death. As P. Kakridis himself notes (293 n.1), Patroclus is not slain by bow.

considers the "heel" wound in early Greek myth about the death of Achilles to be an unimportant detail. The evidence that we have examined would indicate otherwise.

Some scholars who think Achilles wore invulnerable armor have avoided this mistake, and in fact have linked Achilles' invulnerable armor directly with the lower leg wound. Supposing that invulnerable armor prevented a more usual mortal blow, they conclude that Paris and Apollo killed Achilles with a shot to an unprotected area on the lower leg.⁵⁷ An essential problem with this theory is that it ignores the evidence that there was a second wound. It is also implausible that someone could die from a lower leg wound, as Gantz effectively argues (627). In book 11 of the *Iliad* Diomedes survives a wound to the foot. Quintus of Smyrna 3.60ff depicts Achilles dying from a single arrow wound to his ankle, apparently bleeding to death (there is no indication of unique invulnerability in Quintus), but that scene is very awkward, and I cannot believe that Quintus is here repeating an earlier tradition. It seems that he has provided a long death scene to the hero so that he could speak one of the verbose speeches of which Quintus is so fond. Talos the bronze man dies from an ankle wound, but that is because he has only one vein that ends there, and so loses all his blood.⁵⁸ Berthold points out (36 n.1) that death from a lower wound occurs often in world folklore, but that would seem to result from magical motifs like a uniquely vulnerable spot (which causes death once wounded; see p. 268 above), the concentration of the life spirit in the lower part of the body, or the use of lethal poison.

The concentration of the life spirit in an unusual place usually ends in the death of a hero when the location is accidentally or treacherously harmed.⁵⁹ Gantz proposes (1993: 627) that the life spirit of Achilles was once concentrated in Achilles' heel (he

⁵⁷ Berthold 35-36; M. Edwards 1987a: 239, 1991: 322. Janko 1992: 334 apparently follows this concept, though at 409 he suggests the lower wound was on a uniquely vulnerable spot.

⁵⁸ See Apollodorus *Bibl.* 1.9.26, with J. Frazer's notes *ad loc.*

⁵⁹ E.g. Pterelaus and Nisus die after their hair is cut (Apollodorus *Bibl.* 2.4.5; 3.15.8; see Berthold 31ff.). Cf. Samson, whose strength if not mortality is linked with his hair (King 203 notes the parallels between Samson and some versions of the motif of Achilles' heel). The linkage of the life spirit with an external object, e.g. Meleager's with a fire brand, is a related concept.

thinks, oddly, that vital organs would have to be displaced there; such an awkward rationalization is unnecessary in folklore). He suggests that this story fell out of favor but the detail of the ankle wound survived without explanation. This is an interesting but unconvincing idea. Even if we were tempted to consider this possible, the evidence for a second, lethal wound (which he too hastily rejects)⁶⁰ which led us to the conclusion that Achilles did not have unique vulnerability in early Greek myth should lead us to reject this proposal of a single, lethal wound.

The use of poison is a more plausible explanation of how a lower wound could be fatal.⁶¹ Poison is usually considered to have no place in the heroic world, but it is entirely consistent with other magical elements common Greek myth.⁶² Poison users in Greek myth include Odysseus (*Od.* 1.252-66; cf. the suitors' supposition that Telemachus would put poison in their drink, 2.325-330) and Heracles.⁶³ But this theory, like that of Gantz, ignores the evidence that a second wound was required to kill Achilles. Yet perhaps if the poison merely numbed Achilles' lower leg, it could have played a role in the immobilization of the hero.⁶⁴

⁶⁰ He argues (626) that at Apollodorus *Epit.* 5.3-4 "the actual slayer would surely be credited" if the ankle wound by Paris and Apollo did not kill Achilles. But it is easy to assume from the passage that Paris and Apollo are responsible for a second fatal shot. It may be surprising that only the incapacitating wound is mentioned, but that would be the more interesting and famous wound, and we are dealing with an epitome of a handbook. At 874 n.57 he argues that "Apollo should have no need for more than one arrow." True, but a divinity should not employ the full extent of his powers when interfering in mortal affairs, as I pointed out above. It would be an uninteresting story if Apollo simply cut Achilles down.

⁶¹ Rose/Robertson 5 briefly suggest that the lower wound was fatal because of poison.

⁶² See S. West *ad* 1.252-66 for ethical considerations on the use of poison; Murray 148-149 for indications of poison use in Homer; Paton 3 (esp. nn.2, 3) for poison as a magical device.

⁶³ Paton 3 suggests without explanation that Philoctetes and Achilles used poisoned arrows; Philoctetes could have inherited his from Heracles along with the bow (as at Quintus of Smyrna 9.392-395; Philoctetes kills Paris with the help of poisoned arrows at 10.235ff.), and poison could have part of Achilles' medicinal training (the spear given by Chiron to Peleus and eventually owned by Achilles makes Chiron a teacher of destruction, not just of healing—see Robbins 1993: 7-20; poison would merge the two skills). The wounding Telephus received from Achilles (see the summary of the *Cypria* by Proclus, Apollodorus *Epit.* 3.20, and J. Frazer's notes *ad loc.* for other sources) cannot heal without special treatment, which is reminiscent of the snakebite-poisoned wound of Philoctetes.

⁶⁴ S. West *ad* 1.252-66 also reports that it was beyond the means of the ancient Greeks to produce a poison that could kill anyone, but anything can happen in the supernatural world of mythology. Philoctetes kills Paris with his poisoned arrows at Quintus of Smyrna 10.235ff.; his two shots are not immediately fatal but later Paris succumbs. The Celtic hero Diarmid may have sometimes been thought to die because the boar bristle that pierces his sole was venomous (see Bergin, Lloyd, and Schoepperle 157-158; Green 81). Eurydice dies from a snake bite to her foot (see Apollodorus *Bibl.* 1.3.2, with J. Frazer's notes *ad loc.* for

The implausibility of a fatal wound on the lower leg does not disprove the theory that Achilles wore invulnerable armor. Invulnerable armor may in fact be compatible with an immobilization of Achilles. It would be advantageous to wear it, but it could not prevent all fatal wounds.⁶⁵ The example of Hector in the *Iliad*, slain by a wound to the neck in spite of his divine armor, demonstrates that. Memnon also wore divine armor made by Hephaestus, Proclus tells us, yet somehow he was slain by Achilles.⁶⁶ If Achilles wore invulnerable armor, a shot that could get by it still be possible, but very difficult because of his great speed. A first shot that immobilized Achilles would make a fatal wound much easier. It is therefore possible that both invulnerable armor and an immobilizing wound were part of the same story in early Greek myth about the death of Achilles.

I demonstrated above that early stories of Thetis with the infant Achilles contain elements later present in the myth of Achilles' heel. The immobilization of Achilles would also have aspects that later appear in the motif of Achilles' heel. Apollo assists the unlikely slayer Paris just enough to immobilize Achilles, leading to his death. In the motif of Achilles' heel, Apollo also assists Paris, but the lower leg wound that immobilized

other sources; interestingly, Garner 1993: 159 suggests that in a recently found fragment of Stesichorus [43; see n.11 of chapter three] the arrow which struck Achilles on the ankle is compared to a snake hiding in the thicket). The anonymous author of a mediaeval *Excidium Troiae* remarkably had Paris shoot Achilles in his uniquely vulnerable location with a poisoned arrow (see King 203). The translation by Way of θεοῦ δέ μιν λόσ ἐδάμνα (Quintus Smyrnaeus 3.148) as "his strength ebbed through the god-envenomed wound" seems to interpret λόσ as "poison," but it more likely means "arrow," (cf. 3.88, the two meanings are based on different roots; see *LSJ* "λόσ"). But Vermeule 156-157, 246 n.18 notes that Eos can use poisoned arrows, which must not be lethal, and Philoctetes' wound (also lower) is infected with snake poison but does not cause his death. These examples support my suggestion that poison could have merely helped to immobilize Achilles.

⁶⁵ Thus Kullmann 1960: 42. Hainsworth 1993a: 268 points out that in Homer arrows usually cannot penetrate armor but still manage to find uncovered spots. Sometimes these wounds are fatal; see Hainsworth's chart of wounds at 253.

⁶⁶ How is unclear. It is uncertain whether or not Quintus Smyrnaeus thought of divine armor as invulnerable, but he does not explicitly say that the armor of Memnon and Penthesileia (at 1.140-141 he says that Penthesileia also wore divine armor obtained from her father Ares) broke when they were slain, apparently in the chest (see 1.592ff., 2.542ff.). Sometimes art portrayed Pethesileia struck at the base of her neck (see *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 719ff.). Kemp-Lindemann 216 cites an Etruscan and an Italian work of the 5th and 4th centuries B.C. that show Memnon struck in the chest.

Achilles becomes the fatal wounding to his one vulnerable spot. If Achilles also wore invulnerable armor in the early tradition, then the motif of invulnerability would also continue from the earlier to later tradition, transferred from the armor to Achilles himself.⁶⁷ The motif of Achilles' heel probably did not exist in early Greek myth, but the seeds of the story might have. Motifs from early traditions about the death of Achilles were later transformed and re-used to create it.

The impetus for the changes to the story leading to the invention of the motif of Achilles' heel may come from the late variant in which Achilles is ambushed in the temple of Thymbraean Apollo.⁶⁸ This version of his death removes the two characteristics of Achilles that I suggested were present in the earlier tradition: his speed (he is killed when stationary, inside the temple) and his invulnerable armor (he comes to his wedding unarmored).⁶⁹ In one strand of the tradition concerning Achilles' ambush, most notably represented by Dictys and Dares, the concept of a uniquely vulnerable spot is ignored. The other strand features the motif of Achilles' heel. In fact all the literary sources for the motif of Achilles' heel that give any details concerning how his uniquely vulnerable spot is wounded relate the story of his ambush (Hyginus, Lactantius, and Servius; for sources see n.15 above). So do the only two certain representations of Achilles' death through a wound to a uniquely vulnerable location, *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 857, 858. It seems the motif of Achilles' heel is intertwined with the story of his ambush in the temple of Thymbraean Apollo. It is possible that the new version of Achilles' death, in removing the elements of Achilles' speed and armor, necessitated changes in how he was wounded. The Dictys/Dares strand simply ignored as no longer relevant the lower

⁶⁷ Some, e.g. Drerup 231 n.3, have argued instead that an invulnerable Achilles led to the idea of his invulnerable armor. Berthold 38 criticized that idea.

⁶⁸ It is not inconceivable that this variant originated before the motif of Achilles' heel. I have suggested that both originated in the Hellenistic period (see pp. 265-266 and n.44 above).

⁶⁹ He does not appear to wear armor in *LIMC* "Achilleus" nos. 857, 858; it is specified that he does not at Dares 34; Philostratus *Heroicus* 51.1-7 (all of which narrate the ambush of Achilles in the temple). Achilles is also stationary at his death in the Attic red-figure vase *LIMC* "Achilleus" no. 851 (5th century B.C.), but I think Hampe/Krauskopf (*LIMC* "Alexandros") 524 are correct to argue that this is an idiosyncrasy of the artist.

leg wound that had been featured in the earlier tradition. Those who wished to keep the famous lower leg wound in the story would have had to invent a new motive for its presence, for now there is no speeding Achilles to immobilize, and now Achilles is completely unprotected. The motif of Achilles' heel would be a perfect solution. The hero is wounded in the heel for new reasons: he is vulnerable only there, and the spot is linked to his mortality.

Before concluding this examination of the motif of Achilles' heel, we should turn back to the wounding of Diomedes on the foot in book 11 of the *Iliad*, which many have suspected is a reflection of the motif of Achilles' heel. It is no hindrance to this theory that it is the foot, not heel, on which Diomedes is wounded, for that location is compatible with the motif of Achilles' heel. But since the story of Achilles' unique invulnerability does not seem to have existed in early Greek myth, we may conclude that the *Iliad* does not indirectly represent it through the wounding of Diomedes. However, I suspect Homer knew a story about the death of Achilles that contained similar aspects, including a lower wound that immobilized him. The wounding of Diomedes in the foot by Paris could be a reflection of this immobilization of Achilles by Paris. Of course, Diomedes does not die, Apollo does not assist Paris, and the wound is entirely accidental. So this scene could not reflect the death of Achilles as closely as the death of Patroclus does. In the previous chapter I criticized neo-analysts for pursuing a confusing array of motifs transferred from one character to another, and so I am not inclined to stress the wounding of Diomedes as a reflection of Achilles. But many scholars have convincingly shown that Diomedes is a type of Achilles figure (see pp. 221-222 of chapter four). Perhaps the mirroring of Achilles' death by Diomedes exists on a secondary level to the enactment of Achilles' death by Patroclus, as Mueller suggests (53). The vague and fleeting parallel between wounding of Diomedes and the death of Achilles would not serve to foreshadow the death of Achilles, as I think the death of Patroclus does, but rather to emphasize the significance of the wounding of Diomedes. Diomedes will stay

out of action for the rest of the poem, so the Greeks have now lost the warrior who was best in the absence of Achilles. This corresponds to the later permanent loss of their truly best warrior when Achilles is slain after suffering a similarly lower wound. The wounding of Diomedes thus signals the end of his lengthy role as an Achilles figure.⁷⁰

Evidence about the death of Achilles in early Greek myth is unfortunately rare and incomplete, but close examination of it can lead to certain conclusions. The common belief that the motif of Achilles' heel existed at an early date in Greek myth is probably incorrect. It is more likely that Achilles was simply immobilized by a lower leg wound before being slain by a second wound. My conclusions offer little comfort to those who would prefer to view folklore motifs as late and post-Homeric, however. It is possible that invulnerable armor and even poison were involved in this story of Achilles' death, a story that Homer probably knew.

⁷⁰ See Schoeck 76-77; Kullmann 1960: 314-315.

Conclusion

This study has focused on the death of Achilles in the *Iliad* and in early Greek myth, and thereby explored the general issue of the relation between Homer and traditional myth. In chapter one I established that Homer knew a well-developed tradition about the Trojan war. The evidence of art in particular suggests that the myth contained in this tradition was very similar to the material in the poems later collected into the epic cycle. Since these poems are not as dependent on Homer as is commonly supposed, and since they do not display concepts first found long after Homer (another common belief), it is reasonable to consider them representatives of the tradition which Homer received. By surveying a wide range of literature and art we can sometimes ascertain the outlines of this "cyclic" tradition.

The critical world has been so averse to non-Homeric myth about the Trojan war that it has tried to portray it as in some way illegitimate. It has also been eager, for a variety of reasons, to establish Homer as the root of all early Greek literature and culture. Thus a notion arose that Homer killed off the tradition about the Trojan war which preceded him and somehow managed to immediately influence all other poets interested in the Trojan war. This theory ignores the oral culture of the Archaic Age that would have prevented the dominance of individual poems, and it also ignores the evidence of early Greek art, which represented "cyclic" myth before it represented Homeric subjects and which preferred "cyclic" themes to Homeric ones for some time. It also finds it necessary to exaggerate greatly references to the Homeric poems in early Greek literature. Other dubious critical ideas, such as attempts to label the supernatural, erotic, or exotic in myth as "late," have conspired to divide Homer from his tradition. It is tempting to think that the Homeric poems were quite different from other epics about the war at Troy but that

does not mean that they would not be based on the same traditional myth which later poems, such as those in the epic cycle, also used. The *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are unusually fine poems from an epic tradition which began long before Homer and survived long after him. Once we conceive of early Greek literature, even its best examples, as derived from a vast wealth of undocumented but undoubtedly pervasive and long-standing traditional myth, we begin to sense better Homer's relation to myth.¹

In chapter two I began to focus on the death of Achilles through exploration of passages concerned with it in the *Iliad*. Through close examination of the many passages in which his death is predicted in the *Iliad*, it was established that Homer seems to know a tradition about the death of this hero that contained certain details. It also became clear that Homer transforms the material he has received to suit his own poetic purposes. In this case Homer shows little interest in one dramatic prophecy from Thetis to Achilles, preferring to portray Achilles gaining foresight into his fate through extended conversations with his mother, with whom he has a very close relationship. I proposed that prophecy of Achilles' fate in pre-Homeric myth would have been very different and explored the possible manifestations of it, though lack of evidence prevented us from reaching any firm conclusions.

Chapter three presented a reconstruction of the death of Achilles in early Greek myth. A variety of sources in literature and art were used in this endeavor. Because of the conclusions reached in chapter one, this story can be regarded as basically the same one that Homer would have known. A particularly interesting question in this chapter concerned the afterlife of Achilles. I concluded that in pre-Homeric myth he probably

¹ See Nilsson 1933: 50 for the argument that myth is the source of epic poetry and not *vice versa*. He especially faults analysts for believing that early written poems created and developed myth; the same criticism can be applied to early neo-analysis. Though I agree with March that early Greek poets could creatively employ and transform myth, I disagree with her apparent assumption that a handful of poets dominated this myth, immediately and effectively changing its nature through their own compositions. I find Frye's description of literature as "displaced" myth (31ff.) appropriate in this context, and I agree with Notopoulos that Homer was one of the branches of early Greek myth, not the trunk (21).

enjoyed an existence after death in a paradise and also that his translation through his mother is not mutually exclusive with his burial in Troy.

Chapter four explored indirect reflections of the death of Achilles in the *Iliad*. It was first necessary to discuss the school of research known as neo-analysis. Though neo-analytical theory has undergone much change that has improved its arguments, some problems remain. What I call the "vengeance theory" may in particular be questioned, for it both exaggerates the element of vengeance in the story of Achilles' death and also seems to misinterpret the manner in which the *Iliad* re-uses pre-existing myth about the death of Achilles. Finally, by employing neo-analytical methodology transformed by my critique of it, I established that Homer has made both Patroclus and Achilles foreshadow the later death of Achilles. Their actions suggest and re-enact this mythic episode in a cooperative, significant, and unmistakable manner. In this way Homer has gone beyond the boundaries of the dramatic time of his poem to narrate the eventual death of his poem's hero. Thus the resonance of traditional myth is utilized to suggest an extra-Iliadic episode. It is apparent that this is only one aspect of a general narrative technique in which Homer succeeds in telling the traditional story of the whole Trojan war.

The final chapter addressed the question of Achilles' heel, i.e. the story in which Achilles is made almost completely invulnerable when dipped into the Styx as an infant. Tantalizing yet obscure evidence has suggested to many that this story was known in the Archaic Age, but I concluded that it originated in the Hellenistic period. Nonetheless, early myth about the death of Achilles somehow featured the wounding of his lower leg, perhaps because Achilles was immobilized before he was killed.

The problems are large for those interested in the nature of early Greek myth. Time has not been kind to the survival of early Greek literature. Some early artistic representations of Greek myth exist, but never as much as we would like. The Homeric poems provide us with much information, but the question of their date and the degree of invention in them are controversial issues. Thus certainty cannot be reached in exploring

the exact nature of the pre-Homeric myth. Nevertheless it is too simplistic to regard all post-Homeric myth as derived from the Homeric poems, for there was a strong tradition of the Trojan war upon which Homer built and which survived the triumph of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. There is evidence available about early Greek myth, and the methodology employed in this study suggests a way of using it to reach back into the pre-Homeric past. When we consider possibilities like those examined above, we may not be able to prove anything but we are gaining a better sense of how Homer utilized in a distinctive manner the tradition that he received

Appendix A: The Achilles-Memnon Episode

The basic story: Achilles meets Memnon in battle and kills him, attacks Troy, and is killed by Apollo and Paris. The divine mothers Thetis and Eos are often present, and obtain a special afterlife for their sons after they are slain.

- A) Memnon arrives to defend Troy, and before battle, Thetis predicts to Achilles that he will die shortly after Memnon's death*
- B) Memnon kills Antilochus when he rescues his father Nestor from Memnon*
- C) Achilles duels with Memnon and kills him; the divine mothers observe the use of divine scales to signify the outcome*
- D) Eos requests a special afterlife for Memnon; his corpse is removed from the field by divine intervention and buried*
- E) Immediately after killing Memnon, Achilles routs the Trojans and attacks Troy*
- F) Achilles is killed by Apollo and Paris by bow at the Scaean gates*
- G) There is a battle over the corpse of Achilles (in which Glaucus is killed by Ajax), and Ajax carries the body to safety as Odysseus defends*
- H) 1. There is an elaborate funeral ceremony for Achilles which Thetis, the Nereids, and the Muses attend; 2. Thetis takes Achilles from the pyre to a paradise; 3. the Greeks bury his ashes in a conspicuous funeral mound at Troy*
- I) Games are held in honor of Achilles*

Appendix B: Reflection of the Achilles-Memnon Episode in the *Iliad*,
According to the Vengeance Theory

The correspondence of characters: Patroclus~Antilochus, Patroclus~Achilles, Sarpedon~Memnon, Hector~Memnon, Achilles~Thetis, Achilles prefigures himself

- bk. 1:** *Achilles withdraws from battle after a quarrel with Agamemnon (~A)*
- bk. 8:** *Nestor is saved by Diomedes from Hector (~B)*
- bk. 11:** *Diomedes is shot in the foot by Paris (~F)*
- bk. 16:** *Achilles warns Patroclus before battle (~A)*
Patroclus kills Sarpedon (~C)
Sarpedon's corpse is removed from the field by Sleep and Death (~D)
Patroclus routs the Trojans and attacks Troy (~E)
Patroclus is killed by Hector (~B); Patroclus is killed by Apollo, Euphorbus, and Hector (~F)
- bk. 17:** *There is a battle over the corpse of Patroclus, which is eventually rescued (~G)*
- bk. 18:** *Thetis and the Nereids mourn, then visit a prostrate Achilles (~H)*
Thetis tells Achilles that he will die soon after Hector's death (~A)
- bk. 22:** *Achilles meets Hector in battle and kills him; scales are used to signify the outcome (~C)*
Achilles considers attacking Troy (~E)
- bk. 23:** *There is a funeral for Patroclus (~H)*
Games are held in honor of Patroclus (~I)

**Appendix C: The Patroclus Sequence
and the Achilles Sequence**

Patroclus Sequence

(A, C, D, E, F, G, H, I)

*Patroclus~Achilles, Sarpedon~Memnon,
Achilles~Thetis*

Bk. 16:

A. Achilles warns Patroclus before battle
(cf. the warning of Achilles by Thetis)

C. Patroclus kills Sarpedon (cf. the slaying
of Memnon by Achilles)

D. The corpse of Sarpedon is removed by
divine intervention (cf. the removal of the
corpse of Memnon by divine intervention)

E. Patroclus attacks Troy (cf. Achilles'
attack on Troy)

F. Patroclus is killed by Apollo and
Euphorbus by the walls of Troy (cf. the
slaying of Achilles by Apollo and Paris)

Achilles sequence

(H, A, C, E)

*Achilles prefigures his own death,
Hector ~Memnon*

Bk. 17:

G. A battle rages over the corpse of Patroclus (cf. the battle over the corpse of Achilles)

Bk. 18:

H. Thetis and the Nereids mourn a prostrate Achilles (cf. their mourning of him at his funeral)

A. Thetis warns Achilles he will die after Hector's death (cf. her warning that he will die after Memnon's death)

Bk. 22:

C. Achilles kills Hector (cf. his killing of Memnon)

E. Achilles considers attacking Troy (cf. his attack on Troy)

Bk. 23:

H. A funeral ceremony is given for Patroclus (cf. the funeral for Achilles)

I. Games are held for Patroclus (cf. the games for Achilles)

The two sequences together: A, C, D, E, F, G [H, A, C, E] H, I

REFERENCES

Note: I employ the author/date system for references. Date is not given in footnotes when only one work of the author has been cited in this study. For textual matters I refer to either the editor without date or to an abbreviation for the edition. Below are separate lists for abbreviations, editions cited, and works cited. No page numbers are given for articles arranged by alphabet, or for a chapter or article in a book when a table of contents is readily available. Page numbers are always those found in the publication used by myself if an article or book has been translated or reproduced in a new context. Occasionally I refer to the date of the original publication when a significant time has elapsed.

Abbreviations:

Bode *Scriptores rerum mythicarum Latini tres Romae nuper reperti*. Edited by G.H.

Bode. Repr. Hildsheim 1968. [orig. 1834]

Diehl *Anthologia lyrica Graeca*. 3rd ed. Edited by E. Diehl. Leipzig 1954-1955.

D-K *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 6th ed. 3 vols. Edited by H. Diels and W.

Kranz. Zurich 1951.

LIMC *Lexicon iconographicum mythologiae classicae*. Edited by H.C. Ackermann and

J.R. Gisler. Zurich 1981- .

L-P *Poetarum Lesbiorum fragmenta*. Edited by E. Lobel and D. Page. Oxford 1955.

MW *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Edited by R. Merkelbach and M.L. West. Oxford 1967.

Müller *Fragmenta historicorum Graecorum*. Edited by C. Müller. Paris 1841-1870.

OCD *Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2nd ed. Edited by N.G.L. Hammond and H.H.

Scullard. Oxford 1970.

PMG *Poetae melici Graeci*. Edited by D.L. Page. Cambridge 1962.

PMGF *Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta* 1. Edited by M. Davies. Oxford

1991.

Radt *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Vols. 3, 4 (Aeschylus, Sophocles). Edited by S. Radt. Göttingen 1977-1985.

RE *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft*. Edited by G. Wissowa, W. Kroll, K. Mittelhaus and K. Ziegler. Stuttgart 1893- .

Roscher *Ausführliches Lexicon der griechischen und römischen Mythologie*. 6 vols. Edited by W.H.R. Roscher. Leipzig 1884-1937.

Sn.-M. *Pindari carmina cum fragmentis*. 2 vols. Edited by B. Snell and H. Maehler. Leipzig and Stuttgart 1987-1989.

West *Iambi et elegi Graeci*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Edited by M. West. Oxford 1989-1992.

Editions Cited:

Apollodorus

Apollodorus. The Library. 2 vols. Edited by J.G. Frazer. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. 1921.

Epic Cycle and Proclus

Hymni, Cyclus, fragmenta, et cetera. Vol. 5 of *Homeri opera*. Edited by T.W. Allen. Oxford 1912.

Der Troische Epenkreis. Edited by E. Bethe. Stuttgart 1966. [orig. 1919]

Hesiod, the Homeric Hymns, and Homeric. Edited by H.G. Evelyn-White. Loeb Classical Library. London 1914.

Poetae epici Graeci. Testimonia et fragmenta. Vol. 1. Edited by A. Bernabé. Leipzig 1987.

Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta. Edited by M. Davies. Göttingen 1988.

(Proclus only)

Die Quellen der Ilias, pp. 52-57. Edited by W. Kullmann [Allen's text with changes listed on p. 51 n.8]. Wiesbaden 1960. [*Hermes Einzelschriften* 14]

La vita Homeri et les sommaires du cycle. Vol 4 of *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclos.* Edited by A. Severyns. Paris 1963.

Hesiod. Erga

Hesiod, Works and Days. Edited by M.L. West. Oxford 1978.

Theogonia, Opera et dies, Scutum. Edited by F. Solmsen. 2d ed. Oxford 1983.

Homer. Iliad

Ilias. Vols. 1-2 of *Homeri opera.* Edited by T.W. Allen and D.B. Monro. 3rd ed. Oxford 1920.

Homer. Odyssey.

Odyssea. Vols. 3-4 of *Homeri opera.* Edited by T.W. Allen. 2nd ed. Oxford 1917-1919.

Works Cited:

Adkins, A.W.H. 1960. *Merit and Responsibility.* Oxford.

Ahlberg-Cornell, G. 1992. *Myth and Epos in Early Greek Art.* Jonsered.

Alexiou, M. 1974. *The Ritual Lament in Greek Tradition.* Cambridge.

Allen, T.W. 1903. "The Epic Cycle." *CQ* 2: 64-74, 81-88.

———, ed. 1912. *Hymni, Cyclus, fragmenta, et cetera.* Vol. 5 of *Homeri opera.* Oxford.

———. 1924. *Homer. The Origins and the Transmission.* Oxford.

Andersen, Ø. 1982. "Thersites und Thoas vor Troia." *Symb. Osl.* 57: 7-34

———. 1987. "Myth, Paradigm and 'Spatial Form' in the *Iliad.*" In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*, eds. J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. De Jong, J. Kalff (Amsterdam).

———. 1990. "The Making of the Past in the *Iliad.*" *HSCP* 93: 25-45.

Anderson, G. 1986. *Philostratus.* London.

Antonaccio, C. 1993. "The Archaeology of Ancestors." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*, eds. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (Cambridge).

- Austin, N. 1975. *Archery at the Dark of the Moon*. Berkeley.
- Barron, J.P., and P.E. Easterling. 1989. "The Cyclic Epics." In *Early Greek Poetry*, vol. 1.1 of *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge).
- Barth, H-L. 1989. "Achill und das Schicksal des Patroklos: Zum angeblichen Widerspruch zwischen Hom. P 410f. und Σ 9-11." *Hermes* 117: 1-24.
- Bascom, W. 1984. "The Forms of Folklore: Prose Narratives." In *Sacred Narrative*, ed. A. Dundes (Berkeley).
- Bassett, S.E. 1938. *The Poetry of Homer*. Berkeley.
- Bergin, O.J., and J.H. Lloyd, G. Schoepperle. 1912. "The Death of Diarmid." *Revue Celtique* 33: 157-179.
- Bergren, A. 1980. "Helen's Web—Time and Tableau in the *Iliad*." *Helios* 7:19-34.
- Bernabé, A., ed. 1987. *Poetae epici Graeci: Testimonia et fragmenta*. Vol. 1. Leipzig.
- Berthold, O. 1911. *Die Unverwundbarkeit in Sage und Aberglauben der Griechen*. Giessen.
- Bethe, E., ed. 1966. *Der Troische Epenkreis*. Stuttgart. [orig. 1919]
- . 1927. *Die Sage vom Troischen Kriege*. 3rd vol. of *Homer. Dichtung und Sage*. Leipzig.
- Blumenthal, H.J. 1978. "Callimachus, Epigram 28, Numenius fr. 20, and the Meaning of κικλικός." *CQ* 28: 125-127.
- Boardman, J. 1964. *The Greeks Overseas*. London.
- Boedeker, D.D. 1974. *Aphrodite's Entry into Greek Epic*. Leiden.
- Bothmer, D. von. 1981. "The Death of Sarpedon." In *The Greek Vase*, ed. S.L. Hyatt (Latham, N.Y.).
- Bowra, C.M. 1930. *Tradition and Design in the Iliad*. Oxford.
- . 1952. *Heroic Poetry*. Oxford.
- . 1955. *Homer and his Forerunners*. Edinburgh.
- Braswell, B.K. 1971. "Mythological Innovation in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 21: 16-26.

- Brillante, C. 1990. "Myth and History." In *Approaches to Greek Myth*, ed. L. Edmunds (Baltimore).
- Brink, C.O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry. The Ars poetica*. Cambridge.
- Burkert, W. 1976. "Das hunderttorige Theben und die Datierung der Ilias." *WS* n.s. 10: 5-21.
- . 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. Berkeley.
- . 1979b. "Kynaithos, Polycrates, and the *Homeric Hymn to Apollo*." In *Arktouros*, eds. G.W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, and M.C.J. Putnam (Berlin and New York).
- . 1983. *Homo Necans*. Trans. P. Bing. Berkeley.
- . 1985. *Greek Religion*. Trans. J. Raffan. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1992. *The Orientalizing Revolution*. Trans. M.E. Pinder and W. Burkert. Cambridge, Mass.
- Burn, A.R. 1960. *The Lyric Age of Greece*. London.
- Cameron, A. 1993. *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford.
- Campbell, J. 1968. *The Hero with a Thousand Faces*. 2nd ed. Princeton.
- Camporeale, G. 1981. "Achle." In *LIMC*.
- Carpenter, R. 1946. *Folk Tale, Fiction, and Saga in the Homeric Epics*. Berkeley.
- Carpenter, T.H. 1991. *Art and Myth in Ancient Greece*. London.
- Chadwick, H.M. 1912. *The Heroic Age*. Cambridge.
- Clark, M.E. 1986. "Neoanalysis: A Bibliographical Review." *CW* 79: 379-394.
- Clark, M.E. and W.D.E. Coulson. 1978. "Memnon and Sarpedon." *MH* 35: 65-73.
- Clarke, H.H.C. 1981. *Homer's Readers*. Newark, Delaware.
- Coldstream, J.N. 1976. "Hero-Cults in the Age of Homer." *JHS* 96: 8-17.
- . 1977. *Geometric Greece*. London.
- Combella, F.M. 1944. "Homer and Hector." *AJP* 65: 209-243.

- . 1949. Review of E. Howald, *Der Dichter der Ilias* (Zurich 1946). *CP* 44: 54-56.
- . 1950. "Unitarians and Homeric Originality." *AJP* 71: 337-364.
- . 1962. Review of Kullmann 1960. *AJP* 83: 193-198.
- . 1963. Review of Schoeck 1961. *CP* 58: 245-247.
- , trans. 1968. *The War at Troy: What Homer Didn't Tell, by Quintus of Smyrna*. Norman, Oklahoma.
- . 1976. "Homer the Innovator." *CP* 71: 44-55.
- Cook, R.M. 1983. "Art and Epic in Ancient Greece." *BABesch* 58: 1-10.
- Cross, T.P. 1952. *Motif-Index of Early Irish Literature*. Bloomington.
- Danoff, C.M. 1962. "Pontos Euxeinos." In *RE* S IX.
- Davies, M. 1981. "The Judgement of Paris and *Iliad* Book XXIV." *JHS* 101: 56-62.
- . 1986. "Prolegomena and Paralegomena to a New Edition (with Commentary) of the Fragments of Early Greek Epic." *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen 1 phil.-hist. Kl. 2*: 91-111.
- , ed. 1988. *Epicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Göttingen.
- . 1989a. *The Epic Cycle*. Bristol.
- . 1989b. "The Date of the Epic Cycle." *Glotta* 67: 89-100.
- . 1989c. "Kinkel Redivivus" (review of Bernabé 1987). *CR* 103: 4-9.
- , ed. 1991. *Poetarum melicorum Graecorum fragmenta 1 (PMGF)*. Oxford.
- Davison, J.A. 1947. Review of Pestalozzi 1945. *CR* 61: 28.
- . 1955. "Pisistratus and Homer." *TAPA* 86: 1-21.
- . 1962. "The Homeric Question." In *Companion to Homer*, eds. A.J.B. Wace and F.H. Stubbings (London).
- . 1968. *From Archilochus to Pindar*. London.
- de Jong, I.J.F. 1987. *Narrators and Focalizers*. Amsterdam.
- de Romilly, J. 1983. *Perspectives Actuelles sur l'Épopée Homériques*. Paris.

- Diehl, E. 1953. "Pontarches (2)." In *RE*.
- Dieterich, A. 1893. *Nekyia*. Leipzig.
- Dietrich, B.C. 1964 "The Judgment of Zeus." *RhM* 107: 97-125.
- . 1965. *Death, Fate, and the Gods*. London.
- Dihle, A. 1970. *Homer-Probleme*. Opladen.
- Dodds, E.R. 1951. *The Greeks and the Irrational*. Berkeley.
- Drerup, E. 1921. *Das Homerproblem in der Gegenwart*. Würzburg.
- Drews, R. 1969. "Aethiopian Memnon: African or Asiatic?" *RhM* 112: 191-192.
- . 1976. "The Earliest Greek Settlements in the Black Sea." *JHS* 96: 18-31.
- Duckworth, G.E.D. 1933. *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius and Vergil*. Princeton.
- Edmunds, L. 1990. *Approaches to Greek Myth*. Baltimore.
- Edwards, A.T. 1984. "Aristos Achaïōn: Heroic Death and Dramatic Structure in the *Iliad*." *QUCC* 17: 61-80.
- . 1985. "Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Aethiopsis*." *GRBS* 26: 215-228.
- Edwards, M.W. 1987a. *Homer: Poet of the Iliad*. Baltimore.
- . 1987b. "Topos and Transformation in Homer." In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*, eds. J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. De Jong, J. Kalff (Amsterdam).
- . 1990. "Neoanalysis and Beyond." *CA* 9: 311-325.
- . 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 5. Cambridge.
- Edwards, W.M., and R. Browning. 1970. "Philostrati." In *OCD*.
- Else, G.F. 1957. *Aristotle's Poetics: The Argument*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Escher, J.. 1893. "Achilleus" (1). In *RE*.
- Fairbanks, A., ed. 1931. *Philostratus, Imagines. Callistratus, Descriptions*. Loeb Classical Library. London.
- Farnell, L.R. 1916. "Ino-Leukothea." *JHS* 36: 36-44.

- . 1921. *Greek Hero Cults and Ideas of Immortality*. Oxford.
- Fenik, B.C. 1964. *Iliad X and the Rhesus: The Myth*. Brussels.
- . 1968. *Typical Battle Scenes in the Iliad*. Wiesbaden. [*Hermes Einzelschriften* 21]
- Fittschen, K. 1969. *Untersuchungen zum Beginn der Sagendarstellungen bei den Griechen*. Berlin.
- Fleischer, C. 1884-1886. "Achilleus." In Roscher.
- Floyd, E.A. 1989. "Homer and the Life-Producing Earth." *CW* 82: 337-349.
- Foley, H.P., ed. 1994. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Princeton, N.J.
- Ford, A. 1992. *Homer. The Poetry of the Past*. Ithaca.
- Forsdyke, J. 1956. *Greece Before Homer*. New York.
- Fowler, R.L. 1987. *The Nature of Early Greek Lyric*. Toronto.
- Frame, D. 1978. *The Myth of Return in Early Greek Epic*. New Haven.
- Fränkel, H. 1975. *Early Greek Poetry and Philosophy*. Trans. M. Hadas and J. Willis. Oxford.
- Frazer, J.G., ed. 1921. *Apollodorus. The Library*. 2 vols. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Frazer, R.M., trans. 1966. *The Trojan War. The Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian*. Bloomington.
- . 1989. "The Return of Achilles as a Climactic Parallel to Patroklos Entering Battle." *Hermes* 117: 381-390.
- Friis Johansen, K. 1961. *Aias und Hektor: Ein vorhomerisches Heldenlied?* Historik-Filosofiske Meddelelser udgivet af det Kongelige Danske Videnskabernes Selskab 39 1.
- . 1967. *The Iliad in Early Greek Art*. Copenhagen.
- Frye, N. 1963. *Fables of Identity*. New York.

- Gaisser, J.H. 1969. "Adaptation of Traditional Material in the Glaucus-Diomedes Episode." *TAPA* 100: 165-176.
- Gantz, T. 1993. *Early Greek Myth*. Baltimore.
- Gardner, J., and J. Maier., trans. 1984. *Gilgamesh*. New York.
- Garner, R. 1990. *From Homer to Tragedy*. London and New York.
- . 1993. "Achilles in Locri." *ZPE* 96: 153-165.
- Gentili, B. 1988. *Poetry and its Public in Ancient Greece*. Trans. A. T. Cole. Baltimore.
- Green, M.J. 1992. *Dictionary of Celtic Myth and Legend*. London.
- Griffin, J. 1977. "The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer." *JHS* 97: 39-53.
- . 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford.
- Haft, A. 1990. "'The City-Sacker Odysseus' in *Iliad* 2 and 10." *TAPA* 120: 37-56.
- Hainsworth, B.. 1969. "Homer." Oxford. [*G&R New Surveys in the Classics*, no. 3]
- , ed. 1993a. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 3. Cambridge.
- . 1993b. *The Idea of Epic*. Berkeley.
- Halliday, W.R. 1927. "Tenos." *CQ* 21: 37-44.
- Hampe, R. 1981. "Aktorione." In *LIMC*.
- Hampe, R., and I. Krauskopf. 1981. "Alexandros." In *LIMC*.
- Hampe, R. and E. Simon. 1964. *Griechische Sagen in der frühen etruskischen Kunst*. Mainz.
- Hansen, W.F 1972. *The Conference Sequence*. Berkeley.
- . 1990. "Odysseus and the Oar: A Folkloric Approach." In *Approaches to Greek Myth*, ed. L. Edmunds (Baltimore).
- Haslam, M.W. 1991. "Kleitias, Stesichorus, and the Jar of Dionysos." *TAPA* 121: 35-45.
- Havelock, E.A. 1982. *The Literate Revolution in Greece and its Cultural Consequences*. Princeton.
- Heath, M. 1989. *Unity in Greek Poetics*. Oxford.
- Heubeck, A. 1954. *Der Odyssee-Dichter und die Ilias*. Erlangen.

- . 1974. *Die Homerische Frage*. Darmstadt.
- . 1978. "Homeric Studies Today: Results and Prospects." In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*, ed. B.C. Fenik (Leiden).
- . 1989. "Books IX-XII." In *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 2, eds. A. Heubeck, S. West, J.B. Hainsworth (Oxford).
- . 1991. "Studien zur Struktur der Ilias (Retardation-Motivübertragung)." In *Homer. Die Dichtung und ihre Deutung*, ed. J. Latacz (Darmstadt). [orig. 1950]
- . 1992. "Books XXIII-XXIV." In *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 3, eds. A. Heubeck, S. West, J.B. Hainsworth (Oxford).
- Hoelscher, U. 1978. "The Transformation from Folk-Tale to Epic." In *Homer: Tradition and Invention*, ed. B.C. Fenik (Leiden).
- Holland, R. 1894-1897. "Memnon." In Roscher.
- Hommel, H. 1980. *Der Gott Achilleus*. SHAW abhandlung 1, 7-52.
- Hooker, J.T. 1988. "The Cults of Achilles." *RhM*. 131: 1-7.
- Horsfall, N. 1979. "Stesichorus at Bovillae?" *JHS* 99: 26-48.
- Huxley, G.L. 1969. *Greek Epic Poetry*. London.
- Jackson Knight, W.F. 1970. *Elysion*. London.
- Jamison, S.W. 1994. "Draupadi on the Walls of Troy: *Iliad* 3 from an Indic Perspective." *CA* 13: 5-16.
- Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns*. Cambridge.
- , ed. 1987. *Aristotle. Poetics*. Indianapolis.
- 1992. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 4. Cambridge.
- Jebb, R.C. 1905. *Homer*. 7th ed. Glasgow.
- Jensen, M.S. 1980. *The Homeric Question and the Oral-Formulaic Theory*. Copenhagen.
- Jouan, F. 1966. *Euripide et les légendes des chants cypriens*. Paris.

- . 1980. "Le cycle épique: Etat des questions." In *Association Guillaume Budé, Actes du Xe Congrès (Paris)*, 83-104.
- Kakridis, J.T. 1949. *Homeric Researches*. Lund.
- . 1971. *Homer Revisited*. Lund.
- . 1986 "ΑΙΑΣ ΑΠΟΜΑΧΟΜΕΝΟΣ." *WS* 20: 63-67.
- Kakridis, P.J. 1961. "Achilleus' Rüstung." *Hermes* 89: 288-297.
- Kannicht, R. 1982. "Poetry and Art: Homer and the Monuments Afresh." *CA* 1: 70-92.
- Kearns, E. 1989. *The Heroes of Attica*. London.
- Kemp-Lindemann, D. 1975. *Darstellungen des Achilleus in griechischer und römischer Kunst*. Frankfurt.
- King, K.C. 1987. *Achilles*. Berkeley.
- Kirk, G.S. 1962. *The Songs of Homer*. Cambridge.
- . 1966. "Formular Language and Oral Quality." *YSC* 20: 155-174.
- . 1974. *The Nature of Greek Myths*. London.
- . 1976. *Homer and the Oral Tradition*. Cambridge.
- . 1985. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 1. Cambridge.
- . 1990. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 2. Cambridge.
- Knaack, G. 1903. "Demophon" (1). In *RE*.
- Kopff, E. 1983. "The Structure of the Amazonia (Aethiopia)." In *The Greek Renaissance of the 8th Century B.C.*, ed. R. Häg (Stockholm).
- Kossatz-Deissmann, A. 1981a. "Achilleus." In *LIMC*.
- . 1981b. "Antilochus I." In *LIMC*.
- . 1992. "Memnon." In *LIMC*.
- Krohn, K. 1971. *Folklore Methodology*. Trans. R.L. Welsch. Austin.
- Kullmann, W. 1960. *Die Quellen der Ilias*. Wiesbaden. [*Hermes Einzelschriften* 14]
- . 1968. "Vergangenheit und Zukunft in der Ilias." *Poetica* 2:15-37.
- . 1981. "Zur Methode der Neoanalyse in der Homerforschung." *WS* 15: 5-42.

- . 1984. "Oral Poetry Theory and Neoanalysis in Homeric Research." *GRBS* 25: 307-324.
- . 1986. "Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker über Homer und den epischen Kyklos." In *Friedrich Gottlieb Welcker: Werk und Wirkung*, eds. W.M. Calder III, A. Köhnken, W. Kullmann, and G. Pflug (Stuttgart). [*Hermes Einzelschriften* 49]
- . 1991. "Ergebnisse der motivgeschichtlichen Forschung zu Homer (Neoanalyse)." In *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung*, ed. J. Latacz (Stuttgart).
- Lang, A. 1893. *Homer and the Epic*. London.
- Lang, M.L. 1969. "Homer and Oral Techniques." *Hesperia* 38: 159-168.
- . 1983. "Reverberation and Mythology in the *Iliad*." In *Approaches to Homer*, eds. C.A. Rubino and C.W. Shelmerdine (Austin).
- Laurens, A.-F. 1990. "Hekabe." In *LIMC*.
- Leaf, W., ed. 1886-1888. *The Iliad*. 1st ed. 2 vols. London.
- , ed. 1900-1902. *The Iliad*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Repr. Amsterdam 1971.
- . 1912. *Troy: A Study in Homeric Geography*. London.
- Lefkowitz, M.R. 1981. *The Lives of the Greek Poets*. London.
- Lehmann-Hartleben, K. 1938. "Two Roman Silver Jugs." *AJA* 42: 82-105.
- Lloyd-Jones, H. 1973. "Stasinos and the *Cypria*." In *Στασίνοσ Δ', 1968-1972*.
- . 1983. *The Justice of Zeus*. 2nd ed. Berkeley.
- Lesky, A. 1966. *A History of Greek Literature*. Trans. J. Willis and C. de Heer. London.
- . 1967. *Homerus*. Stuttgart. [also in *RE Suppl.* XI]
- Lord, AB. 1960. *The Singer of Tales*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Lowenstam, S. 1981. *The Death of Patroklos*. Königstein.
- . 1993a. "The Arming of Achilles on Early Greek Vases." *CA* 12: 199-218.
- . 1993b. "The Date of our *Iliad* and *Odyssey*." Unpublished paper delivered at the APA Convention, Washington, D.C. [1993 *APA Abstracts* p. 43]
- Lucas, D.W., ed. 1968. *Aristotle. Poetics*. Oxford.

- Luce, J.V. 1975. *Homer and the Heroic Age*. London.
- MacCulloch, J.A. 1918. "Celtic Mythology." In vol. 3 of *The Mythology of All Races*, ed. L.H. Gray and G.F. Moore (repr. New York 1964).
- Macleod, C.W., ed. 1982. *Homer, Iliad Book XXIV*. Cambridge.
- March, J.R. 1987. *The Creative Poet*. London.
- Marx, F. 1885. "Ein Neuer Aresmythus." *AZ* 43: 169-179.
- McLeod, W. 1966. "Studies on Panyassis—An Heroic Poet of the Fifth Century." *Phoenix* 20: 95-110.
- . 1985. "The 'Epic Canon' of the Borgia Table: Hellenistic Lore or Roman Fraud?" *TAPA* 115: 153-165.
- . 1987a. "The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* as Great Literature." In *Approaches to Teaching Homer's Iliad and Odyssey*, ed. K. Myrsiades (New York).
- . 1987b. Review of Kirk 1985. *CV* 31 (n.s. 6): 360-365.
- Merkelbach, R. 1969. *Untersuchungen zur Odyssee*. 2nd ed. Munich.
- Merkelbach, R. and M.L. West. 1967. *Fragmenta Hesiodica*. Oxford.
- Minns, E.H. 1913. *Scythians and Greeks*. Cambridge.
- Mondi, R. 1990. "Greek Mythic Thought in the Light of the Near East." In *Approaches to Greek Myth*, ed. L. Edmunds (Baltimore).
- Monro, D.B. 1883. "On the Fragment of Proclus' Abstract of the Epic Cycle Contained in the Codex Venetus of the *Iliad*." *JHS* 4: 305-334.
- . 1884. "The Poems of the Epic Cycle." *JHS* 5: 1-41.
- , ed. 1893. *Homer. The Iliad*. 2vols. 3rd ed. Oxford.
- , ed. 1901. *Homer's Odyssey. XIII-XXIV*. Oxford.
- Morris, I. 1993. "Poetics of Power. The Interpretation of Ritual Action in Archaic Greece." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*, eds. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (Cambridge).
- Morrison, J. 1992. *Homeric Misdirection*. Ann Arbor.

- Most, G. 1990. "Canon Fathers: Literacy, Mortality, Power." *Arion* 3rd s., 1: 35-60.
- Mueller, M. 1984. *The Iliad*. London.
- Murnaghan, S. 1992. "Maternity and Mortality in Homeric Poetry." *CA* 11: 242-264.
- Murray, G. 1934. *The Rise of the Greek Epic*. 4th ed. Oxford.
- Nagler, M.N. 1974. *Spontaneity and Tradition*. Berkeley.
- Nagy, G. 1979. *The Best of the Achaeans*. Baltimore.
- . 1990a. *Greek Mythology and Poetics*. Ithaca.
- . 1990b. *Pindar's Homer*. Baltimore.
- . 1992. "Homeric Questions." *TAPA* 122: 17-60.
- Nagy, J.F. 1990. "Hierarchy, Heroes, and Heads: Indo-European Structure in Greek Myth." In *Approaches to Myth*, ed. L. Edmunds (Baltimore).
- Nethercut, W.R. 1976. "The Epic Journey of Achilles." *Ramus* 5: 1-17.
- Nilsson, M.P. 1932. *The Mycenaean Origin of Greek Mythology*. Repr. Berkeley 1972.
- . 1933. *Homer and Mycenae*. Repr. Philadelphia 1972.
- . 1949. *A History of Greek Religion*. 2nd ed. Oxford.
- Nisetich, F.J. 1989. *Pindar and Homer*. Baltimore.
- Notopoulos, J.A. 1964. "Studies in Early Greek Oral Poetry." *HSCP* 68:1-77.
- Olrik, A. 1992. *Principles for Oral Narrative Research*. Trans. K. Wolf, J. Jensen. Bloomington. [orig. 1922]
- Onians, R.B. 1951. *The Origins of European Thought*. Cambridge.
- Owen, E.T. 1946. *The Story of the Iliad*. Repr. Wauconda, Il. 1989.
- Page, D.L. 1959. *History and the Homeric Iliad*. Berkeley.
- . 1961. Review of Kullmann 1960. *CR* 11: 205-209.
- , ed. 1962. *Poetae melici Graeci*. Oxford.
- . 1963. Review of Schoeck 1961. *CR* 13: 21-24.
- . 1973. *Folktales in Homer's Odyssey*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma*. Oxford.

- Parry, A. 1966. "Have We Homer's *Iliad*?" *YCS* 20: 175-216.
- Paton, W.R. 1912. "The Armour of Achilles." *CR* 26: 1-4.
- Pépin, J. 1991a. "The Survival of Myths in Early Christianity." Trans. G. Honigsblum.
In *Mythologies*, eds. Y. Bonnefoy and W. Doniger (Chicago), 2: 649-654.
- . 1991b. "Christian Judgments on the Analogies between Christianity and Pagan Mythology." Trans. D. White. In *Mythologies*, eds. Y. Bonnefoy and W. Doniger (Chicago), 2: 655-665.
- Perry, B.E. 1937. "The Early Greek Capacity for Viewing Things Separately." *TAPA* 68: 403-427.
- Pestalozzi, H. 1945. *Die Achilleis als Quelle der Ilias*. Zurich.
- Pfeiffer, R. 1968. *History of Classical Scholarship*. Vol 1. Oxford.
- Pfister, F. 1970. *Götter- und Heldensagen der Griechen*. 2nd ed. Heidelberg.
- Pfuhl, E. 1955. *Masterpieces of Greek Drawing and Painting*. Trans. J.D. Beazley.
London.
- Pinney, G.F. 1983. "Achilles Lord of Scythia." In *Ancient Greek Art and Iconography*,
ed. W.G. Moon (Madison).
- Pley, J. 1931. "Memnon" (1). In *RE*.
- Pope, M. 1985. "A Nonce-Word in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 35: 1-8.
- Price, T. H. 1979. "Hero Cult in the 'Age of Homer' and Earlier." In *Arktouros*, eds.
G.W. Bowersock, W. Burkert, and M.C.J. Putnam (Berlin and New York).
- Propp, V. 1984. *Theory and History of Folktale*. Edited by A. Liberman, trans. by A.Y.
Martin, R. Martin *et al.* Minneapolis.
- Rabel, R. 1990. "Apollo as a Model for Achilles in the *Iliad*." *AJP* 111: 429-440.
- . 1991. "Hippothous and the Death of Achilles." *CJ* 86: 126-130.
- Radt, S., ed. 1977-1985. *Tragicorum Graecorum fragmenta*. Vols. 3, 4 (Aeschylus,
Sophocles). Göttingen.
- Ramage, E.S. 1962. Review of Schoeck 1961. *CW* 55: 293.

- Ramage, E.S. 1962. Review of Schoeck 1961. *CW* 55: 293.
- Rankin, H.D. 1972. "Thersites the Malcontent, a Discussion." *Symb. Osl.* 47: 36-60.
- Redfield, J.M. 1975. *Nature and Culture in the Iliad*. Chicago.
- Reinhardt, K. 1961. *Die Ilias und ihr Dichter*. Ed. U. Hölscher. Göttingen.
- Renehan, R. 1987. "The Heldenot in Homer: One Heroic Ideal." *CP* 82: 99-116.
- Richardson, N.J., ed. 1974. *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter*. Oxford.
- . 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Vol. 6. Cambridge.
- Ritchie, W. 1964. *The Authenticity of the Rhesus of Euripides*. Cambridge.
- Robbins, E. 1990a. "Achilles to Thetis: *Iliad* 1.365-412." *EMC/CV* 9: 1-15.
- . 1990b. "The Gifts of the Gods: Pindar's Third Pythian." *CQ* 40: 307-318.
- . 1993. "The Education of Achilles." *QUCC* 45: 7-20.
- . 1994. "The Divine Twins in Early Greek Poetry." In *Corolla Torontonensis*, eds. E. Robbins and S. Sandahl (Toronto).
- Robert, C. 1920-1926. *Die griechische Heldensage*. Vol. 2 of *Griechische Mythologie*; L. Preller rewritten by C. Robert. 4th ed. Berlin.
- Rohde, E. 1925. *Psyche*. Trans. W.B. Hillis. Repr. New York 1966.
- Romm, J.S. 1992. *The Edges of the Earth in Ancient Thought*. Princeton, N.J.
- Rose, H.J., and C.M. Robertson. 1970. "Achilles." In *OCD*.
- Rosner, J. 1976. "The Speech of Phoenix: *Iliad* 9.434-605." *Phoenix* 30: 314-327.
- Russo, J. 1968. "Homer Against His Tradition." *Arion* 7: 275-295.
- . 1992. "Books XVII-XX." In *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 3, eds. A. Heubeck, S. West, J.B. Hainsworth (Oxford).
- Rutherford, R.B. 1982. "Tragic Form and Feeling in the *Iliad*." *JHS* 102: 145-160.
- Rzach, A. 1922. "Kyklos." In *RE*.
- Sadurska, A. 1964. *Les Tables Illiaques*. Warszawa.
- Schadewaldt, W. 1965. *Von Homers Welt und Werk*. 4th ed. Stuttgart.
- . 1975. *Der Aufbau der Iliad*. Frankfurt.

- Schapiro, H.A. 1993. "Hipparchos and the Rhapsodes." In *Cultural Poetics in Archaic Greece*, eds. C. Dougherty and L. Kurke (Cambridge).
- Schefold, K. 1975. "Das homerischen Epos in der antiken Kunst." In *Wort und Bild* (Basel).
- Schein, S.L. 1984. *The Mortal Hero*. Berkeley.
- Scheliha, R. von. 1943. *Patroklos*. Basel.
- Schoeck, G. 1961. *Ilias und Aithiopsis*. Zurich.
- Scodel, R. 1977. "Apollo's Perfidy: *Iliad* Ω 59-62." *HSCP* 81: 55-57.
- . 1982. "The Achaean Wall and the Myth of Destruction." *HSCP* 86: 33-50.
- . 1989. "The Word of Achilles." *CP* 84: 91-99.
- Scott, J.A. 1921. *The Unity of Homer*. Berkeley.
- Scully, S. 1984. "The Language of Achilles." *TAPA* 114: 11-28.
- Severyns, A. 1928. *Le cycle épique dans l'école d'Aristarque*. Paris.
- . 1938. *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*. Vols. 1-2. Paris.
- . 1953. *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*. Vol. 3. Paris.
- , ed. 1963. *La vita Homeri et les sommaires du cycle*. Vol. 4 of *Recherches sur la Chrestomathie de Proclus*. Paris.
- Shefton, B.B. 1973. "Agamemnon or Ajax?" *RA* 203-218.
- Sheppard, J.T. 1922. *The Pattern of the Iliad*. London.
- Simon, E. 1984. "Mars auf pränestinischen Cisten." In *LIMC "Ares/Mars"*, E.Simon and G. Bauchhenss, p. 510.
- Simpson, M., trans. 1976. *Gods and Heroes of the Greeks: The Library of Apollodorus*. Amherst.
- Singor, H.W. 1992. "The Achaean Wall and the Seven Gates of Thebes." *Hermes* 120: 401-411.
- Sinn, U. 1979. *Die Homerischen Becher*. Berlin.
- Sinos, D. 1980. *Achilles, Patroklos, and the Meaning of Philos*. Innsbruck.

- Slatkin, L.M. 1991. *The Power of Thetis*. Berkeley.
- Snell, B. 1953. *The Discovery of the Mind*. Trans. T.G. Rosenmeyer. Oxford.
- Snodgrass, A.M. 1971. *The Dark Age of Greece*. Edinburgh.
- . 1980. *Archaic Greece*. London.
- . 1987. *An Archaeology of Greece*. Berkeley.
- Snowden, F.M., Jr. 1970. *Blacks in Antiquity*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1981. "Aethiopes." In *LIMC*.
- . 1993. *Before Color Prejudice*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Solmsen, F. 1982. "Achilles in the Islands of the Blest. Pindar vs. Homer and Hesiod." *AJP* 103: 19-24.
- Stanley, K. 1993. *The Shield of Homer*. Princeton, N.J.
- Suter, A. 1993. "Paris and Dionysos: *Iambos* in the *Iliad*." *Arethusa* 26: 1-18.
- Talbert, R.J.A., ed. 1985. *Atlas of Classical History*. London.
- Taplin, O. 1980. "The Shield of Achilles Within the *Iliad*." *G&R* 27: 1-21.
- . 1992. *Homeric Soundings*. Oxford.
- Tardieu, M. 1991. "The Gnostics and the Mythologies of Paganism." Trans. D. White. In *Mythologies*, eds. Y. Bonnefoy and W. Doniger (Chicago), 2: 667-679.
- Thalmann, W.G. 1984. *Conventions of Form and Thought in Early Greek Epic Poetry*. Baltimore.
- Thompson, S. 1955-1958. *Motif-Index of Folk Literature*. 2nd ed. Bloomington.
- Thomas, R. 1992. *Literacy and Orality in Ancient Greece*. Cambridge.
- Thordarson, F. 1972. "Die Ferse des Achilleus—Ein Skythisches Motiv?" *Symb. OsI.* 47: 109-124.
- Thornton, A. 1984. *Homer's Iliad*. Göttingen.
- Touchefeu, O. 1988. "Hektor." In *LIMC*.
- Tsagarakis, O. 1982. "The Teichoskopia Cannot Belong to the Beginning of the Trojan War." *QUCC* 41: 61-72.

- Vermeule, E. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*. Berkeley.
- Verrall, A.W. 1910. *The Bacchantes of Euripides and Other Essays*. Cambridge.
- Versnel, H.S. 1990. "What's Sauce for the Goose is Sauce for the Gander: Myth and Ritual, Old and New." In *Approaches to Greek Myth*, ed. L. Edmunds (Baltimore).
- Vian, F. 1959. *Recherches sur les Posthomériques de Quintus de Smyrne*. Paris.
- Wade-Gery, H.T. 1950. *The Poet of the Iliad*. Cambridge.
- Waser, O. 1909-1915. "Styx." In Roscher.
- Waszink, J.H. 1947. *Tertullian: De anima*. Amsterdam.
- Way, A.S. 1913. *Quintus Smyrnaeus. The Fall of Troy*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Webster, T.B.L. 1958. *From Mycenae to Homer*. London.
- . 1964. *Hellenistic Poetry and Art*. London.
- Weiss, C. 1986. "Eos." In *LIMC*.
- Weitzmann, K. 1959. *Ancient Book Illumination*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Welcker, F.G. 1865-1882. *Der epische Cyclus, oder die homerischen Dichter*. 2nd ed. 2 vols. Repr. Hildesheim 1981.
- West, M.L., ed. 1966. *Hesiod, Theogony*. Oxford.
- . 1966b. "New Fragments of Greek Poetry." *CR* 16: 22.
- . 1970. "The Epic Cycle." In *OCD*.
- . 1971. "Greek Epic Poetry" (review of Huxley 1969). *CR* 85: 67-69.
- . 1973. "Greek Poetry, 2000-700 B.C." *CQ* 23: 179-192.
- . 1974. *Studies in Greek Elegy and Iambus*. Berlin.
- , ed. 1978. *Hesiod, Works and Days*. Oxford.
- . 1983. *The Orphic Poems*. Oxford.
- . 1985. *The Hesiodic Catalogue of Women*. Oxford.
- . 1988. "The Rise of the Greek Epic." *JHS* 108: 151-172.

- West, S. 1988. "Books I-IV." In *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 1, eds. A. Heubeck, S. West, J.B. Hainsworth (Oxford).
- Whallon, W. 1979. "Is Hector *Androphonos*?" In *Arktouros*, eds. G.W. Bowerstock, W. Burkert, and M.C.J. Putnam (Berlin and New York).
- Whitman, C. 1958. *Homer and the Heroic Tradition*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, U. von. 1884. *Homerische Untersuchungen*. Berlin.
- Willcock, M.M. 1964. "Mythological Paradeigma in the *Iliad*." *CQ* 14: 141-154.
- . 1967. "The Present State of Homeric Studies." *Didaskalos* 2: 59-69.
- . 1973. "The Funeral Games of Patroclus." *BICS* 20: 1-11.
- . 1976. *A Companion to the Iliad*. Chicago.
- . 1977. "Ad hoc Invention in the *Iliad*." *HSCP* 18: 41-53.
- , ed. 1978-1984. *The Iliad of Homer*. 2 vols. London.
- . 1978. "Homer, the Individual Poet." *LCM* 3: 11-18.
- . 1983. "Antilochus in the *Iliad*." In *Mélanges Edouard Delebecque* (Aix-en-Provence).
- . 1987. "The Final Scenes of *Iliad* XVII." In *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*, eds. J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. De Jong, J. Kalff (Amsterdam).
- Wolf, F.A. 1985. *Prolegomena to Homer*. Translated and edited by A. Crafton, G. Most, and J.E.G. Zetzel. Princeton. [orig. 1795]
- Wood, M. 1985. *In Search of the Trojan War*. Oxford.
- Woodhouse, W.J. 1930. *The Composition of Homer's Odyssey*. Repr. Oxford 1969.
- Young, D.C. 1979. "The Diachronic Study of Myth and Achilles' Heel." *CCA-NS Journal* 4.1: 3-34.
- . 1983. "Pindar, Aristotle, and Homer: A Study in Ancient Criticism." *CA* 2: 156-170.

END

3 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 9 | 5

FIN