INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

ProQuest Information and Learning
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346 USA
800-521-0600

Gaia, Ethnos, Demos:
Land, Leadership, and Community in Early Archaic Greece

Shawn A. Ross

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

University of Washington
2001

Program Authorized to Offer Degree: History

In presenting this dissertation in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctoral degree at the University of Washington, I agree that the Library shall make its copies freely available for inspection. I further agree that extensive copying of the dissertation is allowable only for scholarly purposes, consistent with "fair use" as prescribed in the U.S. Copyright Law. Requests for copying or reproduction of this dissertation may be referred to Bell and Howell Information and Learning, 300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1346, to whom the author has granted "the right to reproduce and sell (a) copies of the manuscript in microform and/or (b) printed copies of the manuscript made from microform."

Signature: 

Date: 10 July 2001

University of Washington
Graduate School

This is to certify that I have examined this copy of a doctoral dissertation by

Shawn A. Ross

and have found that it is complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by the final
examining committee have been made.

Chair of Supervisory Committee:

Carol G. Thomas
Carol G. Thomas

Reading Committee:

Carol G. Thomas
Carol G. Thomas

Alain M. Gowing
Alain M. Gowing

Robin C. Stacey
Robin C. Stacey

Date: 03 July 2001

University of Washington

Abstract

Gaia, Ethnos, Demos: Land, Leadership, and Community in Early Archaic Greece

Shawn A. Ross

Chair of the Supervisory Committee:

Professor Carol G. Thomas, History

Conceptions of individual and community identity correspond substantially, but not wholly, with functional social groups in literary evidence from early Archaic Greece (800-650 BC). Dialogues about identity that populate face-to-face encounters in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* follow closely the military, political, and territorial arrangements found in the catalogues of *Iliad*, Book II. Indeed, a remarkably consistent terminology of social division is used throughout Homer, and continues in large part through Hesiod and Archilochos. The political-military band (*φῦλον*, *φρήτρη*, or *ἔθνος*), defined by allegiance to a particular leader whose rule is personal rather than institutional, recurs throughout the sources examined here. Furthermore, frequent references to geographic features and places of origin combined with repeated use of *γαῖα* (land), *πατρίς γαῖα* (fatherland), and related terms reflect the importance of territoriality, not only to functional social groups but also to individuals' sense of their own origins. Community and territory combine to form the largest functional intra-Hellenic political unit, the *δῆμος*, the totality of the people and their land. The *δῆμος* is the "public" entity; it is what the *βασιλεύς* (king) rules and the body from which people are exiled. Foreignness begins at the edge of the *δῆμος*, in both a terrritorial and a communal sense. The *πόλις* (town), however, is of limited importance, representing only the physical town itself. Superceding the individual *δῆμος*, *γαῖα*, or *ἔθνος* is a strong Panhellenic sentiment, highly developed even as early as Homer. The entity invoked by the terms Achaian, Danaan, and Argive is treated as a political reality in Homer, represented by the entire force beseiging Troy, with its single leader and shared homeland.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables ii

Glossary iii

Chapter I: Introduction 1

The Homeric Epics as Historical Evidence 5
Social Groups and Communities of Identity in Early Greece 12

Chapter II: Face-to-Face Encounters in the Epics 43

The *Iliad* 44
The *Odyssey* 74

Chapter III: Community and Identity in *Iliad* Book II 105

The Achaians 110
The Trojans and their Allies 144

Chapter IV: Intermediate Communities in the Epics 159

Γενεή and *Γένος* 160
Ἔθνος 167
Φῦλον and *Φρήτρη* 170
Γαῖα, *Αἶα*, and *Γῆ* 177
Δῆμος 188

Chapter V: Panhellenism in the Epics 217

Linguistic variation among the Trojan contingents in the *Iliad* 218
Differences in Use between "Achaian/Danaan/Argive" and "Trojan" 221
Description of Greek and Trojan Heroes 223
The Allies of the Trojans 229

Chapter VI: Hesiod and Archilochos 241

Hesiod 241
Archilochos 252

Chapter VII: Conclusion 256

Bibliography 260

LIST OF TABLES

Table I: Face-to-Face Exchanges, Concepts Appearing in Answers 103
Table II: Face-to-Face Exchanges, Concepts Appearing in Questions 104
Table III: Catalogue of Ships, Summary of Contingent Attributes 156
Table IV: Trojan Catalogue, Summary of Contingent Attributes 156
Table V: Catalogue of Ships, Total Occurances of Terms and Concepts 157
Table VI: Trojan Catalogue, Total Occurances of Terms and Concepts 158

GLOSSARY

Term	Transliteration	Definition*
ἀγορή	*agorē*	(1) assembly; (2) public speech; (3) place of meeting
ἀγός	*agos*	leader, chief
αἷμα	*haima*	blood
ἀλλοδαπός	*allodapos*	strange, foreign; subst. stranger
ἀλλότριος	*allotrios*	of or belonging to another, strange
ἄναξ	*anax*	lord (king), master
ἄριστος	*aristos*	best, most excellent
ἄρουρα	*aroura*	cultivated land, ground, the earth; pl. fields
ἀρχός	*archos*	leader, commander
ἄστυ	*asty*	city, esp. as a fortified dwelling-place
βαρβαρόφωνος	*barbarophōnos*	rude (outlandish) of speech
βασιλεύς	*basileus*	king, exercising the functions of commander-in-chief, priest, and judge; pl. kings, nobles, chiefs
γαῖα	*gaia*	earth, land, native land; variants: *αἶα (aia), γῆ (gē)*
γένος	*genos*	family, extraction, birth, age, generation; variant: *γενεή (geneē)*
γέρων	*gerōn*	old man; pl. elders, members of the council
δήμιος	*dēmios*	pertaining to the community, of the people, public
δῆμος	*dēmos*	land, community, people
δμώς	*dmōs*	slave
δῶμα	*dōma*	house, palace, mansion; variant: *δόμος (domos)*
ἔθνος	*ethnos*	company, band, host
ἐπίκουρος	*epikouros*	helper in battle, ally
ἑταῖρος	*hetairos*	companion, comrade; variant: *ἕταρος (hetaros)*
ἡγεμών	*hēgemōn*	guide, leader, commander

* Definitions are from Georg Autenrieth, *A Homeric Dictionary*, trans. Robert P. Keep, revised Isaac Flagg (Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1958).

θέμις	*themis*	law, right; pl. decrees, prerogatives
θεράπων	*therapōn*	attendant, comrade at arms
θής	*thēs*	hired laborer, day laborer
ἶφι	*iphi*	with might, by violence
κοίρανος	*koiranos*	lord, ruler, master
λαός	*laos*	people, host, esp. army
λέσχη	*leschē*	inn, tavern
ξεῖνος	*xeinos*	stranger, guest, guest-friend
ξενίη	*xeniē*	hospitality, entertainment, guest-friendship
οἶκος	*oikos*	house as home, including the family and other inmates and belongings
πάτρη	*patrē*	native country, native land
πατρὶς	*patris*	of one's fathers, native; often with ἄρουρα or γαῖα
περιναιετάων	*perinaietaōn*	part. from περιναιετάω; neighbor, person dwelling about
πόλις	*polis*	city; variant: πτόλις *(ptolis)*
πτολίεθρον	*ptoliethron*	town, city, but in a more restricted sense than πόλις
τέμενος	*temenos*	king's estate, sacred precinct of a god
τηλόθεν	*tēlothen*	from far away
τηλοῦ	*tēlou*	afar, far from
τῆλε	*tēle*	far, far away, far from
τοκεύς	*tokeus*	parents, ancestors
φρήτρη	*phrētrē*	clan
φῦλον	*phylon*	race, people, tribe, class, clan, family; pl. tribes, host

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to express sincere appreciation to the Department of History, especially Professor Robert Stacey, Dr. Susanne Young, and Dr. Lori Anthony, and the members of my Supervisory Committee, Professors Alain Gowing, Robin Stacey, and Jere Bacharach. I would like to extend special thanks to Professor Carol Thomas, for her guidance and encouragement throughout the preparation of this dissertation.

The financial support of the Johnson-Thomas Endowed Fellowship in History, Rondeau Evans Fellowship in History, the Graduate School Humanities Dissertation Fellowship, the Humane Studies Fellowship, and the Richard M. Weaver Fellowship allowed timely completion of this project. I would also like to express my gratitude Lawrence Roseman for his generous contributions to the Department of History, which funded earlier stages of my graduate studies, and for his unabating support throughout my many years of work at the University of Washington.

Finally, I would like to thank my family and friends for their kindness and especially their patience during the completion of this project.

—To my father, Peter,
and also to the memory of my mother, Jacqueline,
and my grandmother, Faye.

CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this dissertation is to define and explore the social groups and communities larger than the *οἶκος* (household) that organized Greek society and defined Greek identity as Greece emerged from the Dark Age into the Archaic Era, circa 800-650 BC. The Homeric epics serve as the basis for this project, supplemented where possible by Hesiod's *Theogony* and *Works and Days* and the poems of Archilochos.[1] In particular, this dissertation defines and examines the Homeric and Hesiodic terms that consistently describe a salient territorial or social division: *γαῖα*, *φῦλον*, *φρήτρη*, *ἔθνος*, *γένος*, and *δῆμος*. In order to establish this vocabulary, Chapters II and III examine face-to-face encounters between heroes in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* and the catalogues of *Iliad* book II respectively. I then systematically discuss Homer's uses of these terms throughout the epic corpus in Chapter IV. Chapter V moves beyond intra-Hellenic communities to the question of Panhellenism in Homer. Finally, Chapter VI applies comparisons from Hesiod and Archilochos to both issues, intra-Hellenic social groups and Panhellenism.

Previous scholars have proposed a variety of schema for describing the social groups or communities of late Dark Age and early Archaic Greece. I have attempted to discuss and build upon the works by these scholars, despite the fact that their emphasis varies widely. Some scholars focus on social groups, while others frame their questions in terms of ethnicity or identity. Even where scholars agree upon a framework for exploring communities—functional or ideological—definition of terms and interpretation of concepts vary widely from scholar to scholar. Moreover, some works focus on an historical period, usually some subdivision of the Dark Age or Archaic period, while others examine the world depicted in a particular body of texts, such as the Homeric epics or Hesiod. Complicating the matter further is the necessity for anyone employing Homer as an historical source to confront the controversy

[1] See below for discussion of dating and applicability of the Homeric epics to the study of Greek history.

surrounding the dating of world of Homer and its correlation, if any, to a real, historical society.

Throughout this project, I have attempted to reconcile issues of political or social functionality on the one hand, and identity on the other, to the greatest possible extent. In the epics, for example, I have given equal weight to the communities, both social and territorial, heroes invoke when they identify themselves, and the groups imbued with political, social, or military importance by Homer.[2] I have chosen to approach the question of late Dark Age/early Archaic community in this manner for a number of reasons. First, I believe that ideological importance and political or social functionality complement one another. A social unit which exercises much sway over the lives of its members is more likely to spring to the forefront of a hero's mind when he considers his origins (on account of allegiance or resentment), while a hero may more readily acquiesce to demands placed upon him by a territorial or social entity with which he identifies strongly. Moreover, in the world crafted by the epic poet, functionality and ideology are not distinguished assiduously; Homer's pan-Achaian military expedition, for example, reflects an ideology of Greek unity rather than an historical, functional Panhellenism in the eighth century BC.[3]

Broadly speaking, two approaches to social organization in Dark Age and Archaic Greece can be discerned in the scholarship. On the one hand, scholars such as Finley, Snodgrass, Donlan, and van Wees concentrate on the functional social and political units that structured early Greek society. The roots of this vein of contemporary scholarship can be traced to Finley's *The World of Odysseus*, first published in 1954, and continue through very recent works such as Haubold's *Homer's People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation*, published in 2000.[4] On the other hand, investigation of

---

[2] Chapter II, for example, focuses mainly on heroes' self-presentation during face-to-face encounters, while Chapter III is devoted to examining Homer's description of the Achaian and Trojan forces in the catalogues of *Iliad* Book II.

[3] See Hans van Wees, *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History* (Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1992), 58.

[4] Earlier work on social groups revolved primarily around ideas of a lineage- or descent-based structures. For a review of this literature, see Walter Donlan, "The Social Groups of Dark Age Greece," *Classical*

the "imagined communities" of early Greece—group identities based on sentiment or ideology rather than functionality—is much more recent. Although earlier works did not entirely ignore individual and group conceptualization of identity, studies released over the past five years by J. Hall, Malkin, and McInerney, explore more directly the nearest early Greek equivalents to what would be called ethnicity in a modern context. In a nutshell, what separates the older examinations of social groups from the newer studies on "ethnicity" is that the former look "in" at and analyze society, while the later attempt to step inside the early Greek mindset and investigate how members of that society conceived of themselves. The two approaches, however, are not mutually exclusive. "Functional" groups, for example, can provide a context for the declarations of identity made by heroes in Homer, and may also serve as a counterweight for the sometimes exclusive focus on ethnicity, as opposed to other potential categories of self-identification.

Before beginning an examination of the communities—functional or ideological—of early Greece, another caveat is in order: the recognition of the difficulty inherent in any attempt to establish a shared pattern of social division or identity in early Greece. The primary sources available for the period are open to a wide range of interpretations, reflected in the discordant reconstructions of social groups and structures discussed below.[5] The question of identity in early Archaic literature is even murkier, partly explaining why it has been so neglected until very recently, even while explorations of Classical Greek identity have been ongoing for the better part of two decades.[6] As the nexus of these two issues, Finley has even taken the

---

Philology 80 (1985): 293-95. Over the past fifty years, however, most work on social groups in Dark Age and early Archaic Greece has tended to downplay the role of tribal structures, which were once thought to organize Greek society before the rise of the πόλις.

[5] Stephen Scully, "The Polis in Homer," *Ramus* 10 (1981): 1, offers a succinct (and generous) evaluation: "The poems present a hybrid world picture with varying and occasionally contradictory systems of social organization."

[6] Important works on identity in Classical Greece include: Francois Hartog, *The Mirror of Herodotus: the Representation of the Other in the Writing of History*, trans. Janet Lloyd (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988), Edith Hall, *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1989), Paul Cartledge, *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993). Recent works that extend these ideas to the Archaic period

view that no local, regional, or national dividing lines of genuine consequence existed at all, at least in the world presented in the epics.[7] Instead, he emphasizes the social and cultural diversity that characterized archaic Greece, pointing out that "Greece" consisted of hundreds of communities spread out over 1,500 miles, while a collective name for Greece emerged comparatively late.[8] The combination of geographical and temporal diversity in early Greek culture with the ambiguous evidence provided by the Homeric epics and other early Archaic literature produces a difficult situation at best for reconstructing either functional social groups or communities of identity for the pre-Classical period.

With regard to sources and periodization, this dissertation primarily concerns the society presented in the Homeric epics. To the extent possible, I have employed Hesiod and Archilochos as comparisons, since these authors have the advantage of being rooted in a known time and place. Although Hesiod and Archilochos are later than Homer (by perhaps fifty and one hundred years, respectively), I believe that at least the terminology relating to social structures remained largely the same, even as the nature and importance of these structures is continually evolving. I have dated the social and political structures depicted in Homer to the eighth century BC, a choice which—along with the decision to use Homer as an historical source at all—requires some justification.

---

include: Jonathan Hall, *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997), Irad Malkin, *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998), and Jeremy McInerney, *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis* (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999).

[7] M. I. Finley, *The World of Odysseus*, second ed. (London: Penguin Books, 1978), 48; 138. Finley's discussion is limited to the Homeric Age, which he specifies as the 10th and 9th centuries BC. See also his discussion of Cretan ethnicity (27), and pan-Hellenic vs. pan-Ionian festivals (36).

[8] Finley 1978, 17-8; 24-5. Cartledge 1993, 3, discussing the Classical period, also emphasizes the differences among the Greeks themselves, pointing out that Herodotos had to omit political institutions and structures from his definition of Greekness, as well as ignore differences in dialect, religion, and mores within what he considered the Greek world.

The Homeric Epics as Historical Evidence

Anyone employing the Homeric as an historical source must grapple the difficulties surrounding the date of society depicted in the epics. Furthermore, although there is some consensus that the poems were composed during the second half of the eighth century BC,[9] scholarship is divided over whether the epics represent a coherent society generally reflecting a single historical period, or a jumbled amalgamation of memories ranging from the Bronze Age to the life of the poet, if not beyond. A brief and incomplete review of the positions taken by a number of scholars illustrates the extent of the controversy. Finley, believes that "Essentially the picture offered by the poems of the society and its system of values is a coherent one," although he continues, "Anachronistic fragments cling to it in spots." Finley argues that the "coherent" society of the epics dates to the tenth and ninth centuries BC, observing that there are "no Ionia, no Dorians to speak of, no writing, no iron weapons, no cavalry in battle scenes, no colonization, no Greek traders, [and] no communities without kings," in Homer.[10] Donlan agrees with Finley on both issues, that Homeric society is historically coherent, and that it can be dated to the tenth and ninth centuries BC.[11] Qviller, focusing on the exercise of political power and the role of the Homeric *βασιλεύς*, argues that Homeric political society should be analyzed as a coherent whole, and dated to the "end of the ninth or the beginning of the eighth century.[12] Luce would push this date somewhat later: "I assume that most aspects of the *πόλις* [as they are depicted on the shield of Achilleus]...reflect the basic realities of life as Homer know it in the second half of the

---

[9] Among others: Walter Donlan, *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece: Attitudes of Superiority from Homer to the End of the Fifth Century BC* (Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado Press, 1980), 1; Ian Morris, "The Use and Abuse of Homer," *Classical Antiquity* 5 (1986): 93. But see van Wees 1992, 58, who argues that Homer may have lived as late as the early seventh century.

[10] Finley 1978, 48. See also 45, where Finley reminds us that Homer believed he was singing about his own past, not a fictional world.

[11] Donlan 1980, 1-2. See also Donlan 1985, 293-308, which does not explicitly argue for a particular date for Homeric society, but uses the epics as evidence for Dark Age social structures.

[12] Contra Anthony M. Snodgrass, "An Historical Homeric Society?" *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* XCIV (1974): 114-25. Bjørn Qviller, "The Dynamics of the Homeric Society," *Symbolae Osloenses* LVI (1981): 113-14.

eighth century BC."[13] Morris agrees, also contending that Homeric society is that of the poet's own lifetime.[14] More recently, Van Wees also holds that epic society should be studied as an organic whole, rather than being analyzed as if it were drawn from an agglomeration of societies spanning hundreds of years, but advocates an eighth or early seventh century date for Homeric society based upon the social and political structures described in the epics.[15] Crielaard, in a very detailed study of many aspects of Homeric society—overseas contact, colonization, the *πόλις*, religion—comes to a similar conclusion about the coherence and dating of the Homeric world.[16] Kirk, conversely, contends that the poems represent a "cultural and linguistic amalgam," spanning centuries of development, basing this position on archaeological and linguistic evidence.[17] Discussing marriage practices, metallurgy, burial, weapons, and the wealth of Homeric society, Snodgrass sees "artificial conflations of historical practices," yielding a society that existed only in mind of the poet, but drawn from many real, historical societies. Snodgrass considers Homer "a poet who is also traditional...but who depends on predecessors of *many* periods, and admits elements from his own experience and imagination into the bargain."[18] The variety of dates proposed for Homeric society reflects the ambiguities inherent in the epics—and in oral traditions more generally—which allow for a wide range of interpretations.

I have chosen to approach the problem of dating Homeric society by accepting that the poet lived during the mid- to late-eighth century, and then considering what information would be available to the poet through the oral tradition from which he crafted his works.

---

[13] J. V. Luce, "The *Polis* in Homer and Hesiod," *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, Section C, 78.1 (1978): 3.

[14] Morris 1986, 93, 120.

[15] Van Wees 1992, 17-23; 54-58.

[16] Jan Paul Crielaard, "Homer, History, and Archaeology," in *Homeric Questions* ed. Jan Paul Crielaard, 201-88 (Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1995), 273-76. Crielaard's article offers an excellent overview the controversy surrounding the date of the Homeric world (201 ff.), as well as a sophisticated attempt to determine that date.

[17] See G. S. Kirk, *The Songs of Homer* (New York, Cambridge University Press: 1962), chapter 9.

[18] Snodgrass 1974, 124-25 (italics in original).

Jan Vansina, in his comparative study of African oral tradition, describes the typical "shape" oral traditions tend to take on.[19] He also discusses how durable certain types of information are when subjected to the rigors of oral transmission. Vansina has described a "three-tiered" structure common to many oral traditions in various societies. First, a mythological, timeless past exists, rich in detail and texture, which justifies the bases of existing society or provides tales of origin.[20] Although entirely divorced from linear time, with many separate stories coexisting with no cause-and-effect relationships, these are not entirely useless to the historian; often they provide much more information about the normative ideas and general beliefs of a culture.[21] Indeed, although tales with no beginning in time cannot be considered evidence within any rigorous historiographical framework, they still may contain portions which are observations of a genuine, once-extant situation, which was then incorporated into the timeless setting.[22] Still, any use made of seemingly-genuine excerpts from these mythological tales must be viewed as information out of context, like an archaeological artifact of unknown provenance.

Following this richly-detailed mythological age comes a hiatus, an ill-defined era where only a few names can be given, perhaps with some uncertainty. Vansina calls this the "floating gap," common to most oral traditions, which gradually advances with the passage of generations. Often, this period is compressed into a generation or two, which bridge the gap between the recent past and the time of origins—although not in the case of Greek legend, which recognizes the passage of time between the Age of Heroes and the Homer's day, if leaving it short on detail. Sometimes, this era is seen by the members of the oral society as a normative period, a repetitive, cyclical, and static middle where society worked properly based upon the model established in the earlier period before the gap. In this case, little of interest would have happened worth telling, as society functioned without the strains and conflicts of the recent past. Whether the

---

[19] J. Vansina, *Oral Tradition as History* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985).

[20] Vansina 1985, 21 ff.

[21] Vansina 1985, 31-32.

floating gap is compressed or idealized by an oral society, that society is rarely conscious of its existence. For the historian, the gap might best be viewed not as a middle period, but rather as a reference to the capacity of different social structures to reckon time; beyond a certain time depth, chronology can no longer be kept, accounts begin to fuse and are thrown back into the period of origins, typically under a culture hero, or are forgotten.[23]

As one moves to recent times, more information again becomes available, tapering off as one moves back in time. This period is described within a chronological framework, and is more useful for the historian.[24] Although even within this horizon—which generally lasts about three generations into the past, perhaps 80 to 100 years or so—a chain of transmission exists for all but the most recent events; the process of oral tradition even after the floating gap can be likened to a succession of historical documents, all lost but the last. Just as each generation of historians reinterprets the past according to the needs and dilemmas of the present, each generation of storytellers reinterprets the tradition handed down to him so that it will better speak to contemporary hearers. A single line of transmission, however, does not exist, as it may in a manuscript tradition. Instead, the product of an oral tradition results from stories being told by many people to many people; it is communal, continuous, and dynamic.[25] Although oral traditions from the three or so generations immediately preceding their codification as text are far more useful and reliable than those from before the floating gap—although both may contain a wealth of seeming-plausible detail—it must be recognized that such information is being seen through the lens of the each generation of storytellers between the occurrence of the event or situation observed and the fixing of the tradition in a written text.

How, then, does Vansina's discussion of oral tradition relate to the historicity of the Homeric epics? The epics speak entirely of the Heroic Age (to use Hesiod's

---

[22] Vansina 1985, 29.

[23] Vansina 1985, 23-24.

[24] Vansina 1985, 21 ff.

chronology), which corresponds to the early period in Vansina's schema. The principal cultural purpose of traditions about the early, "pre-hiatus" tradition is to justify the basis for contemporary society.[26] In general, Vansina continues, oral traditions tend to be normative. Turning to Homer, Ian Morris observes that the epics serve an active, structuring role in Archaic society. He argues that oral poetry is an ideological tool, and that the poet exploited poetry,

> [T]o serve as an ideological tool to legitimize elite domination, presenting it as natural and unchangeable. This, the poet is saying, is how it was in the Heroic Age; this, he is implying, is how it should be now.[27]

If we accept that the purpose served by the epics corresponds to that hypothesized by Vansina for myths and legends set in the distant past, the question of what historical material Homer constructed this exemplar for his contemporaries' remains. The answer is complex; oral traditions assimilate, forget, and modify different types of information at different rates.

Physical objects and places, for example, may become fossilized within the oral tradition (note the boars-tusk helmet and the importance of Mykenai).[28] Persons, events, and sometimes even the shell of political or social units (the name and approximate extent of kings, associations, and kinship groups) which appear in an oral tradition can be drawn from a wide range of periods, since such events, people, and entities which slip beyond the horizon of living memory are usually assimilated into the early, legendary period—if they are not forgotten entirely. The latter is the likely outcome if they are not relevant to contemporary society; Morris also notes that "vanished institutions and conditions of action" disappear.[29] Items that the tradition

---

[25] Vansina 1985, 29.

[26] Vansina 1985, 23-24. The period after the hiatus often shows society in a state of degeneration or decadence; Hesiod's "Age of Iron," for instance.

[27] Morris 1986, 83; 125-27. But see Hilary Mackie, *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad* (New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1996), 3, who argues that more than one heroic code—and more than one model for social organization—can be discerned in the *Iliad*.

[28] Vansina 1985, 10-11; 17-18; 24.

[29] Morris 1986, 87.

retains often serve to express the identity of the group in which they are told, or substantiate rights over land, resources, office, or property.[30]

Most information about social and cultural conditions preserved in oral traditions, however, likely dates to after the horizon of living memory, thus reflecting society as it existed within two or three generations (at most) of the time of the poet. Vansina emphasizes that for information, especially information about abstract entities such as institutions and social groups, to be retained, they must be relevant to the poet's audience. Oral tradition reflects the opinions held by a community, and testifies to that community's values and mentality. Specifically, Vansina argues, oral traditions survive only when they are of direct relevance to the social structure of the day.[31]

Considering the generic properties of oral traditions in relation to Homeric epic, Ian Morris observes:

> The evidence is heavily set against the long-term transmission of dead institutions within a tradition of constantly re-created oral poetry. It would perhaps be an exaggeration to say that non-literate societies float in a kind of perpetual present, but it does seem to be the cast that ideas that are no longer relevant to the present rapidly disappear from oral tradition.[32]

Morris agrees whole-heartedly with Vansina when he observes that Homeric poetry had to please its audience and confirm their ideas about how the world worked. In this sense, oral tradition is part of the poet's present with respect to social structures, while contemporary ideology motivates it. Morris denies the possibility that oral poetry could have re-created the social structure of a vanished world, or assembled it from bits of reality drawn from different chronological periods. Instead, Morris concludes, "the assumptions Homer made about the workings of society will have been based on those of the Greek world in which he lived."[33]

---

[30] Vansina 1985, 19-21. Vansina restricts some of the qualities of oral tradition discussed here to "historical" traditions, excluding epic, but it is clear that Homeric epic is historical in the sense that Homer believed that he was writing about his own past, and the epics fit perfectly within the schema of Hesiod's Ages of Man, which is more self-consciously historical. See also Finley 1978, 45, Morris 1986, 120.

[31] Vansina 1985, 24.

[32] Morris 1986, 87.

[33] Morris 1986, 89.

The only factor mitigating the relentless modernizing of Homer's poetry is what Morris calls the employment of "epic distance." Vansina puts this phenomenon in terms of the demands of historical consciousness, the need to bring the contents of an oral tradition in line with commonly held views of the past.[34] The tendency to archaize events, in oral tradition generally or in Homeric epic particularly, must always be balanced with the necessity that the abstract (social and ideological) aspects of oral tradition be immediately relevant to contemporary society.

Although oral traditions are capable of preserving certain types of information for extended periods of time, their content is also subject to rapid change as poets innovate and stories are retold in a way that makes sense to contemporary audiences. On the one hand, places and objects become literary artifacts enduring for centuries. On the other hand, poets will quickly drop more abstract aspects of society, which make no sense outside their original context, from their poems; in these respects, the poems become reflection of contemporary society. This second tendency is somewhat tempered as the poet engages in intentional archaizing, retaining (but perhaps misinterpreting) institutions that no longer function, or ignoring recent developments in society in order to give their poems a heroic flavor. Examples of such archaizing in the Homeric epics might include those observed by Finley: absence of references to the Dorians, the Olympic Games, colonization, Greek trade with the Levant, and πόλις organization. Long-preserved artifacts coexist with recent social and cultural innovations in the epics.

I have balanced these imperatives by assuming that the social structures and the formulation of personal and communal identity presented in Homer are contemporary or nearly contemporary with the life of the poet. Accordingly, I date communities in the epics to the mid-eighth century. At most archaizing might push the date back two to three generations, describing a situation which existed within the horizon of living memory. Social structures that passed away shortly before the oldest members of Homer's audience were born could have been passed down to them as "the way things used to be," and then employed by the poet to make his songs confirm to the

[34] Morris 1986, 89; Vansina 1985, 31-32.

collectively-held view of the past. I doubt that more purely ideological—and therefore abstract—phenomena, such as identity, would endure even that long, considering how subject they are to contemporary saliency and the active, structuring properties inherent to oral tradition.[35]

Social Groups and Communities of Identity in Early Greece

Taking this dating into account, the following sections set out the conceptual scope of this project. After a brief review of the social and political divisions I will not be discussing (the *οἶκος*, *πόλις*, and *λαός*) in this dissertation, I examine scholarship about the other social groups and communities larger than the individual household. Historical works on the late Dark Ages and the early Archaic period are discussed alongside those of a more philological nature that concentrate on the Homeric epics themselves.

Οἶκος, *Πόλις*, and *Λαός*

I have chosen to exclude the most basic social unit, the *οἶκος*, from this study. Its importance to the society depicted in the epics, however, cannot be overstated, and the *οἶκος* deserves at least brief consideration. I see the *οἶκος* as the fundamental social, economic, and ideological constituent of the communities and social groups examined in this dissertation; although it makes only brief appearances in the arguments which follows, its significance should continually be borne in mind.

The centrality of the *οἶκος* has been well established, most notably by Moses Finley in *The World of Odysseus*. Finley argues that class, (close) kin, and *οἶκος* define a man's life, with a distant fourth place going to a territorial socio-political unit

---

[35] Walter Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece," *Symbolae Osloenses* LXIV (1989): 7. Beginning his discussion of the terms *οἶκος*, *δῆμος*, and *λαός*, Donan writes, "In any body of hearers, at any given time, they would have aroused universally shared images; for it is difficult to conceive how, even in the deliberately archaizing epics, a singer's evocation of these concepts would not have approximated his audience's experience of them."

represented by the assembly.[36] Among these, the importance of the *οἶκος*, or extended household, was paramount.[37] According to Finley's analysis, the *οἶκος* was the smallest social and economic unit. The *οἶκος* constituted the personal domain of an individual, hereditary noble, and consisted of those under the direct and unmitigated power of the noble: his extended family, free retainers (*θεράποντες*), and slaves.[38] As the basic economic division, it was largely self-sufficient, and constituted the smallest self-contained unit of consumption and trade.[39]

Although Finley acknowledges the importance of close kinship, he subordinates even this to the *οἶκος*. The important kinship ties, for Finley, are coequal with the extended family, which enjoys almost complete omnipotence. Standards of conduct and punishment of criminal acts, for instance, are enforced not by the community or social class, but by the family.[40] In fact, almost all aspects of life during times of peace—economic, social, judicial—are the responsibility of the extended family, the other members of the *οἶκος*, and to a lesser extent members of the same social class outside the family and *οἶκος*.[41] Clearly, the family and *οἶκος* overlap and complement one another, but Finley envisions the family as embedded within the *οἶκος*, which includes not only relatives, but also slaves, servants, retainers, and guest friends.[42]

---

[36] Finley 1978: 78. Finley does believe that the political unit commanded a degree of loyalty, although this loyalty was limited in two major respects. On the one hand it was superimposed upon more immediate class, *οἶκος*, and kinship ties, on the other it was not yet so far developed as to categorically distinguish between the members of the numerous Greek polities—or between the Greeks and non-Greeks—who inhabited the world represented in Homer. In a similar vein, Scully 1981, 3, describes the relationship between *οἶκος* and *πόλις* (which replaces Finley's territorial socio-political unit): "The *polis* is distinct from the *oikoi* as singular is from plural, as the whole is from its parts."

[37] Finley 1978, chapters 3-4, esp. 105.

[38] Finley 1978, 51-53; 58.

[39] Finley 1978, 60-61; 70. See also Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 7-13, who discusses economic and social aspects of the *οἶκος* in Homer.

[40] Finley 1978, 57-61; 76-7. Anthony M. Snodgrass, *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 26-7; 31, concurs that the family was the group that commanded immediate loyalty of individuals.

[41] Finley 1978, 83.

[42] Finley 1978, 105. Compare Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 8-9. Donlan agrees with Finley's limitation of the *οἶκος* to close kin, as well as its extension to include a variety of non-kin members of the household.

Finley defends the centrality of the *οἶκος* by arguing that membership in an *οἶκος* is more important than status as free or slave in Homeric society; it is the *θής*, an itinerant laborer unattached to an *οἶκος*, and not the slave, who is most vulnerable.[43] Finley uses the example of Odysseus' meeting with Achilleus in the underworld, where the latter states that it would be better to be a *θής* among the living than a king among the dead.[44] Notably, Achilleus does not compare his situation with that of a slave. This sentiment is echoed in the *Iliad*, where the worst fate to befall someone is to be a "wanderer honored neither by gods nor by mortals."[45] Furthermore, Finley continues, the word for slave most commonly found in Homer (*δμώς*) is based on the word for house rather than the word for labor, emphasizing the slave's membership in the *οἶκος* rather than his economic role. This bond to the *οἶκος* reflects the fact that, unlike the *θής* or wanderer, the slave belongs to a social unit offering at least minimal protection and patronage.[46] In short, according to Finley, the *οἶκος* is smallest socio-economic and political unit to which one belongs, and membership in an *οἶκος* would thus be central to one's identity, as indicated by the repeated sentiment that those who lack an *οἶκος* are the most unfortunate of men.

Other scholars have for the most part accepted the prominence of the *οἶκος* as proposed by Finley. Runciman, for instance, believes that *οἶκοι* are the basis of this society.[47] Donlan, also affirms the importance of the *οἶκος;* he considers it, along with the *δῆμος* and *λαός*, one of the three "clearly delineated social units" in Homer and Hesiod. Donlan, moreover, limits the size and scope of the *οἶκος* to the nuclear family,

---

[43] Finley 1978, 57.

[44] *Od.* XI.489-91; see Finley 1978, 57.

[45] *Il.* XXIV.527-33; Finley 1978, 138.

[46] Finley 1978, 59; 78. Finley 1978, 71, continues by adding that if a dividing line involving free and unfree people must be drawn, the line between those who "remained their own masters" on the one hand, and *θῆτες* and *δμώες* on the other, is much clearer than the line between people who are technically free or slave. This distinction is one of the principal constituents of "class" for Finley, in his tripartite division of society into kin, class, and *οἶκος*. See also Donlan 1989, 10, who adds the terms *δμωαί* and *οἰκῆες* to *δμώες* as words for unfree laborers attached to an *οἶκος*.

[47] W. G. Runciman, "Origins of States: The Case of Archaic Greece," *Comparative Studies in Society and History* XXIV.3 (1982): 351.

plus servants, adopted members, and (usually) sons after marriage.[48] Considering this consensus, I do not consider it controversial to accord the *οἶκος* the considerable importance as the basic building block of late Dark Age/early Archaic Greek society.

Neither does my investigation deal at length with the *πόλις*, either as a social or political unit or as a basis for a category of identity. I have chosen to exclude the *πόλις* from this study for two principal reasons. First, I believe that the meaning and significance of the *πόλις*, particularly in the epics, is limited to the built town or citadel, and does not serve as either a functional social unit or an important component of identity. Second, the *πόλις* has received a great deal more attention than the other intermediate categories of identity discussed below. Consequently, I have focused on communities that are more important, but also comparatively neglected, in Homer.

Van Wees, for example, presents one of the most sustained arguments for the importance of "towns" to the society represented in the epics.[49] Inverting Finley's model, van Wees considers households important, but argues that they are deeply imbedded in a social and political superstructure of "towns," "states," and ultimately a Panhellenic super-state.[50] Individual leaders within this structure "are neither clan-leaders, nor feudal lords, nor heads of large autonomous households, nor food-redistributing *big men* or *chiefs*;" instead, they are wealthy landowners who rule walled towns.[51]

---

[48] Donlan 1985, 298-99. See also Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 7-13.

[49] Van Wees considers the town (he avoids the term *πόλις*) to be the entity referred to by the term "fatherland" (*πάτρη, πατρίς*). Luce 1978, 1-15, embraces the term *πόλις* (contending that it often means just "town," but sometimes refers to a larger state or community; Luce's definition overlaps van Wees sufficiently to justify comparison), but for the most part agrees with van Wees concerning the function of the town/*πόλις*. He sees the *πόλις* as a social and administrative center of the community, and like van Wees stresses that houses, an *ἀγορή*, and a wall are hallmarks of a *πόλις* (2-3). Later, Luce adds residence of the king to this list of buildings (9). Luce senses some tension in Homer between the use of *πόλις*, which sometimes designates a (dependent) village or town (the term *κώμη* never appears in the epics), but also can display a "discernible tendency to acquire something like its later Classical sense of an autonomous city-state" on the other (8-9).

[50] Van Wees 1992, 40, argues that this structure is consistently portrayed in the epics, while admitting that they may not be realistic

[51] Van Wees 1992, 54. Emphasis in original.

For Van Wees it is these towns that form the basis of the social and political systems. Physically, towns consist of walls, houses, streets, a meeting-place (*ἀγορή*), shrines and altars for public worship, a communal well and wash basin, and a "lounge" (*λέσχη*), which van Wees describes as "remarkable public building." For van Wees, the town is the center of public life for the *δῆμος* and a group of dominant families whose members are known collectively as "princes" (*βασιλῆες*). Towns, moreover, enjoy "a considerable amount of communal organisation," and an "active community life."[52] Each family owns a scepter, the symbol of rulership, and members of the family bear the title *βασιλεύς* or *βασίλεια*. A subgroup of the *βασιλῆες* actually exercise royal power, and are known as "elders" (*γέροντες*). Only one, however, holds the scepter and has the right to the full perogatives of rule, symbolized by the scepter. This *βασιλεύς* is known as "the ruler" (*ἄναξ*). The position of the *ἄναξ* (and the *βασιλῆες* as a group) is formal, public, and hereditary. Towns have an established system of government centered on a hereditary monarch and elders drawn from a group of "princely" families who make decisions on behalf of, and pass judgments for, the people.[53]

Scully, although he spends less time than van Wees reconstructing the entirety of Homeric society, also asserts the primacy of the *πόλις*, subordinating even the *οἶκος*.[54] "The primary position of the *polis* in the poems," according to Scully, "hardly seems a point to be debated." "The word *polis* resounds throughout the text," he continues.[55] Scully argues that the prerequisites of civilization exposed through Homer's negative description of the Kyklopes should be associated with the *πόλις*, not the *οἶκος* (or any other social group).[56] Furthermore, he contends that humankind is depicted in Homer as "a creature of the *polis*," who has come in from the wilderness, a move symbolized by the founding of Troy and the accompanying transfer of population from the slopes of

---

[52] Van Wees 1992, 30-31.

[53] Van Wees 1992, 25-36.

[54] Scully's interests lie more in the symbolic value of the *πόλις* in Homer, but it is clear that he considers the *πόλις* to be the "organizing principle of community life." Scully 1981, 2; see also 1-3.

[55] Scully 1981, 1.

[56] Scully 1981, 4.

Mt. Ida.[57] For Scully, the *πόλις* defines human civilization, setting it apart from the natural world of Mt. Ida and from the barbarism of the Kyklopes.[58]

In my opinion, however, van Wees, Scully, and others who focus on the *πόλις* conflate its role with other institutions in early Greek society. The *πόλις* of the epics is not the *πόλις* of the later Archaic or Classical world, either in terms of its extent and function, or in terms of its political, social, and ideological importance.[59] The term *πόλις* in Homer refers *only* the built city, not the city and its hinterland. Furthermore, *πόλις* refers *specifically* to the built city, not to any abstract entity, either social unit or polity.[60] Even Scully admits that "the city in Homer has almost no concept of citizenship."[61] As far as identity is concerned, in the epics, the *πόλις* often serves the same role as a river or mountain, marking simply the specific geographical location of

---

[57] Scully 1981, 14.

[58] See also Stephen Scully, *Homer and the Sacred City* (Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1990), which takes for granted the assumption that the *πόλις* is the basis of society in Homer.

[59] Compare Finley 1978, 120. Finley argues that through competition warriors gained personal glory in the epics, whereas later, "when the community principle gained mastery," competition brought glory to the *πόλις* rather than (or in addition to) the individual. Implicit in this argument is that the "community principle" is not yet well established, and to the extent that it is, it is not embodied in the *πόλις*, which receives very little attention in *The World of Odysseus*. Snodgrass 1980, 27 ff., esp. 32, adds that in the ninth century BC there was no city life since settlements were too small and few in number (at least on the Greek mainland), although the relevance of this to the epics depends upon the date to which one assigns them.

[60] Donlan 1985, for instance, does not even consider the *πόλις* in his discussion of social groups in Dark Age Greece. Runciman 1982, 358, likewise contends that in Homer *πόλεις* are merely communities with a residential center, not states. Finley 1978, 34, states that "neither poem has any trace of a *polis* in its political sense. *Polis* in Homer means nothing more than a fortified site, a town." Finley goes on to accuse Snodgrass of confusing "objects and institutions" when the latter professes to see a recognition of the rise of the *πόλις* in Homer (155-56). Snodgrass 1980, 27, however, proposes only a limited "contamination" of the epics by "the poet's awareness of the growth of the city-state in his own time." In his discussion of the changes in organization that occurred during the early Archaic period, Snodgrass argues that the earliest meaning of *πόλις* was "citadel" or "stronghold," presumably basing this observation on the Homeric usage of the word (28). Snodgrass further contends that just because urban areas exist does not mean that they hold special status for their society (33). Runciman 1982, 358, argues that in Homer *πόλεις* are merely communities with a residential center, not states. Luce 1978, 1-15, completely disagrees, drawing fine distinctions in usage between *πόλις* and related words such as *ἄστυ*, *πτόλις*, and *πτολίεθρον*, asserting that the term *πόλις* (and to a lesser extent its equivalents) invokes a social unity, and elevating the *πόλις* above other terms which might express community, such as the *δῆμος* or *γαῖα* (see esp. 5-9).

[61] Scully 1981, 5.

origin for a hero. As far as being a unit of social organization, it lacks the abstract, public overtones of the word *δῆμος*, and it does not invoke the aggregate groups designated by *φῦλον*, *ἔθνος*, and *φρήτρη*. Instead, it describes a collection (of any size) of houses surrounded by a wall, supplemented by other public spaces and buildings.[62] While the *βασιλεύς* has a house in the *πόλις*, the *πόλις* is not coterminous with what he rules, an entity usually designated by the term *δῆμος*, sometimes by *γαῖα*.[63] Because of the *πόλις*' significance to the later Archaic and Classical Greek world, and because of its centrality in the Greek renaissance of the late eighth century BC, some scholars have exaggerated its role in the Homeric epics.[64] The significance of the *πόλις* has been read back from the later periods, while the importance of the *γαῖα* and *δῆμος* have been under-appreciated.[65] For these reasons I have concentrated on more neglected but more salient social groups and categories of identity.

---

[62] Van Wees 1992, 28-31; Scully 1981, 4-9.

[63] Runciman 1982, 358. See below.

[64] Runciman 1982, 358, for instance, argues that the earliest direct evidence for the existence of the *πόλις* as state comes from inscriptions from Dreros, in Krete, in the second half of the seventh century BC.

[65] Van Wees' interpretation of Homeric society is, I believe, a good example of imbuing the *πόλις* with more than appropriate significance. Many of the functions of the *βασιλεύς*, and the localization of the *βασιλεύς* in the "town," reflect a transposition of the concepts *πόλις* and *δῆμος* in Van Wees' work that is unwarranted by the uses of the terms in Homer (see below). Qviller 1981, 113, concurs: "A careful reading of the text, will, I think, reveal that the community is in several instances asserting itself in a way that signals the formation of a *polis*-society," but he then uses this observation to posit a date (late ninth-early eighth century BC) similar to that proposed by Snodgrass, who rejects the notion that the *πόλις* is important in Homer. Qviller also sees "the Troy of the poet" as "an incipient *polis*" (143). Luce 1978, 1-15, goes even further, contending that "The *polis* dominates the whole composition [of the epics]. It is, for Homer, the outstanding feature of human society" (1). He defines the *πόλις* as "a small self-contained community engaged in subsistence agriculture" (2), and goes on to argue that the *πόλις* is the "social and administrative center of the community" (3). For Luce, the *πόλις* "is regarded as the typical form of human community," and constitutes one of "the vital co-ordinates that determine a man's identity" in the epics (8). Finally, Luce associates political institutions—monarchy, assembly, courts—with the *πόλις* (courts, 1-2; assembly, 10-12; monarchy, 13-15). Snodgrass 1980, 29, counters that the idea of a king ruling over a single town and its territory is absent from the Catalogue of Ships, and that examples are "few and controversial" elsewhere in the epics. Finley 1978, 48, dates Homeric society to the tenth and ninth centuries BC partly based on the fact that Homer's world lacks any developed notion of the *πόλις*. Compare Snodgrass 1980, 27; Morris 1986, 100; 123. On the other hand, Van Wees, Scully, Qviller, Luce, and others, have put forward compelling interpretations of Homer in which the *πόλις* looms large (see above). I hope to give these arguments the attention they deserve by addressing them more thoroughly at another time.

Another division I do not deal with at length here is the λαός, the "people." Donlan considers the λαός, along with the δῆμος and the οἶκος, to be one of the three clearly delineated social units in Homer and Hesiod. Λαός, like δῆμος, often means the "people," Donlan continues, but unlike δῆμος, λαός never means land, and it occurs in the plural as well as the singular. In addition to designating a group of men who follow a particular leader (much like ἔθνος, φῦλον, and φρήτρη) it sometimes refers to a collection of men from several communities.[66] Λαός' meaning is, on the one hand, diffuse in the sense that it is applied to many different kinds of groups. On the other hand, it is used only of people, lacking deeper meanings invoking "a class of beings with common identification," or "an aggregate of like beings" contained in terms like γένος or φῦλον.[67] For these reasons I disagree with Donlan and do not believe that λαός represents any coherent social unit, but instead designates a mass of people under any circumstances.[68]

"Tribal" Divisions: *Γένος*

Through the first half of the twentieth century, most work on social structures in Greece sought to detect survivals of "primordial" lineage groups in Homer and other early Greek literature.[69] With Finley's *The World of Odysseus*, first published in 1954, more emphasis was given to the οἶκος; by the 1970's a direct assault on the importance of

---

[66] Donlan 1985, 298-99; Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 15-16.

[67] See also Donlan 1985, 295.

[68] Van Wees and other authors also fail to recognize the λαός as a "clearly delineated social unit." But see Johannes Haubold, *Homer's People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), which is primarily devoted to an exploration of the term λαός in early Greek poetry. This title was published to late for more a more thorough discussion at the present time; I hope to give it the attention it deserves at a later date.

[69] The works of Gustave Glotz (published between 1904 and 1928) perhaps best represent this older view in a mature form. For a synopsis, see D. Roussel, *Tribu et Cité: études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique* (Paris: Les Belles lettres, 1976), Première partie, Chapitre premier, "Position du Problème," 17-26. Compare F. Bourriot, *Recherches sur la nature du Génos: étude d'histoire sociale athénienne, périodes archaïque et classique* (Paris: Université de Lille, 1976), Première partie, Chapitre II, "Le Génos, état de la question," 29 ff., and Conclusion, "Les trois faiblesses de l'historiographie du XIX^{e} siècle et du début du XX^{e} siècle à propos du génos," 1385 ff. See also Donlan 1985, 293-94.

kinship groups was underway. Roussel and Bourriot both strongly dissented from the contention that extended lineage groups ordered late Dark Age and early Archaic Greek society. Furthermore, they argued that examples of kinship-based organizations were not holdovers from a more primitive society, but instead arose with the *πόλις*, and represented institution created and manipulated by oligarchs and tyrants to enhance their control over the *πόλις*.[70]

Anglophone scholarship on the limitations of kinship groups begins in earnest with Walter Donlan, who builds upon the ideas first proposed by Roussel and Bourriot (as well as Finley's contentions about the primacy of the *οἶκος*). He argues against the importance of kinship or lineage ties beyond the nuclear family, and instead posits that the society reflected in the epics was arranged into loosely organized military-political associations.[71] Functionally, kinship ties beyond the individual *οἶκος* extend only to second cousins, and people sharing such ties should be considered more of a "category" than a "group." In other words, any individual might be able to call upon relatives as far removed as his second cousins, but such ties are based upon each individual; no permanent or formal kinship-based structures exist outside the *οἶκος*.[72]

Anthony Snodgrass has, to an extent, rejected the tendency to downplay lineage groups. Snodgrass sees most "tribal" divisions like the *φρήτρη* and *γένος* as late and

---

[70] Roussel 1976, "Note sur la notion de tribu et de société," 9-14; Première partie, Chapitre II, "La parenté dans la société homérique," 27-34, where Roussel succinctly makes one of his groundbreaking assertions: "Jamais [les mots de génos ou de généa] ne désignent un groupe stable et organisé, auquel ressortiraient les individus qui en seraient membres et qui se manisfesterait comme tel dans la vie sociale" (29). Roussel also considers Hesiod in Captitre III, "Le monde d'Hésiode," 35-38. See also Deuxième partie, Chapitre premier, "Sur les mots phratrères et phratrie," 95-98, and Chapitre V, "La phratrie dans le monde d'Homère," 117-22. Compare Bourriot 1976, Deuxième partie, Chapitre I, Introduction, 236-37, Section B, "Homère," 240-61, esp. 261-63, and Section C, "Oeuvres dites 'Homeriques,'" 264-65, and Section D, "Hesiode," 264-71.

[71] Donlan 1985, 298. Donlan rejects the idea that kinship groups such as tribes structured Greek society. Others have rejected this reinterpretation; see the discussion of Snodgrass below. Even Finley 1978, 79, remains attached to the existence of primordial tribal groups, although he believes that these were quite ancient, arriving with the first Greeks at the beginning of the second millennium BC, and changed significantly as they were exposed to large-scale territorial organizations in Egypt and the Near East.

[72] Donlan 1985, 302. Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 8, in a discussion of the *οἶκος* adds, "There is no identification with any broader kin group; in fact, *oikos* is the only formal kinship unit named in Homer and Hesiod."

artificial creations of the mature Greek state, developed so that some military, religious, or civic matters could be handled by smaller, more manageable groups. Questioning the complete rejection of lineage-based social groups, however, Snodgrass argues for a genealogical element in the definition of the Archaic ἔθνος.[73]

Lineage groups, furthermore, have enjoyed something of a revival within scholarship concerned with ethnicity in early Greece, which will be discussed at length below. For now let it suffice to say that J. Hall, in his pioneering work on ethnicity in Archaic Greece, considers membership in a putative descent group to be the basis of ethnic identity. On the same note, Morgan explains the difference between the two principal state forms of the Archaic period through her observation that as they emerged, the πόλις emphasized control of space and territory, while the ἔθνος emphasized control of time by invoking shared descent from a common ancestor, expressed in the present by kinship ties.[74] Malkin also considers putative descent important, but sees it more as a tool for ennobling particular rulers or families rather than establishing "ethnic" relationships among a group or between groups.

Unlike their nineteenth- and early twentieth-century predecessors, J. Hall, Morgan, and Malkin argue in terms of putative descent defining communities of identity rather than real descent defining functional social units. A close examination, however, of the use of terms such as γένος, φῦλον, and φρήτρη—sometimes taken to invoke real or imagined kinship ties—provides very little evidence for either functional or ideological groups based upon lineage, at least in the literary sources examined here. Salient kinship ties in Homer, Hesiod, and Archilochos are consistently limited to close familial relationships, with occasional references to more distant paternal ancestors, usually for the purpose of establishing status.

---

[73] Snodgrass 1980, 25-8; 42-3. See below. Compare Anthony M. Snodgrass, *The Dark Age of Greece: An Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to the Eighth Centuries BC* (New York: Routledge, 1971), 387. In this earlier work, which predates the studies of Roussel and Bourriot, Snodgrass makes an even stronger case for the tribal nature of early (in this case Dark Age) Greek society.

[74] C. Morgan, "Ethnicity and Early Greek States: Historical and Material Perspectives," *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 37 (1991): 141, 148.

Military Contingents: *Φῦλον* and *Φρήτρη*

Beginning in the early 1980's, scholars building upon Roussel's and Bourriot's effective criticism of lineage-based social organization began presenting alternative social groups based upon loyalty to a particular military or political leader.

Bjørn Qviller, for example, builds upon the earlier work of Finley, Roussel, and Bourriot, and foreshadows many of the ideas later presented by Donlan and Runciman.[75] The characteristics of this society include a *βασιλεύς* who operates much like a "big man" or "chieftain," and who bases his power upon personal ability.[76] According to Qviller, the position or the *βασιλεύς*, with respect to both subordinates and equals, is largely maintained through the exchange of gifts and the distribution of largess, either extracted from subjects or taken as booty in military actions. Gifts and largess, in turn, produced a body of retainers within the *οἶκος* of the *βασιλεύς*, and a group of guest-friends without.[77] Like Donlan and Runciman, Qviller believes political cohesiveness is instigated by the needs of warfare and defense.[78] Furthermore, Homeric warfare, according to Qviller's argument, relies on a system of military bands made up of retainers belonging to prominent *οἶκοι*.[79] Throughout his analysis, Qviller subordinates the role of extended kinship or genealogical ties to non-kinship groups.[80] Qviller sees intrinsic contradictions in this system, in which the demands placed on the

---

[75] Qviller 1981, 109-55.

[76] Although Qviller 1981, 117, admits that epic kingship "was somewhat more developed than that of a big-man whose coercive power remains weak and rudimentary." In particular, Qviller points out that Homeric kingship was a patrimony to which the king's son had first claim, although this claim could be challenged.

[77] Qviller 1981, 115 ff.; 116-17, deal with the role of the "big-man" and the importance of the distribution of largess; 120 ff. place the Homeric king in the continuum of political leadership "between the big-man and a chieftain." Here, Qviller explains the role of gift-giving in maintaining a position of leadership through placing gift-recipients under obligation to the giver. Compare Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 12-13.

[78] Qviller 1981, 135-36. Compare Donlan 1985, 304; Runciman 1982, 364.

[79] Qviller 1981, 115. Compare Donlan 1985, 297.

[80] Qviller 1981, 109-13; 117. Qviller limits the importance of kinship to immediate kinship groups and recognizes the importance of the *οἶκος*: "A feature that contributed to the development of the Homeric kingship is the noticeable absence of *large* and influential organizations based on kinship. Such organizations were usually restricted to one settlement" (117; emphasis in original).

βασιλεύς naturally alienate him from those on which his position depends, leading to instability which eventually resulted in the rise of a collegiate nobility during the early Archaic period.[81]

Writing about the same time as Qviller and echoing many of the new ideas unleashed once kinship-based social organization was abandoned, Runciman reconstructs the society depicted in the epics through the use of anthropological theories about the origin of states. He differentiates between "semi-states" and "proto-states," distinguished by the potential for the latter to develop into full-fledged states without radical alteration or revolutionary change.[82] According to his schema, the *Odyssey* is a semi-state society, with little prospect for development. Runciman sees the semi-state society depicted in the epics as based upon the *οἶκος*, and claims a profound lack of institutionalized governing structures. Agreeing with Qviller, Runciman considers the *βασιλεύς* to be a "big-man" governing by might, maintaining power through his own abilities, and exercising a very person rule. Runciman goes on to argue that *βασιλεύς* draws his critical military retinue from people with whom he himself has personal ties, such as friends and servants.[83] Again, formal, institutionalized governing structures are absent; instead, power is personal and must be accrued and defended by each individual ruler. The personal prowess of the *βασιλεύς* is critical—one rules *ἶφι*, by might.[84] In this world, appropriate birth serves an important legitimating role, but can only underpin, not win or maintain, power.[85] Foreshadowing van Wees, Runciman contends that *βασιλῆες* are nobles, not kings, who receive gifts for mediating local disputes. Runciman's view of the role of the people is also similar to that of van Wees: they

---

[81] Qviller 1981, 115 ff.; 130 ff., on the "structural weakness" of big-man societies in general and Homeric society in particular. Compare Luce 1978, 13-14.

[82] Runciman 1982, 354-55. Compare Qviller 1981, 117, who puts the arguments more in terms of the "structural weaknesses" of a "big-man" society. Qviller later states explicitly that personal power retards political development, contributing "to the containment of evolutionary advance" (131-32).

[83] Runciman 1982, 354.

[84] Runciman 1982, 355. Compare Carol Thomas, "Monarchy in Ruins," *Aegaeum* 20 (1999): 830, who argues that "direct relationships replaced indirect administrative procedures" during the Dark Age. See also Qviller 1982, 116.

[85] Runciman 1982, 362-63.

participate in assemblies but only as an audience.[86] In short, Runciman believes that epics depict a dead-end "semi-state" society, in which the power or the *βασιλεύς* is personal rather than institutional, and where, despite nascent discrimination between public and private affairs, people are not yet either citizens or subjects.[87] Although Runciman does not deal at length with the Homeric terminology for the groups he describes, it is clear that Runciman conceives of a society organized around personal leadership exercised by a *βασιλεύς* whose position depends upon his ability to win a following.

Donlan provides the most thorough argument that military/political bands formed the most important political and social units (with the exception of the *οἶκος*) within Dark Age sociaty. Donlan's Dark Age world, revealed primarily through the epics, is based upon small, local communities united by family (meaning close relatives, centered around individual *οἶκοι*) and neighborly ties.[88] At the highest level, Donlan recognizes the importance of the *δῆμος*, a particular territory and its inhabitants, but does not attribute much saliency to this social division.[89] Between the intimacy of the *οἶκος* and the neighborhood on the one hand, and the extensive but distant *δῆμος* on the other, Donlan argues for intermediary political/military groups, the *φῦλον*, *ἔθνος*, and *φρήτρη*, which are not based on kinship but instead consist of the followers acquired by capable leaders, *βασιλῆες* who act as chieftains or "big men."[90]

For Donlan, close relatives and neighbors form the basis of Dark Age society, but he considers these small-scale groups subject to "ambiguities and conflicts of interest." Thus, they were supplemented by a new leadership based upon personal alliances and

---

[86] Runciman 1982, 358.

[87] Qviller 1981, 115 ff., similarly emphasizes the personal nature of power in the epics.

[88] Donlan 1985, 302, cites Hesiod that it is best to supplement familial ties with "neighborly" relationships based not on kinship but on local community. According to Donlan, ties and obligations that center around local cults, festivals, plantings, harvests, and local defense will foster such the development of such non-kin communities. Snodgrass 1980, 26-27; 31, contends that at the local level a continuing "village habit" both preceded the advent of the *πόλις* and survived its rise.

[89] See below.

reciprocal bonds of loyalty. As certain *οἶκοι* and their leading men came to dominate their neighbors and kinsmen, a low-level political and economic elite emerged. The most successful among this elite came to be local "big men" (*βασιλῆες*) who attracted a small band of followers. Donlan believes that *φῦλον*, *ἔθνος*, and *φρήτρη* are all terms which designated such groups.[91] He emphasizes that these independent groups were based primarily on personal loyalty, the "shared identity as the free followers of a leading man" and performed no formal civic or legal functions, although they may have dealt with minor local matters through consensus or arbitration.[92] Donlan strongly contests the notion that any ties of lineage—real or imagined—united these groups, and instead contends that "familial" language used to describe them is metaphorical or borrowed: "it does not mean that their members were therefore related, or that they imagined a common ancestor, or that they were recruited by descent."[93] As Dark Age conditions became more settled, Donlan argues that recruitment by able leaders broadened in scope beyond pre-existing kin and neighbor ties, but remained limited to a more or less set territory. Still, personal loyalty remained the basis of the group, and its principal collective activities were military. As in the systems reconstructed by Qviller and Runciman, the *βασιλεύς* held his position by personal competence to lead. He received deference and privileges from other members of the elite, but was still a *primus inter pares* linked by close ties with subordinate nobles, whom Homer also calls *βασιλῆες*.[94] His position was precarious and always dependent upon his ability but, Donlan argues, his sons were afforded hereditary succession to his position of leadership under normal circumstances, provided they were capable of successfully securing and executing this role. Donlan asserts that such a society, built of

---

[90] Again, Qviller 1981, 116 ff foreshadows many of Donlan's arguments, exploring at length the degree to which the Homeric *βασιλεύς* resembles a "big man" or "chieftain."

[91] Donlan 1985, 302-03.

[92] Donlan 1985, 303.

[93] Donlan 1985 300-01. Donlan notes that "slurred distinctions between 'friends,' 'companions,' and kin are frequent the epic," using the case of Patroklos and Achilleus as an example.

[94] Donlan 1985, 304-05. This broader meaning of *βασιλεύς*, as well as the distinction between *the βασιλεύς* and the group of elites referred to as *βασιλῆες*, is also considered by van Wees (see below).

independent groups led by men selected primarily on their ability to lead, produced an unstable polity which suffered from the successive rise and fall of minor chiefdoms, reflected in the numerous legends about various heroes and kings in the epic tradition. Donlan concludes by arguing that this fragile hierarchy gave way to a system of collegial rule by a land-owning nobility by the middle of the eighth century.[95]

A cluster of terms used in Homer, including *φρήτρη*, *φῦλον*, and sometimes *ἔθνος*, denotes military contingents of the kind described by Qviller, Runciman, and Donlan. There is some variation, however, in their usage and meaning. *Φῦλον*, for example, refers specifically to an organized contingent and retains some overtones of kinship relationships, while *ἔθνος* designates a class of being with a common identity and may designate the community of people from which a contingent is drawn as well as the contingent itself.

The People and their Land: *Δῆμος*, *Ἔθνος*, and *Γαῖα*

Beyond the intensely personal relationships of household, kin, and band are larger, more remote divisions within early Greek society. There is much less agreement concerning these larger social groups, however, and a wide variety of opinions about their nature and importance have been proposed.

In Snodgrass's interpretation of the early Archaic period, family, village, and either *ἔθνος* (and later the *πόλις*) are the principal intra-Hellenic communities, although a nascent Panhellenism exists as well. A. Snodgrass chooses the large, diffused, regional-tribal grouping like that which Aristotle calls the *ἔθνος* as the most important large-scale social unit, the group larger than the family to which Greeks owed allegiance before the advent of the *πόλις* and in areas where it did not emerge. Snodgrass contends that this expansive, diffused group—represented in Homer by collective terms such as Myrmidons, Boiotians, Epeians, etc.—had both a territorial and

[95] Donlan 1985, 305. Qviller 1981, 109-55, esp. 117 ff. (see discussion above).

a genealogical delineation.[96] Snodgrass believes that the ἔθνος took on civic and political qualities from an early time, but that its origins, reflected in Homer, "[bear] the stamp of tribalism."[97] Snodgrass, however, balances the tribal basis for the ἔθνος with the territorial, expressed in Homer and through regional schools of pottery in the ninth and eighth centuries BC, as well as by epichoric alphabets somewhat later.[98]

Donlan considers the δῆμος, along with the οἶκος and λαός, to be one of the three "clearly delineated social units" in Homer and Hesiod. He sees the δῆμος as the largest division of early Greek society, consisting of a set area of land along with all free inhabitants of the area, "the all-inclusive social unit—a particular people and their land."[99] Politically, the δῆμος, according to Donlan, consists of an unstable collection of military/political associations, within which the leader of each subgroup acts as a representative of his followers.[100] In this hypothosis, the δῆμος, although delineated territorially and communally, is somewhat incohate; while the people making up the δῆμος are divided into discrete social units with independent leaders.

Van Wees, unlike Donlan and Snodgrass, considers the δῆμος in Homer to be a social class rather than a territorially, communally, or genealogically defined socio-political unit. Van Wees's argument, although I believe it makes too much of a single aspect of term's use, reveals how Homer employs δῆμος when describing activities belonging to the public sphere.[101] Van Wees interprets the term δῆμος to mean "the

---

[96] Compare McInerney 1999, 8-9, who sees the ἔθνος as fundamental in the epics, encompassing both territoriality and tribal relationships.

[97] Snodgrass 1980, 28. See also 26-27; 47-48; 60-61; 68-69.

[98] Snodgrass 1980, 27.

[99] Donlan 1985, 298-99. Donlan does not seem to consider the political/military groups he associates with the terms φῦλον, ἔθνος, and φρήτρη to have been clearly delineated or stable; consequently, he treats them as a different class of association. See also Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 13-14. Compare Finley 1978, 78. Although he does not ascribe this meaning to δῆμος specifically, Finley accords the socio-political unit represented in Homer by the assembly fourth place in his hierarchy of social groups, after family, class, and οἶκος.

[100] Donlan 1985, 304. Qviller 1981, 128 ff. Qviller also emphasizes the role of the "band" of warriors, although he treats the phenomenon less systematically than Donlan.

[101] Compare Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 14, where he, more correctly I believe, equates δῆμος with "the populace at large, expressing a common will or experience."

people" as opposed to the "princes" (*βασιλῆες*).[102] In this formulation, the *δῆμος* serves a largely passive role, while the *βασιλῆες* actively manage social and political affairs. For example, van Wees proposes that the elder *βασιλῆες* (*γέροντες*) settle disputes, allocate farmland, maintain relations with other communities, and dictate strategy in war. Younger *βασιλῆες* command the army in battle and divide the spoils of victory, or swear oaths of surrender. The preeminent ruler (referred to as *the βασιλεύς*) can call a meeting of the other *βασιλῆες*, who make most important decisions (van Wees does not specify whether by this he means only the *γέροντες* or the *βασιλῆες* as a whole). The people, on the other hand, provide food and drink consumed. The princes may invite the people to be present at debates where "a public matter" (*δήμιος*) is discussed, but the *δῆμος* does not participate directly in the decision, although it may express approval or disapproval. Ultimately, the ruler formulates a decision or resolution, which is absolute, although it is considered to express the will of the people as a whole.[103] Regular "law sessions" (*Θέμις*) are also occasionally held, where the elders advise the ruling prince about cases brought by the people. All in all, a "simple, but comprehensive and well-established system of government," is depicted in the epics, and although the real power lies with the *βασιλῆες*, the *δῆμος* incorporates "the entire male population" into polity.[104]

Van Wees envisions the operation of this government within the confines of the individual town. He contends that the socio-political unit larger than the town is the "state," which "has no name in the epics."[105] This state incorporates a number of towns,

---

[102] Van Wees 1992, 30-31. Compare Finley 1978, 51-53; 75; 106-07; 111. Finley argues that among those who were free, hereditary nobles (*ἄριστοι*) were set apart from the rest of the *δῆμος* by their monopoly on power and wealth.

[103] Van Wees 1992, 33, notes that "'the Trojans' (XX.184-86) and 'the Lykians' (VI.194-95) are said to make grants of land, while elsewhere it is clear that the actual decision to dispose of land lies with the elders."

[104] Van Wees 1992, 36. Compare Luce 1978, 1-15, who holds a similar view of the role of king, nobles, and assembly. In particular, Luce discusses the courts (1-3), arguing that the council has the final say rather than the king, the social structure (3), and the political operation of the *πόλις* (10).

[105] Van Wees 1992, 36. What van Wees means by this is that there is no generic name for the state in Homer.

and often has a collective name (Elis or Euboia, for example). The inhabitants also frequently have an "ethnic" name usually, but not always, based upon the territorial name (as in the case of the Epeians and the Abantes). The states themselves correspond to the territories from which the contingents in the Catalogue of Ships originate.[106] Thus, each state has a common army. The Pylians' collective sacrifice to Poseidon witnessed by Telemachos provides evidence for a state religion or cult as well, van Wees continues. Although he believes that most day-to-day business would have gone on at the level of the town, van Wees also argues that the state has a single monarch in peace as well as war. This monarch, usually the ruler of the largest or wealthiest town, serves as a military ruler, a supreme judge, and an overlord above the individual princely families in each town, who can depose or impose local princes.[107] Thus, van Wees contends that the δῆμος is a socio-political class, operating within the confines of the "town." The town, in turn, serves as the primary social and political unit, while a shadowy and nameless "state" plays an important role only with regard to the war and the organization of the army.

In previous scholarship, the terms ἔθνος and δῆμος have been seen as designating larger social groups, whether based on territory, people, or genealogy. To this list I add the term γαῖα, which most directly invokes a territorially-based unit; Donlan points out that γαῖα can serve as a synonym for the "land" component of for the "land and people" entity invoked by the term δῆμος.[108] The ἔθνος, with its basic meaning of a group of beings sharing a common identity, serves in the societal realm as an intermediary class, referring sometimes to a contingent, sometimes to the larger community from which it is drawn; I do not believe that it has strong overtones of genealogical relationship or

---

[106] Van Wees 1992, 36-37. Van Wees provides Nestor's story about the war between the Pylians and the Epeians as an example of epic states in action; likewise Agamemnon's offer of seven towns to Achilleus.

[107] Van Wees 1992, 36-39.

[108] Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 14. See also Finley 1978, 78, where he notes the importance of territory: "As a precondition [The assembly] requires a relatively settled, stable community made up of many households and kinship groups; in other words, the imposition upon kinship of some territorial superstructure." I believe that territorial aspects of both social groups and identity have been neglected in the past. Finley is the exception rather than the rule in appreciating the early importance of territoriality.

lineage. *Δῆμος*, perhaps the most interesting and multifaceted term examined in this dissertation, can invoke territory or people, but in either case usually designates something in the public realm, although I disagree with van Wees and Finley that it primarily or usually designates a social class, the "people" as distinct from the "elite."

Panhellenism

Above households, local communities, military contingents, territorial states, and other intra-Hellenic social groups in early Greece, one is confronted with the enigma of Panhellenism. Unlike most of the more limited social groups and communities, the very existence, and not just the nature, of Panhellenic sentiment is up for debate. Undoubtedly, the Achaians are depicted in Homer as acting in concert. Still the extent of the "unity" displayed in the epics, as well as what, if any, relationship they have to a real, historical situation, remains hotly contested.

Finley argues that pan-Hellenism emerged only slowly and late—after the time of Homer—and was essentially an ideology, a set of beliefs that lead one to claim that one was Greek.[109] Snodgrass, conversely, sees evidence of Panhellenism in the common use of religious sanctuaries far from political centers (such as Dodona and Delphi). Panhellenic sanctuaries were supplemented by "league" and "state" sanctuaries, both of which Snodgrass believes helped to define membership in a political communities through common cult practices, although he stresses that at the same time cosmopolitan dedications continued at all three types.[110] Based partly upon dedications left at Ithaka as traders or proto-colonizers crossed from "Greek" into "non-Greek" territory, Malkin also contends that at least a "proto-pan-Hellenism" existed in the early archaic period.[111] Supplementing religious practices with civic, Snodgrass also takes the exclusive nature of citizenship in many Greek political communities, and in particular the categorical exclusion of non-Greeks from such communities, as indicating the existence of an underlying Panhellenic sentiment, or at least a recognition of the

[109] Finley 1978, 24-25.

[110] Snodgrass 1980, 55-7.

difference between Greeks and non-Greeks.[112] McInerney believes that "Panhellenism became a reality in the eighth century."[113] Also arguing the case of Panhellenism, Van Wees contends that the world of the epics displays not just Panhellenic sentiment, but real political unity. He does not believe that Greek unity was accidental or temporary, and rejects Thoukydides' claim that the early Greek states did not compose "something separate from the outside world."[114] He instead argues that in the epics Agamemnon is consistently presented as ruler over all of Greece:

> The heroic world, then, knows a nation of All-Akhaians, a political unit conscious of being different from the rest, recognizing a single ruler, and able to mobilize a single army. This nation embraces twenty-nine states. Each of these states consists of a number of towns. And each of these towns is a true social and political community uniting many households.[115]

Van Wees proposes two possible interpretations of Panhellenic political unity in the epics: either that political unity did exist during the Mycenaean age, or that Archaic consciousness of Greek cultural unity and separateness manifest themselves as political unity in the epics.[116]

Communities of Identity: Ethnicity in Archaic Greece?

Panhellenism in general, and Van Wees' final observation about consciousness of Greek cultural unity and separateness, bridges the gap between social groups and communities, not necessarily functional, which share a common identity. Van Wees essentially proposes the existence of a salient Panhellenic identity in Archaic Greece, which, although depicted as politically functional in the epics, was essentially ideological in nature. Presumably, van Wees could also argue the same for his other

---

[111] Malkin 1998, 26; 41-46; 60.

[112] Snodgrass 1980, 88-91.

[113] McInerney 1999, 29.

[114] Thuc. 1.3. Van Wees 1992, 39.

[115] Van Wees 1992, 40.

[116] Van Wees 1992, 57-58. See also Mackie 1996, 6-12, for a discussion of Panhellenism and "nationalism" in the *Iliad*, particularly the question of whether or not the poems display a "pro-Achaian bias." Later, Mackie observes that the *Iliad* is indeed a "Panhellenic poem" (19).

levels of social and political organization; namely, that Greeks of the Archaic period may have based their identity on "citizenship" in a "town" or "state." In other words, intermediary communities, regardless of the specific nature or functionality of the underlying social units, can contribute to the formation of a multi-faceted intra-Hellenic identity, perhaps augmented by Panhellenism. Some of these communities might be—and indeed have been—considered "ethnic" in nature.

"Ethnicity," variously defined, is a widely discussed aspect of Greek identity. Although this is more true of the Classical and later periods of Greek history, a number of books and articles dealing at least tangentially with ethnicity in the Archaic Period have appeared in recent years. Applying a modern concept such as ethnicity to early Greece can prove problematic, and care must be taken not to anachronistically search for concepts familiar today but foreign to antiquity. If, however, one defines ethnicity broadly, as "the way in which social groups consciously choose to assert their identity and to define and constitute themselves in relation to others in any given set of circumstances," then manifestation of ethnicity so defined can indeed be found in Homer and other early Greek sources.[117]

A few words about ethnicity in Classical Greece will help to establish the context for more recent work on ethnicity in early Greece. Discussions of ethnicity in Classical Greece generally invoke Panhellenic identity. The encounter between Greeks and Persians in the late sixth and fifth centuries BC, and particularly the Persian War of 480-479, have been seen as a critical in the emergence of Panhellenism, providing the Greeks with an "other" against which they could construct their own identity. The literature produced in the aftermath of this conflict, from Aischylos' *Persai* to Herodotos' *Histories*, reflects this change, displaying a sharpened sense of opposition

---

[117] Morgan 1991, 133. See Malkin 1998, 55-61; 135, for an excellent discussion of the application of the concept of ethnicity to Archaic Greece. See also J. Hall 1997, 19-26, "Defining the Ethnic Group," and 26-32, "The genesis and maintenance of ethnic groups," summarized 32-33. Compare McInerney 1999, 25-35; David Konstan, "Defining Ancient Greek Ethnicity," *Diaspora* 6.1 (Spring, 1997): 109; John Buckler, review of *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis* by Jeremy McInerney, in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2000.11.29 http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2000/2000-11-29.html (18 May 2001); E. Hall 1989, 165. See Anthony D. Smith, "Ethnic Election and Cultural Identity," *Ethnic Studies* 10 (1993): 9-25, for a succinct example of modern use of the term "ethnicity."

between Greek and Barbarian.[118] F. Hartog, E. Hall, P. Cartledge, and others have demonstrated the emergence of this Greek-Barbarian dichotomy and its importance in the development of Greek self-definition. The tendency of the Greeks to define their collective identity in opposition to a stereotyped, foreign "other" should be seen, in the words of Paul Cartledge, as part of a process by which "Greeks . . . construct[ed] their identities negatively, by means of a series of polarized oppositions of themselves to what they were not."[119] Cartledge adds other oppositional pairs to Greek vs. Barbarian, including Men Vs. Women, Citizens vs. Aliens, Free vs. Slave, and Gods vs. Mortals, rounding out the categories he sees as central to the Classical Greek sense of identity. Cartledge is fairly representative; oppositional pairing of this nature has animated much of the discussion of Greek identity in the Classical period.[120]

Concentration by scholars on "oppositional" identity in the Classical period has retarded investigation of identity in the Archaic period, as the sources for that era produce little evidence for identity constructed on difference with an "other." Hillary Mackie, in her introduction to *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad*, writes:

> In the context of the work presently being done on perceptions of ethnicity in the ancient world, however, Homer gets relatively short shrift. One contributory factor is that the preferred methodological approach to ancient constructions of ethnicity and difference focuses on the concept of alterity ("otherness") strictly defined. The term identifies the condition of an out-group defined by a dominant in-group and as the result of a systematic process of negative polarization as "the other."[121]

The self-conception of Greek identity before the Classical period is, however, more complex and difficult to reconstruct, and does not conform to the simple "oppositional" model. M. Finley, for example, could contend that no local, regional, or national

---

[118] Malkin 1998, 19; 60-61; J. Hall 1997, xiii; 44-46; Konstan 1997, 107-10; Cartledge 1993, 11; 38 ff. Note Cartledge's caveats (11; 39).

[119] Cartledge 1993, 12. On the *Persai*, see E. Hall 1989, Cartledge 1993, 39. Concerning Herodotus, see Hartog 1988, who concentrates on Herodotos' account of the Scythians, and Cartledge 1993, 55-62.

[120] For example, Malkin 1998, 138-39, discusses the reinterpretation of Homer to provide opposed pairs of Greeks and Trojans.

[121] Mackie 1996, 8.

dividing lines of genuine consequence existed which categorically differentiated among cultural or territorial groups; for Finley, Homer's world was one without "ethnic" groups, in which individuals and classes vary in capacity, but not peoples.[122] More recently, scholars considering the question of Greek identity in the Archaic Period have disagreed about the importance of its various components. The only consensus that has emerged is that Greek identity in the Archaic Era was multi-layered, consisting of simultaneous membership in various communities, some distinct and some overlapping. J. Hall, focusing on intra-Hellenic ethnicity based upon putative genealogical relationships, uses the term "aggregative" to describe this multi-layered identity:

> If, from the fifth century, Greek self-definition was oppositional, prior to the Persian Wars it was aggregative. Rather than being defined "from without," it was constructed cumulatively "from within." It was a definition based not on difference from the barbarian but on similarity with peer groups which attempted to attach themselves to one another by invoking common descent from Hellen.[123]

Hall suggests that the different categories of self-identification coexist in any given individual or group, and emphasizes that intra-Hellenic ethnic identities precede any Panhellenic identity.

The change from aggregative to oppositional thinking did not occur as rapidly as is implied by scholars who single out the Persian Wars as the critical turning point in the conceptualization of Greek identity. Malkin reminds us that regular and extensive contact between Greeks and non-Greeks predated the Persian Wars by several centuries, and that there were other points of origin for oppositional thinking than just the conflict with the Persians.[124] Konstan's warning that "one cannot draw a sharp temporal line dividing the aggregative and the oppositional modes" of identity-creation must be considered, while his description of developments during this era as a "pre-history" to

---

[122] Finley 1978, 132-35.

[123] J. Hall 1997, 47. Compare Malkin 1998, 55-61, esp. 60-61 for the transition from aggregative to oppositional identity. See also Konstan 1997, 107-09.

[124] Malkin 1998, 139; 149.

Greek ethnic identity aptly invokes the uncertainties involved in the process of Greek self-identification in the Archaic period.[125]

Although this general picture of layered identity is accepted by many, difficulties remain in determining what aspects of identity were most important for the Greeks of the Archaic period. Thus far, I have couched much of this discussion in terms of intra-Hellenic ethnicity and Panhellenism. These are, however, only two of many salient components of early Greek identity. The temptation to concentrate exclusively on ethnicity or Panhellenism (potentially an ancient surrogate for modern nationalism) because of its resonance in the modern world must be resisted. Although the scholars discussed below at least touch on these two issues, they also admit other categories of identity which are more foreign or unexpected to the modern observer.

Moreover, the limitations of the sources render study of identity in Archaic Greece even more problematic than the study of social groups. Konstan, for example, observes that there is "a relative dearth of historical information [about ethnicity] and of explicit testimonies to ethnic self-assertion" from the Archaic period.[126] Although more information is available about genealogies, places of origin, attachment to households, class relationships, and other non-ethnic indicators of categories of self-identification that made up the multi-layered Greek sense of identity, none of this information is transparent and much of it is inconsistent. Given this degree of uncertainty, it is not surprising that although most scholars agree that Greek identity was multi-layered, there is much debate over what those layers were, and which of them were the most important during the Archaic period.

Nevertheless, intra-Hellenic ethnicity and Panhellenism have animated most inquiries into the nature of Greek identity. J. Hall, for example, expands his notion of "aggregate" identity by advocating a conception of community based upon "nested ethnicity":

---

[125] Konstan 1997, 109-10.

[126] Konstan 1997, 100.

> [W]hereby a citizen of a city such as Sparta could subscribe not only to a Dorian ethnicity but also to a Greek identity that was itself constituted by ethnic subdivisions such as the Dorians and Aiolians.[127]

While downplaying the role of Panhellenism, Hall allows for multiple levels of intra-Hellenic identity within the same individual or group. Among these divisions, Hall emphasizes divisions between Dorians, Ionians, Aiolians, and other intra-Hellenic but supra-political groups. He sees ethnicity in Archaic Greece as based on (putative) descent from an (imagined or invented) common ancestor, although he does allow a secondary place to territorial claims.[128] Hall is very specific about what he considers the criteria for defining ethnicity in the Archaic Greek context: descent and kinship—specifically belief in shared descent from a putative common ancestor—rather than language or culture.[129] In practice, this brings Hall to emphasize the large, amorphous, socio-linguistic divisions in Greek society represented by the Dorians, Ionians, Aiolians, etc. As discussed above, Hall believes that any Panhellenic sense of "Greekness" is constructed from these intra-Hellenic divisions, and is not clearly defined during the Archaic period.[130]

Such a narrow and specific definition of ethnicity is useful for divorcing the concept of ethnicity from its modern overtones and placing it in context, but it also invites criticism from those who would define ethnicity differently or more broadly. D. Konstan, for instance, in his extended review of *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*, charges that Hall overemphasizes putative descent from a common ancestor as the primary criterion of ethnicity. Konstan observes that genealogies may serve—or be manipulated for—other purposes, such as fostering civic identity.[131] On the basis of this criticism, Konstan also questions Hall's prioritizing of vague "ethnic" affiliations

---

[127] J. Hall 1997, xiii.

[128] J. Hall 1997, 2; 25.

[129] J. Hall 1997, 2-3; see below.

[130] Compare McInerney 1999, 29 ff.

[131] Konstan 1997, 101; 106.

(Dorians, Ionians, Aiolians).[132] Konstan embraces the multi-layered nature of Greek identity, but argues for a less restrictive conception of ethnicity than that proposed by Hall. Ethnic identities, Konstan believes, should include any "self-conscious insistence on an image of the organic cohesion of a community . . . opposed to and complementary to the integrity that derives from political or contractual bonds."[133] These identities might range from the intensely local, like the individual city state, to the Panhellenic. At the same time, self-definition might be based on any number of criteria, not just the construction of putative genealogical relationships. Konstan sees the expression of identity as arising where power and authority are contested, which can range from the local (πόλις) to the global (Panhellenic) level, along any number of axes including, but not limited to, Hall's conception of ethnicity.[134]

In this context, earlier observations about the use and importance of genealogical and socio-linguistic relationships should also be mentioned. Speaking about the development of Greek mythology, Finley observes:

> Each new tribe, each new community, each shift in power relations within the aristocratic elite, meant some change in the genealogies of heroes, the outcome of past family feuds, in the delicate balances among men and gods.[135]

This hints at how putative heroic genealogies are not only the result of building ethnic identity, but are just as likely to serve the ends of political propaganda or the enhancement of status.[136] Snodgrass observes that the most common reason for invoking descent from (or at least close association with) a legendary hero was to legitimate a claim to territory.[137] Such a combination of territoriality and lineage can also be found in Morgan, who stresses that the Archaic ἔθνος was defined and organized

---

[132] Konstan 1997, 101.

[133] Konstan 1997, 109.

[134] Konstan 1997, esp. 98-99; 101; 104, 109-10.

[135] Finley 1978, 24.

[136] Konstan 1997, 103; for political and civic identity, see also 106-08. Compare Malkin 1998, 134-36, who discusses the ennobling power of putative genealogies.

[137] Snodgrass 1980, 38; see also 69-75 for Snodgrass' contention that strong, self-conscious bonds between present and past were maintained in Archaic Greece.

by kinship—and that "citizenship" was based upon lineage rather than birthplace—but also that the people of the ἔθνος recognized territorial boundaries (which Morgan maintains are of secondary importance to descent and lineage).[138]

Snodgrass, like Hall, sees socio-linguistic groups (Doric-speakers, Ionic-speakers, etc.) as functional groups in the eighth and especially the seventh centuries BC, articulated mainly through "league sanctuaries." He tends, however, to subordinate the "ethnic" function of league (pan-Ionian, etc.) sanctuaries in the eighth century BC to the political, interpreting the Panionion on Mount Mykale in Asia Minor, for example, as the product of a league of cities, united by their status as the original Greek colonies in Ionia, rather than an institution based on Ionian "ethnic" solidarity.[139] Further pressing his case of the subordination of political to ethnic concerns, Snodgrass emphasizes the use of "ethnic" (anti-Doric, etc.) propaganda, particularly by tyrants later in the Archaic period.[140]

Returning our attention to more recent work on ethnicity, Malkin follows Konstan's advice, concentrating less on a single manifestation of ethnicity, and more on the variety of ways in which different Greeks (and non-Greeks) could conceive of themselves. Instead of limiting his definition to those who claim descent from a common ancestor, he expands it to include any conscious expression of group identity—admitting that lineage itself was one of the most important of such expressions.[141] He places even more emphasis than Konstan on the degree of fragmentation among discrete communities of identity:

> The Greek place in the Archaic period consisted of difference. Aside from occupying ourselves with the observations of differences between "others"

---

[138] Morgan 1991, 131; 141-42; 148. See also Thomas 1999, 831, who also discusses the importance of lineage, at least at the local and regional level.

[139] Snodgrass 1980, 56.

[140] Snodgrass 1980, 115; see also 88-93, where he discusses a further interaction between political and ethnic issues, seeing patterns of citizenship that tend to follow socio-linguistic lines (Doric-speaking *poleis*, for instance, tend to have exclusive citizenship according). Snodgrass, however, holds a nuanced view of the pattern of citizenship: while exclusive citizenship is almost always found in Doric-speaking city-states, inclusive citizenship can be found in both Doric- and Ionic-speaking *poleis*, while colonies of either dialect-group tend to be exclusive.

[141] Malkin 1998, 55-61; 134-35.

> that seem to be the focus of so much intellectual discourse, we should look for a more sophisticated difference within a "same." For Greeks such observation would have come naturally, since . . . the idea of "Greece" as a place did not exist in the Archaic period.[142]

Malkin sets the stage for the rest of his work by advancing the claim that "the 'imagined community' of the ἔθνος or nation can be of far greater significance for self-definition and relations with others than any 'objective' definition of race or primordial ethnicity."[143] However, he reminds the readers that "'difference' may not have been regarded at all in ethnic terms," observing that "in 'Greece' there were autochthonous Arkadians (Greeks but outside the genealogy of the eponymous Hellen), 'pre-Greek' Pelasgians (e.g. at Lemnos), and a mixture of Eteo- and Dorian Cretans."[144]

As a further counterweight to the importance of genealogical ethnicity, Malkin points out how colonists often invoked their mother city or "country" (such as the ἔθνος of Achaia), and not their "ethnicity" (Dorian, Ionian, etc.) as they established the institutions of their new colonies.[145] He also acknowledges the role of the city in Homer, and discusses the importance of individual (mostly aristocratic) households, as well as their ability to span city and regional boundaries.[146] Malkin spends much time exploring the various roles and activities of the aristocracy: "traditional" agrarian pursuits versus the new opportunities offered by proto-colonization, colonization, piracy, and trade, the roles of leaders, subordinates, and guest-friends in elite society. Malkin links the ideas of class and ethnicity by observing monarchs who "ennobled" their genealogy by claiming descent from Greek heroes in such a way that their propaganda served eventually (if completely unintentionally) to Hellenize their people as ethnicity became a more salient aspect of identity.[147]

---

[142] Malkin 1998, 17.

[143] Malkin 1998, 8-9.

[144] Malkin 1998, 19.

[145] Malkin 1998, 18.

[146] Malkin 1998, 122-24.

[147] Malkin 1998, 135: "For the royal houses in question [who adopted Greek genealogies], the point was not to Hellenize the ethnic origins of their peoples but to heroize their own." See also Malkin 1998, 134-36; 150-51; 154-55. Compare Runciman 1982, 351, argues that even the "ennobling" aspects of lineage

Jeremy McInerney, in a recently released book on Phokis, sees ethnicity in archaic Greece as based upon the ἔθνος, in Snodgrass' sense of the term. Arguing that ethnicity is dynamic, arising from social interaction, McInerney holds that ethnicity is ideological, appeals to conceptions of cultural differences. This situational ethnicity often serves political ends, and is responsive to changing needs of a self-defined ethnic group. As the principal political division in early Greece (coexisting with the πόλις), the ἔθνος naturally serves as the basis of such an "ethnic" group. McInerney warns against applying anachronistic models forged from the study of modern, multi-ethnic states, but does contend that ethnic groups in ancient Greece were dynamic, elective affiliations related primarily to the socio-political unit called the ἔθνος.[148]

J. Hall, Konstan, Malkin, and McInerney disagree over precisely what aspect of identity the term "ethnicity" should apply to the world of Archaic Greece. Membership in a loosely-defined descent group, a concrete political-territorial unit, some other intra-Hellenic division, or even a Panhellenic idea of "Greekness" may have carried meaning for a Greek of the Archaic period, or may simply be modern ideas read into limited and problematic sources. This uncertainty illustrates both the complexity of early Greek identity and the difficulty surrounding application of modern terms such as "ethnicity," to a remote and poorly documented world.

* * *

Considering the range of options open, what were the various concepts with which Greeks of the Archaic Period perceived and built their own identity? Which were the most salient, how were they prioritized, and how did this change under different situations? Considering that identity is, as J. Hall emphasizes with regard to ethnicity, "socially constructed and subjectively perceived," in the first instance this question

---

are the mark of a "non-state" or stateless society (he considers the society depicted in the epics to be a "semi-state" rather than non-state). Runciman goes on to contend that development of any state-level society requires emancipation from real or fictive kinship as the basis of relations between occupants of governmental roles and those they govern.

[148] McInerney 1999, Chapter 2. This synopsis serves as only a rudimentary introduction to Jeremy McInerney's recent and lengthy discussion of Greek ethnicity. See Buckler 2000 for a thoughtful, and somewhat critical, review of *The Folds of Parnassos*.

must be approached through "emic" evidence, evidence generated by members of the group in question themselves.[149] The earliest evidence for self-expressions of Greek identity in the early Archaic Period is limited to Homer, Hesiod, and fragments of a few other poets.[150] The meaning of words relating to identity found in these authors—*γένος*, *πόλις*, *γαῖα*, *δῆμος*, *οἶκος*, etc.—is not, however, transparent, and their interpretation often benefits from anthropological and comparative analysis. At the same time, doing so carries the risk of not only the injection of anachronistic ideas, but also (sometimes necessary) simplification or distortion arising from the application of an "etic" point of view, in which the schema of the outsider are imposed, for instance when reconstruction functional social or political groups.[151] On the one hand, modern concepts such as race, ethnicity, and nationalism may pollute modern ideas about identity in early Greece. On the other, communities of critical importance to Greek society and identity may have been taken for granted in the sources, while those preserved in the limited sources that survive may have played little role in self-definition.

To answer these concerns, I have based this study on close examination of the specific vocabulary used by Homer, Hesiod, and Archilochos to describe functional social groups and individual or communal identity. I have avoided anachronistic concepts such as "ethnicity" or "the state," relying instead on the actual words used by the ancient authors I examine, which account for the vast majority of (written) primary sources for the early Archaic period. The concepts I thus explore include: *γένος* (and variants), *φῦλον* and *φρήτρη*; *ἔθνος*, *γαῖα* (and variants), and *δῆμος*. I take *γένος* to designate an aggregate of like beings, with generational or genealogical overtones, *φῦλον* and *φρήτρη* are, similarly, aggregates of like beings, but instead of invoking genealogical relationships, tend to represent military contingents when used in a social context. *ἔθνος* can carry a similar meaning, or designate the people from which such a military contingent is drawn. *γαῖα* invokes a fixed territory of origin or homeland, while

---

[149] J. Hall 1997, 18-19; Morgan 1991, 133. Konstan 1997, 100-03 discusses the paucity of evidence.

[150] As well as a handful of inscriptions that are not considered in this dissertation. Here I am designating the period from about the mid-eighth to the mid-seventh centuries BC as early Archaic Greece.

δῆμος represents both a territory and the people which inhabit it, and usually carries the additional meaning of some public aspect either of the people or their territory. These categories are not mutually exclusive, some categories may contribute toward building others, and the salience of each is variable according to the context; these, however, are the recurring social groups and communities encountered in Homer.[152] Drawing these categories initially from face-to-face encounters occurring throughout the epics, combined with the catalogues of *Iliad* Book II, I contend that they consistently reappear throughout the epics, and continue their use—with moderate change of emphasis—through Hesiod and Archilochos.

---

[151] J. Hall 1997, 19.

[152] Other aspects of identity could certainly be found. In his analysis of the post-Persian War, opposition-driven construction of identity, Cartledge 1993 also includes men vs. women, free vs. slave, and gods v. mortals, for instance. Although evidence for each of these could certainly be found in the early Archaic literature, they emerge, for a variety of reasons, as less consistently salient.

CHAPTER II: FACE-TO-FACE ENCOUNTERS IN THE EPICS

Face-to-face encounters between heroes constitute a class of type-scene common in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Hilary Mackie, in particular, points out the importance of face-to-face encounters to Homer's construction of Greek and Trojan identity.[1] Such passages, in which one hero asks the identity of another, reveal most directly the terms in which the poet and his audience conceived of origin and identity.[2] As discussed above, Vansina, Morris, and others who have examined oral tradition point out that mutable, abstract, aspects of society such as group membership and identity must be put in terms that are accessible to the poet's audience, otherwise they will quickly be forgotten or modified to meet contemporary expectations. As such, these dialogues reflect, or at least are conceptualized in terms of, salient contemporary or near-contemporary ideas about origin an identity. In face-to-face encounters between heroes, questions and answers about identity display a consistent pattern of word selection. These terms include: *δώμα*, *οἶκος*, *γένος*, *αἷμα*, *τοκεύς*, *πόλις*, *λαός*, *γαῖα*, and *δῆμος*. Other concepts represented include: "national" origin (*Ἀχαιοί*, *Τρῶες*, or *ἐπίκουροι*), the names of places of origin (including *πόλεις*, territorial region, and geographical features); people of origin (using the plural "ethnic" such as *Κρητοί*, Kretans); parents, close relatives or paternal ancestors; children or progeny (*παίδων παῖδες*); leadership or status (*βασιλεύς*, *ἄναξ*, *ἀρχός*, *ἀγαθὸς*, *ἄριστος*); *ξενίη*-relationships; remoteness (*τηλόθεν*, *τηλοῦ*).[3] Combined with the introduction of the Achaian and Trojan contingents in the catalogues of *Iliad* Book II, face-to-face encounters establish the vocabulary of identity used in the Homeric corpus.

---

[1] Mackie 1996, 6, observes that the *Iliad* "foregrounds the conversations engaged in by Homeric heroes." She uses the language of face-to-face encounters (including other types of encounters beyond warriors questioning one another) to differentiate between speech patterns of Achaians and Trojans, which manifest an "artistic version of ethnic and cultural difference" in Homer (44; see also 43 ff.). Chapter 2 of *Talking Trojan* is devoted to face-to-face encounters in the *Iliad*, and contains an extensive bibliography.

[2] I have also extended the category to include scenes where one character asks another about the identity of a third.

[3] This list in not exhaustive; see Table I and Table II.

The *Iliad*

Iliad VI.123 ff.: Diomedes and Glaukos

In Book VI of the *Iliad*, upon meeting him for the first time in battle, the Achaian Diomedes and the Lykian Glaukos engage in a lengthy exchange of genealogical information.[4] Diomedes begins:

> τίς δὲ σύ ἐσσι φέριστε καταθνητῶν ἀνθρώπων;[5]
>
> Who among mortal men are you, good friend?[6]

Diomedes does not ask leading questions prompting any particular answer, as is common elsewhere in Homer. For example, he does not ask, "who are your parents" or

---

[4] Mackie 1996, 67-71. Mackie discusses this passage at length, using it as an example of warriors questioning one another in her chapter on face-to-face encounters (see Note 1 above). She argues that Diomedes "initiates a boast-and-insult contest" with Glaukos, but that Glaukos responds with a "wonder tale" which "takes them both far from the battle on the Trojan plain" disorienting Diomedes and making him forget about fighting (67). M. M. Willcock, *A Commentary on Homer's Iliad* (London: MacMillan and Co. Ltd.: 1970): 199, introduces this exchange as: "The famous scene of chivalry between Glaukos and Diomedes, two opponents in the battle who find they have family ties of friendship." Compare. G. S. Kirk, ed. *The Iliad: A Commentary; Volume II: Books 5-8*, by G. S. Kirk (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990), 170 ff. Walter Donlan, "The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy," *Phoenix* 43 (1989): 1-15, discusses the implications of the difference in value of armor exchanged by the heroes (see below).

[5] *Il.* VI.123. Mackie 1996, 67, calls this a "typically direct and aggressive question." Texts used for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* include: Homer, *Iliad: Books 1-12*, trans. A. T. Murray, revised by William F. Wyatt, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999); Homer, *Iliad: Books 13-24*, trans. A. T. Murray, revised by William F. Wyatt, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999); Homer, *Odyssey: Books 1-12*, trans. A. T. Murray, revised by George E. Dimock, Loeb Classical Library, (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995; reprint with corrections 1998); Homer, *Odyssey: Books 13-24*, trans. A. T. Murray, revised by George E. Dimock, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995; reprint with corrections 1998).

[6] Translations of the *Iliad* are from *The Iliad of Homer*, trans. Richmond Lattimore (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1951). Translations of the *Odyssey* are from Homer, *Odyssey: Books 1-12*, trans. A. T. Murray, revised by George E. Dimock, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995; reprint with corrections 1998), and Homer, *Odyssey: Books 13-24*, trans. A. T. Murray, revised by George E. Dimock, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995; reprint with corrections 1998). Transliteration of all Greek names and terms follows the practice used by Lattimore (except in quotation from other modern authors, where the original practice has been maintained). Where I have quoted other translations (such as Murray's *Odyssey*, West's *Works and Days*, etc.) I have left the spelling of transliterated Greek words as they are in that translation.

"what is your land," as is common elsewhere, but simply "who are you?"[7] This leaves Glaukos free to answer in any terms, presumably terms familiar to Homer and his audience. After an intervening digression by Diomedes, Glaukos begins his answer:

> *Τυδεΐδη μεγάθυμε τί ἢ γενεήν ἐρεείνεις;*
> *οἵη περ φύλλων γενεή τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.*
> *φύλλα τὰ μέν τ' ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δέ θ' ὕλη*
> *τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη·*
> *ὣς ἀνδρῶν γενεὴ ἣ μὲν φύει ἣ δ' ἀπολήγει.*
> *εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς*
> *ἡμετέρην γενεήν, πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴασιν.*[8]
>
> High-hearted son of Tydeus, why ask of my generation?
> As is the generation of leaves, so is that of humanity.
> The wind scatters the leaves on the ground, but the live timber
> burgeons with leaves again in the season of spring returning.
> So one generation of men will grow while another
> dies. Yet if you wish to learn all this and be certain
> of my genealogy: there are plenty of men who know it.

Immediately, Glaukos speaks of his *γενεή*. This word can have a variety of meanings in Homer, including family, descent, birth, tribe, nation, generation, offspring, birthplace, age, or time of life.[9] Glaukos' simile comparing the successive growth and falling of leaves to the generations of mankind (the term *γενεή* is used to describe the successive generations of both leaves and men) implies that in this case *γενεή* refers primarily to the succeeding generations of his family, and for the most part Glaukos does recount his descent in the lines which follow.[10] The phrase Glaukos uses to introduce his

---

[7] Compare *Il.* XXIV.387; *Od.* I.170; I.406; VIII.550, etc., all discussed below.

[8] *Il.* VI.145-51. Kirk 1990, II.176-77, calls Glaukos' response to Diomedes "witty and clever." He compares Glaukos' recitation of his genealogy to that of Aineias at XX.213-41 (see below).

[9] Henry George Liddell and Robert Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, revised by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of. Roderick McKenzie (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940), from Gregory R. Crane, editor, *The Perseus Project*, http://www.perseus.tufts.edu (April 2001), s.v. "*γενεή*." See also discussion of *γενεή* in Chapter IV below.

[10] Later in the *Iliad*, Poseidon muses about the mortality of men by comparing them to leaves, which bloom and then die (*Il.* XXI.464). Kirk 1990, II.176-77. Willcock 1970, 201, adds that while the simile of the leaves ends on a note of rebirth, the image of succeeding generations culminates in death. Mackie 1996, 67-68, considers the first five lines of this passage (145-49) a "lyrical reflection on mortality," comparing the subject matter and language to the poetry of Simonides and Mimnermos. For a further discussion of the leaf metaphor in this passage and its later use in Classical literature, see Eddie R. Lowry, Jr., "Glaucus, the Leaves, and the Heroic Boast of *Iliad* 6.146-211," in *The Ages of Homer: A*

genealogy, *εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς, / ἠμετέρην γενεήν*, "if you wish to learn all this and be certain / of my genealogy," is a formula which occurs again in the *Iliad*, when Achilleus confronts Aineias.[11] Finally, the introduction to Glaukos' genealogy contains a comment which attests to the common usage of lineage to define identity; Glaukos claims that *πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴσασιν*, "there are plenty of men who know it," hinting here, as elsewhere, at the public nature of knowledge about hero's lineages.

Glaukos continues his answer not with the names of his ancestors but with the place of his family's origin, *ἔστι πόλις Ἐφύρη μυχῷ Ἄργεος ἱπποβότοιο*, "There is a city, Ephyre, in the corner of horse-pasturing Argos."[12] Glaukos begins by stating the name of a *πόλις* followed by that of a territorial region, thereby defining two of the categories in which Homer's characters think about place of origin. Furthermore, despite the fact that Glaukos' family had lived in Lykia since his grandfather was driven from their ancestral home, Ephyre is still important enough for Glaukos to mention as he begins to explain to Diomedes who he is. Even after three generations of living in Lykia, The Argive origin of Glaukos' family, not just his present home, Lykia, is still important.

Glaukos continues describing his *γενεή* with a retelling of his genealogy, which takes up most of the remainder of his speech:

> *ἔνθα δὲ Σίσυφος ἔσκεν, ὃ κέρδιστος γένετ' ἀνδρῶν,*
> *Σίσυφος Αἰολίδης· ὃ δ' ἄρα Γλαῦκον τέκεθ' υἱόν,*
> *αὐτὰρ Γλαῦκος τίκτεν ἀμύμονα Βελλεροφόντην.*[13]

Tribute to Emily Vermeule, edd. J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, 193-204 (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995): 181-92.

[11] *Il.* XX.213. See Willcock 1970, 202; Kirk 1990, II.176. See discussion below.

[12] *Il.* VI.152. See Chapter IV below for a discussion of the frequent use of *γενεή* with place names.

[13] *Il.* VI.153-5. Kirk 1990, II.177-78, discusses the possible locations of Ephyre, particularly the Korinthian connection. He also considers the possible "ethnic" overtones of the passage:

> The Corinthians were regarded as of Aeolic descent (Thucydides 4.42), so Sisuphos here is Aiolides, one of the sons of Aiolos, eponym of the race; his brother Kretheus (Aiolides at *Od.* 11.237), Athamas, Salmoneus and Perieres (cf. [Hesiod], *Ehoiai* frag. 10 M-W) were Thessalians and thus Aeolic, cf. Herodotus 7.176.

Note, however, that Aiolos is in the direct paternal line, only five generations removed from Glaukos; Aiolos is mentioned in the context of a hero recounting his noble lineage. Nowhere in Homer is Aiolos

> [T]here lived Sisyphos, that sharpest of all men,
> Sisyphos, Aiolos' son, and he had a son named Glaukos,
> and Glaukos in turn sired Bellerophontes the blameless.

After another long digression recounting Bellerophontes' exile and labors, Glaukos continues (the lines concerning Bellerophontes' fall from divine favor have been omitted):[14]

> *ἣ δ' ἔτεκε τρία τέκνα δαΐφρονι Βελλεροφόντῃ*
> *Ἰσανδρόν τε καὶ Ἱππόλοχον καὶ Λαοδάμειαν.*
> *Λαοδαμείῃ μὲν παρελέξατο μητίετα Ζεύς,*
> *ἣ δ' ἔτεκ' ἀντίθεον Σαρπηδόνα χαλκοκορυστήν.*
> ...
> *Ἰσανδρον δέ οἱ υἱὸν Ἄρης ἄτος πολέμοιο*
> *μαρνάμενον Σολύμοισι κατέκτανε κυδαλίμοισι·*
> *τὴν δὲ χολωσαμένη χρυσήνιος Ἄρτεμις ἔκτα.*
> *Ἱππόλοχος δέ μ' ἔτικτε, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ φημι γενέσθαι·*[15]
>
> His bride bore three children to valiant Bellerophontes,
> Isandros and Hippolochos and Laodameia.
> Laodameia lay in love beside Zeus of the counsels
> and bore him godlike Sarpedon of the brazen helmet.
> ...
> As for Isandros his son, Ares the insatiate of fighting
> killed him in close battle against the glorious Solymoi,
> while Artemis of the golden reigns killed the daughter in anger.
> But Hippolochos begot me, and I claim that he is my father;

Glaukos lists his male ancestors for five generations, from Aiolos through Sisyphus, Glaukos, and Bellerophontes, to Hippolochos. In addition, Glaukos introduces by name his aunt, Laodameia, his uncle Isandros, and his cousin Sarpedon. Female and collateral

---

or any other of the eponymous ancestors (Doris or Ion) of the later socio-linguistic Greek subdivisions invoked as the ancestor of a *γενεή* (or comparable lineage group). Instead, they are always the forefathers of individual heroes (although once a *δῆμος* is spoken of as being "of" an ancestral hero: Athens, the *δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος*, at *Il.* II.546-47, and once Homer uses the name of a people as a limiting genitive with *γενεή* the *Αἰτωλὸς γενεήν* at Il. XXIII.469-71; see below). It seems likely Aiolos' presence in Glaukos' genealogical tale, like that of Bellerophontes (see Note 17 below), serves to ennoble Glaukos, rather than secure his "ethnic" identity. This usage suggests a function along the lines of that hypothesized by Malkin, namely that at this early stage heroic ancestors served in an ennobling role, and only later did they take on "ethnic" meaning. Malkin 1998, 134-46; 150-55; see above.

[14] Homer himself omits much from this retelling of Bellerophontes' legend, perhaps attesting to how well-known the story was. Willcock 1970, 202; Kirk 1990, II.186.

[15] *Il.* VI.196-9; 203-6. Kirk 1990, II.186-87.

relatives are only mentioned by name in the generation immediately prior to Glaukos himself. Furthermore, when Glaukos' grandmother, Bellerophontes' wife, is mentioned, it is not in her own right but only by her relationship to others, as a daughter, wife, and mother.[16] Indeed, the only woman mentioned by name is Glaukos' aunt Laodameia, Sarpedon's mother, who herself is most important as the link between Glaukos and Sarpedon, the two principal Lykian heroes. Sarpedon is mentioned, as is Glaukos' uncle Isandros, but Glaukos speaks of no other relatives outside the direct male line. Thus, Glaukos spends some 58 lines (VI.153-211) describing the past five generations of his family, but beyond the immediately prior generation, Glaukos mentions only members of the direct, male line: paternal lineage is a key component of his identity.

Returning to Glaukos' account of Bellerophontes' exile and subsequent travails omitted above, Glaukos describes the "naturalization" of Bellerophontes in Lykia after his exile from Argos. According to this story, Proitos dispatches Bellerophontes to Lykia and instructs his father-in-law, the king of Lykia, to see to Bellerophontes' death. This unnamed king then attempts to carry out his son-in-law Proitos' wishes by assigning Bellerophontes various labors. After these labors and a subsequent ambush fail to eliminate Bellerophontes, the king recognizes Bellerophontes' divine descent, accepting him as co-ruler of Lykia:

> *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ γίγνωσκε θεοῦ γόνον ἠὲν ἐόντα*
> *αὐτοῦ μιν κατέρυκε, δίδου δ' ὅ γε θυγατέρα ἣν,*
> *δῶκε δέ οἱ τιμῆς βασιληΐδος ἥμισυ πάσης·*
> *καὶ μέν οἱ Λύκιοι τέμενος τάμον ἔξοχον ἄλλων*
> *καλὸν φυταλιῆς καὶ ἀρούρης, ὄφρα νέμοιτο.*[17]
>
> Then when the king knew him for the powerful stock of the god,
> he detained him there, and offered him the hand of his daughter,
> and give him half of all the kingly privilege. Thereto
> the men of Lykia cut out a piece of land, surpassing
> all others, fine ploughland and orchard for him to administer.

---

[16] *Il.* VI.192.

[17] *Il.* VI.191-5. Kirk 1990, II.185-86, observes that "Bellerophon's triumphs suggested the highest kind of heroic ancestry."

Three steps are taken to initiate Bellerophontes into this joint kingship. First, the king marries his daughter to Bellerophontes. Second, he gives him half of the *τιμή βασιληίς*, the "kingly privilege (lit. "honor")."[18] Finally, the people of Lykia assign him a suitably fertile plot of land.[19] Both here and in the case of Sarpedon, marriage ties bring a man into the new land and community to which he has relocated. A marriage thus brings Bellerophontes into the ruling house of the king, thus making him eligible for joint kingship and eventual succession. Likewise, ownership of a suitable parcel of land confers upon Bellerophontes the wealth and status; the land is *ἔξοχον ἄλλων*, "surpassing all others."[20] Initiation into the joint kingship itself is represented by the bestowal of the "kingly privilege." This story reveals the Lykian aspect of Glaukos' dual identity, attained through incorporation through marriage into the Lykian royal house and ownership of property in the new kingdom. Kingship, of which Glaukos claims a share as the descendant of Bellerophontes, serves as a marker of identity for Glaukos.[21]

The conclusion of Glaukos' speech reinforces the complexity of his conception of his own identity. Here, he revisits his lineage, but also discusses both Ephyre and Lykia, his old *πόλις* and his new kingdom. Finally, he speaks of how his father instructed him to uphold the aristocratic ethos to which Bellerophontes and his other ancestors ascribed:

> *Ἱππόλοχος δέ μ' ἔτικτε, καὶ ἐκ τοῦ φημι γενέσθαι·*
> *πέμπε δέ μ' ἐς Τροίην, καί μοι μάλα πόλλ' ἐπέτελλεν*
> *αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων,*
> *μηδὲ γένος πατέρων αἰσχυνέμεν, οἵ μέγ' ἄριστοι*

---

[18] Willcock 1970, 205. Qviller 1981, 133-34, argues that this term, also appearing at *Il.* IX.616 and XV.189, can mean "domain," and refers to the division of land (compare the encounter of Achilleus and Aineias, *Il.* XX.184 ff). Qviller uses the story of Bellerophon's "naturalization" in Lykia as an example of the dissipation of royal lands through grants to outsiders.

[19] Van Wees 1992, 35, argues that the real decision belongs to the king, who makes it in the name of the "people." Van Wees also uses this passage to discuss the nature of territorial rule (38-39).

[20] Van Wees 1992, 101, observes that hereditary power and private wealth are the two principal sources of status.

[21] Compare the encounter between Hermes and Priam, *Il.* XXIV.387 ff., discussed below.

ἔν τ' Ἐφύρῃ ἐγένοντο καὶ ἐν Λυκίῃ εὐρείῃ.
ταύτης τοι γενεῆς τε καὶ αἵματος εὔχομαι εἶναι.[22]

But Hippolochos begot me, and I claim that he is my father;
he sent me to Troy, and urged upon me repeated injunctions,
to be always among the bravest, and hold my head above others,
not shaming the generation of my fathers, who were
the greatest men in Ephyre and again in wide Lykia.
Such is my generation (*γενεῆς*) and the blood (*αἵματος*) I claim to be born from.

Glaukos now adds the concept of *αἷμα* to that of *γενεή*. *Αἷμα*, blood, used here for the first time in this passage, refers more directly to blood relationship than *γενεή*, which is a broader and more common term encompassing various aspects of birth. The two terms complement one another, and together invoke a sense of community, of particular peoples and places.[23] Furthermore, by announcing that his forefathers were elites in both communities, *οἳ μέγ' ἄριστοι / ἔν τ' Ἐφύρῃ ἐγένοντο καὶ ἐν Λυκίῃ εὐρείῃ*, "who were / the greatest men in Ephyre and again in wide Lykia," Glaukos confirms the importance of both places, and his family's status within them, to his identity. Likewise, his father Hippolochos' exhortation: *αἰὲν ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον ἔμμεναι ἄλλων, / μηδὲ γένος πατέρων αἰσχυνέμεν* "to be bravest and pre-eminent above all, and not bring shame upon the race of my fathers," reinforces the importance of membership in the elite, displayed by adhering to the aristocratic ethos.[24] In short, in the conclusion of Glaukos' speech reveals the importance of his communities of origin—both his present kingdom and ancestral home—as well as the elite status of his family within those communities and its membership in the broader aristocracy to his sense of identity

Glaukos' answer to Diomedes' inquiry reveals various facets of identity meaningful to the poet and his audience. *Αἷμα* and more generally *γενεή* are clearly important, while the use of the phrase *γένος πατέρων* emphasizes the patrilineal nature of ancestral identity. *Γενεή* invokes both the ancestral homeland of the hero and his

---

[22] *Il.* VI.206-11. Kirk 1990, II.187, compares similar passages elsewhere in Homer, including Aineias' encounter with Achilleus, esp. *Il.* XX.241.

[23] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed. s.v. "*αἷμα*;" see also "*γενεή*."

[24] This line is a formula repeated in *Il.* XI.784 by Peleus to Achilleus. Willcock 1970, 207.

current kingdom, as is made clear when Glaukos couples Ephyre and Lykia in the story of his genealogy. Glaukos' mention of "the city Ephyre of innermost Argos" indicates that this ancestral homeland retains some importance, despite the fact that Glaukos himself is three generations removed from Ephyre. The process associated with the introduction of Bellerophontes into the Lykian kingdom itself illustrates several important aspects of identity: membership in a community, in this case established by marriage since Bellerophontes is an exile from his own home; rule over men, embodied in bestowal "kingly honor;" and status conferred by land ownership and a position of authority. As he concludes his genealogy, Glaukos asserts both his stake in Lykian society and his membership in the broader Homeric aristocracy—which transcends status within individual communities and unites the heroes, Achaian and Trojan, under a particular ethos—with the terms *γενεή*, and *αἷμα*, which invoke the idea of a birthright.[25] Ancestral homeland, lineage, rule over men and territory, and elite status are all concepts of identity underlying the dialogue between Glaukos and Diomedes.

The importance of ties of guest-friendship is confirmed in this passage when Diomedes decides not to fight Glaukos because of such a relationship. Diomedes does not respond in kind to Glaukos' extensive discussion of his origins, but answers more briefly, replying with *ὃ μειλιχίοισι προσηύδα* "winning words of friendliness":[26]

> *ἦ ῥά νύ μοι ξεῖνος πατρώϊός ἐσσι παλαιός·*
> *Οἰνεὺς γάρ ποτε δῖος ἀμύμονα Βελλεροφόντην*
> *ξείνισ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν ἐείκοσιν ἤματ' ἐρύξας·*
> *οἵ δὲ καὶ ἀλλήλοισι πόρον ξεινήϊα καλά·*
> *Οἰνεὺς μὲν ζωστῆρα δίδου φοίνικι φαεινόν,*
> *Βελλεροφόντης δὲ χρύσεον δέπας ἀμφικύπελλον*
> *καί μιν ἐγὼ κατέλειπον ἰὼν ἐν δώμασ' ἐμοῖσι.*
> *Τυδέα δ' οὐ μέμνημαι, ἐπεί μ' ἔτι τυτθὸν ἐόντα*
> *κάλλιφ', ὅτ' ἐν Θήβῃσιν ἀπώλετο λαὸς Ἀχαιῶν.*[27]
>
> See now, you are my guest friend from far in the time of our fathers.
> Brilliant Oineus once was host to Bellerophontes

---

[25] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*γενεή*."

[26] *Il.* VI.214.

[27] *Il.* VI.215-23. Kirk 1990, II.188-89, discusses this passage in terms of the heroic institution of guest-friendship.

> the blameless, in his halls, and twenty days he detained him,
> and these two gave to each other fine gifts in token of friendship.
> Oineus gave his guest a war belt bright with the red dye,
> Bellerophontes a golden and double-handled drinking-cup,
> a thing I left behind in my house when I came on my journey.
> Tydeus, though, I cannot remember, since I was little
> when he left me, that time the people of the Achaians perished
> in Thebe.

In this, the first half of Diomedes' speech, he happily reveals the fact that Glaukos has turned out to be his *ξεῖνος πατρώϊός...παλαιός*, "guest friend from far in the time of our fathers." Diomedes relates how Oineus, his grandfather, *ξείνισ' ἐνὶ μεγάροισιν* "was host..in his halls" to Glaukos' grandfather Bellerophontes. Moreover, the two exchanged, *ξεινήϊα καλά*, "fine gifts in token of friendship." The specific nature of this process, both the hosting and the gift exchange, is demonstrated by the terms used: *ξεῖνος*, *ξείνισ'*, and *ξεινήϊα*. Diomedes next provides the link between himself and Oineus, supplying the name of his father Tydeus; he relates two generations of his own genealogy, back to the point where his and Glaukos' families established their ties of guest-friendship.

After confirming that he is bound to Glaukos as a *ξεῖνος*, Diomedes states their continuing obligations to one another:

> *τὼ νῦν σοὶ μὲν ἐγὼ ξεῖνος φίλος Ἄργεϊ μέσσῳ*
> *εἰμί, σὺ δ' ἐν Λυκίῃ ὅτε κεν τῶν δῆμον ἵκωμαι.*
> *ἔγχεα δ' ἀλλήλων ἀλεώμεθα καὶ δι' ὁμίλου·*
> *πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐμοὶ Τρῶες κλειτοί τ' ἐπίκουροι*
> *κτείνειν ὅν κε θεός γε πόρῃ καὶ ποσσὶ κιχείω,*
> *πολλοὶ δ' αὖ σοὶ Ἀχαιοὶ ἐναιρέμεν ὅν κε δύνηαι.*
> *τεύχεα δ' ἀλλήλοις ἐπαμείψομεν, ὄφρα καὶ οἵδε*
> *γνῶσιν ὅτι ξεῖνοι πατρώϊοι εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι.*[28]
>
> Therefore I am you friend and host in the heart of Argos;
> you are mine in Lykia, when I come to your country.
> Let us avoid each other's spears, even in the close fighting.
> There are plenty of Trojans and famed companions in battle for me
> to kill, whom the god sends me, or those I run down with my swift feet,
> many Achaians for you to slaughter, if you can do it.
> But let us exchange our armour, so that these others may know

[28] *Il.* VI.224-31.

how we claim to be guests and friends from the days of our fathers.

Diomedes first reiterates his own status as Glaukos' guest-friend, *ξεῖνος φίλος*, this time more emphatically by adding the term *φίλος*, dear, to *ξεῖνος*. Next, he declares that these ties will be invoked when either warrior travels to the other's homeland; Diomedes then names the regions, Argos and Lykia, in which they both live. Diomedes then proposes that they avoid each other in battle, claiming that there are plenty of other *Τρῶες κλειτοί τ' ἐπίκουροι*, "Trojans and famed companions" for him to kill, and many *Ἀχαιοί* for Glaukos. Finally, reinacting the gift-exchange of their grandfathers, the two exchange armor with one another so that "these others may know / how we claim to be guests and friends from the days of our fathers (*ξεῖνοι πατρώϊοι*)." Here, the act of exchange not only cements longstanding ties between the heroes themselves, but also serves to publicize and therefore validate those ties.[29] Diomedes' speech ends just as it began, with the phrase *ξεῖνοι πατρώϊοι*, bracketing the speech of the intervening passage.

---

[29] There is some debate about whether Diomedes or Glaukos has the upper hand following this exchange. Donlan addresses this directly in "The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy," (1989): 1. Donlan puts the exchange of armor into the context of the "gift-economy" in which the cultivation of personal relationships trumps concerns of cost and profit. Later Donlan interprets this specific passage as an outgrowth of Diomedes' superiority and his manipulation of the encounter (13-15). In short, Diomedes meets Glaukos in battle and "despoils" him by wits instead of strength (15). Mackie 1996, 70, on the other hand, sees Glaukos as controlling the encounter, suggesting that Glaukos carefully constructs his speech to achieve a favorable outcome. Specifically, she argues that Glaukos, unlike Diomedes, knows his opponent as the exchange begins (addressing him as "son of Tydeus"). Furthermore, Mackie claims that the subject of Diomedes' father (and by extension, his lineage) is a weak point for Diomedes, considering that Diomedes does not remember his father (VI.222-23) and that the other Achaians repeatedly taunt him about his inadequacy in comparison with Tydeus (IV.400ff, V.800). Qviller 1981, 117 ff., although he does not treat this scene specifically, also disagrees with Donlan's interpretation of gift-exchange, arguing that through "calculated generosity" the giver of the most valuable gifts places obligations upon the receiver (117; 120). Qviller, furthermore, makes an observation intrinsic to his, Donlan's, and Mackie's analyses: "the power of a Homeric king was enhanced by his rhetorical ability...[demonstrating] the charismatic character of Homeric kingship" (119). Kirk 1990, II.190-91, throws up his hands and precludes "any *literal* and *realistic* understanding of the exchange" (emphasis in original). Instead he asserts that it is:

> [S]elf-evidently intended to by humorous in some way, at the very least *piquant* and paradoxical, and certainly not serious or heroic in the ordinary epic sense...a typical folktale-type transaction containing all the fantasy and exaggeration that are proper to that genre and alien to the normal epic genre.

Kirk believes that Homer's audience would have recognized the substitution of a clear fantasy for the expected ending, a simple exchange like that performed by Hektor and Aias at *Il.* 7.303-05.

Diomedes' response to Glaukos' speech about his origins provides only a brief genealogy of Diomedes, but it reveals several layers of identity for each participant in the verbal exchange. By stating the obligations of hosting one another in their respective homelands, Diomedes invokes territory of origin. Likewise, when Diomedes proposes that the two avoid each other in battle, identity as an Achaian or as a "famed companion" of the Trojans becomes important. Finally, the divergent origins of Diomedes and Glaukos—Achaian and Trojan, Argive and Lykian—are superseded by the enduring ties of aristocratic *ξενίη*.

Iliad III 166 ff.: Helen identifies the Achaian heroes for Priam and the Trojan Elders

As Menelaos and Paris are about to engage in single combat to decide the outcome of the war, Priam and the other Trojan *δημογέροντες*, elders of the people, stand with Helen on the city wall overlooking the battlefield. Three times Priam asks Helen to identify Achaian heroes from among the forces arrayed below.[30] First, he sees Agamemnon and asks:

> *ὥς μοι καὶ τόνδ' ἄνδρα πελώριον ἐξονομήνῃς*
> *ὅς τις ὅδ' ἐστὶν Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ ἠΰς τε μέγας τε.*
> *ἦτοι μὲν κεφαλῇ καὶ μείζονες ἄλλοι ἔασι,*
> *καλὸν δ' οὕτω ἐγὼν οὔ πω ἴδον ὀφθαλμοῖσιν,*
> *οὐδ' οὕτω γεραρόν· βασιλῆϊ γὰρ ἀνδρὶ ἔοικε.*[31]
>
> So you could tell me the name of this man who is so tremendous:
> who is this Achaian man of power and stature?
> Though in truth there are others taller by a head than he is,
> yet these eyes have never yet looked on a man so splendid
> nor so lordly as this; such a man might well be royal.

---

[30] This scene, the *Τειχοσκοπία*, has received much attention, especially considering that it seems out of place for these questions to be posed during the tenth year of the war. G. S. Kirk, ed., *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume I: Books 1-4*, by G. S. Kirk (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 286 ff., discusses the *Τειχοσκοπία* at some length, especially its incongruous position and the likelihood of its basis in a more extensive underlying catalogue. The location and purpose of the *Τειχοσκοπία*, however, are not critical here. Mackie 1996, 38-39, uses the scene to demonstrate that the Trojan *δημογέροντες* are not a true "council of elders."

[31] *Il.* III.166-70. Kirk 1985, I:289, compares Priam's questions about Agamemnon in lines 169-70 to several similar episodes in the *Odyssey* (XIV.253, for example).

Priam immediately identifies this man as an aristocrat. Priam wonders at this *ἀνὴρ ἠΰς τε μέγας*, "man of power and stature," who is *καλὸς*, "splendid" and *γεραρός*, "lordly"—one who may indeed be a *βασιλεύς*. It is not clear whether this determination is made based on attire and armaments, or simply bearing and conduct; in either case, Priam immediately classifies Agamemnon among the elite. Helen, in her reply to Priam, emphasizes Agamemnon's descent, his rule over men, his prowess in battle, and his relationship to her:

> *τοῦτο δέ τοι ἐρέω ὅ μ' ἀνείρεαι ἠδὲ μεταλλᾷς·*
> *οὗτός γ' Ἀτρεΐδης εὐρὺ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων,*
> *ἀμφότερον βασιλεύς τ' ἀγαθὸς κρατερός τ' αἰχμητής·*
> *δαὴρ αὖτ' ἐμὸς ἔσκε κυνώπιδος, εἴ ποτ' ἔην γε.*[32]
>
> This now I will tell you in answer to the question you asked me.
> That man is Atreus' son Agamemnon, widely powerful,
> at the same time a good king and a strong spearfighter,
> once my kinsman, slut that I am. Did this ever happen?

Helen describes Agamemnon as *εὐρὺ κρείων*, "widely powerful," and as a *βασιλεύς ἀγαθὸς*, a "good king." Furthermore, Agamemnon is a *κρατερός αἰχμητής*, a "valiant spearman;" his prowess in war complements his power as king. Finally, Helen points out that Agamemnon was once her *δαὴρ*, brother-in-law. Although Helen lived in Sparta as Menelaos' wife, and is not part of Agamemnon's *οἶκος*, their relationship is important enough for Helen to mention.[33]

Priam responds to Helen's answer, praising Agamemnon for his position of leadership the number of men he commands:

> *ὦ μάκαρ Ἀτρεΐδη μοιρηγενὲς ὀλβιόδαιμον,*
> *ἦ ῥά νύ τοι πολλοὶ δεδμήατο κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν.*
> *ἤδη καὶ Φρυγίην εἰσήλυθον ἀμπελόεσσαν,*
> *ἔνθα ἴδον πλείστους Φρύγας ἀνέρας αἰολοπώλους*
> *λαοὺς Ὀτρῆος καὶ Μυγδόνος ἀντιθέοιο,*
> *οἵ ῥα τότ' ἐστρατόωντο παρ' ὄχθας Σαγγαρίοιο·*
> *καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπίκουρος ἐὼν μετὰ τοῖσιν ἐλέχθην*

---

[32] *Il.* III.177-80.

[33] See Kirk 1985, I:290.

ἤματι τῷ ὅτε τ' ἦλθον Ἀμαζόνες ἀντιάνειραι·
ἀλλ' οὐδ' οἳ τόσοι ἦσαν ὅσοι ἐλίκωπες Ἀχαιοί.[34]

O son of Atreus, blessed, child of fortune and favour,
many are these beneath your sway, these sons of the Achaians.
Once before this time I visited Phrygia of the vineyards.
There I looked on the Phrygian men with their swarming horses,
so many of them, the people of Otreus and godlike Mygdon,
whose camp was spread at that time along the banks of Sangarios:
and I myself, a helper in war, was marshalled among them
on that day when the Amazon women came, men's equals.
Yet even they were not so many as these glancing-eyed Achaians.

Priam opens his speech by calling Agamemnon a *μοιρηγενὲς ὀλβιόδαιμον*, "blessed, child of fortune and favor." The reason for this praise becomes immediately apparent: *ἦ ῥά νύ τοι πολλοὶ δεδμήατο*, "many are these beneath your sway." Of the aspects of identity mentioned in his original question and in Helen's answer, Priam is most impressed with the number of men Agamemnon leads. The significance of this is emphasized by Priam's digression about the Phrygians and Amazons, where he observes that the Achaian host is even more numerous than either of these formidable armies.[35]

In the exchange between Priam and Helen about Agamemnon, the aspects of Agamemnon's identity discussed include his appearance, marking him as a man of high status, his prowess in war, and his relationship by marriage with Helen herself. Most important, however, is Agamemnon's position as king of Mycenae and overlord of the Achaian host, the former invoked by Helen's remarks that he is *εὐρὺ κρείων*, "widely powerful," and a *βασιλεύς ἀγαθός*, a "good king," the latter by Priam's extensive praise for the size of the Achaian host Agamemnon leads.

Following their discussion about Agamemnon, Priam asks Helen about Odysseus:

εἶπ' ἄγε μοι καὶ τόνδε φίλον τέκος ὅς τις ὅδ' ἐστί·
μείων μὲν κεφαλῇ Ἀγαμέμνονος Ἀτρεΐδαο,
εὐρύτερος δ' ὤμοισιν ἰδὲ στέρνοισιν ἰδέσθαι.
τεύχεα μέν οἱ κεῖται ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ,

---

[34] *Il.* III.182-90.

[35] Kirk 1985, I:291, describes the importance of leading a large force as an "index of power."

αὐτὸς δὲ κτίλος ὣς ἐπιπωλεῖται στίχας ἀνδρῶν·
ἀρνειῷ μιν ἔγωγε ἐΐσκω πηγεσιμάλλῳ,
ὅς τ' οἰῶν μέγα πῶϋ διέρχεται ἀργεννάων.[36]

Tell me of this one also, dear child; what man can he be,
shorter in truth by a head than Atreus' son Agamemnon,
but broader, it would seem in the chest and across the shoulders.
Now as his armour lies piled on the prospering earth, still he
ranges, like some ram, through the marshalled ranks of the fighters.
Truly, to some deep-fleeced ram would I liken him
who makes his way through the great mass of the shining sheep-flocks.

As in the case of Agamemnon, Priam praises his subject's physical appearance, and immediately recognizes Odysseus' royal bearing. Even disarmed, Odysseus is as easily distinguishable as "ranges, like some ram, through the marshalled ranks of the fighters." It is clear from this simile, which sets Odysseus apart from and above his men, that Priam has identified Odysseus' royal status and power over men.

Replying to Priam, Helen introduces Odysseus:

οὗτος δ' αὖ Λαερτιάδης πολύμητις Ὀδυσσεύς,
ὃς τράφη ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης κραναῆς περ ἐούσης
εἰδὼς παντοίους τε δόλους καὶ μήδεα πυκνά.[37]

This one is Laertes' son, resourceful Odysseus,
who grew up in the country, rough though it be, of Ithaka,
to know every manner of shiftiness and crafty counsels.

As with Agamemnon, Helen immediately names Odysseus' father, Laertes. But instead of singling out his elite status, she names his homeland, Ithaka, and goes on to describe his knowledge of "shiftiness and crafty counsels." As in the case of Glaukos, place of origin again appears as an important aspect of identity. Furthermore, Homer's aristocratic world is intensely personal, and individual attributes appear in this description as in Priam's questions about Achaian heroes.

Antenor, standing with Helen and Priam on the wall, now responds at length to Helen's identification of Odysseus, recalling that he himself had played host to Odysseus and Menelaos:

---

[36] *Il.* III.192-98.

[37] *Il.* III.200-02.

τὴν δ' αὖτ' Ἀντήνωρ πεπνυμένος ἀντίον ηὔδα·
ὦ γύναι ἦ μάλα τοῦτο ἔπος νημερτὲς ἔειπες·
ἤδη γὰρ καὶ δεῦρό ποτ' ἦλυθε δῖος Ὀδυσσεὺς
σεῦ ἕνεκ' ἀγγελίης σὺν ἀρηϊφίλῳ Μενελάῳ·
τοὺς δ' ἐγὼ ἐξείνισσα καὶ ἐν μεγάροισι φίλησα,
ἀμφοτέρων δὲ φυὴν ἐδάην καὶ μήδεα πυκνά.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ Τρώεσσιν ἐν ἀγρομένοισιν ἔμιχθεν
στάντων μὲν Μενέλαος ὑπείρεχεν εὐρέας ὤμους,
ἄμφω δ' ἑζομένω γεραρώτερος ἦεν Ὀδυσσεύς·
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ μύθους καὶ μήδεα πᾶσιν ὕφαινον
ἤτοι μὲν Μενέλαος ἐπιτροχάδην ἀγόρευε,
παῦρα μὲν ἀλλὰ μάλα λιγέως, ἐπεὶ οὐ πολύμυθος
οὐδ' ἀφαμαρτοεπής· ἦ καὶ γένει ὕστερος ἦεν.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ πολύμητις ἀναΐξειεν Ὀδυσσεὺς
στάσκεν, ὑπαὶ δὲ ἴδεσκε κατὰ χθονὸς ὄμματα πήξας,
σκῆπτρον δ' οὔτ' ὀπίσω οὔτε προπρηνὲς ἐνώμα,
ἀλλ' ἀστεμφὲς ἔχεσκεν ἀΐδρεϊ φωτὶ ἐοικώς·
φαίης κε ζάκοτόν τέ τιν' ἔμμεναι ἄφρονά τ' αὖτως.
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ ὄπα τε μεγάλην ἐκ στήθεος εἵη
καὶ ἔπεα νιφάδεσσιν ἐοικότα χειμερίῃσιν,
οὐκ ἂν ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆϊ γ' ἐρίσσειε βροτὸς ἄλλος·
οὐ τότε γ' ὧδ' Ὀδυσῆος ἀγασσάμεθ' εἶδος ἰδόντες.[38]

Surely this word you have spoken, my lady, can be no falsehood.
Once in the days before now brilliant Odysseus came here
with warlike Menelaos, and their embassy was for your sake.
To both of these I gave in my halls kind entertainment
and I learned the natural way of both, and their close counsels.
Now when these were set before the Trojans assembled
and stood up, Menelaos was bigger by his broad shoulders
but Odysseus was the more lordly when both were seated.
Now before all when both of them spun their speech and their counsels,
Menelaos indeed spoke rapidly, in few words
but exceedingly lucid, since he was no long speaker
nor one who wasted his words though he was only a young man.
But when that other drove to his feet, resourceful Odysseus,
he would just stand and stare down, eyes fixed on the ground beneath him,
nor would he gesture with the staff backward and forward, but hold it
clutched hard in front of him, like any man who knows nothing.
Yes, you would call him a sullen man, and a fool likewise.

---

[38] *Il.* III.204-24. See Kirk 1985, I:294 ff., esp. 296 (concerning line 215), where he observes that nowhere else is *γένος* used in exactly the same manner to mean "age." *Γενεή*, however, is used twelve times to refer to order of birth; see Chapter IV below.

> But when he let the great voice go from his chest, and the words came
> drifting down like winter snows, then no other mortal
> man beside could stand up against Odysseus. Then we
> wondered less beholding Odysseus' outward appearance.

As is the case with the exchange between Diomedes and Glaukos, Antenor applies the verb *ξενίζω* to his hosting of Odysseus and Menelaos, again invoking the guest-friendship that was part of the aristocratic ethos uniting elites as a class in Homer. Antenor also describes Odysseus' bearing and talents, reinforcing the picture painted earlier by Helen. In particular, Odysseus' abilities *μήδεα πυκνά*, "in close counsels," and *Τρώεσσιν ἐν ἀγρομένοισιν*, "before the Trojans assembled," are stressed in Antenor's digression. While in the case of Agamemnon, his identity is expressed through his military prowess and the size of the army he commands, Odysseus is thought of as excelling in private counsel and speech before the assembly, and as Antenor's guest-friend, a tie which, as in the case of Diomedes and Glaukos, transcends the Trojan-Achaian conflict.

As Helen and the Trojan elders on the wall overlooking the battle begin their discussion of Odysseus, Priam immediately infers his position of leadership, likening him to "some deep-fleeced ram...who makes his way through the great mass of the shining sheep-flocks." Helen responds by identifying Odysseus with reference to his father, Laertes, and his place of origin, Ithaka. Antenor further defines the abilities which contribute to his position, although in Odysseus' case these include private counsel and public speech rather than the more overtly martial qualities of Agamemnon. Parentage, place of origin, and leadership define Odysseus in this exchange.

Priam's third inquiry, about Telemonian Aias, takes a simpler form. The question is embellished with nothing more than an observation of this warrior's great stature:

> *τίς τ' ἄρ ὅδ' ἄλλος Ἀχαιὸς ἀνὴρ ἠΰς τε μέγας τε*
> *ἔξοχος Ἀργείων κεφαλήν τε καὶ εὐρέας ὤμους;*[39]
>
> Who then is this other Achaian of power and stature
> towering above the Argives by head and broad shoulders?

[39] *Il.* III.226-7. Kirk 1985, I:297, notes that that the questions follow a pattern of increasing brevity.

Helen's answer is equally brief; she simply names Telemonian Aias and describes him as *οὗτος δ' Αἴας ἐστὶ πελώριος ἕρκος Ἀχαιῶν,* "wall of the Achaians," without further comment.[40] In both the question and the response, only the Achaian aspect of Aias' identity is mentioned.

Helen immediately proceeds to her introduction of Idomeneus:

Ἰδομενεὺς δ' ἑτέρωθεν ἐνὶ Κρήτεσσι θεὸς ὣς
ἕστηκ', ἀμφὶ δέ μιν Κρητῶν ἀγοὶ ἠγερέθονται.
πολλάκι μιν ξείνισσεν ἀρηΐφιλος Μενέλαος
οἴκῳ ἐν ἡμετέρῳ ὁπότε Κρήτηθεν ἵκοιτο.[41]

[A]nd beyond [Aias] there is Idomeneus like a god standing
among the Kretans, and the lords of Krete are gathered about him.
Many a time warlike Menelaos would entertain him
in our own house when he came over from Krete

As with Odysseus, Helen points out Idomeneus' homeland, Krete; Krete or the Kretans are mentioned three times in four lines.[42] As with Agamemnon and Odysseus, she emphasizes his kingship, for he stands *θεὸς ὣς,* "as a god," even among the *Κρητῶν ἀγοί,* "lords of Krete." By pointing out that Idomeneus is a ruler over *ἀγοί,* leaders, Helen places him, like Agamemnon, at the top of a hierarchy of leadership. Furthermore, this high status is confirmed when Helen speaks of how Menelaos, one of the greatest kings of the Achaians, maintained a guest-friendship with the Kretan, specifically indicated by use of the verb *ξενίζω.*

Helen's description of the Achaian heroes for Priam and the elders of Troy offers a glimpse into the way that Homer and his audience conceive of identity and origin. In the cases of Agamemnon, Odysseus, and Idomeneus Helen emphasizes each warrior's role as a king, while Agamemnon in particular is singled out and deemed fortunate for ruling vast hordes of men, and Idomeneus is described as ruling over other leaders. Several times ties of guest-friendship are described, encompassing both Trojans and Achaians and crossing the divisions between the two. The homelands of Odysseus and

---

[40] *Il.* III.229.

[41] *Il.* III.230-33.

[42] See Kirk 1985, I.298.

Idomeneus are named, again emphasizing the importance of place of origin in personal identity. Helen names the fathers of Agamemnon and Odysseus. All except Odysseus are identified as Achaian, while Aias is called Argive as well as Achaian. Finally, the physical attributes of all the heroes mentioned are described, while Odysseus' particular qualities of craftiness and good counsel are dwelt upon at some length. Beyond personal qualities, it is parentage, place of origin, categorization as an Achaian, and especially role as king and ruler, which are central to the concept of identity revealed through Helen and Priam's discussion of the leading Achaians.

Iliad V.470 ff.: Sarpedon and Hektor

Although not a confrontation between enemies, Sarpedon's reprimand of Hektor in Book V of the *Iliad* gives Sarpedon the opportunity to explain his origins to Hektor.[43] As the Trojans collapse under an Achaian onslaught led by Diomedes, the Lykian commander Sarpedon reprimands Hektor:

> *Ἕκτορ πῇ δή τοι μένος οἴχεται ὃ πρὶν ἔχεσκες;*
> *φῆς που ἄτερ λαῶν πόλιν ἑξέμεν ἠδ' ἐπικούρων*
> *οἷος σὺν γαμβροῖσι κασιγνήτοισί τε σοῖσι.*
> *τῶν νῦν οὔ τιν' ἐγὼ ἰδέειν δύναμ' οὐδὲ νοῆσαι,*
> *ἀλλὰ καταπτώσσουσι κύνες ὣς ἀμφὶ λέοντα·*
> *ἡμεῖς δὲ μαχόμεσθ' οἵ πέρ τ' ἐπίκουροι ἔνειμεν.*[44]
>
> Where now, Hektor, has gone that strength that was yours? You said once
> that without companions (*ἐπίκουροι*) and without people (*λαῶν*) you could
> hold this city
> alone, with only your brothers and the lords of your sisters.
> I can see not one of these men now, I know not where they are;
> no, but they slink away like hounds who circle the lion,
> while we, who are here as your companions (*ἐπίκουροι*), carry the fighting.

Sarpedon contrasts the *λαῶν*, people, and *ἐπικούρων*, allies, on the one hand with Hektor's *γαμβροῖσι*, brothers by marriage, and *κασιγνήτοισί*, brothers by birth, on the other. He charges that Hektor mistakenly believed that he and his relatives could hold

---

[43] Mackie 1996, 78, briefly discusses this passage in her treatment of Sarpedon's language (which otherwise focuses on his speech to Tlepolemos). Kirk 1990, II.109, considers it in light of other rebuke scenes in Homer.

[44] *Il.* V.472-77.

Troy without outside help—in this case "outside" seems to refer to both *ἐπικούροι* not belonging to the city and the *λαοί*, whether of the city or not. Again, both groups are contrasted with the sons and sons-in-law of Priam, who Sarpedon implies are shirking their duty and neglecting the *ἐπικούροι* and *λαοί*, comparing them to dogs cowering before a lion. In his rebuke, Sarpedon exposes a clear distinction between Trojans and allies, and indeed between the Hektor's immediate relatives by blood or marrainge and the remainder of the army.[45]

After admonishing Hektor and his relatives for failing to defend their city, Sarpedon goes on to explain the situation of the allies. He complains:

> *ἡμεῖς δὲ μαχόμεσθ' οἵ πέρ τ' ἐπίκουροι ἔνειμεν.*
> *καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπίκουρος ἐὼν μάλα τηλόθεν ἦκω·*
> *τηλοῦ γὰρ Λυκίη Ξάνθῳ ἔπι δινήεντι,*
> *ἔνθ' ἄλοχόν τε φίλην ἔλιπον καὶ νήπιον υἱόν,*
> *κἀδ δὲ κτήματα πολλά, τὰ ἔλδεται ὅς κ' ἐπιδευής.*
> *ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς Λυκίους ὀτρύνω καὶ μέμον' αὐτὸς*
> *ἀνδρὶ μαχήσασθαι· ἀτὰρ οὔ τί μοι ἐνθάδε τοῖον*
> *οἷόν κ' ἠὲ φέροιεν Ἀχαιοὶ ἤ κεν ἄγοιεν.*[46]
>
> while we, who are here as your companions (*ἐπίκουροι*), carry the fighting.
> I have come, a companion (*ἐπίκουρος*) to help you, from a very far place;
> Lykia lies far away, by the whirling waters of Xanthos;
> there I left behind my own wife and my baby son, there
> I left my many possessions which the needy man eyes longingly.
> Yet even so I drive on my Lykians, and myself have courage
> to fight my man in battle, though there is nothing of mine here
> that the Achaians can carry away as spoil or drive off.

By using the singular *ἐπίκουρος* to describe himself only one line after using the plural *ἐπίκουροι* to describe the allies as a whole, Sarpedon strengthens his association with the companions neglected by Hektor. He begins his self-description with *ἡμεῖς δὲ μαχόμεσθ'*, "it is we who fight," as opposed to Hektor and his relatives—the most Trojan of Trojans—who do not. The first person plural verb *μαχόμεσθ'* and particle *δὲ* contrast with the use of second person singular and third plural pronouns and verbs to

---

[45] Mackie 1996, 85-91, discusses the relationship between Trojan and ally and the divided nature of the Trojan army. See Chapter V below.

[46] *Il.* V.477-84. Compare *Il.* XVI.538-40; Kirk 1990, II.110.

Hektor and his relatives in the previous pasage; Sarpedon distinguishes sharply between Hektor and his brothers on the one hand and Sarpedon and the *ἐπικούροι* on the other. Sarpedon's identification with the *ἐπίκουροι* is reiterated in the second half of line 477, where Sarpedon continues: *οἵ πέρ τ' ἐπίκουροι ἔνειμεν*, "we, who are here as your companions." The use of the pronoun at the beginning of the line in addition to two first person plural verbs makes the entire line quite emphatic, drawing a sharp contrast between what precedes and what follows—namely, the conduct of the Trojans on the one hand and that of the allies on the other. The emphasis on the distinct identity of the allies continues in the following line, where the word *ἐπίκουρος* is repeated along with the first person singular pronoun *ἐγὼν*; again, a very emphatic statement. The separation between Trojan and ally is now made in very concrete, geographic terms: Sarpedon states that he has come *μάλα τηλόθεν ἥκω*, "from a very far place." The idea of physical separation is repeated as Sarpedon names his place of origin: *τηλοῦ γὰρ Λυκίη Ξάνθῳ ἔπι δινήεντι*, "Lykia lies far away, by the whirling waters of Xanthos." Thus, in the first three lines of Sarpedon's self-description he twice asserts physical separation from Troy, using first the term *τηλόθεν*, then *τηλοῦ*.[47] The sense of separation, however, is not merely physical; all that is near and dear to Sarpedon—noteably, his family and possessions—has been *ἔλιπον*, left behind, safely away from Troy and its beseigers: his *ἄλοχόν...φίλην*, dear wife; his *νήπιον υἱόν*, infant son; his *κτήματα πολλά*, many possessions. Indeed, Sarpedon states in no uncertain terms what, materially, is at stake for him: *οὔ τί μοι ἐνθάδε*, "there is nothing of mine here" that the Achaians might take away. Despite all this, as their leader he can claim that *Λυκίους ὀτρύνω*, "I drive on my Lykians" and he engages in battle himself. Throughout this passage Sarpedon strongly asserts his identity as a Lykian, the importance of his immediate family to him, and his wealth of possessions.[48] At the same time he draws a sharp distinction between the allies in general and the Lykians in particular as opposed

---

[47] See Mackie 1996, 78, who discusses the theme of "far away Lykia" in the dialogue between Sarpedon and Glaukos.

[48] On the importance of personal wealth and hereditary power, see Van Wees 1992, 101 ff.

to the Trojans proper—both in terms of physical separation and interests at stake in the war against the Achaians—while he strongly identifies himself with the former.

As Sarpedon returns his speech to Hektor and the Trojans, he reiterates the distinction between Trojans and allies:

> *τύνη δ' ἔστηκας, ἀτὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλοισι κελεύεις*
> *λαοῖσιν μενέμεν καὶ ἀμυνέμεναι ὥρεσσι.*
> *μή πως ὡς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἁλόντε πανάγρου*
> *ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν ἕλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένησθε·*
> *οἵ δὲ τάχ' ἐκπέρσουσ' εὖ ναιομένην πόλιν ὑμήν.*
> *σοὶ δὲ χρὴ τάδε πάντα μέλειν νύκτάς τε καὶ ἦμαρ*
> *ἀρχοὺς λισσομένῳ τηλεκλειτῶν ἐπικούρων*
> *νωλεμέως ἐχέμεν, κρατερὴν δ' ἀποθέσθαι ἐνιπήν.*[49]
>
> But you: you stand here, not even giving the word to the rest
> of your people to stand fast and fight in defence of their own wives.
> Let not yourselves, caught as in the sweeping toils of the spun net,
> be taken as war-spoil and plunder by the men who hate you,
> men who presently will storm your strong-founded citadel.
> All these things should lie night and day on you mind, forever,
> supplication to the lords of your far-renowned companions,
> to fight unwearying and hold off the strength of an insult.

Just as Sarpedon had stated that his wife and child were far away in Lykia, but he still urges on his men, he accuses Hektor of failing to *κελεύω*, command, his men to defend their wives. Sarpedon warns that Hektor and his people are in danger of being conquered, *ἁλόντε*, (use of the dual participle maintains the distinction between Hektor on the one hand and the *λαοί*, men, or perhaps the *λαοί* and their wives, on the other),[50] adding that Hektor's *εὖ ναιομένην πόλιν ὑμήν*, well-inhabited city, faces eminent destruction. Use of the second person possesive *ὑμήν* by Sarpedon emphasizes the fact Troy is Hektor's city, not an immediate concern of Sarpedon himself. On the other hand, such is the danger faced by Troy that its fate should preoccupy Hektor day and night: *σοὶ δὲ χρὴ τάδε πάντα μέλειν νύκτάς τε καὶ ἦμαρ*. The contrast between Hektor and Sarpedon, the Trojans and the allies, is complete. The former of each pair has

---

[49] *Il.* V.485-92. Compare *Il.* VI.103-06; Kirk 1990. II.11.

[50] But see Kirk 1990. II.110. who argues that *ἁλόντε* "cannot refer to wives as well. and only under strain to his troops."

everything to lose, the latter nothing; danger is imminent for the families and property of the former, while that of the latter is safely away from Troy and its attackers. The distinction is left standing as Sarpedon concludes his diatribe: Hektor is to *λισσομένῳ*, beg, the *ἀρχοὺς...ἐπικούρων*, leaders of his allies, (a group which Sarpedon is clearly a member) *νωλεμέως ἐχέμεν*, to continually hold firm. Nothing besides Hektor's personal leadership binds the allies to the Trojans, and only that leadership, as he begs the allies to help him defend Troy, will motivate the allies to continue to fight on behalf of his community.

Throughout Sarpedon's rebuke of Hektor, the Lykian commander maintains the distinction between Trojans, led by Hektor, and the allies, constituted of contingents like the Lykians led by commanders like himself. At the same time, other aspects of the identity of each emerge: Sarpedon is from Lykia on the Xanthos, which is far away; he is the leader of the Lykians, urging them to do battle; he speaks of home in terms of his wife, son, and possessions. Hektor is the leader of the Trojans, specifically the sons and sons-in-law of Priam, he is the custodian of a populous *πόλις*, he is the overlord of the entire force opposing the Achaians, and it is his person alone that holds the entire army, Trojans and allies, together. The overall effect of Sarpedon's rebuke, however, is to bring the distinction between Trojan and ally into sharp relief.

Iliad XX.199 ff.: Aineias and Achilleus

As Achilleus returns to battle in *Iliad* Book XX, the first hero he confronts is Aineias. Achilleus taunts the Trojan, asking him why he has dared to step forward and reminding him of an earlier encounter ending in his ignominious defeat.[51] Achilleus ends his speech by urging Aineias to retreat back into the mass of the army:

---

[51] *Il.* XX.156-98. Mackie 1996, 71-74. This passage is the second face-to-face encounter Mackie examines in some length. She argues that whereas Glaukos' speech in Book VI was essentially a wonder tale, Aineias here provides a genealogical narrative, which she classifies as "catalogue poetry," meant to delay his confrontation with Achilleus. Like Mackie, G. S. Kirk, ed., *The Iliad: A Commentary, Volume V: Books 17-20*, by Mark W. Edwards (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991), 313-22, compares this exchange to that between Glaukos and Diomedes, beginning his exegesis by noting the irony of "an eloquent diatribe against to much speechifying," and observing, "there may be a semi-humorous characterization here...of a hero who knows he is the weaker and apprehensively keeps on

...ἀλλά σ' ἔγωγ' ἀναχωρήσαντα κελεύω
ἐς πληθὺν ἰέναι, μηδ' ἀντίος ἵσταο' ἐμεῖο,
πρίν τι κακὸν παθέειν· ῥεχθὲν δέ τε νήπιος ἔγνω.[52]

...No, but I myself urge you to get back
into the multitude, not stand to face me, before you
take some harm. Once a thing has been done, the fool sees it.

Achilleus' speech, particularly this final declaration, implies that Aineias is not worthy or capable of standing against him. Aineias answers this charge first by stating that words do not frighten him, and then immediately—and somewhat abruptly—by invoking his genealogy.[53] Aineias prefaces his genealogical digression with the declaration:

ἴδμεν δ' ἀλλήλων γενεήν, ἴδμεν δὲ τοκῆας
πρόκλυτ' ἀκούοντες ἔπεα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων·
ὄψει δ' οὔτ' ἄρ πω σὺ ἐμοὺς ἴδες οὔτ' ἄρ' ἐγὼ σούς.[54]

You and I know each other's birth, we both know our parents
since we have heard the lines of their fame from mortal men; only
I have never with my eyes seen your parents, nor have you seen mine.

The abruptness of Aineias' invocation of his genealogy and the fact that it begins only five lines after the end of Achilleus' diatribe indicates that Aineias' considers a retelling of his own lineage a response to Achilleus' charge of inadequacy.[55] Also, this passage directly references the identifying power of lineage in Homer: Aineias acknowledges that although the two heroes have never seen each other's *τοκῆας*, parents, they know one another's lineage by reputation. Furthermore, Aineias' words, *ἴδμεν δὲ τοκῆας / πρόκλυτ' ἀκούοντες ἔπεα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων*, "we both know our parents / have heard the lines of their fame from mortal men," give the passage a generic appearance, as though identification on such terms is universal and of long standing: the *ἔπεα*, words,

---

talking." Kirk goes on to discuss the importance of genealogy to heroic status and its appropriateness to the current situation, as well as the theme of "weapons, not words." Compare *Il.* VII.234-43; XVI.630-31. Kirk also examines this passage in light of the epic pattern of challenge and response before a heroic contest (V:311); see also *Il.* V.633-46; VI.123-43; XXII.250-59; *Od.* VIII.158-85.

[52] *Il.* XX.196-98.

[53] Aineias' response begins in lines 199-202.

[54] *Il.* XX.203-05.

[55] Kirk 1991, V:314, particularly Achilleus' "jibe at [Aineias'] relationship with Priam."

identifying the lineage of the heroes are *πρόκλυτ'*, "of old," and *θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων*, "of mortal men;" such words are common currency in the expression of identity. The words themselves that Aineias uses are indeed common in the lexicon of Homeric identity; both *γενεή*, lineage, and *τοκεύς*, parents, occur frequently in face-to-face confrontations between warriors and in other contexts.

Aineias proceeds to a discussion of his and (briefly) Achilleus' genealogy. He begins by stating the names of Achilleus' parents:

> *φασὶ σὲ μὲν Πηλῆος ἀμύμονος ἔκγονον εἶναι,*
> *μητρὸς δ' ἐκ Θέτιδος καλλιπλοκάμου ἁλοσύδνης·*[56]
>
> For you, they say you are the issue of blameless Peleus
> and that your mother was Thetis of the lovely hair, the sea's lady

Before beginning a more detailed genealogical declaration of his own, Aineias discusses only Achilleus' parents, with a reference to Thetis' divinity (*ἁλοσύδνης*, sea-borne). The structure of this sentence, introduced by *φασὶ*, "they say" or "men say," again gives the phrase the generic quality of a statement, and category of identity, in common usage. Aineias counterbalances his naming of Achilleus' parents by next stating his own:

> *αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν υἱὸς μεγαλήτορος Ἀγχίσαο*
> *εὔχομαι ἐκγεγάμεν, μήτηρ δέ μοί ἐστ' Ἀφροδίτη·*[57]
>
> I in turn claim I am the son of great-hearted Anchises
> but that my mother was Aphrodite...

Aineias' two statements of parentage mirror one another: both are two lines long, both include a mortal father in the first line and a divine mother in the second. Aineias implicitly compares and even equates his lineage with that of Achilleus, thereby establishing his own worth as an opponent, regardless of Achilleus' earlier derisive remarks. If anything, Aineias may be claiming superior lineage since his mother is one of the Olympian deities, as opposed to a mere daughter of the Sea. The equation of the two sets of parents and the meaninglessness of Achilleus' taunts emerges even more clearly in the following lines:

---

[56] *Il.* XX.206-07.

[57] *Il.* XX.208-09.

τῶν δὴ νῦν ἕτεροί γε φίλον παῖδα κλαύσονται
σήμερον· οὐ γάρ φημ' ἐπέεσσί γε νηπυτίοισιν
ὧδε διακρινθέντε μάχης ἐξαπονέεσθαι.[58]

[O]ne group or the other will have a dear son to mourn for
this day. Since I believe we will not in mere words, like children,
meet, and separate and go home again out of the fighting.

Here, *τῶν...ἕτεροί*, "one group or the other," closely links the two pairs of parents, while Achilleus' words are condemned as befitting a *νηπύτιος*, baby.[59] Through an appeal to the identity of his parent, who he claims are comparable to those of Achilleus, Aineias asserts that Achilleus' dismissal of him as an opponent is unfounded.

To drive the point further, Aineias does not stop by naming his parents, but instead proceeds into one of the most extensive genealogies provided in the *Iliad*, a lineage extending back seven generations to Zeus himself. Aineias begins his genealogical digression:

εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι, ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς
ἡμετέρην γενεήν, πολλοὶ δέ μιν ἄνδρες ἴσασι.[60]

Even so, if you wish to learn all this and be certain
of my genealogy (*γενεή*): there are plenty of men who know it.

Aineias sets out to provide the *γενεή*, for his *τοκεύς* (the plural pronoun *ἡμέτερος*, "our" includes Aineias' parents as well as himself). Although the term *τοκεύς* can mean "ancestors" in addition to "parents," in this case Aineias limits its meaning to parents and uses the word *γενεή*, to refer to his more remonte ancestors.[61] By claiming that *πολλοὶ...ἄνδρες*, "plenty of men," know his lineage, Aineias again gives the passage a public overtone, implying that *γενεή* is a widely-used category of identity. The fact that the phrase used here, *εἰ δ' ἐθέλεις καὶ ταῦτα δαήμεναι, ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῇς / ἡμετέρην γενεήν*, "even so, if you wish to learn all this and be certain / of my genealogy" is a

---

[58] *Il.* XX.210-12.

[59] Echoing Aineias' early warning to Achilleus: *Πηλεΐδη μὴ δὴ ἐπέεσσί με νηπύτιον ὡς / ἔλπεο δειδίξεσθαι*, "Son of Peleus, never hope by words to frighten me / as if I were a baby (*νηπύτιος*)." *Il.* XX.200-01. See Kirk 1991, V:314-15.

[60] *Il.* XX.213-14. Compare *Il.* VI.145. Kirk 1991, V:314.

formula in Homer repeated, for instance, when Glaukos begins recounting his genealogy to Diomedes, further supports idea that *γενεή* is a common means of identification.[62]

Good to his word, over the course of the next twenty-five lines, Aineas names seven ancestors and nine collateral relatives (including digressions about the horses of Erichthonios and the abduction of Ganymedes, which have been omitted here):

> *Δάρδανον αὖ πρῶτον τέκετο νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς,*
> *κτίσσε δὲ Δαρδανίην, ἐπεὶ οὔ πω Ἴλιος ἱρὴ*
> *ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,*
> *ἀλλ' ἔθ' ὑπωρείας ᾤκεον πολυπίδακος Ἴδης.*
> *Δάρδανος αὖ τέκεθ' υἱὸν Ἐριχθόνιον βασιλῆα,*
> *ὃς δὴ ἀφνειότατος γένετο θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων·*
> ...
> *Τρῶα δ' Ἐριχθόνιος τέκετο Τρώεσσιν ἄνακτα·*
> *Τρωὸς δ' αὖ τρεῖς παῖδες ἀμύμονες ἐξεγένοντο*
> *Ἶλός τ' Ἀσσάρακός τε καὶ ἀντίθεος Γανυμήδης,*
> ...
> *Ἶλος δ' αὖ τέκεθ' υἱὸν ἀμύμονα Λαομέδοντα·*
> *Λαομέδων δ' ἄρα Τιθωνὸν τέκετο Πρίαμόν τε*
> *Λάμπόν τε Κλυτίον θ' Ἱκετάονά τ' ὄζον Ἄρηος·*
> *Ἀσσάρακος δὲ Κάπυν, ὃ δ' ἄρ' Ἀγχίσην τέκε παῖδα·*
> *αὐτὰρ ἔμ' Ἀγχίσης, Πρίαμος δ' ἔτεχ' Ἕκτορα δῖον.*[63]
>
> First of all Zeus who gathers the clouds had a son, Dardanos
> who founded Dardania, since there was yet no sacred Ilion
> made a city in the plain to be a centre of peoples,
> but they lived yet in the underhills of Ida with all her waters.
> Dardanos in turn had a son, the king, Erichthonios,
> who became the richest of mortal men
> ...
> Erichthonios had a son, Tros, who was lord of the Trojans,
> and to Tros in turn there were born three sons unfaulted,
> Ilos and Assarakos and godlike Ganymedes
> ...
> Ilos in turn was given a son, the blameless Laomedon,

---

[61] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v.: "*τοκέυς*;" "*γενεή*." Aineias had paired the two terms at the beginning of this passage (line 203).

[62] *Il.* VI.150-51. Glaukos also ends his speech with the same words as Aineias; see above. See Kirk 1991, V:315.

[63] *Il.* XX.215-20; 230-32; 236-40. See table. Kirk 1991, V:316-22.

> and Laomedon had sons in turn, Tithonos and Priam,
> Lampos, Klytios and Hiketaon, scion of Ares;
> but Assarakos had Kapys, and Kapys' son was Anchises,
> and I am Anchises' son, and Priam's is Hektor the brilliant.

Aineias begins his genealogy with Dardanos, the son of Zeus, and proceeds through Erichthonius, and Tros. He then names the three sons of Tros: Ilos, Assarakos, and Ganymedes. His own lineage proceeds through Assarakos to Kapys and Anchises, Aineias' father. Hektor's lineage splits off with Ilos, then proceeds through Laomedon to Priam, Hektor's father, making Hektor Aineias' cousin (the only cousin named). Four other uncles, Tithonos, Lampos, Klytios, and Hiketaon are named, along with Ganymedes, another great-great uncle. Colateral relative are included for four generations (including the generation of Aineias and Hektor), while the four most remote generations include only direct ancestors. In all, Aineias names seven of ancestors—five uncles, on great-uncle, two great-great uncles, and one cousin. All names mentioned are male, paternal ancestors or relatives, and together provide an extended genealogy for both the Hektor and Aineias, the principal Trojan and Trojan/Dardanian heroes respectively.[64]

Aineias also provides further identifying information about the three mortals in the first four generations of his genealogy: Dardanos, Erichthonios, and Tros. Dardanos founded Dardania on the flanks of Mount Ida. His son Erichthonios was considered a *βασιλεύς*, and one who furthermore *ἠ ἀφνειότατος γένετο θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων* "became the richest of mortal men." Tros, his son, was born to be *Τρώεσσιν ἄνακτα* "lord of the Trojans."[65] Aineias chooses to emphasize the wealth of Erichthonios, as well as the royalty of both Erichthonios and Tros. Aineias also specifies Dardanos' homeland—Dardania, on the slopes of Mount Ida, distinct from the city of Troy, which had not yet been founded. Royal status, wealth, and the place of

---

[64] See Chapter V below for a comparison of Trojan and Dardanian identity.

[65] Erichthonios: *Il.* XX.219-20; Tros: *Il.* XX.230.

origin of the family figure in Aineias' account of his lineage, components of identity familiar from comparable genealogies.[66]

Aineias begins his response to Achilleus' taunt with a statement speaking of their *τοκεύς*, parents. He introduces his more remote genealogy with the term *γενεή*. Likewise, as he concludes his speach and engages Achilleus in battle, Aineias caps the account of his lineage with the phrase *ταύτης τοι γενεῆς τε καὶ αἵματος εὔχομαι εἶναι*, "Such is the generation (*γενεῆς*) and blood (*αἵματος*) I claim to be born from."[67] This statement is a formula duplicated, for instance, at the close of Glaukos' speech concerning his genealogy.[68] In each case, the term *γενεῆς* begins and ends a hero's speech about his paternal lineage. Also in each case, the concept of *αἷμα*, blood, is added at the end of the speech. In addition, Aineias uses the term *τοκεύς*, but he does so in specific reference to his (and Achilleus') parents as opposed to their more distant ancestors.

Some lines later, as Achilleus is about to kill Aineias, Poseidon offers something of a postscript to Aineias' speech about his genealogy. Poseidon justifies his intervention to save Aineias by reminding the other gods that Aineias is not yet fated to die:

> *ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ἡμεῖς πέρ μιν ὑπὲκ θανάτου ἀγάγωμεν,*
> *μή πως καὶ Κρονίδης κεχολώσεται, αἴ κεν Ἀχιλλεὺς*
> *τόνδε κατακτείνῃ· μόριμον δέ οἱ ἐστ' ἀλέασθαι,*
> *ὄφρα μὴ ἄσπερμος γενεὴ καὶ ἄφαντος ὄληται*
> *Δαρδάνου, ὃν Κρονίδης περὶ πάντων φίλατο παίδων*
> *οἳ ἔθεν ἐξεγένοντο γυναικῶν τε θνητάων.*
> *ἤδη γὰρ Πριάμου γενεὴν ἔχθηρε Κρονίων·*
> *νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει*
> *καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.*[69]
>
> But come, let us ourselves get him away from death, for fear
> the son of Kronos may be angered if now Achilleus

---

[66] Van Wees 1992, 101-08, discusses the importance of hereditary power and personal wealth to status. See below for a discussion of the relationship between Trojan and Dardanian identity.

[67] *Il.* XX.241.

[68] *Il.* VI.206-11. Glaukos also begins his speech with the same words as Aineias; see above.

[69] *Il.* XX.300-08. See Kirk 1991, V:325-27.

> kills this man. It is destined that he shall be the survivor,
> that the generation of Dardanos shall not die, without seed
> obliterated, since Dardanos was dearest to Kronides
> of all his sons that have been born to him from mortal women.
> For Kronos' son has cursed the generation of Priam,
> and now the might of Aineias shall be lord over the Trojans,
> and his sons' sons, and those who are born of their seed hereafter.

Again, the "generation" of Dardanos is referred to by the term *γενεή*, as are the ancestors and children of Priam. The two *γενεή* are contrasted in this passage. The favor of Zeus, first bestowed on Dardanos has passed to Aineias, who will be *Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει / καὶ παίδων παῖδες*, "lord over the Trojans, / and his sons' sons." On the other hand, Zeus has *ἤδη γὰρ Πριάμου γενεὴν ἔχθηρε Κρονίων* "cursed the generation (*γενεή*) of Priam." Even though Aineias and Priam share the same ancestor, Dardanos, they are now seen as belonging to two distinct *γενεή*, indicating that collateral male lines can be considered separate *γενεή*. The point at which the genealogies of Priam and Aineias diverge is precisely the point where collateral branches of the descendants of Dardanos are distinguished in Aineias' speech to Achilleus.[70]

Aineias' exchange with Achilleus emphasizes the importance of *τοκεύς*, *αἷμα*, and *γενεή* to individual identity. In order to justify his stand against Achilleus, Aineias invokes his genealogy, naming six generations of paternal lineage, and compares it favorably with that of his opponent. When retelling his *γενεή*, Aineias mentions the original homeland, wealth, and royal status of his ancestors, providing further aspects of identity remembered with their names. Furthermore, Aineias repeatedly asserts that his knowledge of Achilleus' genealogy, and *vice versa*, has been obtained by reputation and word of mouth, indicating that genealogies were a widely known common means of identifying particular heroes. Even as the gods intervene to save the doomed Aineias from Achilleus, the justification for doing so is based upon the survival of his *γενεή*, which is destined to supercede that of Priam as the royal lineage of Troy.

---

[70] Tros is a common ancestor shared by both Priam and Aineias, while Ilos is the forefather of Priam and Assarakos is the ancestor of Aineias.

Iliad XXIV.386 ff.: Priam and Hermes

Near the end of the *Iliad*, as Priam makes his way toward Achilleus' tent to recover the body of Hektor, Hermes appears to him in disguise, offering to assist the old man. Priam, surprised by the kindness of this stranger, asks him who he is:

τίς δὲ σύ ἐσσι φέριστε τέων δ' ἔξεσσι τοκήων;[71]

But who are you, o best of men, and who are your parents?

Priam, after his basic question, *τίς δὲ σύ ἐσσι*, "who are you?" specifically asks of Hermes' *τοκεύς*, parents, again demonstrating the importance of lineage as a component of identity. In answer to Priam's question, the disguised Hermes first names the father of the character he has assumed. However, he goes on to include several other aspects of his identify not explicitly solicited by Priam:

τοῦ γὰρ ἐγὼ θεράπων, μία δ' ἤγαγε νηῦς εὐεργής·
Μυρμιδόνων δ' ἔξειμι, πατὴρ δέ μοί ἐστι Πολύκτωρ.
ἀφνειὸς μὲν ὅ γ' ἐστί, γέρων δὲ δὴ ὡς σύ περ ὧδε,
ἕξ δέ οἱ υἷες ἔασιν, ἐγὼ δέ οἱ ἕβδομός εἰμι·
τῶν μέτα παλλόμενος κλήρῳ λάχον ἐνθάδ' ἕπεσθαι.[72]

For I am Achilleus' henchman, and the same strong-wrought vessel
Brought us here; and I am a Myrmidon, and my father
Is Polyktor; a man of substance, but aged as you are.
He has six sons beside, and I am the seventh, and I shook
Lots with the others, and it was my lot to come on this venture.

Not only does Priam learn that his interlocutor is the seventh and youngest son of Polyktor, but also that he is a Myrmidon.[73] The Catalogue of Ships states that the Myrmidons, who are one of the few groups that has a collective name unrelated to the name of their region of origin, are the inhabitants of a particular area in central Greece.[74] This passage is one of the few in Homer where someone questioned about

---

[71] *Il.* XXIV.387. See G. S. Kirk, ed., *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume VI: Books 21-24*, by Nicholas Richardson (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985), 309-20.

[72] *Il.* XXIV.396-400.

[73] Kirk 1993, VI:314, points out that origin and father's name alone, without stating one's own name, is enough to identify a hero; see also *Od.* XV.267.

[74] See discussion of the Myrmidons in Chapter III below.

their identity responds with the collective name of a people.[75] Continuing on, Hermes states that he is a attendant (θεράπων) of Achilleus, and is close enough to the king to ride in the same ship, μία δ' ἤγαγε νηῦς εὐεργής.[76] Just as Agamemnon's identity is at least in part derived from his role as leader of the Mycenaean contingent and overlord of the Achaian force, Hermes' is partly defined by his position in Achilleus' retinue. He points out that his father is ἀφνειός which, along with the fact that he shares his leader's boat, indicating his status.

With the exception of the collective name of his people, the categories invoked by Hermes' answer are consistent with those encountered in other face-to-face exchanges in the *Iliad*. When asked his identity, Hermes names his father, names his leader, and indicates his social standing by claiming to have shared a ship with his king and by remarking on the wealth of his father. The unusual aspect of his response is his statement that he is a Myrmidon; the Myrmidons are more often described as a distinct group than the other units of the Achaian army, perhaps because of the geographical remoteness of Phthia or the dispute between Achilleus and Agamemnon. Lineage, indicated by the naming of his father, membership in a particular community, that of the Myrmidons, and elite status, indicated by wealth and proximity to the king, are the categories of identity invoked in this exchange.

The *Odyssey*

Odyssey I.169 ff.: Telemachos and Athena (disguised as Mentes)

In the *Odyssey*, where meetings between strangers are more common, heroes directly question one another about identity and origin more frequently and more in specific terms than in the *Iliad*. The first such episode occurs near the beginning of Book I, as

---

[75] At least this directly; *Od.* XVI.199; 205; 234. Compare *Il.* V.482; *Od.* I.181; 419 where a people ruled is named. Compare *Il.* III.184-85; 230-31; *Od.* III.85; 100; XIX.176-77; where a third party is described.

[76] Van Wees 1992, 43, discusses the status and role of this and other retainers. Kirk 1993, VI:317, notes the "mixture of reverence and fear of one's superior" later in this passage at lines 435-36; compare *Od.* XVII.188-89.

Telemachos questions Athena, who has come to Ithaka disguised as the Taphian trader, Mentes. This passage contains a series of questions more detailed and extensive than anything in the *Iliad*:

> *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;*
> *ὁππποίης τ' ἐπὶ νηὸς ἀφίκεο· πῶς δέ σε ναῦται*
> *ἤγαγον εἰς Ἰθάκην; τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετόωντο;*
> *οὐ μὲν γὰρ τί σε πεζὸν ὀίομαι ἐνθάδ' ἱκέσθαι.*
> *καί μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτήτυμον, ὄφρ' ἐὺ εἰδῶ,*
> *ἠὲ νέον μεθέπεις ἦ καὶ πατρώιός ἐσσι*
> *ξεῖνος, ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ ἴσαν ἀνέρες ἡμέτερον δῶ*
> *ἄλλοι, ἐπεὶ καὶ κεῖνος ἐπίστροφος ἦν ἀνθρώπων.*[77]
>
> Who are you among men, and from where? Where is your city and where your parents? On what sort of ship did you come, and how did sailors bring you to Ithaca? Who did they declare themselves to be? For I do not suppose you came here on foot. And tell me this also truly, that I may be certain of it, whether this is your first visit here, or whether you are indeed a friend of my father's house. For many were the men who came to our house as guests, since he, too, had traveled much among men.

Telemachos is quite specific about the information he wants to know. The first question, *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν;* is a formulaic way of asking one's origin, conveying two ideas: "who are you" and "where are you from."[78] Telemachos pursues both meanings of *πόθεν*, asking *πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;* "Where is your city and where your parents?" By specifically mentioning *πόλις* and *τοκῆες* after his initial question, Telemachos emphasizes the importance of *πόλις* and lineage as principal components of

---

[77] *Od.* I.170-77. Translations of the *Odyssey* are from *Homer, Odyssey*, trans. A. T. Murray, revised by George E. Dimock, Loeb Classical Library (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1919, second edition 1995, reprinted with corrections 1998). Alfred Heubeck, Stephanie West, and J. B. Hainsworth, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume I: Introduction and Books I-VIII* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988), 98, comment: "The request to a stranger to introduce himself, generally after a meal, is a typical feature of the Odyssey's many scenes of hospitality." Compare *Od.* III.71 ff.; VIII.550 ff.; XIV.187 ff.; XVI.57 ff. (see below). They continue, "The nearest counterpart in the *Iliad* occurs when warriors on the battlefield recount their family history." See VI.121 ff.; XXI.150 ff. (see above).

[78] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*πόθεν*;" compare idem Autenrieth, 1958 ed., s.v. "*πόθεν*." See Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, 98, who argues instead that, "It is better to take *πόθεν* closely with *ἀνδρῶν*, referring to descent...the meaning then is 'Who are you and who was your father?'" Compare *Od.* XVII.373; XIX.162. Such a reading would enhance the emphasis on parentage at the expense of place of origin, but would not significantly alter my basic argument.

idea of origin.[79] Next, Telemachos asks his visitor about his ship, and then his crew, *τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετόωντο;* "Who did they declare themselves to be?" This is parallel to other questions about leadership and subordination; the identity of Telemachos' guest will be partly defined by whom he leads. Finally, Telemachos inquires whether his guest is a new visitor, *ἠὲ νέον μεθέπεις* to Ithaka, or a guest-friend of Odysseus, *πατρώιός ἐσσι ξεῖνος.* With this question, Telemachos seeks any hereditary guest-friendship between the two families. Furthermore, a positive answer would establish his visitor as a member of the aristocracy, since anyone who is a *ξεῖνος* of Odysseus would share his social status. Telemachos, perhaps unsure of himself, closes his interrogation of the newcomer by asserting the breadth of his father's extensive guest-friend relationships, *ἐπεὶ πολλοὶ ἴσαν ἀνέρες ἡμέτερον δῶ ἄλλοι / ἐπεὶ καὶ κεῖνος ἐπίστροφος ἦν ἀνθρώπων.* "For many were the men who came to our house as guests, since he, too, had traveled much among men." These serve as a mark of Odysseus' elite status and, by extension, his own.

Athena/Mentes delivers a detailed answer addressing each of Telemachos' questions:

> *τοιγὰρ ἐγώ τοι ταῦτα μάλ' ἀτρεκέως ἀγορεύσω.*
> *Μέντης Ἀγχιάλοιο δαΐφρονος εὔχομαι εἶναι*
> *υἱός, ἀτὰρ Ταφίοισι φιληρέτμοισιν ἀνάσσω.*[80]
>
> Therefore I will frankly tell you all. I declare that I am Mentes, the son of wise Anchialus, and I am lord over the oar-loving Taphians.

The disguised goddess first states her name, Mentes, that of his father, Anchialos. Athena/Mentes then names the people he rules, the Taphians. Telemachos' question about his guest's *τοκῆες* is answered directly, but instead of the name of a *πόλις* (or any other place) the name of a people is provided, indicating some flexibility in the use of terms: a question about place of origin can be answered with a statement about people of origin. In answering with the name of the people over which he rules, *ἀνάσσω*, Mentes emphasizes his position as king.

---

[79] Similar questions are posed at *Od.* X.325; XIV.187; XV.264; XIX.105; XXIV.298.

[80] *Od.* I.179-81.

Athena/Mentes next discusses the reason for his voyage, and in the process describes the guest-friendship joining the two families (further discussion of Laertes situation has been omitted):

> *ξεῖνοι δ' ἀλλήλων πατρώιοι εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι*
> *ἐξ ἀρχῆς, εἴ πέρ τε γέροντ' εἴρηαι ἐπελθὼν*
> *Λαέρτην ἥρωα τὸν οὐκέτι φασὶ πόλινδε*
> *ἔρχεσθ', ἀλλ' ἀπάνευθεν ἐπ' ἀγροῦ πήματα πάσχειν*
> ...
> *νῦν δ' ἦλθον· δὴ γάρ μιν ἔφαντ' ἐπιδήμιον εἶναι,*
> *σὸν πατέρ'·...*[81]
>
> Friends of one another do we declare ourselves to be, just as our fathers were, friends from old. You may, if you will, go and ask the old hero Laertes, who, they say, comes no longer to the city, but afar in the fields suffers woes
> ...
> And now I have come, for indeed men said that he, your father, was among his people...

The family of Mentes and that of Odysseus are *ξεῖνοι ἀλλήλων πατρώιοι ἐξ ἀρχῆς*, more accurately translated as "paternal guest-friends of one another from of old," confirming that they are of equivalent status. Mentes/Athena instructs Telemachos to confirm his story with Laertes, who now stays away from the city, *πόλινδε*, remaining in the fields, *ἀγροῦ*. This statement suggests a dichotomy between *πόλις* and countryside surprising considering the later conception of the *πόλις* as including both an urban center and a rural hinterland, supporting the idea that in Homer the *πόλις* refers to the built city itself, without the political and territorial connotation of later periods.[82] Finally, when stating that he has heard that Odysseus had returned, Mentes/Athena uses the phrase *μιν...ἐπιδήμιον εἶναι*, "to be among his people," invoking both the territorial and political sense of the term *δῆμος*.[83]

---

[81] *Od.* I.187-90; 194-95. Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, 100-01, discuss at some length the odd position of Laertes, noting that "physical as well as mental vigour is need for the exercise of power in the heroic world," a theme expanded upon by Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 25-26, and Runciman 1982, 355-56, who use Laertes as an example of kingship depending upon undiminished personal ability. See also Qviller 1981, 115-17.

[82] See Chapter I above.

[83] Political in the sense that a *βασιλέυς* is returning to his subjects; see Chapter IV below.

As a footnote to this passage, Mentes returns Telemachos' questions by asking him if he is not Odysseus' son, since the physical resemblance between the two is so striking:

> *ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι τόδε εἰπὲ καὶ ἀτρεκέως κατάλεξον,*
> *εἰ δὴ ἐξ αὐτοῖο τόσος πάϊς εἰς Ὀδυσῆος.*[84]
>
> But come, tell me this and declare it truly, whether indeed, tall as you are, you are the son of Odysseus himself. .

Telemachos answers in the affirmative:

> *τοιγὰρ ἐγώ τοι, ξεῖνε, μάλ' ἀτρεκέως ἀγορεύσω.*
> *μήτηρ μέν τέ μέ φησι τοῦ ἔμμεναι...*[85]
>
> Therefore, stranger, will I frankly tell you all. My mother says that I am his child...

Telemachos begins by addressing Mentes/Athena using the term *ξεῖνε*, accepting his claim to guest-friendship. He confirms that he is Odysseus' son, and bemoans the loss of his father. Mentes responds to this lament by reassuring Telemachos:

> *οὐ μέν τοι γενεήν γε θεοὶ νώνυμνον ὀπίσσω*
> *θῆκαν, ἐπεὶ σέ γε τοῖον ἐγείνατο Πηνελόπεια.*[86]
>
> Surely, then, no nameless lineage have the gods appointed for you in time to come, seeing that Penelope bore you such as you are.

Again, focus is on the *γενεή* of the hero, further describes as being *οὐ...νώνυμνον* "[not]...nameless." Athena/Mentes' observation emphasizes lineage while imbuing the lineage in question with status in a manner that suggests that the lineage itself is well-known, common currency in the exchange of information about Telemachos' identity.[87]

Telemachos' detailed questioning of Athena/Mentes reveals the importance of *πόλις*—or, more generally, place—of origin, lineage, and ties of guest-friendship to the identity of a Homeric hero. Athena/Mentes' response for the most part mirrors the content of Telemachos' question, but he does shift emphasis from *πόλις* of origin to

---

[84] *Od.* I.206-07.

[85] *Od.* I.214-15.

[86] *Od.* I.222-23.

[87] See examples from the *Iliad* discussed above, where Homer assumes public knowledge of lineage, esp. the confrontation between Aineias and Achilleus. *Il.* XX.203-05.

people of origin, naming the Taphians instead of a place. In the process, Athena/Mentes is able to state his position as king of the Taphians, again indicating the importance of kingship to the identity of the ruler.

Odyssey I.407 ff.: Eurymachos confronts Telemachos about Athena/Mentes

After the meeting between Telemachos and Mentes, Telemachos calls an assembly of the Ithakans. At this meeting, Eurymachos confronts Telemachos, demanding to know the identity of the stranger. Eurymachos asks Telemachos:

> *ὁππόθεν οὗτος ἀνήρ, ποίης δ' ἐξ εὔχεται εἶναι*
> *γαίης, ποῦ δέ νύ οἱ γενεὴ καὶ πατρὶς ἄρουρα.*
> *ἦέ τιν' ἀγγελίην πατρὸς φέρει ἐρχομένοιο,*
> *ἦ ἑὸν αὐτοῦ χρεῖος ἐελδόμενος τόδ' ἱκάνει;*
> *οἷον ἀναΐξας ἄφαρ οἴχεται, οὐδ' ὑπέμεινε*
> *γνώμεναι· οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακῷ εἰς ὦπα ἐώκει.*[88]
>
> Of what land does he declare himself to be? Where are his kinsmen and his native fields? Does he bring some tidings of your father's coming, or did he come here to further some matter of his own? He started up and was instantly gone! Nor did he wait to be known; and yet he seemed no base man in looks.

Eurymachos first desires to know where the stranger is from, and reiterates this question by asking what *γαία*, land, he declares his own. Even when Eurymachos inquires about the stranger's *γενεή* this concentration on place is continued: the question begins with *ποῦ*, where, and he asks for Mentes' *πατρὶς ἄρουρα*, "native fields," as well as his genealogy.[89] The remainder of Eurymachos' questions concerns the nature of Mentes' business on Ithaka, not surprising considering the suspicion generated by the rivalry between the suitors and Telemachos. Finally, Eurymachos asks why the stranger left Ithaka so quickly, and adds that he *οὐ μὲν γάρ τι κακῷ εἰς ὦπα ἐώκει*, "seemed no base man in looks." As was the case of Priam on the walls of Troy in the *Iliad*, Eurymachos appears to have the ability to identify kings and aristocrats on sight.

---

[88] *Od.* I.406-11.

[89] Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, 124, speculate that *πατρὶς ἄρουρα* serves a purpose "more specific than the preceding *γαίης*, 'his ancestral fields' rather than 'his fatherland.'" For the purposes of

In response, after bemoaning the loss of his father, Telemachos curtly answers Eurymachos:

> *ξεῖνος δ' οὗτος ἐμὸς πατρώιος ἐκ Τάφου ἐστίν,*
> *Μέντης δ' Ἀγχιάλοιο δαΐφρονος εὔχεται εἶναι*
> *υἱός, ἀτὰρ Ταφίοισι φιληρέτμοισιν ἀνάσσει.*[90]
>
> But this stranger is a friend of my father's house from Taphos. He declares that he is Mentes, son of wise Anchialus, and he is lord over the oar-loving Taphians

Mentes, Telemachos asserts, is *ξεῖνος δ' οὗτος ἐμὸς πατρώιος ἐκ Τάφου*, "a friend of my father's house from Taphos." Furthermore, he is the son of Anchialos and rules the Taphians, *Ταφίοισι...ἀνάσσει*. Telemachos' answer emphasizes place of origin, this time stated directly as a place-name, Taphos, status as a paternal guest-friend, father's name, and status as a king.

The most striking aspect of the exchange between Telemachos and Eurymachos is the emphasis on place of origin. Eurymachos immediately asks for Athena/Mentes' *γαῖα*, land, and even when he asks about the stranger's *γενεή*, it is coupled with a question about his *πατρὶς ἄρουρα*, "native fields," a phrase that focuses strongly on the physical land itself. In his answer, Telemachos supplies the name of Athena/Mentes' place of origin, although Athena/Mentes never provides this name himself (although it is unclear whether Taphos is the *πόλις* Telemachos originally asked for, or a response to Eurymachos' question about the stranger's *γαῖα*, land).

Odyssey III.70 ff.: Nestor and Telemachos

Directed by Athena, Telemachos sets out for Pylos and Sparta to question Nestor and Menelaos about the fate of his father. Upon arriving at Pylos, Telemachos is welcomed by Nestor and his sons, who are celebrating a feast to Poseidon. After everyone has poured their libations and eaten their fill, Nestor asks Telemachos:

---

this dissertation. I consider phrases such as *πατρὶς ἄρουρα* to refer to the real property of individual *οἶκοι* and therefore have not considered them at length.

[90] *Od.* I.417-19.

ὦ ξεῖνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα;
ἦ τι κατά πρῆξιν ἢ μαψιδίως ἀλάλησθε
οἷά τε λῃστῆρες ὑπεὶρ ἅλα, τοί τ' ἀλόωνται
ψυχὰς παρθέμενοι κακὸν ἀλλοδαποῖσι πέροντες;[91]

Strangers, who are you? Whence do you sail over the watery ways? Is it on some business, or do you wander at random over the sea, as pirates do, who wander hazarding their lives and bringing evil to men of other lands?

Nestor begins with the generic *τίνες ἐστέ;* Who are you? His questions grow more specific, first *πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα;* "Whence do you sail?" Then, he asks *ἦ τι κατά πρῆξιν ἢ μαψιδίως ἀλάλησθε / οἷά τε λῃστῆρες ὑπεὶρ ἅλα;* "Is it on some business, or do you wander at random over the sea, as pirates do?" As Nestor and his companions meet newcomers who are disembarking from a ship, the questions asked after a perfunctory "who are you?" concern place of origin and reason for travel, while the ever-present anxiety over the intentions of strangers manifests itself in the question about piracy.[92] Place of origin and the intentions of the newcomers are of most concern to Nestor.

Telemachos begins his answer by stating his place of origin: *ἡμεῖς ἐξ Ἰθάκης ὑπονηίου εἰλήλουθμεν·*[93] "We have come from Ithaca that is below Neion." Although he does not at first answer Nestor's question *τίνες ἐστέ;* "Who are you?" his identity is revealed in the extended answer he gives Nestor concerning his intentions:

πρῆξις δ' ἥδ' ἰδίη, οὐ δήμιος, ἣν ἀγορεύω.
πατρὸς ἐμοῦ κλέος εὐρὺ μετέρχομαι, ἤν που ἀκούσω,
δῖον Ὀδυσσῆος ταλασίφρονος, ὅν ποτέ φασι
σὺν σοὶ μαρνάμενον Τρώων πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξαι.[94]

[B]ut this business whereof I speak is my own and does not concern the people. I come for far-flung report of my father, in case I may hear it.

---

[91] *Od.* III.71-74.

[92] See Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, 164-65, who observe that this is the passage Thoukydides had in mind when he described the normalcy of raiding and piracy in an earlier age (1.5.1-3). They contend that this is not entirely the case in Homer, since Eumaios explicitly condemns pirates and piracy at XIV.85 ff. Compare *Od.* IX.40 ff.; XIV.247 ff.; XVII.425 ff.

[93] *Od.* III.80.

[94] *Od.* III.82-85.

> report of noble, steadfast Odysseus, who once, men say, fought by your side and sacked the city of the Trojans.

Telemachos states that he has come on personal business, which has nothing to do with the *δῆμος*, a claim that reinforces the idea that Homer uses the term *δῆμος* to represent the public entity.[95] His answer then immediately proceeds to the name of his father.[96] Telemachos also reminds Nestor that Odysseus, *σὺν σοὶ μαρνάμενον Τρώων πόλιν ἐξαλαπάξαι*, "fought by thy side and sacked the city of the Trojans." This connects the two families, and solicits sympathy from Nestor, something reinforced later when Telemachos finishes his speech of introduction with the plea:

> *λίσσομαι, εἴ ποτέ τοί τι πατὴρ ἐμός, ἐσθλὸς Ὀδυσσεύς,*
> *ἢ ἔπος ἠέ τι ἔργον ὑποστὰς ἐξετέλεσσε*
> *δήμῳ ἔνι Τρώων, ὅθι πάσχετε πήματ' Ἀχαιοί,*
> *τῶν νῦν μοι μνῆσαι, καί μοι νημερτὲς ἐνίσπες.*[97]
>
> I beseech you, if ever my father, noble Odysseus, promised you any word or deed and fulfilled it in the land of the Trojans, where you Achaeans suffered woes, be mindful of it now, I pray you, and tell me the unerring truth.

This forces Nestor to call to mind the experiences he shared with Odysseus, reminding him of the bond between the two men, forged when the two warriors fought together before Troy. Here, Telemachos calls on the obligations of guest-friendship even if he does not invoke it by name. These obligations are hereditary, and as such bind Nestor not only to Odysseus himself, but to his son Telemachos as well.[98]

Telemachos' answer to Nestor reveals his homeland and the name of his father. At the same time he invokes the aristocratic bond between the two older men, a bond extending to their descendants, including Telemachos. Homeland, father's name, and ties of guest-friendship emerge as the paramount elements of identity in this passage.

---

[95] See Chapter IV below.

[96] Although Telemachos does not immediately reveal his name; Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, 165.

[97] *Od.* III.98-101.

[98] Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, 166, suggest that these words would be more appropriately reserved for Telemachos' later meeting with Menelaos.

Odyssey 8.550 ff.: Alkinoös and Odysseus

In one of the most detailed direct inquiries about identity in the *Odyssey*, Alkinoös questions Odysseus about his origins when, during the feast held in honor of his guest, he notices Odysseus weeping over a song about the Trojan War. Alkinoös begins (a digression about how people are named has been omitted):

> *εἶπ' ὄνομ' ὅττι σε κεῖθι κάλεον μήτηρ τε πατήρ τε*
> *ἄλλοι θ' οἳ κατὰ ἄστυ καὶ οἳ περιναιετάουσιν.*
> ...
> *εἰπὲ δέ μοι γαῖάν τε· τεὴν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε,*
> *ὄφρα σε τῇ πέμπωσι τιτυσκόμεναι φρεσὶ νῆες·*[99]
>
> Tell me the name by which they called you at home, your mother and your father and other folk besides, your townsmen and the dwellers round about... And tell me your country, your people, and your city, that our ships may convey you there, discerning the course by their wits.

Here, instead of simply asking who the newcomer is, Alkinoös specifically requests Odysseus' identity and origin.[100] First, and at some length, he inquires about his visitor's name. Second, he wants to know where the stranger is from, particularly what *γαῖα*, land, what *δῆμος*, region or community, and what *πόλις*.[101] This suggests a conception of place of origin containing several discrete elements. Furthermore, despite the fact that Alkinoös does not directly ask about Odysseus' lineage, the mention of *μήτηρ τε πατήρ τε* in line 550 and *τοκῆες* in line 554 ensures that this concept remains in the forefront of this discussion about Odysseus' identity. Alkinoös also mentions the other people who are Odysseus' *περιναιετάοντες*, "neighbors," and who live with him *κατὰ ἄστυ*, in his city; *ἄστυ* can be added to *πόλις*, *δῆμος*, and *γαῖα* as types of places mentioned in this question. *Περιναιετάοντες* refers to a group of people, immediate neighbors, rather than a place, but seems to serve as an intermediary category between

---

[99] *Od.* VIII.550-51; 555-56.

[100] Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth 1988, 382-83, point out that, "Alcinous asks, in hugely expanded form, the questions usually condensed into the formula *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν, πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;*"

[101] See Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*γαῖα*," "*δῆμος*," and "*πόλις*." Luce 1978, 6, discusses Homer's differentiation between *πόλις*, *δῆμος*, and *γαῖα* in light of this passage. He summarizes: "Alkinoös wants the ancient equivalent of a postal address: country, county, and town."

τοκῆες and ἄστυ or πόλις.[102] A hierarchy of people and places emerges, from τοκῆες to περιναιετάοντες, through πόλις and ἄστυ, to δῆμος and γαῖα. Parents, neighbors, city, territory, and people all play a role in Alkinoös' question about Odysseus' identity.

Odysseus' answer to these questions makes these categories more concrete. After stating his own name, the name of his father, and his wide spread fame, Odysseus tells Alkinoös about his home:

> εἶμ' Ὀδυσεὺς Λαερτιάδης, ὃς πᾶσι δόλοισιν
> ναιετάω δ' Ἰθάκην εὐδείελον· ἐν δ' ὄρος αὐτῇ
> Νήριτον εἰνοσίφυλλον, ἀριπρεπές· ἀμφὶ δὲ νῆσοι
> πολλαὶ ναιετάουσι μάλα σχεδὸν ἀλλήλῃσι,
> Δουλίχιόν τε Σάμη τε καὶ ὑλήεσσα Ζάκυνθος.
> αὐτὴ δὲ χθαμαλὴ πανυπερτάτη εἰν ἁλὶ κεῖται
> πρὸς ζόφον, αἱ δέ τ' ἄνευθε πρὸς ἠῶ τ' ἠέλιόν τε,
> τρηχεῖ', ἀλλ' ἀγαθὴ κουροτρόφος· οὔ τοι ἐγώ γε
> ἧς γαίης δύναμαι γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ἰδέσθαι.[103]
>
> I am Odysseus, son of Laertes, known to all men for my stratagems, and my fame reaches the heavens. I dwell in clear-seen Ithaca; on it is a mountain, Neriton, covered with waving forests, conspicuous from afar; and round it many islands close by one another, Dulichium, and Same and wooded Zacynthus. Ithaca itself lies low in the sea, farthest of all toward the dark, but the others lie apart toward the dawn and the sun—a rugged island, but a good nurse of young men; and for myself no other thing can I see sweeter than one's own land.

Odysseus declares that he is from Ithaka, but also names the other islands surrounding it, Doulichion, Same, and Zakynthos, which make up the rest of his kingdom.[104] He also describes the relative geographical layout of the archipelago—an appropriate answer to a question involving the navigation of his homeward voyage. Despite the fact that Odysseus' kingdom does not have a specific name, the group of islands listed constitutes a territorial or political entity, although it is clear from Odysseus' nostalgic

---

[102] See Donlan 1985, 302-03, for the importance of "neighborly" ties and a consideration of small-scale communities. See Snodgrass 1980, 26-27; 31, for a discussion of the deep-seated "village habit."

[103] *Od.* IX.19-28.

[104] *Il.* II.631-37. See Chapter III below for a discussion of how Odysseus' kingdom is presented in the Catalogue of Ships. Alfred Heubeck and Arie Hoekstra, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume II: Books IX-XVI* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989), 12-14, discuss at length the ongoing debate, which

praise for the island that Ithaka holds a special place in the kingdom as the location of Odysseus' birth and his seat of power.[105] Finally, before making the statement, *οὔ τοι ἐγώ γε / ἧς γαίης δύναμαι γλυκερώτερον ἄλλο ἰδέσθαι*, "no other thing can I see sweeter than one's own land (*γαίης*)," Odysseus brings the focus of his speech back from the archipelago as a whole to Ithaka specifically. Two tiers, perhaps, of Alkinoös hierarchy of places are present in Odysseus' answer to his questions; he is from Ithaka (*γαῖα*), the central island in an archipelago that he rules (perhaps considered his *δῆμος*).

Various possible categories for conceptualizing origin emerge in this passage. Lineage, as usual, emerges as important in Alkinoös' question, as indicated by the stress placed on Odysseus' *τοκῆες*. Alkinoös also inquires after Odysseus' *γαῖα* (land), *δῆμος* (land or community), *πόλις*, *ἄστυ* (city), and *περιναιετάοντες* (neighborhood). This does not seem to be—or need to be—particularly systematic. For example, it is not clear whether one *γαῖα* can consist of many *πόλεις*, or whether the *γαῖα* itself consists of one *ἄστυ* and its hinterland. Finally, once one moves beyond the realm of parents and immediate neighbors, identity is considered primarily in terms of place rather than people. The terms used are names of spatial units, not groups of people, such as *γενεή* or *ἔθνος* (with the possible exception of *δῆμος*, which has a range of meanings encompassing several aspects of a region or the people who inhabit it).[106] Odysseus' answer concentrates on his place of origin, specifying Ithaka as his homeland, but including the surrounding islands as subsidiary. The exchange between Alkinoös and Odysseus reveals concern with parentage and the conceptualization of place and community of origin.

---

began in antiquity (see, for example, Strabo X.451-58), about the geography of the kingdom of Ithaka presented in the Catalogue.

[105] Compare the kingdom attributed to Odysseus in the Catalogue of Ships, *Il.* II.631-37. Zakynthos, Neriton, and Ithaka appear in both lists of islands, while Same and Samos, which differ only in grammatical gender, may both refer to the same island, or one may name the island and the other its principal settlement.

[106] See discussion in Chapter IV below.

Odyssey IX.252 ff.: The Kyklops and Odysseus

Over the course of Books IX through XII, Odysseus recounts his wanderings to Alkinoös. In the well-known scene where he and twelve of his men go to the cave of the Kyklops, they are initially interrogated by the monster, before being attacked. The Kyklops asks,

> *'ὦ ξεῖνοι, τίνες ἐστέ; πόθεν πλεῖθ' ὑγρὰ κέλευθα;*
> *ἦ τι κατὰ πρῆξιν ἢ μαψιδίως ἀλάλησθε,*
> *οἵά τε λῃστῆρες, ὑπεὶρ ἅλα, τοί τ' ἀλόωνται*
> *ψυχὰς παρθέμενοι κακὸν ἀλλοδαποῖσι φέροντες;*[107]
>
> Strangers, who are you? Whence do you sail over the watery ways? Is it on some business, or do you wander at random over the sea, as pirates do, who wander hazarding their lives and bringing evil to men of other lands?

Echoing the wording of earlier questions posed by Alkinoös and Nestor, the Kyklops asks who the strangers are (using a generic *τίνες ἐστέ*), from where they came, and whether they have legitimate business or are merely pirates. Odysseus, however, gives a reply to the Kyklops different from that he gave to Alkinoös, and from the answer Telemachos gave to Nestor. Odysseus responds:

> *ἡμεῖς τοι Τροίηθεν ἀποπλαγχθέντες Ἀχαιοὶ*
> *παντοίοις ἀνέμοισιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης,*
> *οἴκαδε ἱέμενοι, ἄλλην ὁδὸν ἄλλα κέλευθα*
> *ἤλθομεν· οὕτω που Ζεὺς ἤθελε μητίσασθαι.*
> *λαοὶ δ' Ἀτρεΐδεω Ἀγαμέμνονος εὐχόμεθ' εἶναι,*
> *τοῦ δὴ νῦν γε μέγιστον ὑπουράνιον κλέος ἐστί·*
> *τόσσην γὰρ διέπερσε πόλιν καὶ ἀπώλεσε λαοὺς*
> *πολλούς...*[108]
>
> We, you must know, are from Troy, Achaeans, driven by all the winds there are over the great gulf of the sea. Seeking our home, we have come by another way, by other paths. So, I suppose, Zeus was pleased to devise. And we declare that we are the men of Agamemnon, son of Atreus, whose fame is now the greatest under heaven, so great a city did he sack, and slew many people...

---

[107] *Od.* IX.252-55. Nestor uses the same words with Telemachos, III.71-74 (see above); Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989, 28.

[108] *Od.* IX.259-66.

This is one of the few passages in the *Odyssey* where Odysseus clearly identifies himself and his men as Ἀχαιοί, Achaians.[109] Furthermore, after describing their plight, he refers to himself and his men as the λαοί, people, of Agamemnon. Finally, he mentions the fame of Agamemnon and the military exploits which brought about this renown. Identity as Achaians and association with a powerful and famous king are crucial to Odysseus' answer. This particular combination may result in part from the fact that Odysseus and his men find themselves in a foreign and intimidating environment outside the Hellenic world. Under these circumstances, the broadest aspect of identity, that as an Achaian, is perhaps the most meaningful to a foreigner, the same way that a traveler abroad today would most likely provide his country of origin rather than his home town. Likewise, association with Agamemnon identifies Odysseus through his subordination to the Achaian overlord. Considering Agamemnon's fame and military exploits, mentioned explicitly by Odysseus, this may also invoke the protection of a powerful king. Confronted with a monster whose intentions are unclear, Odysseus invokes the categories of identity which are most meaningful to his potential host, his status as an Achaian and a follower of Agamemnon. Odysseus may also hope that his association with Agamemnon will garner from the Kyklops either respect for or fear of the well-publicized power of Agamemnon. Indeed, Odysseus follows his introduction with a formal supplication to the Kyklops.[110] Identity as followers of Agamemnon and Ἀχαιοί, combined with status as successful heroes, frame Odysseus' answer to the Kyklops.

---

[109] Compare *Od.* XIV.229-31; 240-42; less directly XIX.175-77, all of which are considered below.

[110] *Od.* IX.266-71. Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989, 28, interpret this scene as a mistake made by Odysseus. Specifically, they argue that he disastrously misinterprets his situation:

> He is...unaware that he is outside the heroic milieu, and confronted by a being as unimpressed by the deeds and status of heroes as by the moral order of the heroic world. Odysseus' pathetically proud words, grotesquely inadequate to the matter in hand, are exposed as mere posturing as Polyphemus' reaction severely disillusions the hero.

Odyssey X.325 ff.: Kirke and Odysseus

While recounting his adventures to Alkinoös, Odysseus recounts another episode from his travels during which he is questioned. This incident occurs on the isle of Kirke, after the enchantress's drugs do not, as she expects, turn Odysseus into a swine. It is a rhetorical question, exclaimed during a moment of astonishment; Kirke answers it herself, while Odysseus rebukes her instead of giving an answer.[111] Still, the question itself is of interest as an example of the most common terms in which inquiries about identity are put in the *Odyssey*:

> *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;*[112]
>
> Who art thou among men, and from whence? Where is thy city, and where thy parents?

This is the same formula used by Telemachos when he questions Athena/Mentes. As discussed above, it invokes both the idea of place of origin and parentage, and is a basic way of asking someone who they are by enquiring about their home city and their parents.

Odyssey XIV.185 ff.: Eumaios and Odysseus

Upon returning to Ithaka Odysseus, disguised by Athena as a beggar, is welcomed by Eumaios, his old swineherd. The two fall to talking over food and wine, discussing the fate of Odysseus and the situation on the island. Odysseus asks Eumaios who his owner is.[113] Despairing over the fate of his lord, Eumaios declares that this man's name was Odysseus. Eumaios immediately changes the subject, asking the identity of his guest rather than revealing that of his lord:

> *ἀλλ' ἄγε μοι σύ, γεραιέ, τὰ σ' αὐτοῦ κήδε' ἐνίσπες*
> *καί μοι τοῦτ' ἀγόρευσον ἐτήτυμον, ὄφρ' ἐῢ εἰδῶ·*
> *τίς πόθεν εἶς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;*
> *ὁππoίης τ' ἐπὶ νηὸς ἀφίκεο· πῶς δέ σε ναῦται*

---

[111] Kirke names Odysseus and recognizes that he is on his way home from Troy (lines 330-32). Odysseus rebukes Kirke (lines 336 ff.).

[112] *Od.* X.325. Compare *Od.* I.170; XIV.187; XV.264; XIX.105; XXIV.298. See Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989, 61.

[113] *Od.* XIV.115 ff.

ἤγαγον εἰς Ἰθάκην; τίνες ἔμμεναι εὐχετόωντο;
οὐ μὲν γάρ τί σε πεζὸν ὀΐομαι ἐνθάδ' ἱκέσθαι.[114]

But you, old man, come, tell me of your own troubles, and declare me this truly, that I may be certain of it. Who are you among men, and from where? Where is your city, and where your parents? On what sort of ship did you come, and how did sailors bring you to Ithaca? Who did they declare themselves to be? For I do not suppose you came here on foot.

As in I.170 and IX.325, the line *τίς πόθεν εἶς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;* "Who are you among men, and from where? Where is your city, and where your parents?" occurs. Questions follow about ship and crew. In all respects, this passage is almost a restatement of the earlier questions at I.170 and IX.325, emphasizing the same aspects of identity: parents and place of origin, with the remainder of the question probing intentions, as was also the case with Nestor and Telemachos.

Odysseus' extended answer dwells upon his status and role as a warrior, although he begins by stating that Krete is the native land of his family, *ἐκ μὲν Κρητάων γένος εὔχομαι εὐρειάων.*[115] He does not specify, however, what *πόλις* in Krete he is from, despite that fact that Eumaios specifically requested this information and that Homer twice refers to the many *πόλεις* of Krete.[116] Instead, Odysseus stakes his claim as member of Castor's *γένος*, despite his illegitimate birth:

...ἐμὲ δ' ὠνητὴ τέκε μήτηρ
παλλακίς ἀλλά με ἶσον ἰθαιγενέεσσιν ἐτίμα
Κάστωρ Ὑλακίδης. τοῦ ἐγὼ γένος εὔχομαι εἶναι.[117]

...but the mother that bore me was bought, a concubine. Yet Castor, son of Hylax, of whom I declare that I am sprung, honored me even as his true-born sons.

Odysseus adds that this Castor held high status among the people of Krete:

ὃς τότ' ἐνὶ Κρήτεσσι θεὸς ὣς τίετο δήμῳ
ὄλβῳ τε πλούτῳ τε καὶ υἱάσι κυδαλίμοισιν.[118]

---

[114] *Od.* XIV.185-90. Line 187 also occurs at *Od.* I.170; X.325; XV.264; XIX.105; XXIV.298. Lines 188-190 occur three other times in the *Odyssey* with only slight variation (I.171 ff.; XVI.57 ff.; XVI.222 ff.); Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989, 206.

[115] *Od.* XIV.199; Odysseus' answer begins on line 192.

[116] *Ἐννήκοντα πόληες* (of ninety cities): *Od.* XIX.174; *ἑκατόμπολιν* (of a hundred cities): *Il.* II.649.

[117] *Od.* XIV.202-04.

> He was at that time honored as a god among the Cretans in the land for his good estate, and his wealth, and his glorious sons.

Like Idomeneus in the *Iliad*, the Castor enjoys high status, in this case established by *ὄλβῳ τε πλούτῳ τε*, wealth, and *υἱάσι κυδαλίμοισιν*, famous children. Next, Odysseus recalls how after his father had died and, in a situation reminiscent of Hesiod, he was deprived of a fitting inheritance by his legitimate half-brothers:

> *ἀλλ' ἤ τοι τὸν κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοιο φέρουσαι*
> *εἰς Ἄϊδαο δόμους· τοὶ δὲ ζωὴν ἐδύσαντο*
> *παῖδες ὑπέρθυμοι καὶ ἐπὶ κλήρους ἐβάλοντο,*
> *αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ μάλα παῦρα δόσαν καὶ οἰκί' ἔνειμαν.*[119]
>
> But the Fates of death bore him away to the house of Hades, and his proud sons divided among them his property, and cast lots for it. To me they gave a very small portion, and allotted a dwelling.

Instead of a fair share, Odysseus' persona received only a *παῦρα δόσαν*, "small portion." Still, he continues, his natural ability won him a wife from a wealthy family. A long description of his military prowess follows, culminating with the statement:

> *τοῖος ἔα ἐν πολέμῳ· ἔργον δέ μοι οὐ φίλον ἔσκεν*
> *οὐδ' οἰκωφελίῃ, ἥ τε τρέφει ἀγλαὰ τέκνα,*
> *ἀλλά μοι αἰεὶ νῆες ἐπήρετμοι φίλαι ἦσαν*
> *καὶ πόλεμοι καὶ ἄκοντες ἐΰξεστοι καὶ ὀϊστοί,*
> *λυγρά, τά τ' ἄλλοισίν γε καταριγηλὰ πέλονται.*[120]
>
> Such a man was I in war, but labour in the field was never to my liking, nor the care of a household, which rears comely children, but oared ships were ever dear to me, and wars, and polished spears, and arrows—grievous things, at which others are wont to shudder.

Combined with his later claim to have made his house prosperous with spoils from no less than nine raids,[121] this statement stakes Odysseus' claim to membership among the elite, a proposition confirmed by Odysseus' statements that he, like his father, was honored by the people of Krete:

> *λάγχανον· αἶψα δὲ οἶκος ὀφέλλετο, καί ῥα ἔπειτα*

---

[118] *Od.* XIV.205-06. Compare Helen's description of Idomeneus. *Il.* III.230-31.

[119] *Od.* XIV.207-10.

[120] *Od.* XIV.222-26.

[121] See Heubeck and Hoekstra 1989. 210.

δεινός τ' αἰδοῖός τε μετὰ Κρήτεσσι τετύγμην.[122]

Thus my house at once grew rich, whereupon I became one feared and honored among the Cretans.

Paternal lineage, place of origin, and status—if not rule—among the Cretans mark Odysseus' identity to this point in the passage.

In addition, in this passage the disguised Odysseus three times identifies himself as an Achaian:

πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Τροίης ἐπιβήμεναι υἷας Ἀχαιῶν
εἰνάκις ἀνδράσιν ἦρξα καὶ ὠκυπόροισι νέεσσιν
ἄνδρας ἐς ἀλλοδαπούς, καί μοι μάλα τύγχανε πολλά.
...
ἔνθα μὲν εἰνάετες πολεμίζομεν υἷες Ἀχαιῶν,
τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν Πριάμου πέρσαντες ἔβημεν
οἴκαδε σὺν νήεσσι, θεὸς δ' ἐκέδασσεν Ἀχαιούς.[123]

For before the sons of the Achaeans set foot on the land of Troy, I had nine times led warriors and swift-faring ships against foreign folk, and great spoil continually fell to my hands.
...
There for nine years we sons of the Achaeans warred, and in the tenth we sacked the city of Priam, and set out for home in our ships, and a god scattered the Achaeans.

Although Odysseus' self-identification as an Achaian is never direct, the meaning is clear. In the second of these occurrences, *ἔνθα μὲν εἰνάετες πολεμίζομεν υἷες Ἀχαιῶν*, "there for nine years we sons of the Achaeans warred," Odysseus employs a first person plural verb (*πολεμίζομεν*) with *υἷες Ἀχαιῶν*, "sons of the Achaians," as the subject, indicating that the speaker counts himself among the Achaians. The context of the other two uses also imply identity as an Achaian, since the Odysseus' assumed persona clearly counts himself among the "sons of the Achaians" who went to Troy (*πρὶν μὲν γὰρ Τροίης ἐπιβήμεναι υἷας Ἀχαιῶν*), and was also among those the gods dispersed after the war (*θεὸς δ' ἐκέδασσεν Ἀχαιούς*).[124]

---

[122] *Od.* XIV.233-34.

[123] *Od.* XIV.229-31; 240-42.

[124] *Od.* XIV.229; 242.

Odysseus specifies his identity as an Achaian for two reasons in this passage. First, the passage recounts the Trojan War, where placing oneself in the appropriate camp is expected. Second, the Odysseus' assumed persona hails from Krete, a land which is explicitly described as containing a heterogeneous population elsewhere, made up not only of Achaians but native Kretans, Kydonians, Dorians, and Pelasgians.[125]

In short, when he is asked who he is, the character created by Odysseus mentions his parents and his paternal grandfather, declares his homeland to be Krete, claims to be Achaian, and reports his status as a warrior-aristocrat revered by the people of Krete. Notably, the Kretans are called simply that throughout, despite the "multi-ethnic" nature of the island, implying some sort of meaningful identity among them, beyond affiliation with a particular cultural-linguistic group or *πόλις*.

Odyssey 15.260 ff.: Theoklymenos and Telemachos

Just as Telemachos is about to leave Pylos for Ithaka, a stranger approaches him. This man, Theoklymenos, is seeking asylum from pursuers after murdering a kinsman in Argos.[126] Looking for a ship to carry him to safety, Theoklymenos asks Telemachos who he is and where he is going:

> *τίς πόθεν εἶς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;*[127]
>
> Who are you among men, and from where? Where is your city, and where your parents?

Theoklymenos uses the familiar formula for this question, one emphasizing place of origin and parents.[128] Telemachos, in turn, answers:

> *ἐξ Ἰθάκης γένος εἰμί, πατὴρ δέ μοί ἐστιν Ὀδυσσεύς,*
> *εἴ ποτ' ἔην· νῦν δ' ἤδη ἀπέφθιτο λυγρῷ ὀλέθρῳ.*
> *τοὔνεκα νῦν ἑτάρους τε λαβὼν καὶ νῆα μέλαιναν*
> *ἦλθον πευσόμενος πατρὸς δὴν οἰχομένοιο.*[129]

---

[125] Compare *Od.* XIX.175-77.

[126] Homer provides the story of Theoklymenos, including a lengthy genealogy; *Od.* XV.222 ff.

[127] *Od.* XV.264.

[128] Compare *Od.* I.170; X.325; XIV.187; XIX.105; XXIV.298.

[129] *Od.* XV.267-70.

> Of Ithaca I am by birth, and my father is Odysseus, if ever he existed; but now he has perished by a pitiful fate. Therefore have I now taken my comrades and a black ship, and have come to seek tidings of my father, that has long been gone...

Telemachos states simply that his *γένος* is from Ithaka and that his father is Odysseus. He goes on to describe the nature of his errand. Theoklymenos then asks for asylum; Telemachos grants it. This brief and straightforward exchange highlights the immediate importance of lineage and place of origin in determining the identity of a stranger, so much so that this information is given without Telemachos ever telling Theoklymenos his name.

Odyssey XIX.105 ff.: Penelope and the disguised Odysseus

After Eumaios brings Odysseus to the royal palace of Ithaka, Penelope agrees to see the foreign beggar, completely unaware that this stranger is her husband. When he comes to visit her, she uses a standard, formulaic question to ask his identity:

> *''ξεῖνε, τὸ μέν σε πρῶτον ἐγὼν εἰρήσομαι αὐτή·*
> *τίς πόθεν εἶς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;*[130]
>
> Stranger, this question shall I myself ask you first. Who are you among men, and from where? Where is your city, and where your parents?

In line 105, Penelope uses the typical formula to ask the disguised Odysseus' origin.[131] Penelope's question, however, does not immediately elicit an answer. Odysseus first praises Penelope for her beauty and virtue, and then asks that she not inquire about his travails. Still, after rebuffing his compliment, she repeats the question:

> *ἀλλὰ καὶ ὥς μοι εἰπὲ τεὸν γένος, ὁππόθεν ἐσσί.*
> *οὐ γὰρ ἀπὸ δρυός ἐσσι παλαιφάτου οὐδ' ἀπὸ πέτρης.*[132]
>
> Yet even so tell me of your stock from which you come; for you are not sprung from an oak of ancient story, or from a stone.

---

[130] *Od.* XIX.104-05.

[131] Compare *Od.* I.170; X.325; XIV.187; XV.264; XXIV.298.

[132] *Od.* XIX.162-63. Compare *Il.* XXII.126; Hes. *Th.* 35. See Alfred Heubeck, Manuel Fernández-Galiano, and Joseph Russo, *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume III: Books XVII-XXIV* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992), 83.

With the use of the word *γένος* emphasis changes to Odysseus' lineage, although the phrase *ὁππόθεν ἐσσί* may extend the question to include place of origin.

Odysseus' answer is not interesting only because of what he says about the persona he has assumed—still a fallen aristocrat from Krete, but now with a different lineage and story—but also for his description of Krete and its people. He begins:

> *Κρήτη τις γαῖ' ἔστι, μέσῳ ἐνὶ οἴνοπι πόντῳ,*
> *καλὴ καὶ πίειρα, περίρρυτος· ἐν δ' ἄνθρωποι*
> *πολλοί, ἀπειρέσιοι, καὶ ἐννήκοντα πόληες.*[133]
>
> There is a land called Crete, in the midst of the wine-dark sea, a fair, rich land, begirt with water, and therein are many men, past counting, and ninety cities.

Two concepts are invoked here, the *γαῖα* and the *πόλις;* Odysseus' character is from the *γαῖα* of Krete, and from one of the ninety *πόλεις* that exist on the island. Soon we learn that Odysseus has taken on the role of an aristocrat from Knossos:

> *τῇσι δ' ἐνὶ Κνωσός, μεγάλη πόλις, ἔνθα τε Μίνως*
> *ἐννέωρος βασίλευε Διὸς μεγάλου ὀαριστής,*
> *πατρὸς ἐμοῖο πατήρ, μεγαθύμου Δευκαλίωνος*
> *Δευκαλίων δ' ἐμὲ τίκτε καὶ Ἰδομενῆα ἄνακτα·*
> *ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐν νήεσσι κορωνίσιν Ἴλιον ἴσω*
> *ᾤχεθ' ἅμ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν, ἐμοὶ δ' ὄνομα κλυτὸν Αἴθων,*
> *ὁπλότερος γενεῇ· ὁ δ' ἄρα πρότερος καὶ ἀρείων.*[134]
>
> Among their cities is the great city Cnossus, where Minos reigned when nine years old, he that held converse with great Zeus, and was father of my father, great-hearted Deucalion. Now Deucalion begat me and prince Idomeneus. Idomeneus had gone forth in his beaked ships to Ilium with the sons of Atreus; but my famous name is Aethon; I was the younger by birth, while he was the elder and the better man.

Odysseus has assumed the identity of Aithon, the younger brother of Idomeneus, the king of Knossos. He then recounts his paternal genealogy for three generations, back through Deukalion to Minos, who reigned, *βασίλευε*, over the city. The identity he constructs is based upon the *γαῖα* and *πόλις* of origin, lineage, and status as a member of

---

[133] *Od.* XIX.172-74.

[134] *Od.* XIX.178-84.

the royal family, although this is qualified by admission of being the younger brother of the *ἄνακτα*, reigning king, Idomeneus.

This passage also describes aspects of identity less commonly discussed in Homer. In his description of Krete, Odysseus observes of the people of Krete:

> *ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη· ἐν μὲν Ἀχαιοί,*
> *ἐν δ' Ἐτεόκρητες μεγαλήτορες, ἐν δὲ Κύδωνες,*
> *Δωριέες τε τριχάϊκες δῖοί τε Πελασγοί.*[135]
>
> They have not all the same speech, but their tongues are mixed. There dwell Achaeans, there great-hearted native Cretans, there Cydonians, and Dorians of waving plumes, and goodly Pelasgians.

This passage is one of the rare instances in Homer where either language or what might be considered "ethnicity"—communal identity conferred at birth, perhaps by putative descent—is mentioned.[136] As suits J. Hall's interpretation, the two concepts of language and ethnicity are closely related. Immediately after stating that *ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη*, the languages spoken on the island are "mixed," Odysseus lists the distinct peoples who inhabit Krete: Achaians, Eteokretans, Kydones, Dorians, and Pelasgians, implying that these groups are at least partly defined by what language each speaks. It is not clear whether each of the ninety *πόλεις* on the island is mixed, or each *πόλις* is populated by members of only one group.[137] Nowhere, however, is a particular group identified with a single region within Krete the way that Epeians are

---

[135] *Od.* XIX.175-77.

[136] Finley 1978, 17. Finley takes it as evidence for the cultural diversity of Greece produced by a long process of infiltration of the southern Balkans by Greek speakers in the early Bronze Age. Of the proto-Greek speakers arriving at that time he observes: "The Angles and Saxons in Britain offer a convenient analogy: they were not Englishmen, but they were to become Englishmen one day." Heubeck, Fernández-Galiano, and Russo 1992, 83-84, claim that this is the only settlement of "mixed, international composition" known in early Greece, "whether we assume the description to be valid for the Bronze Age, for Homer's time, or for some period in between." They then proceed with a discussion of interpretations of the origin of each group, and note that "Most striking is the inclusion of Dorians among Cretan populations, since Homer mentions them nowhere else" except possibly in his description of the tripartite settlement of Rhodes (*Il.* II.655; see below). Heubeck, Fernández-Galiano, and Russo also discuss, but ultimately reject, the possible interpretation of *τριχάϊκες* as meaning "dwelling in threefold location," thus echoing the description of Rhodians in the *Iliad* (84-85).

[137] See Heubeck, Fernández-Galiano, and Russo 1992, 83-84, for a range of speculation about settlement patterns on Crete. Compare Strabo X.4.6-7. Homer's other reference to the *πόλεις* of Krete numbers the cities at one hundred (*Il.* II.649).

linked to Elis or Myrmidons to Phthia. Distinctions among the peoples of Krete are, instead, based upon language and communal descent. The description of Krete conceptualizes the island as an land divided into a multitude of *πόλεις*, populated by various peoples speaking different languages.

The fact that Achaians are included in this list of ethnic groups sheds some light on at least one aspect of identity that unites them, language. It also, perhaps, indicates that Achaians thought of themselves as an community, defined by language alone or language paired with other factors such or descent, independent of their territory of origin; Krete is clearly included in Achaia, but contains other groups besides Achaians. The uniqueness of this passage, however, complicates its interpretation.

The face-to-face exchange between Odysseus and Penelope begins ordinarily, with her asking his parents and place of origin, and later reiterating the question in terms of his *γένος*. Odysseus' response is also typical, discussing his paternal ancestors, royal status, and land and *πόλις* of origin. The conclusion of the passage, however, proves unique among such encounters, discussing the language and "ethnicity" of the people of Krete. Although not directly relevant to Odysseus' himself, this digression offers a rare insight into other potential categories of identity in Homer.

<u>*Odyssey* XX.190 ff.: Philoitios and Odysseus</u>

Following his interview with Penelope, the suitors and the goatherd harass the disguised Odysseus in his own home. Meanwhile, his faithful cowherd Philoitios brings the evening's meal to the house and asks the swineherd:

> *τίς δὴ ὅδε ξεῖνος νέον εἰλήλουθε, συβῶτα,*
> *ἡμέτερον πρὸς δῶμα; τέων δ' ἐξ εὔχεται εἶναι*
> *ἀνδρῶν; ποῦ δέ νύ οἱ γενεὴ καὶ πατρὶς ἄρουρα;*[138]
>
> Who is this stranger, swineherd, who has newly come to our house? From what men does he declare he is descended? Where are his kinsmen and his native fields?

[138] *Od.* XX.191-93.

Philoitios first asks a general question about identity, *τίς δὴ ὅδε ξεῖνος νέον εἰλήλουθε*, "Who is this stranger, swineherd, who has newly come to our house?" The word *ξεῖνος* is found in other questions about identity, and may be consciously used here to invoke the obligations of hosts to their guests, obligations which are being blatantly violated at the time the cowherd arrives.[139] Likewise, Philoitios' next question, *τέων δ' ἐξ εὔχεται εἶναι ἀνδρῶν;* "From what men does he declare he is descended?" is an alternative to the usual *τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν;* "Who are you among men, and from where?"[140] Next, Philoitios asks a double question that links descent to homeland, inquiring about both the stranger's *γενεή*, lineage, and his *πατρὶς ἄρουρα*, paternal fields. The use of *ἄρουρα*, "fields," makes the question about homeland very physical, rather than abstract (as might be the case with *δῆμος*), in nature. In this passage, questions about lineage and place of origin take the forefront.

The cowherd's question also emphasizes the home or household of Odysseus and his son Telemachos. Not only does Philoitios use the word *δῶμα* in his question about the stranger, but he goes on to emphasize his loyalty to the household of Odysseus.[141] In the succeeding lines, he states how *ἄλλοι*, others, now command him to bring the cattle to them. The use *ἄλλοι* here implies that these "others" are illegitimate rulers, who have no right to use Odysseus' household or command his servants.[142] Philoitios makes this point clear when he declares that these *ἄλλοι* have no care for Odysseus' son or his house: *οὐδέ τι παιδὸς ἐνὶ μεγάροις ἀλέγουσιν.*[143] The misery this causes Philoitios is comparable to what he would suffer were he to take his cattle and go to live among foreign people:

> *...μάλα μὲν κακὸν υἷος ἐόντος*
> *ἄλλων δῆμον ἱκέσθαι ἰόντ' αὐτῇσι βόεσσιν,*

---

[139] Compare *Od.* I.175-76; III.70; IX.252; XIX.104.

[140] At *Od.* I.170; X.325; XIV.187; XV.264; XIX.105; XXIV.298.

[141] *Od.* XX.208 ff.

[142] Autenrieth. 1958 ed., s.v. "*ἄλλος*."

[143] *Od.* XX.214.

ἄνδρας ἐς ἀλλοδαπούς· τὸ δὲ ῥίγιον, αὖθι μένοντα
βουσὶν ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίῃσι καθήμενον ἄλγεα πάσχειν.[144]

> Now, as for myself, the heart in my breast keeps revolving this matter: a very bad thing it is, while the son lives, to depart along with my cattle and go to another people's land, to an alien folk; but this is worse still, to remain here and suffer woes in charge of cattle that are given over to others.

Both scenarios cause Philoitios pain, because in each case the goods of Odysseus' household are consumed by others. On the one hand they are the suitors, referred to using the terms *ἄλλοι* and *ἀλλότριοι*, on the other foreigners to whom the cowherd might flee, foreigners who constitute an *ἄλλων δῆμος* and who are, like the suitors, described by an *ἀλλο-* compound (*ἀλλοδαποί*).[145] Thus, despite the fact that the suitors are Ithakans, they are as foreign as inhabitants of another land because they are not of Odysseus' house, but still consume his goods. In so doing they violate norms of behavior, just as they do when they mistreat the disguised Odysseus in the scene immediately preceding this passage.

This exchange, initiated by a loyal member of Odysseus' household, the cowherd, emphasizes the importance of the *δῶμα*, house and, especially considering the speaker and his professed loyalty to Odysseus, the entire *οἶκος*. This *οἶκος*-focused sentiment is reinforced by the addition of *γενεή* and *πατρὶς ἄρουρα*, as family and personal landholding are integral parts of the household.[146]

Odyssey XXIV.295 ff.: Laertes and the disguised Odysseus

The final passage in the *Odyssey* where a face-to-face encounter about identity occurs comes in Book XXIV when Odysseus, after killing the suitors, goes to his father, Laertes. Laertes asks,

τίς πόθεν εἶς ἀνδρῶν; πόθι τοι πόλις ἠδὲ τοκῆες;
ποῦ δὲ νηῦς ἔστηκε θοή, ἥ σ' ἤγαγε δεῦρο

---

[144] *Od.* XX.218-21.

[145] See Finley 1978, 102. Finley makes the point that every community outside one's own is "foreign soil." Use of the term *ἀλλοδαποί* and the phrase *ἄλλων δῆμος* indicate that "foreignness" begins at the border of the *δῆμος*. Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. *ἀλλοδαπός*; see Chapter IV below.

[146] See note 88 above for the difference between *πατρὶς ἄρουρα* and *πατρὶς γαῖα*.

ἀντιθέους θ' ἑτάρους; ἦ ἔμπορος εἰλήλουθας
νηὸς ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίης, οἱ δ' ἐκβήσαντες ἔβησαν;[147]

> [W]ho are you among men, and from where? Where is your city and where are your parents? Where is the swift ship moored that brought you here with your god-like comrades? Or did you come as a passenger on another's ship, and did they depart when they had set you on shore?

These lines are a variation on those found earlier in the *Odyssey* with no significant variation.[148] Laertes requests the stranger's place of origin and lineage, and he asks how Odysseus arrived on Ithaka. Likewise, Odysseus' answer contains no surprises, except perhaps that the names he invents here are clearly fabricated:

τοιγὰρ ἐγώ τοι πάντα μάλ' ἀτρεκέως καταλέξω.
εἰμὶ μὲν ἐξ Ἀλύβαντος, ὅθι κλυτὰ δώματα ναίω,
υἱὸς Ἀφειδάντος Πολυπημονίδαο ἄνακτος·
αὐτὰρ ἐμοί γ' ὄνομ' ἐστὶν Ἐπήριτος· ἀλλά με δαίμων
πλάγξ' ἀπὸ Σικανίης δεῦρ' ἐλθέμεν οὐκ ἐθέλοντα·
νηῦς δέ μοι ἥδ' ἕστηκεν ἐπ' ἀγροῦ νόσφι πόληος.[149]

> Then I will tell you all this quite frankly. I come from Alybas, where I dwell in a famous house, and I am the son of Apheidas, son of lord Polypemon, and my own name is Eperitus. But a god drove me from Sicania to come here against my will and my ship lies yonder off the tilled land away from the city.

Odysseus states that he is from *Ἀλύβας*, a name that plays on the word *ἀλάομαι*, to wander. Even in this fabricated response he claims to be from a *κλυτὰ δώματα*, an illustrious household, taking care to establish his identity as an aristocrat. He goes on to state that he is the son of Apheidas and grandson of Polypemon, both of which are again fabricated names. Finally, he uses the title "lord" (*ἄναξ*) to describe his grandfather, thus claiming royal status. This passage is a parody of earlier inquiries, carried out by Odysseus for no legitimate reason, since he is talking to his own father and the suitors have already been defeated. It fits, and plays upon, the established pattern: Odysseus declares his land of origin, states his paternal lineage, and claims royal status.

---

[147] *Od.* XXIV.298-301.

[148] *Od.* I.170; X.325; XIV.187; XV.264; XIX.105.

[149] *Od.* XXIV.303-08. See Heubeck, Fernández-Galiano, and Russo 1992, 395-96, for a discussion of the names improvised here by Odysseus. See also Autenrieth, 1958 ed., s.v. "*Ἀλύβας*;" "*Πολυπημονίδης*."

Summary and Conclusions

A distinct pattern emerges from the exchanges about identity and origin in the epics. Often the poet follows set formulae, but even when phrased differently, the same concepts recur consistently. "When a stranger comes to a new place the standard form of interrogation runs: 'Who are you and where do you come from? Where are your *πόλις* and your parents?' Name, last port of call, residence of parents and location of *πόλις*—there are the passport details as it were, the vital co-ordinates that determine a man's identity."[150] More specifically, the topics recurring in these questions and answers include: various aspects of the *οἶκος* (including the physical structures and fields, as well as close relatives, and retainers), ties between *οἶκοι* (usually manifest through *ξενίη* relationships), more distant lineage (usually paternal), status and class standing, position of leadership, territory of origin, people of origin, and identity as an Achaian, Trojan, or ally.

Although I do not wish to examine the *οἶκος* or class status at length, both play a prominent enough role in exchanges between heroes to warrant at least brief mention. Greek terms related to the *οἶκος* cover both the physical assets of the household as well as its members. *Τέμενος*, *ἀρούρα*, and *φυταλίη* designate lands, fields, and vineyards, *δῶμα* or *μέγαρα* represent the buildings, while possessions in general are invoked with *κτήματα πολλά*. Close relatives may be designated by the term *τοκεύς* (parents), or *γένος*, although the later usually refers to more distant (paternal) lineage in these exchanges.[151] A range of terms describing familial relationships also occurs, or relatives may simply be named.[152] Retainers, *θεράποντες*, should also be associated with *οἶκοι*, although in the *Iliad* they are depicted as followers of a particular ruler. Relationships between *οἶκοι* are usually spoken of in terms of *ξενίη* ties among heroes, and occur frequently. Class standing is asserted though statements about being the best

---

[150] Luce 1978, 6; see also 8.

[151] Although the term *γένος* probably does invoke closer, intra-*οἶκος* relationships at *Od.* I.407.

[152] See Henry Phelps Gates, *The Kinship Terminology of Homeric Greek* (Bloomington: Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics, 1971).

(*ἀριστεύειν καὶ ὑπείροχον* at Il. VI.209 is a good example), and through the possession of wealth, designated by words such as *ἀφνειός*, *πλούτος*, or *ὄλβος*, for instance. A certain status is also accorded to one who is *θεὸς ὣς τίετο*, "honored like a god."

Kinship beyond the immediate family is the subject of several exchanges, but the extent and purpose of the relationships mentioned is restricted. Kinship is always limited to discussion of a hero's lineage, and usually to paternal lineage. Only rarely and for specific reasons are collateral relatives mentioned. Furthermore, any lineage discussed in these exchanges is always discrete and specific, applying only the hero in question (or a closely related pair of heroes, like Sarpedon and Glaukos), never to a group of people. This usage accords well with Malkin's hypothesis about the ennobling power of lineage, rather than J. Hall's idea that descent from a putative ancestor defines an "ethnic" group. Lineage, like immediate family, is invoked by the term *γενεή* (this use of the term is more common in these exchanges).[153] Twice, *αἷμα* is paired with *γενεή* and appears synonymous with the "lineage" definition of the latter term.

Leadership of men plays an important role in the identity of the heroes encountered in exchanges about identity. Designation of leadership may involve use of the word *βασιλεύς* or *ἄναξ* (or their corresponding verbs). More commonly it is designated by a wide range of words and phrases that denote leadership of a people: *εὐρὺ κρείων*, *κρατερὸς αἰχμητής*, *ἀγός*, *ὀτρύνω*, *ἀρξός*, etc. Sometimes, a leader may also be *θεὸς ὣς τίετο*, "honored as a god," which appears to invoke status as well as leadership *per se*. Retainers, *θεράποντες*, and companions, *ἑτάροι*, also relate to leadership on the battlefield, although in the broader context they should probably be associated with a household in the first case and ties between households, perhaps related to *ξενίη* relationships, in the second.

Place of origin and, less commonly, people of origin are also regularly discussed. Specific place of origin is sometimes discussed using an abstract term such as *πόλις* or *ἄστυ*, but is more often invoked by naming specific places, including names

---

[153] Paternal genealogy to some depth is clearly indicated by the term *γένος* in Glaukos' answer to Diomedes at *Il.* VI.145 ff.

of geographical features or individual *πόλεις*. Likewise, regions of origin can be introduced with a word like *δῆμος* or *γαῖα*, or simply named: Argos, Lykia, Elis, Thrace, etc. As was the case with *γένος*, however, *δῆμος* has a range of potential meanings, territory, people, or a combination of both. With the possible exception of the ill-defined *λαός*, the only abstract term used for people of origin in the exchanges examined above is *δῆμος*, although in these passages it more commonly invokes a territory than a people.[154] More frequently, Homer employs the collective name of a people, such as *Κρητοί*, *Θρύγαι*, or *Μυρμιδόνες*, instead of any abstract term.

There is no abstract term for "nationality" in Homer, but identification as an Achaian (or Danaan or Argive), a Trojan, or an ally occurs repeatedly and consistently, and is discussed more fully in Chapter V below. Nor is there any term for "ethnicity," and only once does the poet mention communities resembling "ethnic" groups in J. Hall's (socio-linguistic) sense of the term.[155] Here, Homer recognizes both general variations in language, *ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη*, and specifically names groups, *Ἐτεόκρητες*, *Κύδωνες*, *Δωριέες*, *Πελασγοί*, and *Ἀχαιοί*.

Beyond the household, the terms relating to paternal genealogy, leadership, place of origin, people of origin, and "nationality" occur regularly in passages where two heroes directly question one another about their respective identities. As we shall see, these categories, and the vocabulary used to represent them, accord well with those encountered in another fruitful source of information about identity and the social groups that underlie it: the catalogues in *Iliad* Book II.

---

[154] It appears with the limiting genitive *Τρώων* at *Od.* III.100, an almost certain use where a people is indicated.

[155] In Odysseus' description of Krete at *Od.* XIX.105 ff.

Table I: Face-to-Face Exchanges, Concepts Appearing in Answers

	Term or Category	Number of Occurrences
House and Household	*δῶμα*	2
	οἶκος	4
	ἄρουρα / ἀγρός	1
Non-kin and Inter-*οἶκος* Relationships	*ξεῖνος / ξενίη*	10
	θεράπων	1
	ἑταῖρος / ἕταρος	1
Familial Relationships	*αἵματος*	2
	τοκεύς	1
	γενεή / γένος	14
Named Relatives	Father	25
	Mother	5
	Son	3
	Wife	1
	Brother	2
	Sister-in-Law	1
	Uncle	3
	Aunt	2
	Cousin	10
	Paternal Grandfather	11
	Maternal Grandfather	1
	Grandmother	2
	Great-Grandfather	3
	Great-Granduncle	2
	G-G-Grandfather	4
	G-G-G-Grandfather	3
	G-G-G-G-Grandfather	2
	G-G-G-G-G-Grandfather	1
	Ancestor's Status/Leadership	1
	Anc. *τέμενος / ἄρουρα / ἀγρός*	1
Land, People, and Leadership	*γαῖα*	2 (name supplied once)
	δῆμος	6 (name supplied three times)
	λαός	5
	πόλις	10 (name supplied six times)
	Achaian/Danaan/Argive	12
	Trojan	3
	ἐπίκουρος / Trojan ally	5
	Territorial Name	17
	Collective Name of People	6
	"Ethnic" Name of People[156]	4
	Geographic Feature	8
	"From Afar"	2
	Language	1
	ἀλλοδαπός / ἀλλότριος	1
	Status/Leadership	30

[156] Generally following J. Hall's criteria for ethnicity, namely (putative) descent or socio-linguistic groups.

Table II: Face-to-Face Exchanges, Concepts Appearing in Questions

	Term or Category	Number of Occurrences
House and Household	δῶμα	1
	μέγαρον	1
	ἄρουρα / ἀγρός	2
Inter-οἶκος Relationships	ξεῖνος / ξενίη	5
Familial Relationships	τοκεύς	8
	γενεή / γένος	3
Named Relatives	Father	3
	Mother	1
	Son	1
Land, People, and Leadership	περιναιετάων	1
	γαῖα	2
	δῆμος	2
	ἄστυ	1
	πόλις	7
	Argive/Danaan/Argive	3
	Territorial Name	1
	ἀλλοδαπός / ἀλλότριος	1
	Status/Leadership	6

CHAPTER III: COMMUNITY AND IDENTITY IN *ILIAD* BOOK II

In Book II of the *Iliad*, Homer provides nearly comprehensive lists of the heroes involved in the conflict and the contingents of warriors they lead. These rosters enhance the picture provided by direct exchanges between warriors with complementary descriptions of the identity and origin of contingents and their leaders. Homer regularly discusses shared territory of origin, individual places of origin, leadership, and people of origin when introducing both Achaian and Trojan contingents. The lineage of the groups' leaders is also commonly related. And, of course, identity as an Achaian, Trojan, or ally is built into the very structure of the catalogues. Intermittently, the catalogues also provide other information about social units or community identity, such as the structure and makeup of military contingents or the importance of regional heroes.

The range of Greek terms used in the catalogues also resembles the vocabulary of the face-to-face encounters. Proper names of persons, places, and peoples, however, predominate, while abstract terms are less common. Households appear with the term *δόμος*. Individual places of origin are denoted by many terms for geographic features, as well as by *πτολίεθρον*, which Homer uses interchangeably with *πόλις* throughout the catalogue. No abstract term for region occurs, although the structure of the catalogues is based upon the existence of territorial entities, which are repeatedly, if not invariably, named. Groups of people are designated by the terms *ἔθνος*, *φῦλον*, and *φρήτρη* in the introduction to the Catalogue of Ships, while *φῦλον* and compounds of it also occurs within the catalogues themselves. *Δῆμος* appears, but is used in an unusual context: Athens is called the *δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος*, the "*demos* of Erechtheus," which may be one of the few instances where Homer invokes a regional or "national" hero in at least partial accordance with J. Hall's theory about ethnicity and putative descent. Leadership is again denoted by a range of words, including *ἄναξ*, *ἐμβασιλεύω*, *ἄρξω*, *ἡγέομαι*, *ἄγω*. Distinctions between Trojans and allies are reinforced within the catalogues by Homer's application of terms such as *τηλόθεν* to allied contingents, denoting distance from Troy,

as well as designation of the Karians as *βαρβαροφώνοι*. Overall, however, the poet usually chooses simply to name persons, places, and peoples in the catalogue, and the nature of the entity named must be determined from context.

Only a handful of works deal extensively with either the Catalogue of Ships or the Trojan Catalogue, although many books and articles touch upon one aspect or another of the Catalogues.[1] Most of these works address the nature and origin of the Catalogues, or attempt to determine the specific period of Greek prehistory the Catalogues reflect.[2] *The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's Iliad* by R. Hope Simpson and J. F. Lazenby does this, with further attention paid to relating places mentioned in the Catalogues to archaeological sites. The purpose of this book, as stated by the authors in the Introduction, is to demonstrate how far and in what sense the Catalogue of Ships preserves a memory of Mycenaean Greece.[3] After a comparison of the material and non-material elements of the Homeric versus the Mycenaean and Iron Age worlds, Hope Simpson and Lazenby devote most of their book to a gazetteer of the places mentioned in the Catalogue of Ships, organized by contingent, including citations of ancient authors who mention the sites in question and proposed correlations with archaeological excavations.[4] Many entries also include detailed discussions of geography, and Hope Simpson and Lazenby provide numerous maps proposing a Homeric geography derived from the Catalogue. Their contingent-by-contingent

---

[1] Only bibliography directly pertaining to Book II of the *Iliad* is dealt with here. Secondary works concerning social groups and the conceptualization of identity in Archaic Greece are discussed in Chapter I, while works about specific terms in Homer, such as the *πόλις* or *ἔθνος*, are considered in Chapter IV.

[2] This is the primary concern of the relevant sections of Willcock 1970, and D. L. Page, *History and the Homeric Iliad* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959), as well as the works discussed at length below. See also Scully 1990, Chapter VI notes 48 and 49, where he presents a succinct bibliography covering the dispute over the origin, nature, date, and historicity of the Catalogue of Ships. For a more recent argument proposing a later date for the Catalogue, see J. K. Anderson, "The Geometric Catalogue of Ships," in *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Vermeule*, edd. J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris (Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995): 181-92.

[3] R. Hope Simpson and J. F. Lazenby, *The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's Iliad* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1970), 10. The Introduction deals with the dating of the period depicted in the poems based on material evidence (pp. 1-5) and non-material indicators (e.g. burial customs, religious belief, government operation, pp. 5-10). On the dating and origin of the Homeric poems more generally, see Van Wees 10ff (also 36-40 on other aspects of the Catalogue of Ships).

[4] Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970, 15-152.

commentary is followed by a conclusion in which the authors discuss at length the nature of the Catalogue and argue that the Catalogue is most representative of the late Mycenaean Greek world, with a few possible earlier and later intrusions.[5] Finally, the authors include an Appendix concerning the Trojan Catalogue, tentatively asserting that it best represents the same period, but acknowledging the difficulties inherent in defending this position.[6] Hope Simpson and Lazenby, for the most part, concentrate on correlating the places mentioned in the Catalogue with archaeological sites and applying this information to a discussion of the historicity of the poem—to subjects not at issue in this chapter. Some of their observations, especially concerning the status of contingent leaders and details about geographic locations are, however, relevant to the following discussion and will be noted below in the appropriate context.

S. Scully's *Homer and the Sacred City*, although mostly concerned with Homer's conception of the *πόλις* and its role in the poems, also addresses the nature of the sites mentioned in the Catalogues.[7] Scully, like Hope Simpson and Lazenby, explores the origin, nature, and historicity of the Catalogues, including a discussion of Homeric geography.[8] Most importantly for the present context, Scully discusses the significance of the epithets used by Homer to describe the places mentioned in the catalogue. Scully argues that most of the places mentioned in the Catalogue were thought of as *πόλεις* by poet and his audience, and that epithets like "grassy," "deep in meadows," and "beautiful" were common epithets used to describe *πόλεις* in Book II and elsewhere in Homer.[9] Indeed, Scully devotes an entire Appendix to "Nature and Technology in place Epithets."[10] Although this appendix deals with the entire Homeric corpus, much of the data Scully presents is derived from the Catalogues in Book II. The principal difference between Scully's analysis and that found below is his willingness to ascribe

---

[5] Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970, 153-75.

[6] Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970, 176-83.

[7] The broader implications of Scully's work will be considered in Chapter IV.

[8] Scully 1990, 94-95.

[9] Scully 1990, 21-22; see also 94-95.

[10] Scully 1990, 129-36.

"natural" and geographic epithets to *πόλεις*, whereas I have tended to consider these epithets inconclusive, or tentatively suggested that they may refer to geographic features or regions instead of cities, villages, or towns. Instead, I have firmly categorized as *πόλεις* only those sites mentioned in the Catalogues to which Homer gives what Scully calls "technological" epithets, i.e. those which indicate the construction of man-made buildings or fortifications.[11] In any case, the frequent difficulty in distinguishing between *πόλεις* and other topographic or geographic features reinforces my proposition that the *πόλις* in Homer represents only the built city, and is no more significant, with respect to ideas about identity and origin, than other types of places mentioned in the catalogues and elsewhere.

G. S. Kirk's analysis in *The Iliad: A Commentary* supports Scully's generous view that most places named in the catalogues should be considered *πόλεις*. Kirk asserts that towns formed the vast majority of sites, interspersed with a few regions, mountains, rivers or other landmarks.[12] He further divides epithets into five categories: "well-built town," "rocky, steep, high," "fertile, broad, by sea/river," "lovely, holy, rich," and "others." Each of the five categories is further divided into "specific" epithets, which firmly identify a place in the respective category, and epithets that merely imply a particular categorization.[13] Still, Kirk goes on to contend that the epithets used in the catalogue are rather generic, adding, "Most ancient towns in Greece fitted easily under one or more of these headings."[14] Kirk later admits, "other descriptions are much vaguer" and including "holy," "lovely," "flowering," "grassy," "rocky," "rough," and

---

[11] In addition, of course, to any place that Homer plainly describes as a *πόλις* or *πτολίεθρον*. For "natural" epithets, see Scully 1990, 129-30; for "technological," 131-34; for those Scully considers ambiguous, 134-36.

[12] Kirk 1985, I:173.

[13] Kirk 1985, I:173-75. I disagree with some of Kirk's conclusions about which epithets are certain and which are questionable.

[14] Kirk 1985, I:175. Indeed, many sites, whether towns or not, could carry these epithets.

"steep."[15] Finally, following an exposition about the typical placement of place-name epithets within specific passages, Kirk asserts that

> The catalogue's place-name epithets, already seen to be for the most part very general in meaning, are also usually arbitrary in distribution, depending as they do to some considerable extent on the rigid and conventionalized arrangement of these particular verses.[16]

I agree with Kirk's assessment that place-names in the Catalogue tend to be vague or ambiguous, and as a result advocate a more conservative reading of the passage. I do not, however, categorize a site as a *πόλις* (or as a geographic feature) unless Homer employs an epithet that unambiguously indicates the nature of the site in question.

Most of what has been written about the Catalogues of *Iliad* book II concerns the nature and historicity of individual places mentioned. Although the nature of these sites is an interesting and important part of the formulation of community in the Catalogues, it is only a part of the overall picture. Individual places of origin form part of a matrix of identity, which also includes a shared territory of origin, membership in a named group of people, and loyalty to particular leader.[17] The complexity of identities, group and individual, displayed in the Catalogue of Ships and the Trojan Catalogue warrant careful examination because of the comparatively slight attention this line of inquiry has received and the valuable information provided by the Catalogues about the Homeric vocabulary of identity.

---

[15] Kirk 1985, I:176. The context of these comments is Kirk's argument against a "a purposeful source-document like a muster-list, [particularly] a Mycenaean one," but the argument is equally applicable to a determination of the nature of the sites most commonly referred to by Homer when describing the places of origin of the contingents in the Catalogues.

[16] Kirk 1985, I:177.

[17] Not every contingent displays each category of identity in the Catalogues of Book II. Both Kirk and Peter Loptson, "Pelasgikon Argos in the Catalogue of Ships (681)," *Mnemosyne* XXXIV facsimile 1-2 (1981): 136-38, recognize and discuss the repeated patterns of categorization which occur in the Catalogues. See below.

The Achaians

The Catalogue of Ships: Prelude

In the prelude to the Catalogue of Ships, Agamemnon, responding to Nestor's advice, dispatches heralds to summon the Achaians to battle. At the very beginning of the catalogue of ships, Agamemnon is placed firmly in his role as overlord of the Achaian force:

> *οἱ δ' ἀμφ' Ἀτρεΐωνα διοτρεφέες βασιλῆες*
> *ϑῦνον κρίνοντες...*[18]
>
> And they, the god-supported kings, about Agamemnon
> ran marshalling the men...

Despite being kings, *βασιλῆες*, at his word the leaders surrounding Agamemnon rush about to gather the army, *ϑῦνον κρίνοντες*. Agamemnon is presented as an overlord of other *βασιλῆες*, uniting in his own person the contingents of the Achaians through his leadership.

> Soon, as Athena carries the aegis among the Achaians:
>
> *τοῖσι δ' ἄφαρ πόλεμος γλυκίων ηένετ' ἠὲ νέεσϑαι*
> *ἐν νηυσὶ γλαφυρῇσι φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν.*[19]
>
> And now battle became sweeter to them than to go back
> in their hollow ships to the beloved land of their fathers.

Homer offers a contrast between the two choices faced by the Achaians: engaging in war, *πόλεμος*, or sailing back to their paternal homeland, *πατρίδα γαῖαν*. Despite the fact that Homer is preparing to introduce the various contingents of the Achaian army, the phrase *πατρίδα γαῖαν* appears here, as elsewhere, in the singular; the Achaians are seen by Homer as in some sense coming from the same land.[20] Furthermore, the phrase is used in an explicit comparison between the state of war and a rejection of war in favor of a homecoming, implying a unity among the Achaians distinct from that which

---

[18] *Il.* II.445-46.

[19] *Il.* II.453-54.

[20] See Chapter V below for a discussion of Panhellenism.

arises from their common battle against the Trojans or their shared subordination to Agamemnon.

Now, for the first time in the *Iliad*, the army of the Achaians is arrayed for battle. To emphasize the size and splendor of the Achaian army, Homer employs a series of four similes, which he places between Agamemnon's summoning of the army and the actual roster of Achaian leaders and contingents.[21] The first compares the gleam of Achaian bronze to the blaze of a forest fire. Of more interest, the second and third similes emphasize the multitude of men present, comparing their number to that of the winged birds and swarming flies:

> *τῶν δ' ὥς τ' ὀρνίθων πετεηνῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ*
> *χηνῶν ἢ γεράνων ἢ κύκνων δουλιχοδείρων*
> *Ἀσίῳ ἐν λειμῶνι+ Καϋστρίου+ ἀμφὶ+ ῥέεθρα+*
> *ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα ποτῶνται ἀγαλλόμενα πτερύγεσσι*
> *κλαγγηδὸν προκαθιζόντων, σμαραγεῖ δέ τε λειμών,*
> *ὣς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων*
> *ἐς πεδίον προχέοντο Σκαμάνδριον· αὐτὰρ ὑπὸ χθὼν*
> *σμερδαλέον κονάβιζε ποδῶν αὐτῶν τε καὶ ἵππων.*
> *ἔσταν δ' ἐν λειμῶνι Σκαμανδρίῳ ἀνθεμόεντι*
> *μυρίοι, ὅσσά τε φύλλα καὶ ἄνθεα γίγνεται ὥρῃ.*
> *ἠΰτε μυιάων ἀδινάων ἔθνεα πολλὰ*
> *αἵ τε κατὰ σταθμὸν ποιμνήϊον ἠλάσκουσιν*
> *ὥρῃ ἐν εἰαρινῇ ὅτε τε γλάγος ἄγγεα δεύει,*
> *τόσσοι ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ*
> *ἐν πεδίῳ ἵσταντο διαρραῖσαι μεμαῶτες.*[22]

> These, as the multitudinous nations of birds winged,
> of geese, and of cranes, and of swans long-throated
> in the Asian meadow beside the Kaÿstrian waters
> this way and that way make their flights in the pride of their wings, then
> settle in clashing swarms and the whole meadow echoes with them,
> so of these the multitudinous tribes from the ships and
> shelters poured to the plain of Skamandros, and the earth beneath their
> feet and under the feet of their horses thundered horribly.
> They took position in the blossoming meadow of Skamandros,
> thousands of them, as leaves and flowers appear in their season.
> Like the multitudinous nations of swarming insects

---

[21] See Kirk 1985, I:162-63.

[22] *Il.* II.459-73.

> who drive hither and thither about the stalls of the sheepfold
> in the season of spring when the milk splashes in the milk pails:
> in such numbers the flowing-haired Achaians stood up
> through the plain against the Trojans, hearts burning to break them.

Both passages begin with a group of animals, designated by the term ἔθνος, to which the multitude of Achaians is then compared: flocks of winged birds in the first passage, ὀρνίθων πετεηνῶν ἔθνεα, and swarms of flies in the second ἀδινάων ἐθνεα. The first passage, moreover, uses the same term, ἔθνεα, to describe the Greek contingents. In the second passage, the term is used only with reference to the animals in the simile. The two Homeric meanings of the term are superimposed: ἔθνος can mean "a number of people living together, company, body of men" or, more basically, any collection of animals, including men.[23] The use and meaning of the term ἔθνος will be explored in more length in Chapter IV below, but I contend that although it has not yet acquired its specific, post-Homeric, meaning of a nation or people, it still represents a critical, if fluid, component of identity in Homer.[24] The idea of multiplicity and numerousness, imparted by the term ἔθνος, conveyed by the second and third similes—and indeed, implied by the first as well—is counterbalanced by the reiteration that all the men are Achaians, united in their wish to destroy the men of Troy, τόσσοι ἐπὶ Τρώεσσι κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοὶ / ἐν πεδίῳ ἵσταντο διαρραῖσαι μεμαῶτες. In this statement, the military purpose which joins the Achaians together calls to mind the role of Agamemnon as war leader, the basis for common identity in lines 445-46.

The counterpoint of multiplicity and unity is continued in the fourth and final simile, where the marshalling of the Achaians is compared to the ordering of flocks of goats:

> τοὺς δ' ὥς τ' αἰπόλια πλατέ' αἰγῶν αἰπόλοι ἄνδρες
> ῥεῖα διακρίνωσιν ἐπεί κε νομῷ μιγέωσιν,
> ὥς τοὺς ἡγεμόνες διεκόσμεον ἔνθα καὶ ἔνθα
> ὑσμίνην δ' ἰέναι, μετὰ δὲ κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων
> ὄμματα καὶ κεφαλὴν ἴκελος Διὶ τερπικεραύνῳ,
> Ἄρεϊ δὲ ζώνην, στέρνον δὲ Ποσειδάωνι.

---

[23] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "ἔθνος" (1); compare Autenrieth idem.

[24] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "ἔθνος" (2).

ἠΰτε βοῦς ἀγέληφι μέγ' ἔξοχος ἔπλετο πάντων
ταῦρος· ὃ γάρ τε βόεσσι μεταπρέπει ἀγρομένῃσι·
τοῖον ἄρ' Ἀτρεΐδην Θῆκε Ζεὺς ἤματι κείνῳ
ἐκπρεπέ' ἐν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἔξοχον ἡρώεσσιν.[25]

These, as men who are goatherds among the wide goatflocks
easily separate them in order as they take to the pasture,
thus the leaders separated them this way and that way
toward the encounter, and among them powerful Agamemnon,
with eyes and head like Zeus who delights in thunder,
like Ares for girth, and with the chest of Poseidon;
like some ox of the herd pre-eminent among the others,
a bull, who stands conspicuous in the huddling cattle;
such was the son of Atreus as Zeus made him that day,
conspicuous among men, and foremost among the fighters.

On the one hand, the individual leaders of the contingents separate, *διακρίνωσιν*, and marshal their own men, as a goatherd divides his own sheep out from a common flock. On the other hand, the god-like figure of Agamemnon, *ἐκπρεπέ' ἐν πολλοῖσι καὶ ἔξοχον ἡρώεσσιν*, "conspicuous among men, and foremost among the fighters" towers over all others, a point of focus for the passage and the embodiment of Achaian common purpose. Just as the prelude to the Catalogue of Ships began with Agamemnon dispatching heralds to summon the kings of the Achaians, each of whom then marshaled his own men, it concludes with an image of those leaders, still overshadowed by Agamemnon, separating their men from the multitude. In both cases, the duality of distinction between the contingents led by their own kings and the pre-eminence of Agamemnon over these kings emerges.

After the series of four similes, the poet's final statement before beginning the Catalogue of Ships emphasizes the role of the leaders in ordering the vast number of men:

ἔσπετε νῦν μοι Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι·
ὑμεῖς γὰρ θεαί ἐστε πάρεστέ τε ἴστέ τε πάντα,
ἡμεῖς δὲ κλέος οἷον ἀκούομεν οὐδέ τι ἴδμεν·
οἵ τινες ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι ἦσαν·
πληθὺν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω,
οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι, δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν,

[25] *Il.* II.474-83.

φωνὴ δ' ἄρρηκτος, χάλκεον δέ μοι ἦτορ ἐνείη,
εἰ μὴ Ὀλυμπιάδες Μοῦσαι Διὸς αἰγιόχοιο
θυγατέρες μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον·
ἀρχοὺς αὖ νηῶν ἐρέω νῆάς τε προπάσας.[26]

Tell me now, you Muses who have your homes on Olympos.
For you, who are goddesses, are there, and you know all things,
and we have heard only the rumour of it and know nothing.
Who then of those were the chief men and lords of the Danaans?
I could not tell over the multitude of them nor name them,
not if I had ten tongues and ten mouths, not if I had
a voice never to be broken and a heart of bronze within me,
not unless the Muses of Olympia, daughters
of Zeus of the aegis, remembered all those who came beneath Ilion.
I will tell the lords of the ships, and the ships numbers.

Homer calls on the Muses to tell him who the ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι, "chief men and lords of the Danaans" were. A distinction emerges between ἡγεμόνες and κοίρανοι on the one hand and the πληθύν, multitude, on the other. Moreover, the great size of the πληθύν, as indicated by Homer's lament that he cannot tell of or name them all, οὐκ ἂν ἐγὼ μυθήσομαι οὐδ' ὀνομήνω, is counterbalanced by a plea to the Muses: μνησαίαθ' ὅσοι ὑπὸ Ἴλιον ἦλθον, "[recall to my mind] all those who came beneath Ilion." Again, the common purpose of the Achaian host counterbalances its enormous size. As the passage ends, focus returns to the leaders, this time referred to by the word ἀρχούς, who are the agents for bringing order to the multitude.

A hierarchy of identity emerges in the introduction to the Catalogue of Ships: individual contingents are called ἔθνεα and led by ἡγεμόνες, κοίρανοι, or ἀρχοί, but all are considered Achaians under the supreme authority of Agamemnon, an ἄναξ who is "conspicuous among men, and foremost among the fighters." Both the inclusive term for all who oppose the Trojans (Achaian or Danaan), and the term used to describe each contingent in the succeeding Catalogue of Ships (ἔθνος), are at least partly defined by who in the hierarchy of leadership commands them.

---

[26] *Il.* II.484-93.

The Achaian Contingents

The Boiotians are the first contingent described by Homer. As is typical in the Catalogue, Homer begins by stating the name of the contingent and its leaders:

> *Βοιωτῶν μὲν Πηνέλεως καὶ Λήϊτος ἦρχον*
> *Ἀρκεσίλαός τε Προθοήνωρ τε Κλονίος τε,*[27]
>
> Leïtos and Peneleos were leaders of the Boiotians,
> with Arkesilaos and Prothoenor and Klonios;

In this case, those who led, *ἦρχον*, the Boiotians are identified only by their relationship with the contingent they lead. Homer immediately moves on to a list of the places the Boiotians held or dwelt within (*ἔχους* or *νέμους*).[28] This list of place-names makes up thirteen of the seventeen lines of the Boiotian entry in the Catalogue of Ships.[29] A total of twenty-nine places are named. Most of these place names are unqualified, but those that are described provide indications of how the poet and his audience conceived of territorial control. Of the place names that are elaborated by descriptive terms, the majority, four, are geographic in nature: *Αὐλίδα πετρήεσσαν*, rocky Aulis; *πολύκνημόν τ' Ἐτεωνόν*, "the hill-bends of Eteonos;" *ποιήενθ' Ἁλίαρτον*, grassy Haliartos; *πολυστάφυλον Ἄρνην*, Arne, rich in vines.[30] One more indicates proximity to the sea: *Ἀνθεδόνα τ' ἐσχατόωσαν*, Anthedon on the seashore.[31] Two are specifically described as "citadels": *Μεδεῶνά τ', ἐυκτίμενον πτολίεθρον*, "Medeon, the strong-founded citadel;" *Ὑποθήβας...ἐυκτίμενον πτολίεθρον*, "lower Thebes, the strong-founded citadel."[32] Another is explicitly sacred in nature: *Ὀγχηστόν θ' ἱερὸν Ποσιδήϊον ἀγλαὸν*

---

[27] *Il.* II.494-95.

[28] The verbs used to indicate place of origin include: *νέμους* used twice, in lines 496 and 499; and *ἔχους*, used four times, in lines 500, 504, 505, and 507.

[29] *Il.* II.496-508 list the places of origin of the Boiotians; the first two lines, 495-96, name the leaders of the Boiotians, while the final two lines, 509-10, give the number of the ships and men in the Boiotian contingent.

[30] Aulis: *Il.* II.496; Etenos: 497; Haliartos: 503; Arne: 507.

[31] *Il.* II.508.

[32] Medon: *Il.* II.501; Lower Thebes: 505.

ἄλσος, "Onchestos the sacred, the shining grove of Poseidon."[33] The Boiotians, then, form a recognizable group based primarily on the places they control, including includes cities, geographical areas, and sacred sites. Secondarily, they are defined by the identity of the men they follow, although no further information about either the relationship between rulers and ruled or the identity of the leaders themselves is provided.[34] These two concepts, territory and kingship, define group identity throughout the Catalogue of Ships.

Homer does not even provide a collective name for the second contingent he introduces, calling them simply:

> οἳ δ' Ἀσπληδόνα ναῖον ἰδ' Ὀρχομενὸν Μινύειον,
> τῶν ἦρχ' Ἀσκάλαφος καὶ Ἰάλμενος υἷες Ἄρηος[35]
>
> But they who lived in Aspledon and Orchomenos of the Minyai,
> Askalphos led these, and Ialmenos, children of Ares

Only the names of the places dwelt in (ναῖον) by the people making up this contingent, and the names of those who led them (ἦρχ') are provided. It appears that, at least in certain cases, nothing more abstract than territorial control and personal leadership binds a contingent together. Few other details are provided about the locations named. Orchomenos is modified in the passage by the adjective Μινύειος, indicating the stock of the inhabitants of that location, but not necessarily of the contingent as a whole—neither here nor elsewhere in the *Iliad*, for example, are Askalphos or Ialmenos called Minyan. Homer does, however, provide more detail about, the leaders of this contingent: οὓς τέκεν Ἀστυόχη δόμῳ Ἄκτορος Ἀζεΐδαο, "whom Astyoche bore to him in the house of Aktor."[36] In this case, Homer elaborates upon the identity of the leaders of the contingent by naming their parents, the patriarch of the δόμος, house, into which they were born (perhaps specified because of the special circumstances of their

---

[33] *Il.* II.506.

[34] Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970. 168; Conclusions, notes 100; 101, relate the fact that the Boiotian leaders receive no lengthy genealogy to the dating and origin of the Catalogue, arguing against a significant contribution to the epics by Boiotian poets.

[35] *Il.* II.511-12.

[36] *Il.* II.513.

conception: the secret union of Astyoche and a god), and the father of that patriarch. Two generations is typical of the depth of genealogy explored in the Catalogue. Defining the identity of contingent leaders through genealogy proves an important component of individual identity in the Catalogue, as in the face-to-face encounters described above. About the people who constitute this contingent, however, Homer provides no further information; their identity rests on their places of origin and shared leadership.

Next, Homer turns to the Phokians, who are promptly given a collective name:

αὐτὰρ Φωκήων Σχεδίος καὶ Ἐπίστροφος ἦρχον
υἱὲς Ἰφίτου μεγαθύμου Ναυβολίδαο,[37]

Schedios and Epistrophos led the men of Phokis,
children of Iphitos, who was son of great-hearted Naubolos

The poet begins with the collective name of the contingent, then immediately states the names of the contingent's leaders, Schedios and Epistrophos, followed by their lineage for two generations. Homer then goes on to list the places controlled (*ἔχον* or *ἔναιον*) by the Phokians. Again, these areas include locations explicitly described as either geographical regions or population centers. Geographical names include: *Πυθῶνά τε πετρήεσσαν*, rocky Pytho; *ποταμὸν Κηφισὸν*, the river Kephisos, *Λίλαιαν ἔχον πηγῆς ἔπι Κηφισοῖο*, Lilaia by the wellsprings of Kephisos.[38] The city mentioned is *Ὑάμπολιν*, Hyampolis, the nature of which is indicated by its name.[39] Two lines name the contingent and its leaders, while a further five denote its places of origin. The description of the Phokians ends with the image of the leaders ordering their contingent for battle: finally, the Phokians are arrayed next to the Boiotians, *Βοιωτῶν δ' ἔμπλην ἐπ' ἀριστερὰ ζωρήσσοντο*, linking them closely to this contingent.[40] The description of the Phokians is fairly typical: the lengthiest section of the passage deals with territorial control, while the leadership is briefly named. Additionally, Homer provides two

[37] *Il.* II.517-18.

[38] *Il.* II.519-23.

[39] *Il.* II.521.

[40] *Il.* II.526.

generations of lineage to elaborate the personal identity of the leaders, and establishes a connection between the Phokian and Boiotian contingents.

The Lokrians, led by Aias the lesser, follow in the catalogue. Like the other Catalogue entries, the identity of the contingent's leader and its places of origin are discussed. Four lines are spent describing the leader of the contingent, Aias the lesser:

> *Λοκρῶν δ' ἡγεμόνευεν Ὀϊλῆος ταχὺς Αἴας*
> *μείων, οὔ τι τόσος γε ὅσος Τελαμώνιος Αἴας*
> *ἀλλὰ πολὺ μείων· ὀλίγος μὲν ἔην λινοθώρηξ,*
> *ἐγχείῃ δ' ἐκέκαστο Πανέλληνας καὶ Ἀχαιούς·*[41]
>
> Swift Aias son of Oïleus led the men of Lokris,
> the lesser Aias, not great in size like the son of Telamon,
> but far slighter. He was a small man armoured in linen,
> yet with the throwing spear surpassed all Achaians and Hellenes.

Homer introduces Aias the Lesser as the son of Oïleus, and immediately compares him to Telamonian Aias, establishing a relationship between the two warriors which will endure throughout the *Iliad*. Afterward, Homer makes the unusual statement that Aias *ἐγχείῃ δ' ἐκέκαστο Πανέλληνας καὶ Ἀχαιούς*, surpasses Panhellenes and Achaians with the spear. This is the only occurrence of the term *Πανέλληνες* in Homer; *Ἕλληνες* also occurs only once.[42] Rarely is another collective noun paired with Achaian, Danaan, or Argive when describing the Greeks as a whole, indicating not only a narrower definition for the terms Panhellenes, and Hellenes, but the unusual relationship between these groups and the Achaians as a whole.[43] After this description of Aias, his parentage, and status among the Achaians, nine places controlled by the Lokrians follow in the next three lines. All but one, *Βοαγρίου...ῥέεθρα*, the streams of Boagrios, are unqualified. It is stated, however, that the Lokrians *ναίουσι πέρην ἱερῆς Εὐβοίης*, "dwell across from sacred Euboia," providing more information about the geographical extent and location of the Lokrian homeland. Thus, the group identity of the Lokrians is again defined by the places it inhabits and the name of its leader, although in this case a greater than

---

[41] *Il.* II.527-30.

[42] *Il.* II.684.

[43] See Chapter V below.

usual number of lines and amount of detail are dedicated to describing the leader of the contingent. In this passage, Homer also provides a rare clue about the ambiguous relationship between Hellenes/Panhellenes and Achaians.

Next, Homer turns to the Abantes, from Euboia: *Οἳ δ' Εὔβοιαν ἔξον μένεα πνείοντες Ἄβαντες*, "They who held Euboia, the Abantes, whose wind was fury."[44] Although this passage begins with the phrase *Οἳ δ' Εὔβοιαν ἔξον*, they who held Euboia, it ends with the collective noun *Ἄβαντες*. Indeed, in this ten-line entry in the Catalogue, the term *Ἄβαντες* occurs three times, while Euboia is named only once. The Abantes, together with the Epeians and the Myrmidons, are one of the only contingents to have a name not derived from the name of their region of origin. More typically, Homer goes on to devote four lines listing eight places held by the Abantes.[45] The adjectives applied to one, *πολυστάφυλόν τ' Ἱστίαιαν*, Histiaia rich in vines, indicate it is a geographical region, while another is described as a citadel, *Δίου τ' αἰπὺ πτολίεθρον*, the steep citadel of Dion. The other six place names are unqualified. The contingent leader, Elephenor is then introduced in the fifth line of the passage. He is described as the son of Chalkodon, and his position as leader is stated three times in as many lines:

> *τῶν αὖθ' ἡγεμόνευ' Ἐλεφήνωρ, ὄζος Ἄρηος,*
> *Χαλκωδοντιάδης, μεγαθύμων ἀρξὸς Ἀβαντων.*
> *τῷ δ' ἅμ' Ἄβαντες ἕποντο θοοί...*[46]
>
> of these the leader was Elephenor, scion of Ares,
> son of Chalkodon and lord of the great-hearted Abantes.
> And the running Abantes followed with him...

The bases of identity for the Abantes are typical, with their leader and places of origin discussed. The Abantes, however, are one of the only contingents whose collective name is not related to the name of their region of origin.

The Athenians follow. Homer does not introduce them with a collective noun, referring to this contingent simply as "they who held Athens":

> *οἳ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον*

---

[44] *Il.* II.536.

[45] *Il.* II.536-39.

[46] *Il.* II.540-42.

δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος...[47]

But the men who held Athens, the strong-founded citadel,
the deme of great-hearted Erechtheus...

Later in the passage, however, Homer employs a collective term for the Athenians when he mentions the κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων, youths of the Athenians.[48] Unlike most of the other contingents, no list of place names occurs in this passage; Athens is the only location named. Athens itself, however, is described at some length. It is a εὐκτίμενον πτολίεθρον, strong-founded citadel, and the δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος, "δῆμος of Erechtheus." The uniqueness of Athens emerges quickly; for the first time in the catalogue, the term δῆμος is employed, a usage made more significant because no location other than Athens itself is mentioned. It is also unusual for Homer to present as much detail about the founding hero of the city, Erechtheus. The poet continues:

...ὅν ποτ' Ἀθήνη
θρέψε Διὸς θυγάτηρ, τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος ἄρουρα,
κὰδ δ' ἐν Ἀθήνης εἶσεν ἑῷ ἐν πίονι νηῷ·
ἔνθα δέ μιν ταύροισι καὶ ἀρνειοῖς ἱλάονται
κοῦροι Ἀθηναίων περιτελλομένων ἐνιαυτῶν·[49]

...whom once there
Zeus' daughter tended after the grain-giving fields had born him,
and established him to be in Athens in her own rich temple;
there as the circling years go by the sons of the Athenians
make propitiation with rams and bulls sacrificed

The autochthonous origin of Erechtheus is introduced, as Homer states that τέκε δὲ ζείδωρος ἄρουρα, "the earth, the giver of grain, bore him." The patronage of Athena is also stated, both as nurturer of the hero and as patron deity whose presence in Athens even before the advent of Erechtheus is implied, since she deposits him ἑῷ ἐν πίονι νηῷ, in her own rich temple. Homer also includes a line concerning an ongoing religious festival in Athens propitiating Erechtheus, one of the few etiological digressions in the Catalogue. All told, Homer spends four lines describing Erechtheus, a unique tribute to

---

[47] *Il.* II.546-47.

[48] *Il.* II.551.

[49] *Il.* II.547-51.

an ancestral hero in the catalogue. The bulk of the remainder of the passage is devoted to Menestheus, son of Peteos, leader of the Athenians. Four lines are devoted to Menestheus:

> *τῶν αὖθ' ἡγεμόνευ' υἱὸς Πετεῶο Μενεσθεύς+.*
> *τῷ δ' οὔ πώ τις ὁμοῖος ἐπιχθόνιος γένετ' ἀνὴρ*
> *κοσμῆσαι ἵππους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἀσπιδιώτας·*
> *Νέστωρ οἶος ἔριζεν· ὃ γὰρ προγενέστερος ἦεν·*[50]
>
> of these men the leader was Peteos' son Menestheus.
> Never on earth before had there been a man born like him
> for the arrangement in order of horses and shielded fighters.
> Nestor alone could challenge him, since he was far older.

Three lines are dedicated to describing his excellence in *κοσμῆσαι ἵππους τε καὶ ἀνέρας ἀσπιδιώτας*, "the arrangement in order of horses and shielded fighters," emphasizing again the organizational role of a contingent leader. Homer's description of the Athenians proves to be somewhat unusual. Their identity is based on a specific, singular locale. Homer pays unique tribute to Erechtheus, intimately relating the *δῆμος* of Athens with this early hero. Erechtheus, conspicuously born of the *ἄρουρα*, the earth or the fields, appears to serve in the capacity of a cult figure, associated closely with Athena, her temple, and her worship. Notably, however, he is not Athens' founder or the "ancestor" of the Athenians as a whole, casting some doubt on whether he fills the role ascribed by J. Hall to the figure which serves as progenitor of an "ethnic" group. More typically, the Athenian leader, Menestheus, is named and further identified by his father, Peteos, while his role in bringing order (*κοσμῆσαι*) to his forces is emphasized.

Homer next includes only a brief, two-line mention of Aias—without even his usual epithet Telamonian:

> *Αἴας δ' ἐκ Σαλαμῖνος ἄγεν δυοκαίδεκα νῆας,*
> *στῆσε δ' ἄγων+ ἵν' Ἀθηναίων ἵσταντο φάλαγγες.*[51]
>
> Out of Salamis Aias brought twelve ships and placed them
> next to where the Athenian battalions were drawn up.

---

[50] *Il.* II.452-55.

[51] *Il.* II.557-58.

Homer states simply that he led twelve ships from Salamis and stationed them by the Athenians. Again, only one place-name, Salamis itself, is mentioned. The briefness of this entry in the Catalogue of Ships may reflect the prominence of Aias, combined with small size and relative insignificance of the contingent he leads.

Somewhat more time is spent on the next contingent. No collective name is provided for the men who follow Diomedes. Instead, nine place names are mentioned, including one which is clearly a citadel, *Τίρυνθά τε τειχιόεσσαν*, "Tiryns of the huge walls," and another which refers to a larger, agricultural area, *ἀμπελόεντ' Ἐπίδαυρον*, "Epidauros of the vineyards."[52] Argos is mentioned, but it is not qualified in any way, making it impossible to determine whether Homer here has a city or a region in mind.[53] Two other sites, Hermione and Asine, are used to demarcate a geographic area (a "deep gulf"): *Ἑρμιόνην Ἀσίνην τε, βαθὺν κατὰ κόλπον ἐχούσας*.[54] Homer states that another two locations, Aigina and Mases, are held by the youths of the Achaians: *οἵ τ' ἔχον Αἴγιναν Μάσητά τε κοῦροι Ἀχαιῶν*.[55] After spending four lines describing the homeland of this contingent, an additional five lines describe the three named leaders of this contingent: Diomedes, Sthenelos, and Euryalos. Despite the fact that one of the rulers, Euryalos, is described as the son of a king, Mekisteus, *Μηκιστέος υἱὸς...ἄνακτος*, it is clear that Diomedes, whose name both begins and ends the list of leaders, is the principal ruler; the description of the leaders ends with the phrase, *συμπάντων δ' ἡγεῖτο βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Διομήδης*, "but the leader of all was Diomedes of the great war cry."[56] The father of each of the secondary leaders, as well as the grandfather of Euryalos, is named, although Diomedes' father, Tydeus, is not. Again this may be the case because so much time is devoted the Diomedes and his genealogy later in the *Iliad*.[57] With no

---

[52] Tiryns: *Il.* II.559; Epidauros: 561.

[53] *Il.* II.559.

[54] Compare Homer's description of the homeland of the Thracians in the Trojan Catalogue, *Il.* II.845; see discussion below.

[55] *Il.* II.562.

[56] *Il.* II.567.

[57] Especially during his encounter with Glaukos, *Il.* VI.123-211.

collective name provided, this contingent is explicitly bound only by its common places of origin and shared leadership. Finally, leadership of this contingent is hierarchical, with Diomedes himself the overlord of others, one of whom is described as the son of an *ἄναξ*.

Although Homer dedicates seven lines to the individual places held by Agamemnon's contingent, it is given no collective name or shared territory.[58] Twelve locations are listed, including two clearly identified as citadels: *Μυκήνας εἶχον ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον*, Mykenai, the strong-founded citadel, and *ἐϋκτιμένας τε Κλεωνάς*, strong-founded Kleonai. Unlike the other principal leaders, who are not discussed at length in the Catalogue, five lines are devoted to Agamemnon. These lines do not relate genealogical information—only the name of Agamemnon's father is provided. Instead, Homer dwells on Agamemnon's power:

> *τῶν ἑκατὸν νηῶν ἦρχε κρείων Ἀγαμέμνων*
> *Ἀτρεΐδης· ἅμα τῷ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι*
> *λαοὶ ἕποντ'· ἐν δ' αὐτὸς ἐδύσετο νώροπα χαλκὸν*
> *κυδιόων, πᾶσιν δὲ μετέπρεπεν ἡρώεσσιν*
> *οὕνεκ' ἄριστος ἦην πολὺ δὲ πλείστους ἄγε λαούς.*[59]
>
> of their hundred ships the leader was powerful Agamemnon,
> Atreus' son, with whom followed far the best and bravest
> people; and among them he himself stood armoured in shining
> bronze, glorying, conspicuous among the great fighters,
> since he was greatest among them all, and led the most people.

Agamemnon is called *κρείων*, lord; he *ἅμα τῷ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι / λαοὶ ἕποντ'*, leads the most men and the best; he is *πᾶσιν δὲ μετέπρεπεν ἡρώεσσιν*, pre-eminent among all the heroes.[60] Homer ends the passage by restating lines 576-77 in

---

[58] *Il.* II.569-75.

[59] *Il.* II.576-80.

[60] This is one of the few passages in Book II where superior (or inferior) status is directly addressed. For the most part Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970, 7, are correct in asserting that "although some rule more powerful kingdoms or are better fighters than others and so have more authority, basically...they are all regarded as *equals*." Only once does Homer assert the "preeminence" of a warrior in Book II, in his passage describing Agamemnon (II.576-80). Two other times, in the cases of Hektor and—in a negative sense—Nireus, the number and quality of men led are mentioned, but no phrase equivalent to *πᾶσιν δὲ μετέπρεπεν ἡρώεσσιν* is employed (II.675 and 817-18, respectively). Considering this phrase, Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970, 163, appear to overstate their case somewhat when they contend "the

line 580, again emphasizing that Agamemnon leads the most men: *οὕνεκ' ἄριστος ἔην πολὺ δὲ πλείστους ἄγε λαούς*, and led by far the most soldiers. Still, with not even a collective name for the warriors filling his contingent, his own leadership and suzerainty over the places mentioned seems most important in forming whatever group identity his people have. Agamemnon's individual identity, in turn, rests largely on his role as leader of the largest and best contingent, and overlord of the entire expedition—a fact itself dependent upon the size and quality of the force he commands.

Menelaos' contingent follows: *οἳ δ' εἶχον κοίλην Λακεδαίμονα κητώεσσαν*, "They who held the swarming hollow of Lakedaimon."[61] Again, no collective name for the people of the region is given, although Homer considers their land a unified geographical area, *κοίλην Λακεδαίμονα*. A four-line list of nine place-names follows. Of the nine sites named, the nature of only one site is specifically stated: *Ἕλος τ' ἔφαλον πτολίεθρον*, Helos, a citadel by the sea.[62] Homer next spends five lines describing Menelaos. The poet does not relate Menelaos' lineage. Instead, he is introduced simultaneously as the leader of the contingent and as Agamemnon's brother: *τῶν οἱ ἀδελφεὸς ἦρχε βοὴν ἀγαθὸς Μενέλαος*, "of these his brother Menelaos of the great war cry was leader."[63] Despite this statement linking Menelaos and Agamemnon, Homer adds that Menelaos' ships are *ἀπάτερθε δὲ θωρήσσοντο*, "marshaled apart," perhaps because:

> *...μάλιστα δὲ ἵετο θυμῷ*
> *τίσασθαι Ἑλένης ὁρμήματά τε στοναχάς τε.*[64]
>
> ...since above all his heart was eager
> to avenge Helen's longing to escape and her lamentations.

Catalogue contains no hint that Agamemnon had any authority over the other kings." Concerning Hektor, see Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970, Appendix, note 1. Compare *Il.* II.483.

[61] *Il.* II.581.

[62] *Il.* II.584.

[63] *Il.* II.586. Although Agamemnon is not named in the Greek, it is clear from the position and content of the passage that *ἀδελφεὸς* refers to Agamemnon and Menelaus.

[64] *Il.* II.589-90.

Although his brother may lead the expedition, Menelaos has the most direct and personal stake in it. His identity in the Catalogue rests on his role as the spurned husband of Helen, his relationship to Agamemnon, and his leadership of the people of Lakedaimon.

Homer provides relatively little information about the followers of Nestor; six of its twelve lines are a digression on the myth of the Muses' conflict with Thamyris the Thracians.[65] Most of remainder of the passage lists the places of origin of Nestor's men. Nestor's contingent receives neither a collective name for the people nor a name for any unified region of origin. In four lines, Homer lists nine locations, one of them a geographic feature, *Θρύον Ἀλφειοῖο πόρον*, "Thryon, the Alpheios crossing," another a citadel, *εὐκτίτον Αἰπὺ*, "strong-built Aipy," while the remaining seven place names are unqualified.[66] Only one line is devoted to Nestor himself, and again a place-name is invoked; Nestor is described as *Γερήνιος*, of Gerenia, an epithet he carries throughout the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. Nestor's leadership and shared locations of origin are all that explicitly unite this contingent in the Catalogue of Ships, while Nestor's place of origin is the only information provided about the leader himself.

Homer names Arkadia, by contrast, as a geographical unit in the first line of his description of the contingent, and the warriors making up the contingent are later referred to collectively as *Ἀρκάδες*, Arkadians.[67] Ten places besides Arkadia itself are named in six lines.[68] The locations qualified in the list are, primarily, geographical features: *Κυλλήνης ὄρος αἰπύ*, "the sheer peak, Kyllene;" *Ὀρχομενὸν πολύμηλον*, "Orchomenos of the flocks." In addition, the *Αἰπύτιον...τύμβον*, tomb of Aipytos, is also mentioned.[69] The leader of the Arkadians, Agapenor, is called *κρείων*, lord, and presented as the son of Angkaios. Homer makes a final remark concerning the disposition of Arkadia:

---

[65] *Il.* II.594-600.

[66] *Il.* II.592.

[67] *Ἀρκαδίην*: *Il.* II.603; *Ἀρκάδες*: 611.

[68] *Il.* II.603-08.

αὐτὸς γάρ σφιν δῶκεν ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν Ἀγαμέμνων
νῆας ἐϋσσέλμους περάαν ἐπὶ οἴνοπα πόντον
Ἀτρεΐδης, ἐπεὶ οὔ σφι θαλάσσια ἔργα μεμήλει.[70]

Agamemnon the lord of men himself had given
these for the crossing of the wine-blue sea their strong-benched vessels,
Atreus' son, since the work of the sea was nothing to these men..

Some added emphasis is placed on the isolation of Arkadia from the sea, leading to the provision of ships by Agamemnon. This may indicate some relationship between Arkadia and the Argolid or Agapenor and Agamemnon, or simply highlight the wealth and power of Agamemnon, who is able to spare some sixty ships while still bringing a hundred of his own. Overall, Homer's description of the Arkadians and their leader is typical of the more complete entries in the Catalogue: he uses a single term to designate the geographic region of origin and a collective name for its inhabitants, and he names the contingent's leader and his father, while some addition information about the mountainous and landlocked geography of Arkadia is also provided.

Moving through the Peloponnesos, Homer next turns to the Epeians. He provides the collective name of the people of this contingent, and describes the area they control. Like the Abantes and the Myrmidons, the Epeians appear to have a collective name that is not based upon the name of their region of origin. Referred to here as *Βουπράσιόν τε καὶ Ἦλιδα*, Bouprasion and Elis, only eleven lines later Homer uses the term Elis alone to indicate the entire region.[71] The passage concerning the Epeians includes three lines describing their place of origin, followed by seven lines discussing the internal divisions of the Epeian contingent and their leaders. Homer provides six place names; none are described as *πόλεις* or citadels. Instead, the land of the Abantes is described explicitly as a geographical region, with the names of the locations that demarcate its boundaries given:

οἳ δ' ἄρα Βουπράσιόν τε καὶ Ἦλιδα δῖαν ἔναιον
ὅσσον ἐφ' Ὑρμίνῃ καὶ Μύρσινος ἐσχατόωσα

---

[69] Kyllene: *Il.* II.603; Orchomenos: 605; tomb of Aipytos: 604.

[70] *Il.* II.612-14.

[71] In the description of the succeeding contingent in the Catalogue, *Il.* II.626; see below.

πέτρη τ' Ωλενίη καὶ Ἀλήσιον ἐντὸς ἔέργει,[72]

They who lived in Bouprasion and brilliant Elis,
all as much as Hyrmine and Myrsinos the uttermost
and the Olenian rock and Alesion close between them

Of the three places that ἐντὸς ἔέργει, "close between them," the region of Bouprasion and Elis, one is itself described as a geographical feature, the πέτρη τ' Ωλενίη, rock of Olen; the nature of the others is not disclosed, although Myrsinos is ἐσχατόωσα, on the seashore. In any case these places define a geographic region that they bound. Just as the description of the place of origin of this contingent focuses on a geographic region rather than specific cities or citadels, the leadership of the contingent is also unusual in that it appears to consist of four coequal rulers which—unlike the multiple leaders of the contingent of Diomedes, for instance—do not answer to a single overlord. Also, somewhat more attention than usual is given to the genealogy of the Epeian leaders, with three of the four provided with two generations of lineage: the leaders of two sub-contingents are described as:

τῶν μὲν ἄρ' Ἀμφίμαχος καὶ Θάλπιος ἡγησάσθην
υἷες ὃ μὲν Κτεάτου, ὃ δ' ἄρ' Εὐρύτου, Ακτορίωνε·[73]

Of two tens Thalpios and Amphimachos were leaders,
of Aktor's seed, sons one of Kteatos, one of Eurytos

The two leaders appear to be cousins, and their common grandfather, as well as their respective fathers, is named. Likewise, Homer states that the fourth contingent is led by Polyxeinos, son of Agasthenes (accorded the epithet ἄνακτος, king), son of Augeias, again providing two generations of genealogy as well as a royal title, ἄνακτος.[74] Only the third contingent lacks two generations of paternal lineage: it is led by Diores, described only as the son of Amarygnkeus.[75] Homer describes the Epeians with a collective noun, and treats their place of origin as a single region bounded by the place-names he provides. Emphasis is placed upon the region rather than the individual sites

[72] *Il.* II.615-17.

[73] *Il.* II.620-21.

[74] *Il.* II.623-24.

[75] *Il.* II.622.

since, with the exceptions of Bouprasion and Elis (which in some sense designates or constitute the entire region), the only sites mentioned are those bounding the region as a whole. More than the usual information about political organization is also provided; Homer describes four sub-contingents led by peers—without any hierarchy culminating in a single leader—whose lineage in three of the four cases is recounted to the second generation.[76]

Homer now moves from the mainland of the Peloponnesos to the Ionian Islands. Little information is provided about the first insular contingent described by Homer; no collective name for the people or shared territory is provided for this contingent. Homer expends two of six lines on this contingent's place of origin:

> *οἳ δ' ἐκ Δουλιχίοιο Ἐχινάων θ' ἱεράων*
> *νήσων, αἳ ναίουσι πέρην ἁλὸς Ἤλιδος ἄντα,*[77]
>
> They who came from Doulichion and the sacred Echinai,
> islands, where men live across the water from Elis

Only two place names are given; the people of this contingent are said to hold Doulichion and the Echinai, with the latter described explicitly as islands. Homer indicates that Doulichion is also an island, stating that it and the Echinai lie off the coast of Elis—this time used without the accompanying name Bouprasion. Unlike the situation of Odysseus and the Kephallenians, however, no mention of territory on the mainland is made.[78] No other place names or further descriptions are given, as Homer immediately moves on to name the leader of this contingent, Meges. Homer spends three lines describing Meges:

> *τῶν αὖθ' ἡγεμόνευε Μέγης ἀτάλαντος Ἄρηϊ*
> *Φυλεΐδης, ὃν τίκτε Διῒ φίλος ἱππότα Φυλεύς,*
> *ὅς ποτε Δουλίχιον δ' ἀπενάσσατο πατρὶ χολωθείς·*[79]
>
> Meges was the leader of these, a man like Ares,

---

[76] This appears to be one of the exceptions to the observation made by Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970. 7. that Homer focuses on personal relationships rather than the way forces are commanded and organized. See also the discussion of the Rhodian contingent below.

[77] *Il.* II.625-26.

[78] *Il.* II.635; see below.

[79] *Il.* II.627-29.

Phyleus' son, whom the rider dear to Zeus had begotten,
Phyleus, who angered with his father had settled Doulichion.

Twice Homer states the name of his father, Phyleus, and adding that Phyleus was an exile not originally from Doulichion. Homer mentions neither Phyleus' lineage nor his original homeland. In this line, the name Doulichion is used alone, without mention of the Echinai, indicating the specific destination of Phyleus, although neither Doulichion nor the Echinai appear to refer to the territory as a whole. Homer never uses a collective name for the people of these islands, and their identity rests on loyalty to Meges and origin from Doulichion.

By contrast, Homer does collectively designate the people whom Odysseus leads as Kephallenians. Over the course of four lines he continues by naming six locations that they held.[80] Interestingly, Kephallenia itself is not mentioned in the list, despite its existence as a named place elsewhere in Homer and its being the basis for the collective name of Odysseus' people. These six locations are apparently islands or places on islands, as Homer goes on to claim that the Kephallenians *οἵ τ' ἤπειρον ἔχον ἠδ' ἀντιπέραι' ἐνέμοντο*, "those who held the mainland and the places next to the crossing."[81] Descriptions of two of the places named further indicate that they are geographical regions: *Νήριτον εἰνοσίφυλλον*, Neriton covered in forests, and *Αἰγίλιπα τρηχεῖαν*, rugged Aigilips. Similarly, the mainland (*ἤπειρον*) should also be considered a geographic region.[82] The people forming this contingent have a collective name, but the geographical region from which they originate does not, and the collective name is not derived from any place name mentioned in Homer's description of the contingent. As is common with the more prominent heroes, Homer does not elaborate upon Odysseus' lineage or origin, failing even to name his father or residence on Ithaka.

Likewise, the Aitolians are given a collective name as a people, but Homer does not designate their homeland by a single name in the Catalogue of Ships. Instead, five place-names are given in two lines, but only one of these has a potentially meaningful

[80] *Il.* II.631-34.

[81] *Il.* II.635.

epithet, *Καλυδῶνά τε πετρήεσσαν*, rocky Kalydon, which may indicate a geographic feature or region rather than a city or citadel. Homer devotes the second half of the passage to a discussion of the leadership of the Aeolians. After mentioning Thoas and his father, Andraimon, in the first line of the passage, Homer spends another three lines discussing the original rulers of the Aitolians.[83] This digression about Oineus and Meleagros serves to provide information about the rulers of Aitolia rather than relate directly to the identity of Thoas, as the relationship between these previous rulers and Thoas himself is not specified. Indeed, no further information is provided about Thoas' genealogy, beyond the name of his father provided in the first line of the passage. After that line, Thoas is not named again until the final line of the passage, where the size of his contingent is listed. Homer's description of the Aitolian contingent provides a collective name for the people of the region, but no single name for the region itself, while the ruler of the contingent and the name of his father are mentioned, as well as an unusual digression about their original rulers.[84]

On the other hand, the terms Krete and Kretan are both used by Homer in the passage concerning the contingent led by Idomeneus. After naming Idomeneus as the leader of the Kretans, Homer spends three lines listing seven sites.[85] The only sites which are described in a way that defines their nature are three designated citadels or cities: *Γόρτυν...τειχιόεσσαν*, Gortyna of the great walls, and *Φαιστόν τε Ρύτιόν τε, πόλεις εὖ ναιετοώσας*, "Phaistos and Rhytion, well-peopled towns."[86] Appropriately, the phrase *ἄλλοι Θ' οἳ Κρήτην ἑκατόμπολιν ἀμφενέμοντο*, "and others who dwelt beside them in Krete of the hundred cities," follows the list of place names. No other entry in the Catalogue of Ships or the subsequent list of Trojans so explicitly states the prominence of *πόλεις* in a given region. At the end of the passage, Homer returns

---

[82] Neriton: *Il.* II.632; Aigilips: 633.

[83] Thoas and Andraimon named: *Il.* II.638; original rulers recounted: 641-43.

[84] Compare Kirk 1985, I:222-23.

[85] *Il.* II.646-48.

[86] Gortyna: *Il.* II.646; Phaistos and Rhytion: 648.

briefly to the leadership of the contingent.[87] Idomeneus' name is repeated although he receives no genealogical treatment. Homer introduces a second leader, Meriones, also without any genealogical background. The fact that his name appears only once, while Idomeneus' name brackets the description of the places of origin of the Kretans, combined with the emphatic statement *τῶν μὲν ἄρ' Ἰδομενεὺς δουρὶ κλυτὸς ἡγεμόνευε*, "of all these Idomeneus the spear-famed was leader," indicates Meriones' lesser status.[88] The sophistication and complexity of the Kretan contingent, elaborated upon in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, is indicated here by the use of both the collective name for the people of Krete and the name of the island itself, as well as the emphasis on the urban character of its inhabitation.

The island of Rhodes and its inhabitants the Rhodians serve as shared territory of origin and collective name for those who follow Tlepolemos. More than the usual attention, however, is paid to Tlepolemos' origins and especially the organization of the people he leads. In the first line of the passage, Homer states that Tlepolemos leads the Rhodians and is the son of Herakles. Both claims are later repeated, and the circumstances of Tlepolemos' birth and rise to power are recalled:

> *τῶν μὲν Τληπόλεμος δουρὶ κλυτὸς ἡγεμόνευεν,*
> *ὃν τέκεν Ἀστυόχεια βίῃ „Ἡρακληείῃ,*
> *τὴν ἄγετ' ἐξ Ἐφύρης ποταμοῦ ἄπο Σελλήεντος*
> *πέρσας ἄστεα πολλὰ διοτρεφέων αἰζηῶν.*
> *Τληπόλεμος δ' ἐπεὶ οὖν τρ‹φ' ἐνὶ μεγ‹ρῳ εὐπήκτῳ,*
> *αὐτίκα πατρὸς ἑοῖο φίλον μήτρωα κατέκτα*
> *ἤδη γηρ‹σκοντα Λικύμνιον ὄζον Ἄρηος·*
> *αἶψα δὲ νῆας ἔπηξε, πολὺν δ' ὅ γε λαὸν ἀγείρας*
> *βῆ φεύγων ἐπὶ πόντον· ἀπειλησαν γάρ οἱ ἄλλοι*
> *υἱέες υἱωνοί τε βίης Ἡρακληείης.*
> *αὐτὰρ ὅ γ' ἐς Ῥόδον ἶξεν ἀλώμενος ἄλγεα πάσχων·*[89]
>
> Of all these Tlepolemos the spear-famed was leader,
> he whom Astyocheia bore to the strength of Herakles.
> Herakles brought her from Ephyra and the river Selleëis
> after he sacked many cities of strong, god-supported fighters.

---

[87] *Il.* II.650-51.

[88] *Il.* II.650.

[89] *Il.* II.657-67.

> Now when Tlepolemos was grown in the strong-built mansion,
> he struck to death his own father's beloved uncle,
> Likymnios, scion of Ares, a man already ageing.
> At once he put ships together and assembled a host of people
> and went fugitive over the sea, since the others threatened,
> the rest of the sons and the grandsons of the strength of Herakles.
> And he came to Rhodes a wanderer, a man of misfortune

Homer names Tlepolemos' mother, Astyocheia, describes her status as Herakles' war-captive and states her place of origin (she had been *ἄγετ' ἐξ Εφύρης ποταμοῦ ἄπο Σελλήεντος*, "brought...from Ephyra and the river Selleëis"). Homer then goes on to recount how the sons and grandsons of Herakles had exiled Tlepolemos from his mother's homeland after he killed his own grand uncle, Likymnios. The crucial juncture in Tlepolemos' rise to power among those who would become the Rhodians comes when he *πολὺν δ' ὅ γε λαὸν ἀγείρας*, "assembled a host of people." Tlepolemos' lineage, including his mother, father, grand uncle and, indirectly, his cousins (*υἱέες υἱωνοί τε βίης Ἡρακληείης*, "the sons and the grandsons of the strength of Herakles") looms behind his identity, despite the fact that Tlepolemos' role as leader of the Rhodians is based on the breakdown of these familial relationships and the exile of the hero himself.

The story of Tlepolemos' origin and exile is bracketed by an unusually explicit recounting of the organization of the Rhodians:

> *ἐκ Ῥόδου ἐννέα νῆας ἄγεν Ῥοδίων ἀγερώχων,*
> *οἳ Ῥόδον ἀμφενέμοντο διὰ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες*
> *Λίνδον Ἰηλυσόν τε καὶ ἀργινόεντα Κάμειρον.*
> ...
> *τριχθὰ δὲ ᾤκηθεν καταφυλαδόν, ἠδὲ φίληθεν*
> *ἐκ Διός, ὅς τε θεοῖσι καὶ ἀνθρώποισιν ἀνάσσει,*
> *καί σφιν θεσπέσιον πλοῦτον κατέχευε Κρονίων.*[90]
>
> [He] led from Rhodes nine ships with the proud men of Rhodes aboard them.
> those who dwelt about Rhodes and were ordered in triple division,
> Ialysos and Lindos and silver-shining Kameiros.
> ...

[90] *Il.* II.654-56; 668-70.

> and they settled there in triple division by tribes (*καταφυλαδόν*), beloved
> of Zeus himself, who is lord over all gods and all men,
> Kronos' son, who showered the wonder of wealth upon them.

A more than usually complex structure of identity accompanied this settlement: the Rhodians are *διὰ τρίχα κοσμηθέντες* "ordered in triple division," and are *τριχθὰ δὲ ᾤκηθεν καταφυλαδόν*, "settled...in triple division by tribes." Only in the second instance is a specific term, the adverb *καταφυλαδόν*, used to designate the divisions; the sub-groups are *φῦλα*. These divisions seem to have a geographical basis or distribution; instead of providing collective names for the groups, Homer states their geographical distribution: *Λίνδον Ἰηλυσόν τε καὶ ἀργινόεντα Κάμειρον*, "Ialysos and Lindos and silver-shining Kameiros." Thus, although the tripartite division on Rhodes is in the first instance a division of people into *φῦλα*, these groups still retain a distribution tied to geographic regions. Furthermore, no hierarchy of leadership is revealed; Tlepolemos is the only ruler Homer mentions.[91] Finally, Homer states that Zeus granted the Rhodians *θεσπέσιον πλοῦτον*, wondrous wealth; in this case the phrase clearly refers to the collective wealth of the people rather than the individual wealth of their leader. In the eighteen lines composing the Homer's passage about the Rhodians in the Catalogue of Ships, twelve lines recount Tlepolemos' identity, origins, and rise to power among the Rhodians, while another six describe the organization and wealth of the Rhodians.[92] Just as the urban nature of settlement in Krete—another region with a complex internal structure—is emphasized by Homer, he also dwells on the internal structure of Rhodian settlement, its tripartite nature, and the origins of Tlepolemos, whose leadership unifies the three Rhodian *φῦλα*.

Homer next describes a small contingent led from Syme by Nireus. No collective name for this contingent is used, although Syme appears to refer to their entire area of

---

[91] Donlan 1985, 296-97, discusses this passage at some length. He takes the word *καταφυλαδόν* as indicating the existence of "a social group called the *phylon*." He goes on to argue that the *φῦλα* in this passage consisted of small, localized groups (formed prior to Tlepolemos' exile). If the *φῦλον* is indeed a social group beyond a simple division of people, created ad hoc to assist with the settlement of a new territory, it is a social group tied closely to ideas of territoriality, as *γένος* often is (see the sections covering *φῦλον* and *γένος* in Chapter IV below).

[92] Tlepolemos: *Il.* II.653; 657-66; the Rhodians: 654-56; 668-70.

their origin. No other place-names are mentioned. Both Nireus' parents are named, Aglaia and Charopos, and Homer uses the term *ἄναξ*, king, to describe Charopos, indicating his status.[93] Despite Homer's acknowledgement of Nireus' personal beauty, in terms of both prowess and power he is portrayed as almost the opposite of Agamemnon. Homer calls him *ἀλαπαδνὸς*, "of poor strength," and states *παῦρος δέ οἱ εἵπετο λαός*, "few people [followed] with him."[94] The contingent from Syme, then, is defined by its place of origin and the identity of its leader, Nireus. In turn, his personal identity, like Agamemnon's, is partly derived from the contingent he leads, including its size and quality—or, in the case of Nireus, the lack thereof.

Another relatively minor contingent follows, that led by Pheidippos and Antiphos. Homer assigns no collective name to the contingent, nor does he employ a single name for its homeland. Instead, the first two (of five) lines dedicated to this contingent are used to list six place names.[95] One, Eurypylos, is explicitly described as a *πόλις*, city, while another is a geographical area: the *νήσους τε Καλύδνας*, Kalydnian Islands. The next two lines describe the leaders of this contingent, Pheidippos and Antiphos.[96] The two leaders appear coequal. They are also brothers, the sons of king Thessalos, son of Herakles; two generations of paternal lineage are thus provided. Allegiance to particular leaders defines this contingent, while the genealogy of the co-rulers determines their identity.

Of all the Achaian contingents, the Myrmidons are the most distinctive and separate. The complex and somewhat ambiguous identity of the followers of Achilleus is reflected in the multiplicity of place names and collective names used by Homer in reference to this contingent. Homer begins his passage describing this contingent with a three-line list of six place-names:

> *νῦν αὖ τοὺς ὅσσοι τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἔναιον,*
> *οἵ τ' Ἅλον οἵ τ' ϝΑλόπην οἵ τε Τρηχῖνα νέμοντο,*

---

[93] *Il.* II.672.

[94] *Il.* II.675.

[95] *Il.* II.676-77.

[96] *Il.* II.678-79.

οἵ τ' εἶχον Φθίην ἠδ' Ἑλλάδα καλλιγύναικα,[97]

Now all those who dwelt about Pelasgian Argos,
those who lived by Alos and Alope and at Trachis,
those who held Phthia and Hellas the land of fair women

None of the locations named are modified by epithets that indicate the type of place in question, although one, Argos, is called Pelasgian, which could be considered an "ethnic" term describing the origins of the people inhabiting the region.[98] Complicating matters further, Homer provides not one, but three, collective terms for the inhabitants of these locations: *Μυρμιδόνες δὲ καλεῦντο καὶ Ἕλληνες καὶ Ἀχαιοί*, who were called Myrmidons and Hellenes and Achaians.[99] The explicit description of this people as Achaian is unique in the Catalogue of Ships, as is the use of multiple collective names for a people. This is also the only use of both a group name based on a listed place name (*Ἕλληνες*, Hellenes, and *Ἑλλάδα*, Hellas, respectively) in conjunction with another collective name, *Μυρμιδόνες*, Myrmidons, totally unrelated to any place name listed.[100] The remaining ten lines of the passage briefly recount the circumstances of the Myrmidons' withdrawal from battle.[101] This situation, involving both rejection of Agamemnon's leadership and physical isolation from the other Achaians, combined with any distinction perceived in the mind of the poet, contributes to the Myrmidons' distinctiveness and separation from the main body of the Achaian force. The Myrmidons, with their multiple places of origin and collective names, are thus most defined by their loyalty to Achilleus and the situation surrounding his conflict with

---

[97] *Il.* II.681-83.

[98] Loptson 1981, 136-38, contends that line 681, *νῦν αὖ τοὺς ὅσσοι τὸ Πελασγικὸν Ἄργος ἔναιον*, refers not to the Myrmidons specifically, but rather functions as an introduction to the remaining nine contingents of the Catalogue. He goes on to observe that this line does not strictly conform to any of the three forms with which contingents are typically introduced (see below), but that line 682 does follow one of these forms. On the other hand, line 681 can be considered a variation of the form "those who dwelt in..." and treated at part of the passage considering the Myrmidons, especially since Homer's description of this contingent contains other anomalies or variations not found elsewhere in the Catalogue.

[99] *Il.* II.684.

[100] Compare the Epeians of Elis and the Abantes of Euboia.

[101] *Il.* II.685-94.

Agamemnon. Achilleus' individual identity, as is the case with others of the principal heroes, is not elaborated upon in the Catalogue.

The remaining contingents are relatively minor in size and importance, featuring heroes who receive relatively little attention in the *Iliad*. The first of these minor contingents receives neither a collective name nor a named region of origin from Homer. Homer begins his description of this contingent with a three-line list of five locations. Three of these carry rural epithets indicating that they may be geographic regions: *Πύρασον ἀνθεμόεντα / Δήμητρος τέμενος*, "Pyrasos of the flowers / the precinct of Demeter;" *Ἴτωνά τε μητέρα μήλων*, "Iton, mother of sheepflocks;" and *Πτελεὸν λεχεποίην*, "Pteleos deep in the meadows."[102] The next five lines of the passage relate the story of the death of Protesilaos, the original leader of this contingent. His wife and house in Phylake, his death at the hands of a Dardanian, and his Achaian identity are all described in this digression.[103] Finally, Homer turns to Podarkes, the leader who replaced Protesilaos. Podarkes is introduced as:

> *ἀλλά σφεας κόσμησε Ποδάρκης ὄζος Ἄρηος*
> *Ἰφίκλου υἱὸς πολυμήλου Φυλακίδαο*
> *αὐτοκασίγνητος μεγαθύμου Πρωτεσιλάου*[104]
>
> but Podarkes, scion of Ares, set them in order,
> child of Iphikles, who in turn was son to Phylakos
> rich in flocks, full brother of high-hearted Protesilaos

Homer provides two generations of Podarkes' paternal lineage, and establishes his relationship to the deceased leader of the contingent. The passage continues with a further tribute to the Protesilaos:

> *ὁπλότερος γενεῇ· ὁ δ' ἅμα πρότερος καὶ ἀρείων*
> *ἥρως Πρωτεσίλαος ἀρήϊος· οὐδέ τι λαοὶ*
> *δεύονθ' ἡγεμόνος, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἐσθλὸν ἐόντα·*[105]
>
> [Podarkes] younger born; but the elder man was braver also,
> Protesilaos, a man of battle; yet still the people

---

[102] *Il.* II.695-97.

[103] *Il.* II.698-702.

[104] *Il.* II.705-06.

[105] *Il.* II.707-09.

lacked not a leader, though they longed for him and his valour.

This statement echoes Homer's earlier observation: *οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν*, "Yet these, longing as they did for their leader, did not go leaderless." Homer's contention that Protesilaos was *ἀρείων*, the better [man], and *ἐσθλὸν*, noble, compares the former leader's status favorably with that of his replacement. Twice, with minor variation, Homer invokes the transition of power from Protesilaos to Podarkes, in phrases that join loyalty to a new leader with a desire for the old.[106] The legitimacy of the new leader is emphasized with the forceful and specific term *αὐτοκασίγνητος*, full-brother, which declares Podarkes relationship with Protesilaos. The blood relationship between the two men helps to transfer the ability and nobility of Protesilaos to Podarkes, allowing the contingent then to pledge its loyalty to the new leader. Still, Podarkes has not yet demonstrated that his performance is equal to that of Protesilaos, who valiantly sacrificed himself to enable the success of the Achaian expedition, leading the men of his contingent to long for (*πόθεόν*, repeated twice) their deceased leader. Relationship to the previous leader enhances the status of his replacement, but the latter's success ultimately depends upon his own performance and abilities.[107] Leadership, however problematic, remains the principal element uniting this contingent, which has neither a collective name nor a single shared territory of origin.

Like the contingent of Podarkes, that led by Eumelos also lacks a collective name and named region of origin. In two lines Homer states that the warriors of this contingent originate from four locations.[108] One is a city or citadel, *εὐκτιμένην Ἰαωλκόν*, strong-founded Iolkos.[109] The remaining three lines of the passage provide some genealogical information about Eumelos.[110] His parents are Admentos and

---

[106] *Il.* II.703; 708-09.

[107] See discussion of kingship above in the Introduction, esp. the concerning Qviller 1981, Runciman 1982, Donlan 1985, and Donlan "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989).

[108] *Il.* II.711-12.

[109] *Il.* II.712.

[110] *Il.* II.713-15.

Alkestis, while his maternal grandfather is Pelias. It is unusual for Homer to provide a maternal genealogy longer than the paternal, but in this case it probably reflects a more illustrious maternal lineage, traceable to the hero Pelias. The status of Eumelos proves important since, again, the person of the contingent leader provides the focal point of group identity, with no collective name or single place of origin indicated.

Medon leads another contingent without a collective name or single region of origin. His men originate from four locations named over the course of two lines, one of which, *Ὀλιζῶνα τρηχεῖαν*, rugged Olizon, appears to be a geographic region.[111] As is the case with the followers of Podarkes, his contingent too has lost its leader. The next eight lines discuss the identity and fate of the wounded Philoktetes.[112] Homer describes the former leader, who suffers from snakebite away from combat on Lemnos, as an *ἄνακτος*, king, indicating his status. As is the case with Podarkes, Homer employs the phrase *οὐδὲ μὲν οὐδ' οἳ ἄναρχοι ἔσαν, πόθεόν γε μὲν ἀρχόν*, "Yet these, longing as they did for their leader, did not go leaderless" to designate the situation of Medon.[113] Although Homer makes no explicit negative comparison between Medon and Philoktetes, the fact that the men still "long for" (*πόθεόν*) the latter indicates a similarly tentative succession of power, requiring legitimization of the contingent leader. The final two lines of the passage then introduce Medon himself; the names of both Medon's parents, Oïleus and Rhene, are given, and Homer adds that he is the illegitimate son of Oïleus. As is the case with the other minor contingents that fall toward the end of the Catalogue of Ships, the collective identity of the followers of Medon largely rests upon his leadership, inherited from Philoktetes in much the same way that Podarkes succeeded Protesilaos.

The five-line entry for the next contingent includes two lines naming its places of origin and a further two lines describing its leaders. Homer names three places, including one city, *Οἰχαλίην πόλιν Εὐρύτου Οἰχαλιῆος*, "Oichalia, the city of Oichalian

---

[111] *Il.* II.716-17.

[112] *Il.* II.718-25.

[113] *Il.* II.726.

Eurytos," and another, *Ἰθώμην κλωμακόεσσαν*, rock-terraced Ithome, which appears to be a geographical feature.[114] Oichalia is further identified as the city of Oichalian Eurytos, apparently a founder or hero. Homer mentions no relationship between this hero and the current leaders of the contingent, however. These, the brothers Podaleirios and Machaon, are briefly described as healers and sons of the god Asklepios.[115] Thus, places of origin and common leadership define the identity of this contingent, although Homer provides little further information about either the contingent or its leaders.

Eurypylos leads another contingent identified only by its locations of origin. Four place names are given, two of which, *κρήνην Ὑπέρειαν*, the spring Hypseria, and *Τιτάνοιό τε λευκὰ κάρηνα*, "the pale peaks of Titanos," are geographic features.[116] Homer identifies Eurypylos only as the son of Euaimon.[117] No further information is provided about either the contingent or its leader, despite the large, forty-ship force following Eurypylos.

The contingent led by Polypoites similarly lacks any collective or regional name. In two lines (of ten) Homer lists five place names, including one explicitly described as a city, *πόλιν τ' Ὀλοοσσόνα λευκήν*, "the white city Oloösson."[118] Homer then names both Polypoites' parents and his paternal grandfather; he is the son of Peirithoös and Hippodameia, while Zeus is the father of Peirithoös.[119] Polypoites' genealogy is followed by a digression concerning the battle with the Centaurs, certifying Peirithoös' status as a hero.[120] Finally, Homer introduces Polypoites' companion Leonteus, along with two generations of his paternal lineage; he is *υἱὸς ὑπερθύμοιο Κορώνου Καινείδαο*, "son of high-hearted Koronos the son of Kaeieus." Shared leadership is again the principal element of identity for the contingent.

---

[114] *Il.* II.729-30.

[115] *Il.* II.731-32.

[116] *Il.* II.734-35.

[117] *Il.* II.736.

[118] *Il.* II.738-39.

[119] *Il.* II.741-42.

[120] *Il.* II.743-44.

Gouneus leads a contingent with a rather more complex identity. This contingent originates from a location called Kyphos, which seems to be a regional name rather than the name of a single city, as the size of the contingent and its collective names are given before a list of other place-names. Two collective names, *Ενιῆνες* and *Περαιβοί*, the Enienes and the Perrhaibians, are provided. These apparently refer to two distinct groups rather than being alternative names for the same group (as is the case with the Myrmidons/Hellenes, for instance); whereas Homer states that the followers of Achilleus are called (*καλεῦντο*) by three different names, in this passage it is said that two named groups follow (*ἕποντο*) Gouneus—synonymous names do not seem to be used in the *Iliad* in the same phrase to describe the same people.[121] Over the next six lines, three locations are listed and described.[122] Of the three places named, two are rivers, and in one of those cases Homer explicitly mentions the *ἔργα*, plowland, around the river Titaressos. No further information about Gouneus, his origins, or his genealogy is provided.

The final contingent in the catalogue of ships is that of the Magnesians. Homer begins the brief passage by naming their leader, Tenthredon, and his father, Prothoös.[123] Although given the collective name *Μαγνήτων*, the Magnesians, Homer provides the name of no shared territory of origin. Of the two place-names mentioned in a little more than one line of text, one is a geographical feature *Πήλιον εἰνοσίφυλλον*, forested Pelion, while the other does not receive an epithet.[124] No other information is provided in this brief passage.

The heroes and their contingents collectively are identified as *ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι*, "the leaders and the princes among the Danaans" as Homer concludes the

---

[121] Myrmidons/Hellenes: *Il.* II.684; Enienes/Perrhaibians: 749. For example, I could find no sentences in which Homer pairs Achaians with Danaans or Argives. Autenrieth, 1958 ed., s.v. "*Ἀργεῖος*," adds that the combination *Ἀργείων Δαναῶν*, *Od.* VIII.578 is "peculiar."

[122] *Il.* II.750-55.

[123] *Il.* II.756.

[124] *Il.* II.758.

Catalogue of Ships.[125] Homer then re-emphases the central role of Agamemnon's leadership and the importance of Menelaos as the instigator of the war to Achaian identity. When the poet turns to the question of the best of the Achaians, he phrases the question in terms of *οἳ 'μ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἕποντο*, "[those] who went with the sons of Atreus."[126]

Summary and Conclusions

The Catalogue of Ships provides both a vocabulary representing categories of identity and an indication of the relative importance of each category. Certainly, the content of the Catalogue of Ships is shaped by the "developed rules and tendencies of oral poetry, with formal variation kept to a functional minimum."[127] As both Kirk and Loptson have observed, entries in the Catalogue tend to fall into three classes: "Either the first focus of attention is on the towns the people in question have come from...Or it is on an ethnic or tribal identification of the people...Or first attention is given the leader."[128] However, the frequency with which Homer chose to deploy each category of passage, as well as the categories themselves, reflects categories of identity—place of origin, people of origin, and leadership—which carried some degree of saliency for the poet and his audience.

---

[125] *Il.* II.760.

[126] *Il.* II.762.

[127] Kirk 1985, I:171.

[128] Loptson 1981, 136. It is also worth citing Kirk 1985, I:170-71 at length:

> There are three different modes, sometimes carefully varied for successive entries, sometimes not...They are here called A, B and C:
>
> A. "Of the X's...Y (and Z) was/were leader(s), (of them) who dwelt in/possessed (etc.) D, E, F..." So the first entry (Boiotoi) and 5 others.
>
> B. "Those who dwelt in/possessed (etc.) D, E, F...of them Y (and Z) was/were leader(s)." This is much the commonest mode, embracing the entries for Argos, Mukenai, Pulos and 14 others, with the Murmidones as a variant in addition.
>
> C. "Y led (brought) (so many) ships from D (E, F...)." Four small contingents are described in this mode (which includes the ship-numbers...), including that of (Salaminian) Aias. Somewhat similarly Odysseus led the Kephallenes, but the ship number is postponed...

As can be seen from Table III, the category common to all contingents is that of allegiance to a particular leader. Indeed, Homer's structure of the Catalogue itself revolves around the concept of leadership; it is a list of *ἡγεμόνες Δαναῶν καὶ κοίρανοι*, "the leaders and the princes among the Danaans."[129] Accordingly, all twenty-nine contingents are associated with one or more leaders, yielding a total of forty-four men declared by Homer to fill that role.[130] The status or rank of contingent leaders is only explicitly mentioned eight times with respect to a total of four leaders, perhaps indicating the relative importance of leadership itself in the Catalogue. Indeed, Homer's conception of status is directly based upon the quantity and/or quality of the men led in three of the eight times it is invoked. After leadership, the next most common category of identity involves the individual places dwelt in or held by the people from which each contingent is drawn. Twenty-five of the twenty-nine contingents contain a list of such locations. Geographic features, including rivers, mountains, bays, etc., are the most common type of site mentioned, followed by *πτολίεθρα* and *πόλεις*, citadels and cities.[131] Homer also includes one region defined by a circuit of discrete locations, a number of temples and sanctuaries, and one tomb in his lists which, taken together, contain 177 distinct places.[132] The genealogy of contingent leaders is the next most common category of identity related by Homer in the Catalogue; twenty-two of the twenty-eight descriptions include at least the name of one ancestor of the contingent's leader(s). Most commonly, Homer names the leader's father, accounting for thirty-two of the fifty-one ancestors named, but nine times the paternal grandfather is also mentioned, while the mother is named six times, brothers twice, and the maternal grandfather once. No relatives more distant than grandparents are ever mentioned in the Catalogue. In short, these three categories—places of origin, leadership, and leader's lineage—are the most prevalent in the Catalogue of Ships.

---

[129] *Il.* II.487; repeated 760.

[130] See Table V (eight additional heroes are "with" the leaders). Compare Table VI concerning the Trojans. See also Scully 1990, Chapter VI note 49.

[131] This assertion excludes sites with ambiguous epithets which Kirk and Scully take to be towns.

[132] Willcock 1970, 66, counts 175 places.

indicating the saliency of local identity, loyalty to a particular individual (and, conversely, leadership of a particular body of men), and immediate descent in the Homeric conception of identity.

Less commonly invoked by Homer are collective names for the people from which each contingent is drawn or the name of an inclusive, shared region of origin for the people making up the contingent. Fifteen contingents have collective names; most derive from the name of the shared region of origin, which Homer provides for eleven contingents. Only three collective name—the Myrmidons, the Abantes, and the Epeians—not associated with a region of origin are designated over the course of the Catalogue.[133] Thus, while identity based on coming from a region or belonging to a people is not uncommon in the Catalogue, it is less often mentioned than specific location of origin. Also rare is the use of any terms to clarify the proper name for a people or territory; Athens (or the Athenians, depending on the ambiguous meaning of the term) is considered a *δῆμος*, Rhodes is *καταφυλαδόν*, divided into *φῦλα*, while the Athenian polity is referred to as a *πτολίεθρον*, citadel, and the Kretan as *ἑκατόμπολις* of a hundred cities. When Homer does assign a collective name to a people, it is usually derived from regions of origin; rarely are these collective names abstracted from names based on territory. It is even more uncommon for Homer to explicitly state that a contingent, some of its members, or its leaders are Achaian, Danaan, or Argive, a situation that occurs only three times. Furthermore, while historical digressions of some kind occur in eight passages of the Catalogue, only twice are "ethnic" epithets employed.[134] Although Homer names a people of origin for slightly more than half of the contingents he lists, most often this name cannot be considered "ethnic" or otherwise abstract; instead it is usually based upon the name of the shared territory assigned by Homer to the contingent in question.

Taken together, the five compontents of identity most commonly invoked in the Catalogue of Ships—places of origin, leadership, leader's lineage, common people of

---

[133] Snodgrass 1980, 28, believes that the use of the "plural ethnic... bears the stamp of tribalism."

origin, and a shared territory—account for the vast majority of Homer's description of the Achaian force.

The Trojans and their Allies

The Trojan Catalogue: Prelude

Homer introduces the list of Trojans in Book II with a vignette of Priam holding assembly before the gates of the city. While the assembly is proceeding, Iris, disguised as Polites, son of Priam, admonishes the Trojans for not preparing to meet the Achaians in battle. Iris/Polites first warns Priam about the prowess and size of the Achaian force. Turning to Hektor as the overlord of the Trojan army, Iris/Polites next admonishes him to prepare to do battle in defense of his city. At this juncture Iris/Polites invokes the composite nature of the Trojan force, as Iris/Polites orders:

> *Ἕκτορ σοὶ δὲ μάλιστ' ἐπιτέλλομαι, ὧδε δὲ ῥέξαι·*
> *πολλοὶ γὰρ κατὰ ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμου ἐπίκουροι,*
> *ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων·*
> *τοῖσιν ἕκαστος ἀνὴρ σημαινέτω οἵσί περ ἄρχει,*
> *τῶν δ' ἐξηγείσθω κοσμησάμενος πολιήτας.*[135]
>
> Hektor, on you beyond all I urge this, to do as I tell you:
> all about the great city of Priam are many companions,
> but multitudinous is the speech of the scattered nations:
> let each man who is their leader give orders to these men,
> and let each set his citizens in order, and lead them.

Here, the concept of Trojan *ἐπίκουροι*, allies, is introduced. No similar term is ever applied to contingents of the Achaian force, indicating a fundamental difference in Homer's conception of the group identity of each side. Also introduced here is the observation that the Trojan allies speak a variety of languages: *ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα*, another characteristic of the Trojans and allies unparalleled within the Achaian force. Homer also describes the allies of the Trojans as *πολυσπερέων*, widespread, an idea

---

[134] "Ethnic" here being defined according to J. Hall's thesis; i.e. derived from a belief in a putative common ancestor.

[135] *Il.* II.802-06.

reiterated in descriptions of the Trojan contingents, which are repeatedly described with terms indicating distance or separation.[136] Iris/Polites advises Hektor to utilize the great number of Trojan *ἐπίκουροι* collected in the city. Because of disparate nature of the Trojan force, however, Iris/Polites warns Hektor that to do so effectively he will have to work through their leaders: *τοῖσιν ἕκαστος ἀνὴρ σημαινέτω οἵσί περ ἄρχει*, "let each man who is their leader give orders to these men." Furthermore, while Troy itself is twice referred to as an *ἄστυ*, the commanders of the Trojan allies are ordered to marshal their men, each from his own *πόλις* (indicated by the use of the term *πολιήτας*, the citizens of a *πόλις*): *τῶν δ' ἐξηγείσθω κοσμησάμενος πολιήτας*. This statement parallels Nestor's advice to Agamemnon, directing him to divide the Achaians:

> *κρῖν' ἄνδρας κατὰ φῦλα κατὰ φρήτρας Ἀγάμεμνον,*
> *ὡς φρήτρη φρήτρηφιν ἀρήγῃ, φῦλα δὲ φύλοις.*[137]
>
> Set your men in order by tribes, by clans, Agamemnon,
> and let clan go in support of clan, let tribe support tribe.

Just as Achaian contingents are divided into *φρήτρη* and *φῦλα*, the Trojans are organized by *πόλις*. A few lines later, just before Homer begins introducing the contingents of Trojans and allies, the results of this division by *πόλις* are summarized: *ἔνθα τότε Τρῶές τε διέκριθεν ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι*, "There the Trojans and their companions were marshaled in order."[138] The divisions so created are called by no special term, they are simply divided, *διέκριθεν*. The distinction between Trojan and ally, however, is again reinforced. Thus, in the twenty-nine lines preceding the roster of Trojans, Homer introduces the idea of a diverse force, consisting of Trojans and *ἐπίκουροι*, divided by language and distance, and separated into contingents on the basis of membership in a particular *πόλις*, themes developed as the Trojan contingents themselves are described.

---

[136] See Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*πολυσπερέων*." See Chapter V concerning systematic differences in Homer's conception of Trojan and Achaian identities. See below for further discussion of terms indicating distant places of origin for Trojans allies.

[137] *Il.* II.362-63.

[138] *Il.* II.815.

The Trojans

The first contingent introduced is that led by Hektor himself. The first word of the passage introducing Hektor's contingent is *Τρωσὶ*, Trojans, the third word is *ἡγεμόνευε*, led, while Hektor's name ends the first line, leaving no doubt as to the identity of his men or his role as their leader. Next, Homer names Hektor's father, Priam, but as is the case with many of the prominent Achaian heroes, the poet does not further elaborate upon Hektor's genealogy.[139] Finally, like Agamemnon Hektor is said to marshal *ἅμα τῷ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι / λαοὶ*, "far the best and bravest / fighting men," establishing his position as preeminent leader of the Trojan forces.[140] Leadership of the Trojans, status as leader of "far the best and bravest," and the name of his father define Hektor's identity in this brief opening passage in the roster of Trojans and allies.

Homer next introduces the Dardanians. The plural noun *Δαρδανίων* opens this passage, providing the collective name for members of the contingent.[141] No further information is provided about the identity or homeland of the Dardanians, beyond the identity of Aineias, their leader. Homer introduces Aineias as the leader of the Dardanians, then goes on to name both his parents, Anchises and Aphrodite.[142] Two lines are devoted to Aineias' identity, while the final two lines of the passage introduce the other Dardanians who accompany Aineias, Archelochos and Akamas. Aeneas, however, is clearly the principal leader of the contingent; not only is a term for leadership (*ἦρχεν*) used only with Aeneas, but he is mentioned first and discussed separately from the other two Dardanians, who are introduced with the statement *οὐκ οἶος, ἅμα τῷ γε δύω Ἀντήνορος υἷε*, "not [Aineias] alone, but with him were two sons of Antenor."[143] Aineias' leadership and parentage define his identity, while the only

---

[139] *Il.* II.816-17.

[140] *Il.* II.817-18. Compare Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970, Appendix, note 1.

[141] *Il.* II.819.

[142] *Il.* II.820-21.

[143] *Il.* II.822-23.

marker of a Dardanian identity beyond the collective name itself in this passage rests on the contingent's loyalty to Aineias and his companions.

Homer now turns to another contingent of *Τρῶες*, Trojans. They are distinguished from the Trojans led by Hektor by their place of origin:

> *οἳ δὲ Ζέλειαν ἔναιον ὑπαὶ πόδα νείατον Ἴδης,*
> *ἀφνειοὶ πίνοντες ὕδωρ μέλαν Αἰσήποιο*[144]
>
> They who lived in Zeleia below the foot of Mount Ida,
> men of wealth, who drank the dark water of Aisepos

The term Trojan, then, applies not only to those from Troy itself, but also to others from the Troad, specifically Zeleia, near Mount Ida and the river Aisepos.[145] As was the case with the Rhodians, Homer singles out the people from which this contingent is drawn for their wealth. Finally, Homer designates Pandarus as the leader of the contingent and names his father, Lykaon. No further information about the lineage of Pandarus is provided. Place of origin and membership in the community Homer calls Trojan, as well as wealth and leadership by Pandarus son of Lykaon mark the identity of this contingent.

The next contingent of Trojans, like many of the Achaian contingents, receives neither a collective name nor a shared territory of origin. Instead, Homer describes those making up the contingent as:

> *οἳ δ' Ἀδρήστειάν τ' εἶχον καὶ δῆμον Ἀπαισοῦ*
> *καὶ Πιτύειαν ἔχον καὶ Τηρείης ὄρος αἰπύ,*[146]
>
> They who held Adresteia and the countryside of Apaisos,
> they who held Pityeia and the sheer hill of Tereia

Only one of the place-names given is modified in such a way as to indicate that it is a geographical feature rather than city: *Τηρείης ὄρος αἰπύ*, the steep mountain of Tereia. Homer designates another, Apaisos, as a *δῆμος*, a term used only once in the Catalogue

---

[144] *Il.* II.824-25.

[145] It is unclear as to whether or not Zeleia is an inclusive term for the entire area inhabited by these Trojans.

[146] *Il.* II.828-29

of Ships, referring to Athens and the Athenians.[147] The two other place names are unmodified. After spending two lines describing the individual places of origin for this contingent, Homer uses the remaining five lines of the passage to introduce its co-leaders, Adrestos and Amphios.[148] Most of these lines discuss the fate of Adrestos and Amphios; the only information about their identity Homer provides is a brief discussion of their lineage. As is typical in the list of Trojans and allies, the only genealogical information given is the name of their father, Merops (further modified by the name of his place of origin, Perkote).[149] Individual places of origin and shared leadership mark the identity of the people from which this contingent is drawn.

The last Trojan contingent Homer describes also lacks a collective name or shared territory of origin in Homer's description; it too is briefly identified only by a list of place names: Perkote, Praktion, Sestos, Abydos, Arisbe. None of the places listed is modified in such a way as to indicate the nature of the site named. After spending two lines on place names, Homer uses the remaining three lines of the passage to discuss the leader of the contingent, Asios, who is identified only as the son of Hyrtakos. No further information is provided beyond the fact that he himself came *Ἀρίσβηθεν...ἄπο Σελλήεντος*, "from Arisbe and from the river Selleëis."[150] As is the case with the preceding contingent, shared leadership and individual places of origin define the identity of the people behind this contingent.[151]

The *Ἐπίκουροι*

Homer now turns to the *ἐπίκουροι*, the allies of the Trojans. Certain patterns emerge in his descriptions of these contingents. All are designated by a collective name, a striking degree of consistency considering the haphazard provision of this marker of identity in the Catalogue of Ships and the roster of Trojans to this point. Homer also provides

---

[147] See Chapter IV for a discussion of Homer's use of the term *δῆμος*.

[148] *Il.* II.830-34.

[149] *Il.* II.831.

[150] *Il.* II.838-39.

[151] For a discussion of the geography of the first four contingents, see Scully 1990. 94.

detailed genealogical information about the leaders of the remaining contingents. In general, Homer's entries in the list of Trojans and allies that concern the *ἐπίκουροι* differ systematically from his earlier descriptions in structure and content, thereby distinguishing the *ἐπίκουροι* from the Trojans and Dardanians.

The first explicitly non-Trojan or -Dardanian force listed is composed of the *φῦλα Πελασγῶν*, tribes of the Pelasgians.[152] *Πελασγῶν* serves as a limiting genitive for the plural noun *φῦλα*, supplying one of the few instances in the Catalogue where an abstract term for a social group is used.[153] Homer also provides the name of their territory of origin: *Λάρισαν ἐριβώλακα*, rich-soiled Larissa.[154] Only rarely in the Catalogue of Ships or in the earlier descriptions of Trojan and Dardanian contingents does Homer include both a collective name and a shared territory of origin in such a brief (four-line) entry. Here, as is the case with the Epeians and the Myrmidons, the collective name for the people appears unrelated to the name of their territory. Homer also provides the names of the Pelasgian co-leaders: Hippothoös and Pylaios, sons of [Pelasgian] Lethos, son of Teutamos. Two generations of paternal lineage are provided along with a confirmation of the identity of Lethos as Pelasgian. Again, outside the descriptions of the *ἐπίκουροι*, "ethnic" epithets are rare in Book II. Finally, although no hierarchy of leadership is explicitly stated, Hippothoös seems to emerge as the senior leader, being named twice (his name opens the passage) and listed first when paired with Pylaios. The identity of the Pelasgian contingent is delineated by its collective name—repeated in the description of Hippothoös lineage—its shared place of origin, and its leaders, who are themselves provided with a two-generation genealogy, all of which contributes to a rich and specific idea of Pelasgian identity, particularly considering the brevity of the passage.

---

[152] *Il.* II.840.

[153] See discussion in Chapter IV below; compare Donlan 1985, 295.

[154] *Il.* II.841.

The Thracians are now briefly introduced in only two lines.[155] Still, Homer names their leaders, Akamas and Peiroös, as well as the contingent's place of origin and collective name. The second word of the passage is *Θρήϊκας*, immediately providing the collective name for the contingent. The second line of the passage indicates the homeland of the Thracians; Homer states that the people consists of *ὅσσους Ἑλλήσποντος ἀγάρροος ἐντὸς ἔέργει*, "all the Thracians held within the hard stream of the Hellespont." No detailed information, genealogical or otherwise, is provided about the contingent's leaders. In only two lines Homer puts forth the three aspects of identity which most consistently recur in his descriptions of the *ἐπίκουροι*: the collective name of the people from which the contingent is drawn, their shared territory of origin, and the names of their leaders.

The entry for the Kikonians is again only a brief two lines in length.[156] As is the case with all the *ἐπίκουροι*, Homer provides a collective name for the contingent (*Κικόνων*), although in this case no territorial or place names occur. Instead, the second line of the passage includes two generations of the contingent leader's genealogy: Euphemos, the leader of the Kikonians, is the son of Troizenos, son of Keas. Thus, two of the three markers of identity typically found in Homer's passages about the *ἐπίκουροι*, a collective name and shared loyalty to a leader, are found in his description of the Kikonians, while a shared territory of origin is omitted and the leader's genealogy is added.

Homer's description of the Paionians, by contrast, contains no genealogical information about their leader, Pyraichmes. Instead, Homer devotes two of the three lines of the passage to their homeland:

> *τηλόθεν ἐξ Ἀμυδῶνος ἀπ' Ἀξιοῦ εὐρὺ ῥέοντος,*
> *Ἀξιοῦ οὗ κάλλιστον ὕδωρ ἐπικίδναται αἶαν.*[157]
>
> [Pyraichmes led them] from Amydon far away and the broad stream of Axios,

---

[155] *Il.* II.844-45.

[156] *Il.* II.846-47.

[157] *Il.* II.849-50.

Axios, whose stream on all earth is the loveliest water.

Homer names the shared territory of the Paionians, Amydon, then spends a line and a half describing the river Axios, which seems to be the major defining feature of their homeland, just as the Hellespont is for the Thracians. Also, for the first time, a contingent is described as *τηλόθεν*, "from afar," a variation of a phrase applied to a total of four contingents (the Paionians, Halizones, Phrygians, and Lykians), suggesting a geographic arrangement for the roster of Trojans and allies, beginning with Troy itself and radiating outward on to ever more remote homelands of the allies.[158] Thus, Homer includes information about all three categories of identity—homeland, collective name, and leader's name—commonly found in his descriptions of the *ἐπίκουροι*.

Homer's passage about the Paphlagones is somewhat longer than that concerning the first four contingents of *ἐπίκουροι*. Homer begins the passage with *Παφλαγόνων*, the collective name for the people making up the contingent. He then names their leader, Pylaimones, although no further information about the hero appears in the passage.[159] The second line of the passage indicates the Paphlagones' homeland; they are *ἐξ Ἐνετῶν*, "from the land of the Enetoi."[160] The term *Ἐνετῶν* appears to be the name of (or at least derived from the name of) a people or tribe.[161] The final three lines of this five-line passage elaborate upon the identity of the Paphlagones by listing seven place names, including one river, *Παρθένιον ποταμὸν*, the river Parthenios, and one mountain,

---

[158] In their Appendix concerning the Trojan Catalogue, Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970, 176, suggest that:

> The contingents seem to be grouped together in five geographical areas—the Troad, the European allies from beyond the Hellespont, the Far Eastern allies (Paphlagonians and Alizonians), the near Eastern allies (Mysians and Phrygians), and the allies from south of the Troad—and in the last four cases, the list appears to begin with the contingent from nearest Troy, and to end with the one from farthest away.

See also Appendix, note 2. Compare Scully 1990, 93-94; Chapter VI, note 48; Willcock 1970, 85; Kirk 1985, I:250.

[159] *Il.* II.851.

[160] *Il.* II.852.

[161] Not only is *Ἐνετοί* translated as the name of a people in the Loeb *Iliad*, but it is defined as "a tribe of the Paphlagonians" by Autenrieth, 1958 ed., s.v. "*Ἐνετοί*." Unfortunately, the term occurs nowhere else in Homer, so its definition must be derived solely from this passage.

ὑψηλοὺς Ἐρυθίνους, high Erythinoi.[162] Again Homer designates a homeland and leader's name for the Paphlagones contingent.

Little information is provided in the two-line passage about the Halizones, except their place of origin, Alybe, and the name of their co-leaders, Odios and Epistrophos.[163] Like the Paionians, Phrygians, and Lykians however, Homer remarks that the Halizones were led from τηλόθεν, far away. Even in this short passage, Homer delivers the basic elements of identity for a contingent of ἐπίκουροι: a collective name, place of origin, and leader.

Although the passage concerning them is longer, Homer does not mention a place of origin for the Mysians. Only the names of the Mysian leaders, Chromis and Ennomos are given (in the first line of the passage, preceded by the collective name Μυσῶν), followed by three lines discussing their forthcoming fate at the hands of Achilleus.[164]

The Phrygians also receive only a short entry, but in this case Homer provides all three basic pieces of information about their identity: their collective name (Φρύγας), their place of origin, Askanios, and the name of their leader, Phorkys. Homer also notes that the Phrygians, like the Lykians, Paionians, and the Halizones, are from τῆλ', far away.[165]

Homer provides similar information in his three-line entry concerning the Maionian. He begins with their co-leaders, the brothers Mesthles and Antiphos. In the second line of the passage, he adds the names of their parents: Talaimenes and the Gygaian lake.[166] The final line of the passage repeats the collective name for the people (Μήονας), and goes on to explain their place of origin: οἳ καὶ Μήονας ἦγον ὑπὸ Τμώλῳ γεγαῶτας, "these led the Maionian men whose home was beneath Mount Tmolos."[167]

---

[162] *Il.* II.853-55.

[163] *Il.* II.856-57.

[164] *Il.* II.858-61.

[165] *Il.* II.862-63.

[166] *Il.* II.864-65.

[167] *Il.* II.866.

Like the Thracians enclosed by the Hellespont, the shared territory of origin for the Maionian is defined a topographic feature.[168] Again, Homer presents place of origin, people of origin, and leadership as the defining aspects of identity of this contingent of *ἐπίκουροι*.

The longest entry in the roster of Trojans and allies concerns the Karians. Homer opens this passage by naming Nastes as the leader of the *Καρῶν* and adding that the Karians are *βαρβαροφώνων*, barbarous of speech.[169] In this manner Homer revisits the idea introduced at the beginning of the roster of Trojans, namely that the various contingent speak different, mutually unintelligible, languages.[170] Homer omits any shared territory of origin for the Karians, but spends two lines listing four locations, three of which are geographic regions or topographic features: *Φθιρῶν τ' ὄρος*, mountain of Phthiron, *Μαιάνδρου τε ῥοὰς*, streams of Maiandros, and *Μυκάλης τ' αἰπεινὰ κάρηνα*, peaks of Mykale.[171] Finally, Homer returns to the Karians' leadership. Nastes' name is repeated, while a second leader, Amphimachos, is now introduced. Nastes emerges as the principal leader; his name is the first word of the passage concerning the Karians, while Amphimachos is mentioned only later and in conjunction with Nastes. The leaders are brothers, and Homer names their father, Nomion, although no other genealogical information is revealed.[172] The final four lines of the passage describe Nastes' golden armor and foreshadow his death at the hands of Achilleus.[173] In addition to the collective name for the people from which this contingent is drawn, Homer provides the names of its leaders and their father, as well as a list of individual places of origin.

The roster of Trojans and Allies concludes with a two-line entry for the Lykians. The brevity of the passage mirrors that of some of the important Achaians; the Lykians

---

[168] Compare Scully 1990, 92.

[169] *Il.* II.867.

[170] *Il.* II.804; see above.

[171] *Il.* II.868-69.

[172] *Il.* II.870-71.

[173] *Il.* II.872-75.

too play a prominent role as the most important of the Trojan *ἐπίκουροι* in the *Iliad*. The names of the co-leaders, Sarpedon and Glaukos are given, and Homer uses both the terms for the Lykians as a people, *Λύκιοι*, and Lykia as a homeland, *Λυκίη*. The Lykians are the only contingent of *ἐπίκουροι* whose place or origin derives from group name (a situation opposite that of the Achaian contingents, most of which have collective names based upon the name given for their shared territories). Furthermore, Homer adds that the Lykians—like the Paionians, Halizones, and Phrygians—arrive from *τηλόθεν*, far away. Finally, Homer demarcates the Lykian's homeland by specifying that Sarpedon and Glaukos led the contingent from *Ξάνθου ἄπο δινήεντος*, "the whirling waters of Xanthos."[174]

Summary and Conclusions

Like the Catalogue of Ships, the Trojan Catalogue conforms to three distinct patterns.[175] The striking differences in the frequency each type of passage, however, underscores the discretion available to the poet in the formulation of each entry in the Catalogues. As Kirk observes, two types of entry, that emphasizing group membership and that focusing on leadership, occur more often (proportionally) in the Trojan Catalogue than in the Catalogue of Ships, while the formulation highlighting individual places of origin occurs much less frequently.[176] Such variations indicate systematic choices on the part of the poet that reflect distinction between Trojans, allies, and Achaians in the mind of the poet.

Despite Iris/Polites' command that the Trojans be ordered according to *πόλεις* (*κοσμησάμενος πολιήτας*), most entries lack any cities, and instead are based on group

---

[174] *Il.* II.876-77.

[175] The same patterns applied to the Achaians are used for the Trojans and their allies. Kirk 1985, I:248; see above.

[176] Kirk 1985, I:248. Kirk also notes that three Trojan or allied contingents fit no category, and he discusses differences in the vocabulary of leadership (248-49).

membership and shared territories.[177] Thirteen of sixteen contingents receive collective names, a much higher percentage than is the case with the Achaians (fifteen of twenty-nine). Homer provides shared territories of origin for ten of the sixteen Trojan and allied contingents, again a higher percentage than the eleven of twenty-nine named for the Achaians. On the other hand, only five Trojan or allied contingents have individual places of origin enumerated, as opposed to twenty-five of the twenty-nine Achaian contingents. Named leadership is ubiquitous, and the lineage of contingent leaders is related in approximately the same proportion, across both catalogues.[178] In descending order, lineage, collective names of a people, shared territory of origin, and individual places of origin are the most common categories of identity in the Trojan Catalogue; despite these differences in frequency of appearance, the same categories of identity are present in both catalogues. The same is true of specific vocabulary describing places, regions, and communities: *δῆμος, φῦλα, πτολίεθρον,* and *πόλις* occur in each catalogue—as do proper names that should certainly be categorized under equivalent abstract concepts.[179] Finally, as is the case with the Achaians, there is almost no trace of the "ethnic" identity—group identity based upon putative descent from a common ancestor—in the Trojan Catalogue.

Although there are differences in emphasis between the Catalogue of Ships and the Trojan Catalogue, similarities mark the conceptualization and vocabulary found in both rosters. Homer's vocabulary of identity and the social groups and communities it implies, based upon the catalogues of *Iliad* Book II and face-to-face encounters between heroes, will now be examined systematically in Chapter IV.

---

[177] *Il.* II. 806. Kirk 1985. I:248, also notes that "Relatively few towns are mentioned, and most of the entries are distinguished by tribal names; a relatively large number of natural features (rivers, mountains, a lake) occur."

[178] See Table V and Table VI. Compare Scully 1990, Chapter VI note 48; Kirk 1985. I:248-50; Willcock 1970. 85; Hope Simpson and Lazenby 1970. 176 ff.

[179] Exceptions to the consistency between the Trojan Catalogue and the Catalogue of Ships include the addition of language and designation as "from afar" to the Trojan Catalogue; these differences are discussed at length in Chapter V.

Table III: Catalogue of Ships, Summary of Contingent Attributes

	Category	Number of Contingents Containing	
		Name(s)	Term(s)
Contingent	Collective Name(s) of People of Origin	15	2
	Achaian/Danaan/Argive	2	n/a
	Shared Territory of Origin	11	2
	Individual Places of Origin	25	20
	"Ethnic" designation[180]	1	n/a
	Wealth	1	1
	Ancestral hero/Historical digression	8	n/a
Contingent Leader(s)	Leadership	29	29
	Place of Origin	2	0
	Achaian/Danaan/Argive	1	n/a
	Lineage	22	22
	Status	4	4
	Status of Ancestors (from Lineage)	6	6

Table IV: Trojan Catalogue, Summary of Contingent Attributes

	Category	Number of Contingents Containing	
		Name(s)	Term(s)
Contingent	Collective Name(s) of People of Origin	13	1
	Shared Territory of Origin	10	3
	"From afar"	n/a	4
	Language	n/a	1
	Individual Places of Origin	5	4
Contingent Leader(s)	Leadership	16	16
	Place of Origin	2	1
	Status	n/a	1
	Lineage	10	10
	Ancestors' Place of Origin	1	0
	Ancestors' "Ethnic" Designation	1	n/a

[180] Generally following J. Hall's criteria for ethnicity, namely (putative) descent or socio-linguistic groups.

Table V: Catalogue of Ships, Total Occurrences of Terms and Concepts

	Category	Total Occurrences			
		Name(s)		Term(s)	
Contingent	Collective Name(s) of People of Origin	24		δῆμος	1
				καταφυλαδόν	1
	Shared Territory of Origin	12		πτολίεθρον	1
				ἑκατόμπολις	1
	Achaian/Danaan/Argive	Ἀχαιοί	2	n/a	
	Individual Places of Origin	177		Stated[181]	
				πτολίεθρον	6
				πόλις	6
				τύμβος	1
				Sanctuary/Temple	2
				Geographic Feature	17
				Region	1
				Ambiguous	
				Geog. Feature/Region	19
				City/Citadel	5
	"Ethnic" designation	Μινύειος	1	n/a	
		Πελασγικός	1		
	Wealth	1		θεσπέσιος πλοῦτος	1
	Ancestral Hero or Legend	8		n/a	
Contingent Leader(s)	Leadership	52 (Including eight heroes who are "with" the leaders but not leaders themselves)		ἄρχω / ἀρχός	18
				ἡγεμονεύω	15
				ἄγω	8
				ἀνάσσω	1
				κοσμέω	2
				οὐδὲ ἄναρχος	2
	Place of Origin	2		0	
	Achaian/Danaan/Argive	Δαναοί	1	n/a	
	Lineage	51		Father	32
				Paternal Grandfather	9
				Mother	6
				Maternal Grandfather	1
				Brother	2
				Unspecified Relative	2
	Status	4		Prowess of Contingent	3
				κρείων	2
				κυδιάω	1
				ἄριστος...πολὺ	1
				ἄναξ	1
	Status of Ancestors	6		ἄναξ	5
				ἐσθλός	1

[181] Terms that are "stated" appear in the relevant passage, or are strongly associated by context (in which case only a proper name occurs in the text). Similarly, "ambiguous" terms are (less securely) implied.

Table VI: Trojan Catalogue, Total Occurrences of Terms and Concepts

	Category	Total Occurrences			
		Name(s)		Term(s)	
Contingent	Collective Name(s) of People of Origin	Trojans	2	φῦλα	1
		Dardanians	1		
		Others	12		
	Shared Territory of Origin	12		Stated	
				Region	1
				Geographic Feature	2
				Ambiguous	
				Region/Geog. Feature	2
	"From afar"	n/a		τηλόθεν	3
				τῆλε	1
	Language	n/a		βαρβαρόφωνος	1
	Individual Places of Origin	21		Stated	
				δῆμος	1
				Geog. Feature	5
				Ambiguous	
				Region/Geog. Feature	3
Contingent Leader(s)	Leadership	32		ἡγεμονεύω	5
				ἄρχω	9
				ὄρχαμος	1
				ἀρχός	4
	Place of Origin	3		Geog. Feature	1
	Status	1		Quality and Quantity of Men Led	1
	Lineage	16		Father	13
				Mother	2
				Grandfather	2
	Ancestors' Place of Origin	1		0	
	Ancestors' "Ethnic" Designation	Πελασγός	1	n/a	

CHAPTER IV: INTERMEDIATE COMMUNITIES IN THE EPICS

Based upon the face-to-face encounters between warriors and Homer's description of the leaders and their peoples in the Catalogue of Ships and the Trojan Catalogue, a vocabulary of identity and origin can be compiled for the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Between identity based on membership in an *οἶκος*, and an emerging Panhellenic identity lies a matrix of overlapping communities and social units, the most important of which are based on allegiance to a particular leader or origin from a specific place.[1] Homer uses the term *γαῖα* and its variants to describe communities larger than the *οἶκος* based on territoriality, while words designating the social units based on groups of people include: *φῦλον*, *ἔθνος*, *γενεή* (or *γένος*), and *φρήτρη*. The term *δῆμος* fills an ambiguous role, sometimes designating a territory, sometimes a community, sometimes both. The challenge lies in determining the meaning of each term, the saliency of each concept, the criteria which define it, the interplay between territorial and group identity, and the relationship between the concepts of identity and underlying social groups. Examination of the use of terms gleaned from the catalogues and exchanges between heroes demonstrates that lineage groups outside the immediate family and the direct, paternal line of descent play little role in organizing Homeric society and contribute little to heroic identity. This is true both in the sense that there are no securely identifiable social units based upon kinship groups, and also that very few hints of identity based upon putative descent (outside of direct, singular paternal lineage) from a common ancestor, putative or otherwise, can be found. These phenomena, the lack of "ethnic" identity based upon putative descent and the lack of kinship groups, are related and point to a society which is not organized, either in the sphere of operative social units or in terms of the construction of group identities, by kinship, real or imagined.

---

[1] I have chosen to think of membership in a military contingent or subdivision thereof as reflecting loyalty to a particular leader since this is how the category of identity is most commonly articulated in the epics (i.e. words and phrases denoting leadership or loyalty far outnumber the use of abstract terms like *φῦλον*, *ἔθνος*, and *φρήτρη*). I will generally refer to leadership and loyalty rather than to membership in "military units," which strikes me as too abstract for the concept encountered in Homer (but see Donlan, 1985.)

Instead, what organizes Homeric social groups and what provides identity for Homeric heroes is origin from a particular territorial community, a *πατρίς γαῖα*, a nascent political (or perhaps more accurately, public) entity, the *δῆμος*, and various (perhaps temporary and certainly unstable) military groupings such as *φῦλον*, *ἔθνος*, and *φρήτρη*.

Γενεή and *Γένος*

The terms *γενεή* and *γένος* occur eighty-six times in Homer, and the words invoke a broad range of meanings. Liddell and Scott provide a range of meanings for *γένος*, including direct descent; offspring, posterity; clan, house, family; age, generation; and tribe. For *γενεή* they supply race, family; race, generation; offspring; age, time of life; or even birthplace.[2] Most of time when Homer uses this term, he means the immediate family or extended kin group, while other uses, such as generations of men or breeds of horses have nothing to do with human communities. Considering the importance placed by J. Hall on putative descent from a common ancestor, and the emphasis of older theories on kin in structuring early Greek society, it is worth exploring whether or not the term is ever applied to a group larger than the immediate family or direct paternal lineage of an individual hero. In other words, do the terms *γενεή* or *γένος* ever indicate a functional social unit or a community united by supposed descent from a shared ancestor which, in either case, includes members outside a direct line of descent within a single heroic family

Homer's usage of *γενεή* and *γένος* can be broken into about six categories. Several can be immediately dissmissed as unrelated to the questions of identity and social groups. This includes eight references to classification of beings (gods, animals, or men), such as *καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼ θεός εἰμι, γένος δέ μοι ἔνθεν ὅθεν σοί*, "I am likewise a god, and my race [*γένος*] is even what yours is."[3] I have also included designation of breeds of animals in this category, such as *ἡμιόνων γένος*, "the race [*γένος*] of she-

---

[2] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*γένος*;" "*γενεή*."

[3] *Il.* IV.58. See also *Il.* VI.180; XII.23; XXIII.347. *Il.* XV.141 offers a slight variation, grouping the *γενεή* and the *τόκος* of humanity.

mules."[4] Another twelve uses of these terms refer directly to order of birth—*γενεῇ πρότερος*, "older born," *ὁπλότερος γενεῇ*, "younger born," or a variation.[5] Eight times *γενεή* or *γένος* means "generation," as in the succeeding generations of humanity; Glaukos' speech at *Iliad* VI.145 ff is the most famous example of this usage:

> *Τυδεΐδη μεγάθυμε τί ἤ γενεήν ἐρεείνεις;*
> *οἵη περ φύλλων γενεή τοίη δὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν.*
> *φύλλα τὰ μέν τ' ἄνεμος χαμάδις χέει, ἄλλα δέ θ' ὕλη*
> *τηλεθόωσα φύει, ἔαρος δ' ἐπιγίγνεται ὥρη:*[6]
>
> High-hearted son of Tydeus, why ask of my generation?
> As is the generation of leaves, so is that of humanity.
> The wind scatters the leaves on the ground, but the live timber burgeons
> With leaves again in the season of spring returning.

Finally, in seven instances, the term *γένος* refers to parentage; the phrase *πατρὸς δ' ἐξ ἀγαθοῦ γένος εὔχεται ἔμμεναι υἱός*, "[he] declares himself to be born [*γένος*] the son of a good father."[7]

The usage of *γενεή* and *γένος* which proves to be the most relevant to a discussion of intermediate communities revolves around lineage and genealogy. In most cases, when Homer uses either of these terms to describe lineage, immediate ancestry, or at most close collateral kinship is indicated. Poseidon's speech regarding his rescue of Aineias typifies this usage of *γενεή*:

> *...μόριμον δέ οἱ ἐστ' ἀλέασθαι,*
> *ὄφρα μὴ ἄσπερμος γενεή καὶ ἄφαντος ὄληται*
> *Δαρδάνου, ὃν Κρονίδης περὶ πάντων φίλατο παίδων*
> *οἳ ἔθεν ἐξεγένοντο γυναικῶν τε θνητάων.*
> *ἤδη γὰρ Πριάμου γενεήν ἔχθηρε Κρονίων:*
> *νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαο βίη Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει*

---

[4] *Il.* II.852. See also *Il.* V.265; 268; *Od.* XX.212.

[5] *Il.* XV.166; II.707. See also *Il.* III.215; VI.24; VII.153; IX.58; IX.161; XIV.112; XV.182; XVIII.365, XXI.439; XIX.184.

[6] *Il.* VI.145-48. See also *Il.* I.250; XXIII.790. *Od.* III.245; XIV.325; XIX.294. See *Od.* XVI.117 for a variation, where Telemachos employs the term *γένος* when he is describing how his family has only one male child per generation: *ὧδε γὰρ ἡμετέρην γενεὴν μούνωσε Κρονίων.* See Chapter II above for discussion of this passage in the context of the confrontation between Glaukos and Diomedes.

[7] *Od.* XXI.331; a variation of this line occurs at *Il.* XIV.113. See also *Il.* V.896; XIII.354; XIV.201; 302; XXI.186.

καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισθε γένωνται.[8]

...It is destined that [Aineias] shall be the survivor,
that the generation [*γενεήν*] of Dardanos shall not die, without seed
obliterated, since Dardanos was dearest to Kronides
of all his sons that have been born to him from mortal women.
For Kronos' son has cursed the gerneration [*γενεήν*] of Priam,
And now the might of Aineias shall be lord over the Trojans,
And his sons' sons, and those who are born of their seed hereafter.

Here, it is clear that *γενεή* refers to the decendants of Dardanos on the one hand, and Priam on the other. Homer's use of term is still quite concrete; it invokes the direct descendants of Dardanos and Priam, as indicated by the use of *παίδων παῖδες* when describing the progeny of Dardanos who are destined to rule (*ἀνάξει*) over the Trojans. This example is typical of how Homer employs *γενεή* and *γένος* to mean close relationship or direct (usually paternal) descent, as well as the rights and privilidges which are passed from generation to generation.[9] For example, Homer has Diomedes describe his *γένος* as *οὐκ...κακὸν*, "not base," as *οὐ...νώνυμνον*, "not nameless," and four times describes a *γένος* or *γενεή* as "royal" (*βασιλήων* or *βασίλειος*).[10] Elsewhere, Homer contrasts the rights or station conferred by *γενεή* and *γένος* with seniority or ability.[11] In each case, *γενεή* or *γένος* and the status or privileges conferred by it (or contrasted against it) clearly derive from lineage.

It is not surprising that lineage is so frequently invoked by Homer, since family and household play such a central role in the poems. Certain aspects of Homer's deployment of the term, however, imply another aspect of community: territory or place of origin. Frequently, a *γενεή* or *γένος* is identified with a particular place when it

---

[8] *Il.* XX.302-08. This usage occurs twenty times for *γένος* and twenty-five times for *γενεὴ*.

[9] See *Il.* VI.209; X.86; XIX.105; *Od.* IV.63; XIV.508.

[10] Status conferred through *γένος* or *γενεὴ*: *Il.* XIV.126; *Od.* I.222; royal status: *Il.* X.239; *Od.* IV.62; XV.533; XVI.401. See also *Od.* I.386-87: *μὴ σέ γ' ἐν ἀμφιάλῳ Ἰθάκῃ βασιλῆα Κρονίων / ποιήσειεν, ὅ τοι γενεῇ πατρώιόν ἐστιν.* "May the son of Cronos never make you king in seagirt Ithaca, which thing is by birth [*γενεῇ*] your heritage."

[11] *Il.* XI.786; X.239 respectively.

is introduced. For example, as Asteropaios and Achilleus are about to face one another in battle, Asteropaios tells Achilleus of his origin:

> *Πηλεΐδη μεγάθυμε τί ἦ γενεὴν ἐρεείνεις;*
> *εἴμ' ἐκ Παιονίης ἐριβώλου τηλόθ' ἐούσης*
> *Παίονας ἄνδρας ἄγων δολιχεγχέας...*[12]
>
> High-hearted son of Peleus, why ask of my generation (*γενεή*)?
> I am from Paionia far away, where the soil is generous
> and lead the men of Paionia with long spears...

Immediately after using the term *γενεή*, Asteropaios states his place of origin, Paionia, and then mentions his homeland again when describing the men he leads. Although he names his father and grandfather (after reusing the term *γενεή*),[13] the fact that the first information he gives Achilleus is the name of his homeland establishes a connection between *γενεή* and place of origin. Likewise, after killing Iphition, Achilleus proclaims over his body:

> *ἐνθάδε τοι θάνατος, γενεὴ δέ τοί ἐστ' ἐπὶ λίμνῃ*
> *Γυγαίῃ, ὅθι τοι τέμενος πατρώϊόν ἐστιν*
> *Ὕλλῳ ἐπ' ἰχθυόεντι καὶ Ἕρμῳ δινήεντι.*[14]
>
> Here is your death, but your generation (*γενεή*) was by the lake waters
> of Gyge, where is the allotted land of your fathers
> by fish-swarming Hyllos and the whirling waters of Hermos.

Although no region like Paionia is named, only the Gygaian Lake, a geographic feature, the idea of territoriality is reinforced by the use of the term *τέμενος*, "allotted land," in the following line and the addition of two more bodies of water in line 392. Achilleus describes a *τέμενος* bounded or defined by three lakes or rivers. In the *Odyssey* the relationship between *γενεή* / *γένος* and place of origin emerges even more explicitly. Odysseus twice uses the phrase *ἐκ μὲν Κρητάων γένος εὔχομαι εὐρειάων*, "I announce that my origin (*γένος*) is from Crete, a spacious land" when describing his false identity,

---

[12] *Il.* XXI.152-54.

[13] *Il.* XXI.157-59.

[14] *Il.* XX.390-92.

first to Eumaios, later to Penelope.[15] Likewise, immediately before naming his father, Telemachos tells Theoklymenos: *ἐξ Ἰθάκης γένος εἰμί*, "of Ithaca I am by birth [*γένος*]," a phrase echoed by Odysseus as he deceives his father, Laertes in Book XIV: *εὔχετο δ' ἐξ Ἰθάκης γένος ἔμμεναι*, "he declared that by lineage [*γένος*] he came from Ithaca."[16] Such references are not limited to Odysseus and his son; Alkinoös tells his daughter:

> *ἤδη γάρ σε μνῶνται ἀριστῆες κατὰ δῆμον*
> *πάντων Φαιήκων, ὅθι τοι γένος ἐστὶ καὶ αὐτῇ.*[17]
>
> For already you are being courted by all the best men
> of the Phaiakians hereabouts, and you too are a Phaiakian [lit.: from the same *γένος*].

Not only does Alkinoös state that the best of the Phaiakians *κατὰ δῆμον*, in the *δῆμος*, are courting Nausikaä, but adds that she herself is from (*ὅθι*) the same *γένος*. Although the meaning of *δῆμος* is somewhat ambiguous, use of the relative adverb *ὅθι*, where, makes it clear that Alkinoös is referring to a place, namely Phaiakia. Another adverb denoting place is used with *γένος* by Melanthios when he tells the other suitors that he does not know (the disguised) Odysseus' origin: *αὐτὸν δ' οὐ σάφα οἶδα, πόθεν γένος εὔχεται εἶναι*, "but of the man himself I do not know surely where he claims he was born."[18] Again, the use of *πόθεν*, where, indicates that a place of origin is sought. Twice more, *γενεή* is used with an interrogative adverb denoting place (*ποῦ*) and closely paired with the phrase, *πατρὶς ἄρουρα*, "paternal fields."[19] In all, about ten of the forty-five uses of the term *γενεή* or *γένος* invoke place of origin, indicating a relationship in the mind of the poet between *γενεή* / *γένος* and place of origin.

---

[15] *Od.* XIV.199; XVI.62. Compare *Od.* XVII.523, where Odysseus claims to be from Krete in the same line where he states he is of the *γένος* of Minos.

[16] *Od.* XV.267; XIV.269 respectively.

[17] *Od.* VI.34-35.

[18] *Od.* XIII.373.

[19] *Od.* I.407; XX.193. Compare *Od.* XIX.116, where *γένος* is paired with *πατρίδα γαῖαν*, "native [lit. paternal] lands."

Conversely, in only two ambiguous cases is *γενεή* used in conjunction with the name of a people. In the first, Nestor recounts how Peleus was once pleased when Nestor spoke to him about *πάντων Ἀργείων ἐρέων γενεήν τε τόκον τε*, "the generation (*γενεή*) and blood (*τόκος*, lit. 'birth') of all the Argives."[20] Here *γενεή* means either generation (in the sense of one generation of men following another) or lineage, but as it is paired with the term *τόκος* the latter meaning seems more logical. If *γενεή* does invoke lineage, it is interesting that it is used in the singular, implying the existence of one "lineage" encompassing all the Argives.[21] Even if this is the case, it provides more evidence for Panhellenic sentiment than for the existence of intermediate categories of identity. Admittedly, the usage here is ambiguous both as to the precise meaning of the term *γενεή* and whether or not it should be read as indicating a single lineage for the Argives.

The other instance in which Homer employs the term *γενεή* in conjunction with the name of a people is less ambiguous. Idomeneus, seeing a warrior returning from battle with the mares of Eumelos, recognizes Diomedes and proclaims:

> *...δοκέει δέ μοι ἔμμεναι ἀνὴρ*
> *Αἰτωλὸς γενεήν, μετὰ δ' Ἀργείοισιν ἀνάσσει*
> *Τυδέος ἱπποδάμου υἱὸς κρατερὸς Διομήδης.*[22]
>
> ...but it seems to me the man who is leading
> is an Aitolian by birth [*γενεή*], but lord of the Argives,
> the son of Tydeus, breaker of horses, strong Diomedes.

This is the only instance in Homer where *γενεήν* is coupled with the name of a people, the Aitolians.[23] As in the case of Nestor's speech to Pelius, *γενεή* is singular. Furthermore, Homer contrasts Diomedes Aitolian *γενεή* with the fact that he rules over

---

[20] *Il.* VII.128.

[21] Since the speech in which this phrase occurs is directed to the entire Achaian army, assembled to find a champion to face Hektor in single combat, and since neither Peleus nor Nestor are from the region of Argos, the term Argives as used in this passage probably denotes the entirety of the Achaians rather than residents of the region of Argos.

[22] *Il.* XXIII.469-71.

[23] Variants of the term *Αἰτωλὸς* occur 14 times in Homer; those that are not ambiguous consistently invoke "the Aitolians" as a people. The term *Αἰτωλία*, referring to the region, does not occur in Homer.

(*ἀνάσσει*) the Argives—again Homer uses the name of the people, *Ἀργεῖος*.[24] In this passage, then, Homer implies the existence of a unified, singular Aitolian *γενεή*.

When the terms *γενεή* and *γένος* are used in the context of kinship, they refer to direct lineage: the immediate or at most extended family, and do not reflect any intermediate social group based upon kinship or descent. Moreover, ideas of place (often on a regional scale) are coupled with *γενεή* and *γένος*, indicating a relationship between region of origin and lineage. On the other hand, in only two instances does Homer link the term *γενεή* with the name of a people; one of these is Panhellenic in sense, leaving one example of a people, the Aitolians, spoken of as a single *γενεή*. If in this case *γενεή* Homer still intends to invoke lineage with the term, this is the only example of Homer considering a people as descended from some putative common ancestor, as is central to J. Hall's conception of identity. This meager evidence, especially when compared with the copious linkage of *γενεή* to place (a ten-to-one ratio), speaks to a much stronger identity based on (familial) origin from a place rather than membership in an kinship group descended from a common ancestor, real or putative.[25]

The pattern of usage for the term *γένος* posited here accords well with that argued by W. Donlan.[26] Donlan contends that *γένος* designates a "class of being" with common identification, conveying a general sense of birth, origin, stock, descent, descendant, family, or lineage. This list should also be expanded to include "class of being" such as the gods as a category or a breed of horse. Donlan, following Bourriot and Roussel, correctly observes that *γένος* "does not signify 'clan' or any other extensive kinship group;" instead, like *φῦλον* and *ἔθνος*, *γένος* is an inclusive term

[24] In this case meaning the residents of Argos, Tiryns, etc., see *Il.* II.560-68.

[25] Snodgrass 1980, 38. In a related observation, Snodgrass notes that one of the primary reasons Greeks of the Archaic period took recourse to their legendary past was to establish rightful ownership over a particular territory, specifically through demonstrating that they were "linked by descent or other close association, plausibly or even implausibly, with a legendary personage who had once inhabited a place."

[26] Donlan 1985, 295-96.

"denoting an aggregate of like beings."[27] Indeed, nowhere in Homer is γένος used to invoke an extended kinship group, a observation made explicitly by Snodgrass as well.[28] Donlan is justified when he claims that there is nothing in the usage of γένος to suggest that it was a term for a formal corporate kinship group, but it does appear that the types of "aggregate of like beings" which γένος can designate include the Achaians as a whole or the community of the Aitolians in *Iliad* XXIII.471. The latter might elsewhere be referred to as a δῆμος, a people and the territory they occupy, or ἔθνος, the military contingent that a community can field, both of which are functional social groups in Homer. This conclusion, however, is extrapolated from only one example of each of the two uses, and should be treated as tentative and provisional. Much more commonly, γένος, as argued by Donlan, denotes an aggregate of like beings, usually with overtones of "family" in its broadest sense.[29]

Ἔθνος

The term ἔθνος occurs twenty-nine times in Homer. Although ἔθνος, defined by Liddell and Scott as a number of people living together, body or host of men, company, or band of comrades, should be a promising term in the study of communities and social groups, but Homer's use of the word proves to be rather vague.[30] Again, its usage can be broken into a number of categories, two of which shed little light on intermediate categories of identity in Homer. Five times, Homer applies the term to groups of

---

[27] Donlan 1985, 295.

[28] Snodgrass 1980, 26, "the genos in its technical sense of an established social organization in entirely absent, in the texts of Homer and Hesiod." Snodgrass does, however, believe that a form of simple tribalism, without the "elaborate substructure of phratry and genos," organized the Greeks of the Dark Age (27-28). This tribal organization is reflected in Homer's use of the "plural ethnic"—Myrmidons, Boiotians, Kilikians, etc.—to refer to a king's subjects or components of the armies at Troy. These plural ethnics, referring to a king's subjects or components of an army, may however describe just that: followers of a particular leader and members of a military contingent.

[29] Compare Donlan 1985, 301-02.

[30] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "ἔθνος."

animals such as swarms of bees or flocks of birds.[31] Three times in the *Odyssey*, Homer speaks of the ἔθνεα νεκρῶν, "tribes of the dead."[32] The remaining occurrences of ἔθνος describe non-lineage-based groups of people, although most uses are rather vague, invoking ill-defined and perhaps transient communities. The most common usage of the term, employed by Homer fifteen times, is some variation of the phrase ἔθνος ἑτάρων, "throng of companions," into which warriors retreat.[33] Homer applies this phrase to Achaian, Trojan and, in one case, allied contingents, but no further information (beyond the limiting genitive ἑτάρων) defines the group of warriors in question in these fifteen passages. Another vague passage, apparently similar in meaning, includes Nestor's use of the term ἔθνος in the phrase ἔθνος πεζῶν "hoard of foot-soldiers" which seems to apply to the entire force of infantry deployed by the Pylians against the Elians in one of Nestor's historical digressions.[34]

Two occurrences of the term ἔθνος in *Iliad* Book II shed some light on the matter. In the introduction to the Catalogue of Ships, Homer introduces some action of the Achaians with the line: ὣς τῶν ἔθνεα πολλὰ νεῶν ἄπο καὶ κλισιάων, "so the many nations of men from the ships and shelters," the first time as Agamemnon calls the men to assembly, the second as they stream onto the plain before Troy.[35] Considering that the word ἔθνος isused in the plural (ἔθνεα) when describing the Achaians in these two passages, that the passages occur in the introduction to the Catalogue of Ships, and that the νεῶν...καὶ κλισιάων, "ships and shelters," of the Achaians are arranged by contingent, it seems likely that an ἔθνος refers to the warriors who make up an

---

[31] Bees: *Il.* II.87; birds: *Il.* II.460; XV.671; houseflies: *Il.* II.469, swine: *Od.* XIV.74. In the four cases from the *Iliad*, the usage comes in a simile describing either the Achaian or Trojan forces.

[32] *Od.* X.526; XI.32; XI.34.

[33] *Il.* III.32; VII.115; XI.585; 595; XIII.159; 531; 566; 596; 649; XIV.408; XV.591; XVI.817; XVII.114; 581; 680. All refer to retreats except XI.595, XVII.114, and XV.591, in which the warrior in question stands among the ἔθνος ἑταίρων. See Donlan 1985, 295.

[34] *Il.* XI.722.

[35] *Il.* II.91; 464.

individual contingent.[36] Homer's uniquely direct application of the term ἔθνος to the Lykians, again using a limiting genitive as was the case with ἔθνος ἑτάρων and ἔθνος πεζῶν, calling them the Λυκίων μέγα ἔθνος, "the great horde [ἔθνος] of the Lykians," supports the view that the contingents (of Achaians or Trojan allies) each make up an ἔθνος.[37] Likewise, the term (in the singular) is once applied to the Trojan army as a whole, this time using λαῶν as the limiting genitive; after Aeneas gathers together the heroes "who were lords of the Trojans along with him" his "heart...gladdened within him" as he surveyed the λαῶν ἔθνος, "swarm of the host."[38] The preceding text, detailing as it does the various commanders of the Trojans, explicitly naming them as such, and stating that the army (λαοί) followed them indicates that the λαῶν ἔθνος should be taken as specifically refering to the Trojans rather than the assembled force of Trojans and allies. Thus, the use of the term ἔθνος as it is applied to the Lykians and Trojans as well as in the introduction to the Catalogue of Ships seems to refer to individual, organized contingents of men.

Complicating matters further, in a single instance Homer applies the term to the entirety of the Achaian force, using Ἀχαιῶν as a limiting genitive with ἔθνος calling them the Ἀχαιῶν ἔθνος, "the swarming [ἔθνος of the] Achaians."[39] In the passage surrounding this phrase, Athena appears to Menelaos disguised as Phoinix, and charges him with sole responsibility for rallying the Achaians, offering no hint of any internal division.[40] Aside from this single use, which may be another indication of nascent Panhellenism, Homer applies ἔθνος consistently only to individual contingents most commonly with the phrase ἔθνος ἑτάρων.

---

[36] This definigion is also plausible in the case of phrase ἔθνος ἑταίρον discussed above; in those cases the term ἔθνος would refer to the contingent that accompanied the hero to Troy (or to the Trojan force as a whole when the phrase is applied to a Trojan warrior).

[37] *Il.* XII.331.

[38] *Il.* XIII.495.

[39] *Il.* XVII.552. The scene concerns the struggle over Patroklos' corpse. This single "Panhellenic" use of the term ἔθνος mirrors a similar, and also unique, use of γένος; see above.

In general an ἔθνος, like a γένος, designates a class of being with common identification. Unlike γένος, however, ἔθνος does not appear to have overtones of birth or family. When not referring to animals or corpses, ἔθνος in the epics denotes a military contingent. Donlan argues that building from the basic meaning of an inclusive term "denoting an aggregate of like beings," ἔθνος (along with γένος and φῦλον) "refer to large or small groupings of people who have a common identity." It is unclear, however, whether the entity invoked by the term ἔθνος is derived from the act of enrollment in a contingent under common leadership, or whether the ἔθνος is a pre-existing unit, a self-conscious or organized group of people from which each contingent is drawn.[41] Finally, unlike φῦλον and φρήτρη, the ἔθνος appears to be coterminous with the δῆμος, if one considers the each contingent of the Achaian (or Trojan and allied) army is drawn from a single δῆμος and constitutes a single ἔθνος.

Φῦλον and Φρήτρη

Like γένος and ἔθνος, the term φῦλον, which occurs twenty times in Homer, carries a range of meanings; Liddell and Scott provide: race, tribe, clan, class, and nation.[42] Again, most occurrences shed little light on functional social groups or group identity. As is the case with γένος, Homer often uses φῦλον to distinguish categorically between gods, men, women, and animals. In four instances, φῦλον modifies the term ἀθανάτων or θεῶν, designating the gods as a category distinct from men.[43] Unlike γενεή / γένος,

---

[40] Menelaos' special status is also reflected in *Iliad* Book II, where he is introduced as "above all his heart was eager / to avenge Helen's longing to escape and her lamentations," and in his single combat with Paris in Book III.

[41] Donlan 1985, 295, appears to include ἔθνος with γένος and φῦλον in his category of words that mean "family" in its widest sense. Unlike in the usage of γένος and φῦλον, however, I found no cases where ἔθνος invoked blood or kinship relationships of any kind. Donlan includes military contingents or groups of contingents in his definition of ἔθνος, and notes the tendency of the word to be paired with ἑταῖροι in the *Iliad*. Beyond this brief discussion, Donlan does not discuss the ἔθνος.

[42] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "φῦλον."

[43] With ἀθανάτων: *Il.* V.441; with θεῶν: *Il.*XV.54; XV.161; XV.177. See above for similar use of γενεή / γένος, but note that this term is used only with respect to the gods or animals, never with or ἄνθρωπος or γυνή.

φῦλον is also used to categorize mortals; twice in the *Iliad* it is combined with γυναικῶν to describe women as a class, three times in the *Odyssey* it is combined with ἀνθρώπων to describe men—or, more generally, humankind—as a category.[44] In all five cases, Homer employs φῦλον in the plural: αἳ κάλλει ἐνίκων φῦλα γυναικῶν, "who in their beauty surpassed the races (φῦλα) of women," and δύσζηλοι γάρ τ' εἰμὲν ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων, "we are quick to anger, we tribes (φῦλα) of men upon the earth," are typical examples.[45] Similarly, Homer combines φῦλον, again in the plural, with a limiting genitive of the species being classified in order to categorize insects in one case and giants in another.[46] Finally, in a similar construction, Homer once applies φῦλον (this time in the singular) to an occupation, invoking a particular type of bard:

> ...οὕνεκ' ἄρα σφέας
> οἵμας μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε, φίλησε δὲ φῦλον ἀοιδῶν.[47]
>
> ...for the Muse has taught them the paths of song, and loves the tribe (φῦλον) of minstrels.

Thirteen of the twenty uses of the term φῦλον refer to the gods as a class, to species of animals or other beings, to men or women generically or, in one case, to men engaged in a particular occupation. Only in the other seven cases is a specific group of people invoked.

Two of these seven uses, both spoken by the swineherd Eumaios in Book XIV of the *Odyssey*, describe lineage groups.[48] The first of these appears to bridge the gap between φῦλον as a term referring to the "races of women" and its meaning as a lineage group. Eumaios, talking to the disguised Odysseus upon his return to Ithaka, speaks of the fate of his master and Helen's responsibility for it:

> ἀλλ.' ὄλεθ'—ὡς ὤφελλ' Ἑλένης ἀπὸ φῦλον ὀλέσθαι
> πρόχυυ, ἐπεὶ πολλῶν ἀνδρῶν ὑπὸ γούνατ' ἔλυσε·[49]

---

[44] *Il.* IX.130, IX.272; *Od.* III.282; VII.307; XV.409.

[45] *Il.* IX.130; XIV.361; *Od.* VII.307.

[46] Flies: *Il.* XIX.30-31; giants: *Od.* VII.206.

[47] *Od.* VIII.481-82.

[48] See Donlan 1985, 295.

[49] *Od.* XIV.68-69.

> but he [Odysseus] perished—as I would all the tribe of Helen had perished in utter ruin, since she loosened the knees of many warriors.

Here, Homer uses *φῦλον* in the singular, unlike the five instances where Homer uses the term to describe women or men as a class. It is as if the *Ἑλένης...φῦλον* is a constituent of the *φῦλα γυναικῶν*.[50] The second use of *φῦλον* to invoke lineage groups is clearer. Eumaios warns the disguised Odysseus of the suitor's plot against Telemachos:

> *...τὸν δὲ μνηστῆρες ἀγαυοὶ*
> *οἴκαδ' ἰόντα λοχῶσιν, ὅπως ἀπὸ φῦλον ὄληται*
> *νώνυμον ἐξ Ἰθάκης Ἀρκεισίου ἀντιθέοιο.*[51]
>
> For him now the lordly suitors lie in wait on his homeward way, that the race [*φῦλον*] of godlike Arceisius may perish out of Ithaca, and leave no name.

Homer elsewhere names Arkeisios, Laertes' father, as the progenitor of Odysseus' line.[52] In this case, *φῦλον*, again used in the singular, refers specifically to the descendants of Arkeisios, and the threat to Telemachos' life is made more urgent since *γενεὴν μούνωσε Κρονίων*, "the son of Kronos made [Arkeisios'] house (*γενεή*) run in a single line."[53] In at least one case, and probably two, Homer uses the term *φῦλον* to describe lineage groups.

Five times Homer uses the term *φῦλον*, always in the plural, to describe divisions of an army or contingent.[54] In the introduction to the Catalogue of Ships, he repeats the term three times as Nestor advises Agamemnon about the ordering of his army:

> *κρῖν' ἄνδρας κατὰ φῦλα κατὰ φρήτρας Ἀγάμεμνον,*
> *ὡς φρήτρη φρήτρηφιν ἀρήγῃ, φῦλα δὲ φύλοις.*

---

[50] Construction of the two phrases is parallel: *Ἑλένης...φῦλον* uses *φῦλον* in the singular with a singular limiting genitive (the name of one woman), while *φῦλα γυναικῶν* uses *φῦλα* in the plural with a plural limiting genitive (women in general). On the other hand, the usage in this passage could be synonymous with *φῦλα γυναικῶν* and simply refer to all women; i.e. Eumaios could be wishing for the destruction of womankind as a whole rather than for the destruction of Helen and her *φῦλον*. The use of the singular rather than the plural implies Helen's *φῦλον* specifically, but some ambiguity remains.

[51] *Od.* XIV.180-82.

[52] Explicitly in *Od.* IV.755; XVI.118; see also XXIV.270; XXIV.517 where Homer mentions him specifically as the father of Laertes.

[53] *Od.* XVI.118. Over the course of the *Odyssey*, Homer uses the terms *φῦλον*, *γενεή*, and *γονή* to describe Arkeisios' lineage.

[54] The five uses occur in two separate passages. See Donlan 1985, 295.

εἰ δέ κεν ὣς ἔρξῃς καί τοι πείθωνται Ἀχαιοί,
γνώσῃ ἔπειθ' ὅς θ' ἡγεμόνων κακὸς ὅς τέ νυ λαῶν
ἠδ' ὅς κ' ἐσθλὸς ἔῃσι: κατὰ σφέας γὰρ μαχέονται.[55]

Set your men in order by tribes (φῦλα), by clans (φρήτρας), Agamemnon,
and let clans go in support of clan, let tribe support tribe.
If you do it this way, the Achaians obey you,
you will see which of your leaders is bad, and which of your people,
and which also is brave, since they will fight in divisions

Here, Homer uses φῦλα to refer to the divisions of the Achaian force, each made up of a leader (ἡγεμών) and the people (λαοί) who follow him. These φῦλα improve accountability in the army and allow independent military units to support one another.[56] Other than the tactical value of division according to φῦλα and the mention of leaders and followers, Homer provides no indication of the exact nature of a φῦλον. Homer does pair φῦλα with φρήτραι, but the latter occurs only here in the epics, shedding little light on the nature of the divisions invoked by either term. The use of the verb κρῖν', "to separate, divide, put apart, pick out, choose," an elision of κρῖνε, a second-person imperative, implies that the φῦλα and φρήτραι are ad hoc rather than pre-existing groups, which Nestor advises Agamemnon to organize on the spot.[57] The only other indication in Homer of the meaning of φρήτρη comes in Book IX of the *Iliad*, where Nestor condemns the man who foments war among the δῆμος:

ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιός ἐστιν ἐκεῖνος
ὃς πολέμου ἔραται ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυόεντος.[58]

Out of all brotherhood (ἀφρήτωρ), outlawed, homeless shall be that man
Who longs for all the horror of fighting among his own people (ἐπιδημίου).

---

[55] *Il.* II.362-66.

[56] Donlan 1985, 297-98. Compare Qviller 1981, 118; 142-43, who distinguishes military following a particular leader from the δῆμος as a whole, but does not associate them with any particular Homeric term.

[57] Qviller 1981, 143, sees division of the army into φῦλα and φρήτραι as a "new and excellent idea," although I hope the present argument demonstrates the Qviller overstates his case (at least with regard to φῦλα) when he claims: "There is no place for *phyla* and *phratrai* elsewhere in Homer." Qviller, following A. Andrews, "Phratries in Homer," *Hermes* 89.2 (May 1961): 129-40, attributes the genesis of φῦλα and φρήτραι to the early πόλις after the disappearance of kingship.

[58] Il. IX.63-64. See Donlan 1985, 298.

The instigator of civil conflict is without hearth, without law, and without *φρήτρη*. As Donlan observes, by stating what the socially disruptive man is excluded from, Nestor posits the existence of a community articulated by *φρήτρη*, *θέμις*, and *ἑστία*: "Belonging to the people thus appears to be expressed here...in terms of its two conspicuous elements: the primary household and the band of warrior-companions."[59] Although he is careful to note that the *φρήτρη* is neither a lineage or "jural" group, Donlan adds that membership in a *φρήτρη* conveyed "the fraternal solidarity of men bound together as warriors in the service of their chief and as sharers in the common experiences of everyday life in the cantons."[60] In any case, the close association of *φρήτρη* and *φῦλον* in Book II of the *Iliad* at least implies that the two types of group are related, at least in function and probably in composition. *Φρήτρη*—like the instances of *φῦλον* that describe communities unrelated by direct descent—most likely designates a military contingent or subdivision of an army.

In another example of *φῦλον* being used to designate a military contingent, in the Trojan Catalogue, the Pelasgians allies of the Trojans are introduced as a collection of *φῦλα*:

> *Ἱππόθοος δ' ἄγε φῦλα Πελασγῶν ἐγχεσιμώρων*
> *τῶν οἳ Λάρισαν ἐριβώλακα ναιετάασκον:*
> *τῶν ἦρχ' Ἱππόθοός τε Πύλαιός τ' ὄζος Ἄρηος,*
> *υἷε δύω Λήθοιο Πελασγοῦ Τευταμίδαο.*
> *αὐτὰρ Θρῄϊκας ἦγ' Ἀκάμας καὶ Πείροος ἥρως.*[61]
>
> Hippothoös led the tribes of spear-fighting Pelasgians,
> they who dwelt where the soil is rich about Larissa;

---

[59] Donlan 1985, 298. This accounts for two of the three alpha-privatives used by Nestor. I would argue that the third, *ἀθέμιστος*, denotes loss of recourse to the laws and customs of the *δῆμος* itself, as adjudicated by the *βασιλῆες*. On the same page of his argument, Donlan himself observes that the *δῆμος* is one of the three clearly delineated social units in Homer (along with the *λαός* and *οἶκος*). On the meaning of *θέμις*, see Finley 1978, 78, "A gift of the gods and a mark of civilized existence, sometimes it means right custom, proper procedure, social order, and sometimes merely the will of the gods...with little of the idea of right." Compare Luce 1978, 12 and esp. 15, "a traditional system specifying the rights and duties arising from one's status in society, and ultimately sanctioned by the gods."

[60] Donlan 1985, 305-08, esp. 307, discusses the Dark Age *φρήτρη*, admitting that its existence in the epics (and Hesiod) is "shadowy," represented by a total of two occurrences. Compare Qviller 1981: 142-43; Andrews 1961.

[61] *Il.* II.840-44.

Hippothoös and Pylaios, scion of Ares, led these,
sons alike of Pelasgian Lethos, son of Teutamos.

Although the term is used in the plural with the plural noun *Πελασγῶν* as its limiting genitive, no other hint of internal division is provided. The *φῦλα Πελασγῶν* share a territory of origin, Larissa, and two co-leaders Hippothoös and Pylaios. Some light is thrown on the nature of *φῦλα* by comparing this passage with an earlier passage in the Catalogue of Ships where Tlepolemos is said to have *τριχθὰ δὲ ᾤκηθεν καταφυλαδόν*, "settled [the Rhodians] in triple division by tribe."[62] Here, the adverb *καταφυλαδόν* is used to describe the division of the Rhodians, indicating the existence of sub-groups presumably called *φῦλα*. Like the Pelasgians, the men of Rhodes are divided into multiple *φῦλα*, in this case three. Both uses support Donlan's contention that *φῦλα* are small-scale military subgroups, subdivisions of the *δῆμος* (or perhaps the *ἔθνος*, at least in the case of the Achaians).[63]

In an analogous passage, where Hektor exhorts the allies of the Trojans to confront the Achaian army, he calls on the many divisions using the term *φῦλα*:

κέκλυτε μυρία φῦλα περικτιόνων ἐπικούρων:
οὐ γὰρ ἐγὼ πληθὺν διζήμενος οὐδὲ χατίζων
ἐνθάδ' ἀφ' ὑμετέρων πολίων ἤγειρα ἕκαστον,
ἀλλ' ἵνα μοι Τρώων ἀλόχους καὶ νήπια τέκνα
προφρονέως ῥύοισθε φιλοπτολέμων ὑπ' Ἀχαιῶν.[64]

Hear me, you numberless hordes (*φῦλα*) of companions who live at our borders.
It was not for any desire nor need of a multitude
that man by man I gathered you to come here from your cities,
but so that you might have good will to defend the innocent
children of the Trojans, and their wives, from the fighting Achaians.

Again, however, Homer provides little information about the nature of *φῦλα* beyond their role as military divisions. Homer adds only that Hektor gathered the various contingents of allies from their respective *πόλεις*, a claim made earlier in the Trojan

---

[62] *Il.* II.668. See also Donlan 1985, 295-97.

[63] Donlan 1985, 297. See Heubeck, Fernández-Galiano, and Russo 1992, 83-84, as well as the relevant sections of Chapter III above.

[64] *Il.* XVII.220-24. Compare Donlan 1985, 297.

Catalogue.[65] Immediately preceding this passage, Homer states that Hektor, ὄτρυνεν δὲ ἕκαστον ἐποιχόμενος ἐπέεσσι, "Ranged [the allies'] ranks, and spoke a word to encourage each captain," and follows this claim with a three-line list of allied leaders' names, perhaps indicating that—as is the case in the passage describing Achaian φῦλα—leadership plays a role in determining who constitutes a φῦλον.[66] Thus, based on Homer's use of the term φῦλα in these two passages, it appears to be a term designating a division within a larger body of men, defined by loyalty to a particular leader and sometimes by origin from a particular πόλις.

In all but eight uses of the term, φῦλον is employed generically to categorize gods, humans, women, or animals. In two of the eight exceptions, φῦλον denotes a lineage group, while in the other six it denotes a contingent or subdivision of the army.[67] Donlan includes φῦλον with ἔθνος and γένος in his category of terms that denote "an aggregate of like beings" and, when applied to people, refer to groups who have a common identity.[68] Donlan is careful to point out, however, that these terms, including φῦλον, do not invoke formal social groups based on lineage.[69] Instead, he suggests that φῦλον,

> [W]as the name by which such small leader-groups [the Achaian, Rhodian, Pelasgian, and *epikouroi* sub-divisions] were known in the Dark Age...[*phula*] specify small local groups, parts of larger groups of followers, the latter designated by *phretre*.[70]

Donlan sees φῦλον, along with φρήτρη, as terms designating not lineage groups, but instead as military/political associations made up of members drawn from various οἶκοι and neighborhoods, who followed a single chief or "big man" (βασιλεύς) and based

---

[65] Compare *Il.* II.362-66; see above.

[66] *Il.* XVII.215-18.

[67] To this list can be added the example of the compound καταφυλαδόν (*Il.* II.668) for a total of nine.

[68] Donlan 1985, 295.

[69] Donlan 1985, 295. Compare Snodgrass 1980, 26-28.

[70] Donlan 1985, 297. Transliterated in original.

upon personal loyalty.[71] In turn, these *φῦλον*, along with *φρήτρη* were constituent parts of the *δῆμος*, while a leader of a *φῦλον* represented his people in the larger *δῆμος*.

Γαῖα, *Αἶα*, and *Γῆ*

More frequent that any of the terms describing groups of people are words that relate identity to origin from a specific place or region. *Γαῖα* and its variants *αἶα* and *γῆ* are the most common terms Homer uses to denote a homeland or place of origin—in total they appear some 337 times. Furthermore, unlike the term *δῆμος* there is no uncertainty about the meaning of *γαῖα*; whereas *δῆμος* appears at times to include the population of a region as well as the physical place itself, *γαῖα* unambiguously refers to a land of origin.[72] As such, parallel uses *γαῖα* and *δῆμος* shed light on Homer's use of the latter. Almost half of the occurrences of *γαῖα* in Homer mean earth or land in the generic sense, or even simply ground or soil.[73] More specifically, Homer uses *γαῖα* to denote a "land" to refer to a place, rather than simply the earth or "land" as opposed to sea or sky. For example, Homer uses phrases such as *ἐπὶ πολλὴν / γαῖαν ἐληλουθώς*, "traversing much territory (*γαῖα*)," or *πατὴρ δ' ἐμὸς ἄλλοθι γαίης*, "as for my father, he is in some other land."[74] One of the few uses of *γαῖα* in the plural carries this meaning: *ἴμεν ἐς Λῆμνον... / ἥ οἱ γαιάων πολὺ φιλτάτη*, "[Hephaistos] would go to Lemnos...far the dearest of all lands (*γαιάων*)," demonstrating that while *γαῖα* in the singular can refer to the entire earth, in a sense the earth is also divided into many discrete *γαίαι*.[75]

---

[71] Donlan 1985, 298-303. See Chapter I above for a discussion of Donlan's reconstruction of social groups in Dark Age Greece. By contrast, Snodgrass 1980, 28, argues that the way in which Homer refers to a king's subjects, a state, or a component of an army, with the plural ethnics such as "Myrmidons," indicates a tribal organization.

[72] See Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*γαῖα*," where it is defined as land, country, fatherland, or earth. See also Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*αἶα*" and "*γῆ*."

[73] One-hundred sixty-five of 337 by my count, based upon searches using *The Perseus Project* (2001), and the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae*, CD-ROM (University of California, Irvine, 2000).

[74] *Il.* XV.81; *Od.* II.131.

[75] *Od.* VIII.283-84. Compare *Od.* XIII.211; 238; 326; XIV.85; 302; XXIV.281.

The nature and extent of an individual *γαῖα* in the sense of a specific land emerges over the course of Homer's poems. Twenty-five times Homer uses *γαῖα* in a phrase that explicitly names a region or people. Most such phrases occur in the *Odyssey* and refer to the lands Odysseus visits during his wanderings: *Φαιήκων ἐς γαῖαν*, "land of the Phaeacians," *γαίης Λωτοφάγων*, "land of the Lotus-eaters," or *Κυκλώπων...γαῖαν*, "land of the Cyclopes."[76] Only once are allies of the Trojans named in a similar phrase in the *Iliad*: *Θρηκῶν καθορώμενος αἶαν*, "land of the Thracian raiders."[77] Homer also uses *γαῖα* to refer to regions within Achaia: *Πύλου...ἀπίης γαίης*, "Pylos...a distant land," *Πυλίων...γαίης*, "the country of the Pylians," *Λακεδαίμονι αὖθι φίλῃ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ*, "Lakedaimon, the beloved land of their fathers," *Ἰθάκην...πατρίδα γαῖαν*, "Ithaka, our native land," and *πατρίδα γαῖαν... Ἰθάκης*, "your native land of rugged Ithaca."[78] The example of *Πύλου...γαίης* and *Πυλίων...γαίης* demonstrate that Homer may refer to a *γαῖα* either by its regional name or the collective name of its inhabitants—an ambiguity worth noting when considering the use and definition of *δῆμος*.[79]

One use of the term *γαῖα* also provides evidence for at least proto-Panhellenism. Homer also considers Achaia itself to be a single *γαῖα*; the phrase *Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν*, "land of Achaia" occurs three times, while the form *Ἀχαιΐδος...αἴης* occurs once.[80] Furthermore, in the third passage containing the phrase *Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν* Homer elaborates upon what he considers the land of Achaia to include:

> *οἵη νῦν οὐκ ἔστι γυνὴ κατ' Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν,*
> *οὔτε Πύλου ἱερῆς οὔτ' Ἄργεος οὔτε Μυκήνης:*

---

[76] The Phaiakians: *Od.* V.35; 280; 288; 345; VI.195; 202; XIX.279; the Lotus-eaters: *Od.* IX.85; the Kyklopes: *Od.* IX.106; 117; 166.

[77] *Il.* XIII.4.

[78] Pylos: *Il.* I.269-70; the Pylians: *Il.* V.545; Lakedaimon: *Il.* III.244; Ithaka: *Od.* X.420; 462-63. To this list could be added *Λήμνου γαῖαν*, "land of Lemnos," *Od.* VIII.301, which Homer did not consider Greek (*Od.* VIII.294). See also *Od.* XIV.302: *ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ Κρήτην μὲν ἐλείπομεν, οὐδέ τις ἄλλη / φαίνετο γαιάων*, "But when we had left Crete, and no other land appeared," where the use of *ἄλλη* in the phrase *ἄλλη φαίνετο γαιάων* following the word *Κρήτην* indicates that Homer considers Krete a *γαῖα* as well.

[79] See below.

[80] *Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν*: *Il.* I.254; VII.124; *Od.* XXI.107. *Ἀχαιΐδος...αἴης*: *Od.* XIII.249.

οὔτ' αὐτῆς Ἰθάκης οὔτ' ἠπείροιο μελαίνης[81]

A lady, the like of whom is not now in the Achaean land, neither in sacred Pylos, nor in Argos, nor in Mycenae, nor yet in Ithaca itself, nor in the dark mainland

Ithaka, Pylos, Argos, Mycenae, "the dark mainland" and presumably the other locations mentioned in the Catalogue of Ships collectively constitute a single Achaian land (*Ἀχαιΐδα γαῖαν*, singular), while each individual region—Pylos, Lakedaimon, Krete—is also in some sense its own *γαῖα*.

The most common expression related to identity involving the term *γαῖα* is the phrase *πατρίς γαῖα* or its variant *πατρίς αἶα*.[82] The former occurs eighty-eight times, the latter sixteen, meaning, "land of one's fathers" or, by extension, "native land."[83] Homer employs this phrase with both groups and individuals. When used to describe the homeland of a group of people, Homer applies it almost exclusively to the Achaians as a whole, providing yet more evidence for some sense of Panhellenism. In these cases, the phrase *πατρίς γαῖα* does not occur in the same line as the group name (*Ἀχαιοί*, *Δαναοί*, *Ἀργεῖοι*), but instead in the lines preceding the collective name for the Achaians. It is clear, however, that in most instances phrase *πατρίς γαῖα* should be associated with the Achaians as a whole. The first occurrence of *πατρίς γαῖα* in the *Iliad* is a typical example. It occurs in a speech delivered by Agamemnon, which begins:

τῷ ὅ γ' ἐρεισάμενος ἔπε' Ἀργείοισι μετηύδα:
ὦ φίλοι ἥρωες Δαναοὶ θεράποντες Ἄρηος[84]

Leaning upon this sceptre he spoke and addressed the Argives:
Fighting men and friends, o Danaans, henchmen of Ares...

Homer's introduction and the first line of the speech itself make it clear that the entire Achaian force is being addressed, with Agamemnon serving in his capacity as overlord. The body of the speech consists of Agamemnon's test of the Achaians, in which he

---

[81] *Od.* XXI.107-09.

[82] A more limited sense of place of origin is implied by *πατρὶς ἄρουρα*.

[83] Autenrieth, 1958 ed., s.v. "*πατρίς*", "*γαῖα*", "*αἶα*". Compare Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. idem.

orders all to return home. Although Agamemnon adds that he himself will *δυσκλέα Ἄργος ἱκέσθαι, ἐπεὶ πολὺν ὤλεσα λαόν*, "go back / to argos in dishonour having lost many of my people,"[85] the succeeding lines leave no doubt that Homer conceives of the entire Achaian force sharing a single homeland:

> *αἰσχρὸν γὰρ τόδε γ' ἐστὶ καὶ ἐσσομένοισι πυθέσθαι*
> *μᾶψ οὕτω τοιόνδε τοσόνδε τε λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν*
> *ἄπρηκτον πόλεμον πολεμίζειν ἠδὲ μάχεσθαι*
> *ἀνδράσι παυροτέροισι, τέλος δ' οὔ πώ τι πέφανται:*
> *εἴ περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλοιμεν Ἀχαιοί τε Τρῶές τε*
> *ὅρκια πιστὰ ταμόντες ἀριθμηθήμεναι ἅμφω,*
> *Τρῶας μὲν λέξασθαι ἐφέστιοι ὅσσοι ἔασιν,*
> *ἡμεῖς δ' ἐς δεκάδας διακοσμηθεῖμεν Ἀχαιοί,*
> *Τρώων δ' ἄνδρα ἕκαστοι ἑλοίμεθα οἰνοχοεύειν,*
> *πολλαί κεν δεκάδες δευοίατο οἰνοχόοιο.*
> *τόσσον ἐγώ φημι πλέας ἔμμεναι υἷας Ἀχαιῶν*
> *Τρώων, οἵ ναίουσι κατὰ πτόλιν: ἀλλ' ἐπίκουροι*
> *πολλέων ἐκ πολίων ἐγχέσπαλοι ἄνδρες ἔασιν,*
> *οἵ με μέγα πλάζουσι καὶ οὐκ εἰῶσ' ἐθέλοντα*
> *Ἰλίου ἐκπέρσαι εὖ ναιόμενον πτολίεθρον.*[86]
>
> And this shall be a thing of shame for the men hereafter
> to be told, that so strong, so great a host of Achaians
> carried on and fought in vain a war that was useless
> against men fewer than they, with no accomplishment shown for it;
> since if both sides were to be willing, Achaians and Trojans,
> to cut faithful oaths of truce, and both to be numbered,
> and the Trojans were to be counted by those with homes in the city,
> while we were to be allotted in tens, we Achaians,
> and each one of our tens chose a man of Troy to pour wine for it,
> still there would be many tens left without a wine steward.
> By so much I claim we sons of the Achaians outnumber
> the Trojans—those who live in the city; but there are companions
> from other cities in their numbers, wielders of the spear, to help them,
> who drive me hard back again and will not allow me,
> despite my will, to sack the well-founded stronghold of Ilion.

In this passage, the *λαὸν Ἀχαιῶν*, "host of Achaians" is compared directly to that of the *Τρώων, οἵ ναίουσι κατὰ πτόλιν*, "Trojans—those who live in the city," most explicitly

---

[84] *Il.* II.109-10.

[85] *Il.* II.115.

in line 123: *εἴ περ γάρ κ' ἐθέλοιμεν Ἀχαιοί τε Τρῶές τε*, "since if both sides were to be willing, Achaians and Trojans." The final four lines of the passage add the *ἐπίκουροι*, "companions," extending the comparison to the entire army of Trojans and allies. In the context of the two opposing armies—each taken as a whole with the only visible internal division being that between Trojan and ally—the term *Ἀχαιοί* (along the terms *Δαναοί* and *Ἀργεῖοι*) must refer to the Achaian force in its entirety. Moreover, Agamemnon concludes his speech:

> *ἀλλ' ἄγεθ' ὡς ἄν ἐγὼ εἴπω πειθώμεθα πάντες:*
> *φεύγωμεν σὺν νηυσὶ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν:*
> *οὐ γὰρ ἔτι Τροίην αἱρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν.*[87]
>
> Come then, do as I say, let us all be won over; let us
> run away with our ships to the beloved land of our fathers
> since no longer now shall we capture Troy of the wide ways.

Agamemnon implores *πειθώμεθα πάντες: / φεύγωμεν*, "let us all be won over; let us run away;" the context, combined with the use of first person plural verbs with *πάντες*, indicates that the entire Achaian force is included in this exhortation. Finally, the place the Achaians flee to is their *φίλην...πατρίδα γαῖαν*, "beloved land of our fathers." *Πατρίς γαῖα* appears here, as always, in the singular. Agamemnon and the entire Achaian army will return to what Homer and his audience consider to be a single, shared fatherland.

The phrase *πατρίς γαῖα* is used similarly, to apply to the Achaian force as a whole, fifteen times in the *Iliad*.[88] In one of these cases, the context in which the phrase occurs is a speech directed at *Δαναῶν ἡγήτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες*, "leaders and men of counsel among the Danaans," rather than at the *Δαναοί* as a whole, but the only distinction made is between leaders and followers, not specific place or community of origin.[89] Likewise, in a later speech Aias address the *ὦ φίλοι ἥρωες Δαναοί*, "Friends

---

[86] *Il.* II.119-33.

[87] *Il.* II.139-141.

[88] *Πατρίς γαῖα*: *Il.* II.140; 158; 454, VII.335; 460; IX.27; 47; XI.14; XV.499; 505; *πατρίς αἶα*: *Il.* II.162; 178; IV.172; XI.817; XV.740.

[89] *Il.* XI.817.

and fighting men of the Danaans."[90] In the other thirteen cases in which the phrase *πατρίς γαῖα* occurs with *Ἀχαιοί*, *Δαναοί*, or *Ἀργεῖοι*, the latter term is unmodified and the association unambiguous. Thus, all fifteen passages where *Ἀχαιοί*, *Δαναοί*, or *Ἀργεῖοι* appear with *πατρίς γαῖα* clearly refer to the entire Achaian force (or at the very least its undifferentiated leadership) and its homeland, with no reference to internal divisions within the army or specific territories within Achaia.

Perhaps surprisingly, there is only one instance in Homer—with the exception of Odysseus and crew in the *Odyssey*—where the *πατρίς αἶα* of an individual contingent is mentioned in a way analogous to the Achaians and their homeland. The exception is a speech by Glaukos, directed at Hektor and the other Trojan leaders, in Book XVI of the *Iliad*:

> *πρῶτα μὲν ὄτρυνεν Λυκίων ἡγήτορας ἄνδρας*
> *πάντῃ ἐποιχόμενος Σαρπηδόνος ἀμφιμάχεσθαι:*
> *αὐτὰρ ἔπειτα μετὰ Τρῶας κίε μακρὰ βιβάσθων*
> *Πουλυδάμαντ' ἔπι Πανθοΐδην καὶ Ἀγήνορα δῖον,*
> *βῆ δὲ μετ' Αἰνείαν τε καὶ Ἕκτορα χαλκοκορυστήν,*
> *ἀγχοῦ δ' ἱστάμενος ἔπεα πτερόεντα προσηύδα:*
> *Ἕκτορ νῦν δὴ πάγχυ λελασμένος εἰς ἐπικούρων,*
> *οἵ σέθεν εἵνεκα τῆλε φίλων καὶ πατρίδος αἴης*
> *θυμὸν ἀποφθινύθουσι: σὺ δ' οὐκ ἐθέλεις ἐπαμύνειν.*
> *κεῖται Σαρπηδὼν Λυκίων ἀγὸς ἀσπιστάων,*
> *ὅς Λυκίην εἴρυτο δίκῃσί τε καὶ σθένεϊ ᾧ:*[91]
>
> ...And first of all
> he [Glaukos] roused toward battle all the men who were lords of the Lykians,
> going everywhere among them, to fight for Sarpedon;
> afterwards he ranged in long strides among the Trojans,
> by Poulydamas the son of Panthoös and brilliant Agenor,
> and went to Aineias and to Hektor of the brazen helmet
> and stood near them and addressed them in winged words: "Hektor,
> now you have utterly forgotten your armed companions
> who for your sake, far from their friends and the land of their fathers,
> a wearing their lives away, and you will do nothing to help them.
> Sarpedon has fallen, the lord of the shield-armoured Lykians,

[90] *Il.* XV.740.

[91] *Il.* XVI.532-42.

who defended Lykia in his strength and the right of his justice.

Immediately, Homer distinguishes the Lykians from the Trojans. In the first two lines of the passage, introduced with the word *πρῶτα*, "first," Glaukos *ὄτρυνεν Λυκίων ἡγήτορας ἄνδρας*, "rouses toward battle all the men who were lords of the Lykians," then, after a clear transition indicated by the word *αὐτὰρ*, "afterwards," he *ἔπειτα μετὰ Τρῶας κίε μακρὰ βιβάσθων*, "ranged in long strides among the Trojans." Glaukos claims that Hektor has *πάγχυ λελασμένος εἰς ἐπικούρων*, "utterly forgotten [his] armed companions (*ἐπικούρων*)," goes on to state that these *ἐπικούροι* are *τῆλε φίλων καὶ πατρίδος αἴης*, "far from their friends and the land of their fathers," but he immediately follows this accusation with the reason for his exhortation:

> *κεῖται Σαρπηδὼν Λυκίων ἀγὸς ἀσπιστάων,*
> *ὃς Λυκίην εἴρυτο δίκῃσί τε καὶ σθένεϊ ᾧ*
>
> Sarpedon has fallen, the lord of the shield-armoured Lykians
> who defended Lykia in his strength and the right of his justice.

Thus, although the term *ἐπικούροι* occurs in the line preceding *τῆλε...πατρίδος αἴης*, the *πατρίς αἶα* in this passage appears to be that of the Lykians. Not only are the Lykians the only group of *ἐπικούροι* listed in the passage, but Homer introduces Glaukos' speech where the phrase *τῆλε...πατρίδος αἴης* occurs with two lines about his activity among the Lykians (and the Trojans, from whom they are clearly distinguished). Furthermore, in the three lines following *τῆλε...πατρίδος αἴης*, Homer mentions Sarpedon, the Lykians, and Lykia. The *πατρίς αἶα* in question refers to the paternal land of the Lykians specifically, rather than the *ἐπικούροι* as a whole. This is the only instance in Homer, with the exception of Odysseus' crew, where *πατρίς αἶα* or *πατρίς γαῖα* refers to the homeland of a particular contingent, rather than to the homeland of the Achaians as a whole or an individual hero.

Πατρίς γαῖα is used most commonly with individual warriors. It or its variation *πατρίς αἶα* occur in this context eighty-five times. The phrase is associated with Odysseus some fifty-three times, with another four referring to Odysseus and his crew. Telemachos is next, associated with *πατρίς γαῖα* nine times; Achilleus has the term used in conjunction with his name another five times. Eleven other heroes' names are

associated with the phrase one or two times.[92] One instance where a specific homeland is clearly indicated occurs with Sarpedon, one of the few non-Greeks to whom the phrase *πατρίς γαῖα* is applied. At the beginning of the passage where the phrase occurs, the Lykians are named.[93] Furthermore, when Sarpedon, speaking, exhorts Hektor, he contrasts his own homeland to Hektor's city:

> *ἐν πόλει ὑμετέρῃ, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἀρ' ἔμελλον ἔγωγε*
> *βοστήσας οἶκον δέφιλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν*[94]
>
> ...in your city
> my life must come to an end, since I could return no longer
> back to my own house and the land of my fathers...

Thus, *ἐν πόλει ὑμετέρῃ* stands opposed to *πατρίς γαῖα*, reflecting the dicotomy between Trojan and ally.[95] Combined with Homer's specific mention of the Lykians seven lines earlier, it is clear that Homer intends that Lykia be understood as Sarpedon's *πατρίς γαῖα*. Most of the references to a *πατρίς γαῖα*, however, refer to Greeks. Many, if not most, of these occurrences refer not to a single *πατρίς γαῖα* to which all Achaians belong, but instead to specific heroes' regions of origin within Greece. One of the most explicit examples of this usage occurs in Book III, when Helen enumerates the Achaian heroes for Priam. She notes that she does not see Kastor and Polydeukes, and speculates why.[96] To this Homer adds:

> *ὡς φάτο, τοὺς δ' ἤδη κάτεξεν φυσίζοος αἶα*
> *ἐν Λακεδαίμονι αὖθι φίλῃ ἐν πατρίδι γαίῃ.*[97]
>
> So she spoke, but the teeming earth lay already upon them
> away in Lakedaimon, the beloved land of their fathers.

---

[92] Based on searches using the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (2000), and *The Perseus Project* (2001).

[93] *Il.* V.679.

[94] *Il.* V.686-87.

[95] See Chapter V below.

[96] *Il.* III.237.

[97] *Il.* III.243-44. See above.

The *πατρίς γαῖα* invoked here is that of Kastor and Polydeukes specifically, namely Lakedaimon, rather than Achaia as a whole. Another specific passage involves Odysseus:

> *δὸς μὴ Ὀδυσσῆα πτολιπόρθιον οἶκαδ' ἱκέσθαι*
> *υἱὸν Λαέρτεω, Ἰθακῃ ἔνι οἰκί' ἔχοντα.*[98]
>
> Grant that Odysseus, the sacker of cities, may never reach his home, the son of Laertes, whose home is in Ithaca.

Two lines prior to the phrase *πατρίς γαῖα* Homer names Ithaka, leaving no doubt as to Odysseus' destination.[99] A final example in which a specific native land is mentioned occurs in the passage concerning Menelaos' reaction to his learning of Agamemnon's death. Here, the god Proteos advises Menelaos:

> *...ἀλλὰ τάχιστα*
> *πείρα ὅπως κεν δὴ σὴν πατρίδα αἶαν ἵκηαι.*
> *ἦ ἠάρ μιν ζωόν γε κιξήσεαι, ἦ κεν Ὀρέστης*
> *κτεῖνεν ὑποφθάμενοσ, σὺ δέ κεν τάφου ἀντιβολήσαισ.*[100]
>
> Rather, with all the speed you can, strive to come to your native land for either you will find Aegisthus alive, or Orestes may have forestalled you and slain him, and you may chance upon his funeral feast.

Homer intends his audience to understand the Argolid as Menelaos' *πατρίς γαῖα* in this passage, despite the fact that his kingdom is Lakedaimonia rather than Argos; the specifics of the situation in Argos—the presence of Aegisthus and Orestes, for instance—designate it as the *πατρίς γαῖα* Homer has in mind. Presumably, *πατρίς γαῖα* here indicates, literally, the land of Menelaos' (and Agamemnon's) father, Atreus. In each of the cases involving Achaians, Homer refers to a specific region using the phrase *πατρίς γαῖα*, as opposed to Achaia as a whole.

Most of the other instances where individual warriors are mentioned do not explicitly name their region of origin, and there is often some ambiguity as to whether Homer intends to indicate the specific region or Achaia as a whole. On one hand, when

---

[98] *Od.* IX.530-31.

[99] *Πατρίς γαῖα* appears in IX.533.

[100] *Od.* IV.544-47.

Athena exhorts Odysseus to rally the Achaians, who are preparing sail home in defeat, she states:

> *εὗρεν ἔπειτ' Ὀδυσῆα Διὶ μῆτιν ἀτάλαντον*
> *ἑσταότ': οὐδ' ὅ γε νηὸς ἐϋσσέλμοιο μελαίνης*
> *ἅπτετ', ἐπεί μιν ἄχος κραδίην καὶ θυμὸν ἵκανεν:*
> *ἀγχοῦ δ' ἰσταμένη προσέφη γλαυκῶπις Ἀθήνη:*
> *διογενὲς Λαερτιάδη πολυμήχαν' Ὀδυσσεῦ,*
> *οὕτω δὴ οἶκον δὲ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν*
> *φεύξεσθ' ἐν νήεσσι πολυκλήϊσι πεσόντες,*
> *κὰδ δέ κεν εὐχωλὴν Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ λίποιτε*
> *Ἀργείην Ἑλένην, ἧς εἵνεκα πολλοὶ Ἀχαιῶν*
> *ἐν Τροίῃ ἀπόλοντο φίλης ἀπὸ πατρίδος αἴης;*[101]
>
> There [Athena] came on Odysseus, the equal of Zeus in counsel,
> standing still; he had laid no hand upon his black, strong-benched
> vessel, since disappointment touched his heart and his spirit.
> Athene of the grey eyes stood beside him and spoke to him:
> "Son of Laertes and seed of Zeus, resourceful Odysseus:
> will it be this way? Will you all hurl yourselves into your benched ships
> and take flight homeward to the beloved land of your fathers,
> and would you thus leave to Priam and to the Trojans Helen of Argos,
> to glory over, for whose sake many Achaians
> lost their lives in Troy far from their own native country?

Here, the fact that Athena mentions the Achaians only two lines after the phrase *πατρίς γαῖα*, combined with a mention of their collective purpose at Troy, as well as a repetition of the phrase *πατρίς γαῖα* clearly referring to the Achaians collectively, strongly indicates that the first use of the phrase should be likewise interpreted. On the other hand, the passage where Agamemnon reproaches himself upon the wounding of Menelaos is typical:

> *αἰδ' οὕτως ἐπὶ πᾶσι χόλον τελέσει' Ἀγαμέμνων,*
> *ὡς καὶ νῦν ἅλιον στρατὸν ἤγαγεν ἐνθάδ' Ἀχαιῶν,*
> *καὶ δὴ ἔβη οἶκον δὲ φίλην ἐς πατρίδα γαῖαν*
> *σὺν κεινῇσιν νηυσὶ λιπὼν ἀγαθὸν Μενέλαον.*[102]
>
> Might Agamemnon accomplish his anger thus against all his
> enemies, as now he led here in vain a host of Achaians
> and has gone home again to the beloved land of his fathers

[101] *Il.* II.169-78.

[102] *Il.* V.178-81.

with ships empty, and leaving behind him brave Menelaos.

Here, Agamemnon mentions in his speech that he leads a host of Achaians, but the statement about returning to his *πατρίς γαῖα* seems to apply specifically to Agamemnon himself, especially since his return is contrasted with the *λιπών*, "leaving behind" of Menelaos, who shares a *πατρίς γαῖα* with Agamemnon.[103] Many, if not most, of the other passages that speak of a particular individual and his or her *πατρίς γαῖα* are similarly ambiguous, but clear examples of *πατρίς γαῖα* referring to Achaia as a whole, and to specific regions within Achaia, are both attested.

Γαῖα, along with its variants such as *πατρίς γαῖα*, proves central to the conception of identity in the epics, and describes an important aspect of community and polity also reflected in the term *δῆμος*. Territory of origin—and territoriality in general—is often invoked both when Homer describes heroes, and when they discuss their identity, their lineage, or their home communities among themselves. The territorial basis of community in the epics has largely been ignored or taken for granted, however.[104] In the context of leadership, Qviller points out the importance of landed property to the maintenance of royal power, distinguishing the Homeric *βασιλεύς* from a true "big-man" who holds only moveable property.[105] Snodgrass is more typical, however. Although he acknowledges that "The dominant geographical unit...had been a region of territory, whose area could reach a thousand square miles or more," he goes on to argue that people inhabiting region of territory were primarily organized through a "tribal system."[106] Morgan holds a similar view, believing that the Archaic *ἔθνος* recognized territorial boundaries but was primarily conceived of and organized though ties of lineage and descent.[107] Likewise, van Wees sees the "town" as the principal organizational unit in the epics, superimposed by a shadowy "state" that was

---

[103] See above.

[104] Qviller 1981, 132, about the importance of landed property to the *βασιλεύς* comments: "The importance of this feature of Homeric sociology is commonly overlooked."

[105] Qviller 1981, 132-34.

[106] Snodgrass 1980, 25-26. But see also Thomas 1999, 831, on the localism of Dark Age Greece.

[107] Morgan 1991, 131; 141-42; 148.

coterminous with a given territory but far less important.[108] Similarly, Donlan, who sees the δῆμος as one of the organizing elements of Dark Age society, and acknowledges its territorial aspects, subordinates its importance to the φῦλον and φρήτρη.[109] Finley acknowledges that the community made up by various households and crisscrossed with kinship ties was "territorially delineated," but he focuses on the human relationships within this territory, relationships within and between οἶκοι, and more widely among kinship groups.[110] Despite this neglect, however, Homer's frequent use of γαῖα and its variants, which occur over 100 times in a context related to origin or identity, indicates their importance. Although the meaning of γαῖα can vary from an individual region to Achaia as a whole, in each case it provides territorial bounds to a human community.

Δῆμος

Homer uses the term δῆμος in a variety of ways. Liddell and Scott provide a range of meanings, from "district, country, land" to "people, inhabitants" and "common people."[111] Donlan believes the δῆμος invokes "both an area of land and all free inhabitants of the area," adding that it is always similar and takes limiting genitives which are either geographical places or collective names for groups of people.[112] More specifically, it appears in Homer to refer most frequently to the people in public or political capacities, but it also carries overtones of territoriality, as indicated by parallel uses of δῆμος and γαῖα.

---

[108] Van Wees 1992, 25 ff.; 53 ff.

[109] Donlan 1989, 295 ff.

[110] Finley 1978, Chapter 4, esp. 78.

[111] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "δῆμος;" see also Autenrieth, 1958 ed., s.v. idem., definitions I.1; I.2; II.1.

[112] Donlan 1985, 298.

Land

One of the most common and important means of δῆμος in Homer is simply "land," which accounts for twenty-two of the 116 times the word appears. The context of each of these occurrences clearly indicates that Homer is using δῆμος to indicate land strictly in its geographic sense. For example, in the Catalogue of Ships, Homer uses the word δῆμος to describe the place held by a contingent: οἳ δ' Ἀδρήστειάν τ' εἶχον καὶ δῆμον Ἄπαισοῦ, "They who held Adrestaia and the countryside (δῆμον) of Apaisos."[113] In addition to a δῆμος held by a group, Homer speaks of traveling to a δῆμος, contrasting it to a journey across the sea, removing any ambiguity as to whether a land or its people are intended.[114] The term δῆμος is also frequently modified by adjectives such as κραναός, "rocky" or πίων, "fertile," which are more suited to describe a land rather than a people.[115] Eleven times, all in the *Odyssey*, Homer uses δῆμος to describe the land of the Trojans. In each case it is clear that the speaker intends the territory of Troy to be understood. Since the heroes being discussed are all Achaian, δῆμος cannot be meant to invoke the people of Troy.[116] In each of these cases δῆμος clearly refers to a territory entity, and its use is parallel to γαῖα when the latter term is employed to indicate a specific region rather than Achaia as a whole.

This definition of δῆμος, land in the geographic sense, is well-attested and uncontroversial. One final observation on its precise meaning is, however, warranted. A δῆμος is not necessarily co-terminous with the kingdoms described in the Catalogue of Ships, as γαῖα usually appears to be. For example, Homer speaks of the Κεφαλλήνων...δήμῳ, "the land of the Cephallenians," and describes Odysseus' contingent as being made up of the Κεφαλλῆνας μεγαθύμους, "high-hearted men of

---

[113] *Il.* II.282. Compare V.710, where the δῆμος held by the Boiotians is mentioned.

[114] *Od.* IV.821. Compare *Il.* VI.225, where Glaukos and Diomedes discuss visiting one another's δῆμος.

[115] Compare Autenrieth, 1958 ed., s.v. "κραναός;" "πίων." Κραναός: *Il.* II.201; πίων: V.710; XVI.673; 683, XX.385; *Od.* XIV.329; XVII.526; XIX.271; 399.

[116] *Od.* I.237; III.100; 220; IV.243; 330; VIII.220; XIII.266; XXII.36; XIV.27; XXIV.31.

Kephallenia."[117] However, Homer also frequently mentions the *δῆμος Ἰθάκης*, and Ithaka is listed as one of seven places of origin of the *Κεφαλλῆνας μεγαθύμους*.[118] While in each case a geographic area seems to be envisioned, the extent of the *δῆμος Ἰθάκης* differs from, and is presumably contained within, that of the *δῆμος Κεφαλλήνων*. In most cases, however, the territorial sense of *δῆμος* is synonymous with *γαῖα*.

Exile

Homer consistently uses *δῆμος* to describe the entity from which people are exiled.[119] In terms of exile, expulsion from the *δῆμος* is a frequent punishment in cases involving the commission (or suspected commission) of some crime. One such case occurs in Glaukos' speech to Diomedes. After a false accusation by Proitos' wife against Bellerophontes:

> *ὅς ῥ' ἐκ δήμου ἔλασσεν, ἐπεὶ πολὺ φέρτερος ἦεν,*
> *Ἀργείων: Ζεὺς γάρ οἱ ὑπὸ σκήπτρῳ ἐδάμασσε.*[120]
>
> [Proitos] drove [Bellerophontes] out from his own domain (*ὅς...δήμου*),
> since he was far greater,
> from the Argive country Zeus had broken to the sway of his scepter.

Proitos drives Bellerophontes *ἐκ δήμου*; it is the *δῆμος* that Bellerophontes leaves to found a new dynasty in Lykia. Most other cases of exile following the commission of crimes involve analogous expulsion from the *δῆμος*. In Book IX of the *Iliad*, for instance, when Odysseus', Aias', and Phoinix's embassy to Achilles fails. Aias contrasts the settlement of a dispute with the intransigence of Achilleus:

> *...καὶ μέν τίς τε κασιγνήτοιο φονῆος*
> *ποινὴν ἢ οὗ παιδὸς ἐδέξατο τεθνηῶτος:*
> *καί ῥ' ὃ μὲν ἐν δήμῳ μένει αὐτοῦ πόλλ' ἀποτίσας,*
> *τοῦ δέ τ' ἐρητύεται κραδίη καὶ θυμὸς ἀγήνωρ*
> *ποινὴν δεξαμένῳ...*[121]

---

[117] *Od.* XX.210; *Il.* II.631.

[118] *Δῆμος Ἰθάκης*: *Il.* III.201; *Od.* I.103; XIII.97; XIV.126; 329; XIX.399; XIV.284.

[119] A point mentioned but not pursued by Donlan 1985, 298-99, note 21.

[120] *Il.* VI.159-60.

> ...and yet a man takes from his brother's slayer
> the blood price, or the price for a child who was killed, and the guilty
> one, when he has largely repaid, stays still in the country (*ἐν δήμῳ*),
> and the injured man's heart is curbed, and his pride, and his anger
> when he has taken the price...

Here, payment of the *ποινή*, "blood price," for the crime allows the transgressor to remain in the *δῆμος*. Likewise, when Priam comes to ransom the body of Hektor, Homer begins a simile in Book XIV with the image of an exiled man:

> *ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἂν ἄνδρ' ἄτη πυκινὴ λάβῃ, ὅς τ' ἐνὶ πάτρῃ*
> *φῶτα κατακτείνας ἄλλων ἐξίκετο δῆμον*
> *ἀνδρὸς ἐς ἀφνειοῦ, θάμβος δ' ἔχει εἰσορόωντας,*[122]
>
> ...as when dense disaster closes on one who has murdered
> a man in his own land (*πάτρῃ*), and he comes to the country (*δῆμον*) of others,
> to a man of substance, and wonder seizes on those who behold him...

In this simile, the end result of a crime requiring exile is arrival in a *ἄλλων...δῆμος*, a "country of others." In Book XXI of the *Odyssey*, the suitors threaten the disguised Odysseus with a similar fate, when he asks if he can participate in the contest of the stringing of the bow. Antinoös threatens him:

> *ὣς καὶ σοὶ μέγα πῆμα πιφαύσκομαι, αἴ κε τὸ τόξον*
> *ἐντανύσῃς: οὐ γάρ τευ ἐπητύος ἀντιβολήσεις*
> *ἡμετέρῳ ἐνὶ δήμῳ, ἄφαρ δέ σε νηῒ μελαίνῃ*
> *εἰς Ἔχετον βασιλῆα...*[123]
>
> Even so do I declare great harm for you, if you shall string the bow, for you shall meet with no kindness at the hands of anyone in our land, but we will send you instantly in a black ship to king Echetus . . .

Here, the suitors lay claim to the *δῆμος* when Antinoös claims it with the first person plural possessive pronoun *ἡμετέρῳ*, and warns Odysseus that he will will be sent away from that *δῆμος* to king Echetus. Here, *δῆμος* is used to describe the land and people from which the "guilty" party is separated. Although, of course, Odysseus thwarts the

---

[121] *Il.* IX.632-36.

[122] *Il.* XXIV.480-82.

[123] *Od.* XXI.305-08.

suitors, after he and Telemachos kill them Odysseus himself contemplates the possibility of enduring punishment of exile and separation from his *δῆμος*:

> *καὶ γάρ τίς θ' ἕνα φῶτα κατακτείνας ἐνὶ δήμῳ,*
> *ᾧ μὴ πολλοὶ ἔωσιν ἀοσσητῆρες ὀπίσσω,*
> *φεύγει πηούς τε προλιπὼν καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν*[124]
>
> For whoever has killed but one man in a land (*ἐνὶ δήμῳ*), even though it is a man that leaves not many behind to avenge him, he goes into exile, and leaves his kindred and his native land (*πατρίδα γαῖαν*).

Here again it is the *δῆμος* which the exile leaves behind. The killer in this passage flees from a *δῆμος* to a *πατρίς γαῖα*, just as in an earlier passage a murderer must leave his *πάτρη* for a *ἄλλων...δῆμος*, "country of others." Similarly, the term *δῆμος* occurs twice in the passage where the exile Melampos seeks refuge with Telemachos as the latter is leaving Pylos for home.[125] In passages dealing with exile the term *δῆμος* is used for both the land from which one is expelled, and the land in which someone seeks refuge.

Although conceptually an exile may be separated from his people as much as his homeland, the language in these passages is strictly territorial. The only other terms used, as *δῆμος* is, in passages dealing with exile are *γαῖα* and *πατρίς γαῖα*; terms such as *γενεή* or *ἔθνος* never appear in this context.[126] In passages dealing with exile, *δῆμος* is paired once with *πατρίς γαῖα*, and once with *γαῖα*. In the first of these passages, the suitors contemplate exile at the hands of the Achaians of Ithaka as a possible outcome of their poor behavior:

> *μή τι κακὸν ῥέξωσι καὶ ἡμέας ἐξελάσωσι*
> *γαίης ἡμετέρης, ἄλλων δ' ἀφικώμεθα δῆμον*[127]
>
> Beware, then, that [the Achaians of Ithaka] do not work us [the suitors] some harm and drive us out from our country (*γαίης*), and we come to the land of strangers (*ἄλλων...δῆμον*).

---

[124] *Od.* XIII.118-22.

[125] *Od.* XV.228; 238.

[126] The term *πηός* occurs at *Od.* XXIII.120, but this term, meaning "kinsman by marriage," invokes close relationships rather than referring to any larger, abstract social group. Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*πηός*."

[127] *Od.* XVI.381-82.

Near the end of the *Odyssey*, Odysseus warns Telemachos of the repercussions of killing the suitors:

> *καὶ γάρ τίς θ' ἕνα φῶτα κατακτείνας ἐνὶ δήμῳ,*
> *ᾧ μὴ πολλοὶ ἔωσιν ἀοσσητῆρες ὀπίσσω,*
> *φεύγει πηούς τε προλιπὼν καὶ πατρίδα γαῖαν*[128]
>
> For whoever has killed but one man in a land (*δήμω*), even though it is a man that leaves not many behind to avenge him, he goes into exile, and leaves his kindred and his native land (*πατρίδα γαῖαν*).

Combined with *γαίης, δῆμος* refers to the other or foreign land; in the second example, both *δῆμος* and *πατρίδα γαῖαν* indicate the homeland of the exile. In both cases, the terms appear interchangeable, indicating the territorial nature of *δῆμος* in this context.

Homer only rarely uses *γαῖα* or a variant alone in the context of an exile. A formula including the term occurs twice when Homer describes Medon, the brother of Aias the Lesser, first in Book XIII of the *Iliad*, then again in Book XV:

> *...αὐτὰρ ἔναιεν*
> *ἐν Φυλάκῃ γαίης ἄπο πατρίδος ἄνδρα κατακτὰς*[129]
>
> ...yet he was living away from
> the land [*γαίης*] of his fathers, in Phylake, since he had killed a man

The reason for the exile, and the location of exile, are stated directly. The fact that Homer provides the name of the place—rather than of the people—of exile reinforces the territoriality of the concept. In another example, near the beginning of the *Odyssey*, as Zeus comments about mortals bring fate upon themselves, he uses Aigisthos' murder of Agamemnon, and Orestes' revenge, as his example:

> *ἐκ γὰρ Ὀρέσταο τίσις ἔσσεται Ἀτρεΐδαο,*
> *ὁππότ' ἂν ἡβήσῃ τε καὶ ἧς ἱμείρεται αἴης.*[130]
>
> For from Orestes shall come vengeance for the son of Atreus when once he has come to manhood and longs for his own land (*αἴης*).

Orestes, presumably, has been exiled by the temporarily victorious Aigisthos. Instead of a crime, Aigisthos instigates Orestes' exile as the logical result of the murder of

---

[128] *Od.* XXIII.118-20.

[129] *Il.* XIII.695-96; XV.335-36.

[130] *Od.* I.41-42.

Orestes' father and the subsequent usurpation of his kingdom by Aigisthos. Three times, then, *γαῖα* or *αἶα* standing alone refer to a land from which someone is exiled; in two other cases they are combined with *δῆμος* in a single sentence under the same context. In five instances, *δῆμος* is used alone. On the one hand, then, *δῆμος* appears to be the preferred term for the entity from which someone is exiled, but the occasional use of *γαῖα* or *αἶα* underline the fundamentally territorial meaning of *δῆμος*, especially since in no case is a collective term for a group, such as *γενεή* or *ἔθνος*, used in the context of exile.[131]

Native and Foreign Lands

In a related usage, Homer also employs *δῆμος* in phrases that distinguish between or contrast native and foreign lands.[132] At its most basic, this usage appears when Achilleus states that since his homeland is Phthia, yet he fights before Troy, he is *ἀλλοδαπῷ ἐνὶ δήμῳ*, "in a strange land."[133] Likewise, when Odysseus enters the games of the Phaiakians, he issues an open challenge to all, but adds that he will not compete with Laodamas, his host:

> *ἄφρων δὴ κεῖνός γε καὶ οὐτιδανὸς πέλει ἀνήρ,*
> *ὅς τις ξεινοδόκῳ ἔριδα προφέρηται ἀέθλων*
> *δήμῳ ἐν ἀλλοδαπῷ: ἔο δ' αὐτοῦ πάντα κολούει*[134]

---

[131] See also the related use of *δῆμος* in *Od.* IV.164-66:

> *πολλὰ γὰρ ἄλγε' ἔχει πατρὸς πάϊς οἰχομένοιο*
> *ἐν μεγάροις, ᾧ μὴ ἄλλοι ἀοσσητῆρες ἔωσιν,*
> *ὡς νῦν Τηλεμάχῳ ὁ μὲν οἴχεται, οὐδέ οἱ ἄλλοι*
> *εἴσ' οἵ κεν κατὰ δῆμον ἀλάλκοιεν κακότητα.*
>
> For many sorrows has a son in his halls when his father is gone, when there are no others to be his helpers, just as it is now with Telemachus; his father is gone, and there are no others among the people (*δῆμον*) who might ward of his ruin.

As is the case in the passages dealing with exile, the *δῆμος* is the entity from which one is absent, although in this case it is Odysseus rather than Telemachos, the subject of the passage, who is away from his *δῆμος*.

[132] Finley 1978, 102, observes that in the epics every other "community" is foreign soil. *Δῆμος* is used so consistently in this context that it seems "foreignness" begins at the border of the *δῆμος*.

[133] *Il.* XIX.323-25.

[134] *Od.* VIII.209-11.

> Foolish is that man and worthless, who challenges to a contest the host who receives him in a strange land (*δήμῳ ἐν ἀλλοδαπῷ*); he only mars his own fortunes.

Homer emphasizes the vulnerability of the traveler and importance of guest-friendship in mitigating it. In a more detailed passage, the nurse Eurykleia, begging Telemachos not to travel abroad seeking news of his father, says of Odysseus:

> *...ὁ δ' ὤλετο τηλόθι πάτρης*
> *διογενὴς Ὀδυσεὺς ἀλλογνώτῳ ἐνὶ δήμῳ.*[135]
>
> But he has perished far from his country (*πάτρης*), the Zeus-born Odysseus, in a strange land (*ἀλλογνώτῳ ἐνὶ δήμῳ*).

As is the case in several of the passages dealing with exile, Homer pairs *δῆμος* with another term—in this case *πάτρη*—that emphasizes the territorial sense of *δῆμος*.[136] In a similar passage, Eumaios greets the disguised Odysseus by complaining:

> *ἀντιθέου γὰρ ἄνακτος ὀδυρόμενος καὶ ἀχεύων*
> *ἧμαι, ἄλλοισιν δὲ σύας σιάλους ἀτιτάλλω*
> *ἔδμεναι: αὐτὰρ κεῖνος ἐελδόμενός που ἐδωδῆς*
> *πλάζετ' ἐπ' ἀλλοθρόων ἀνδρῶν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε,*
> *εἴ που ἔτι ζώει καὶ ὁρᾷ φάος ἠελίοιο.*[137]
>
> It is for a godlike master that I mourn and grieve, as I stay here, and rear fat swine for other men to eat, while he perhaps in want of food wanders over the land and city of men of foreign speech, if indeed he still lives and sees the light of the sun.

Eumaios compares his lot, to stay (*ἧμαι*, lit. "sit") in Ithaka, forced to provide food for others, with that of his master, in lacking food in *ἀλλοθρόων ἀνδρῶν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε*,

---

[135] *Od.* II.365-66.

[136] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*πάτρη*:" "fatherland, native land." They add that in a single instance in Homer (*Il.* XIII.354), the term is used in the sense of "fatherhood, descent from a common father." Even here, however, direct lineage rather than membership in a putative descent group appears to be indicated, since the passage discusses how Zeus and Poseidon share a single father:

> *ἦ μὰν ἀμφοτέροισιν ὁμὸν γένος ἠδ' ἴα πάτρη,*
> *ἀλλὰ Ζεὺς πρότερος γεγόνει καὶ πλείονα ᾔδη,*
>
> Indeed, the two [Zeus and Poseidon] were of one generation and a single father, but Zeus was the elder born and knew more.

In *Od.* II.356-66, the passage in question here, however, the much more common, territorial sense of *πάτρη* is almost certainly indicated.

[137] *Od.* XIV.40-44.

"the land (*δῆμος*) and city (*πόλις*) of men of foreign speech." The correct order of things has been inverted, as outsiders infest Odysseus' home and Odysseus wanders the *δῆμος* and *πόλις* of men so alien that they do not even speak his language—a strong statement considering how rarely in Homer linguistic difference is acknowledged.[138] This is also one of several passages where Homer employs *δῆμος* in conjunction with *πόλις* in order to contrast town and countryside.[139] In an analogous passage, the cowherd makes a similar complaint upon meeting the disguised Odysseus:

> *...μάλα μὲν κακὸν υἷος ἐόντος*
> *ἄλλων δῆμον ἱκέσθαι ἰόντ' αὐτῇσι βόεσσιν,*
> *ἄνδρας ἐς ἀλλοδαπούς: τὸ δὲ ῥίγιον, αὖθι μένοντα*
> *βουσὶν ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίῃσι καθήμενον ἄλγεα πάσχειν.*[140]
>
> ...a very bad thing it is, while the son lives, to depart along with my cattle and go to another people's land, to an alien folk; but this is worse still, to remain here and suffer woes in charge of cattle that are given over to others.

Like Eumaios the swineherd, the cowherd compares the evils of being preyed upon by the suitors with those of traveling to a foreign land.[141] In this case, however, he weighs these as options for himself rather than comparing his predicament with that of Odysseus. He considers, on the one hand, going to a *ἄλλων δῆμον*, "another people's land," an idea repeated in the following line with the phrase *ἄνδρας ἐς ἀλλοδαπούς*, "to an alien folk," which—if *δῆμος* is understood in a territorial sense—also seems to balance the statement by complementing the land (*δῆμον*) with the men (*ἄνδρας*). On the other hand, the cowherd complains that the alternative: remaining (again the verb, *κάθημαι*, means "to be seated") in Ithaka and giving the cattle over *ἐπ' ἀλλοτρίῃσι*, "to others." The suitors are again treated as foreign; the term used to describe them emphasizes the inappropriateness of their actions, which is severe enough to justify the cowherd's abandoning Odysseus' son and leaving his own *δῆμος*. Overall, the use of

---

[138] See Chapter V below.

[139] See Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*δῆμος*." II.1. See above.

[140] *Od.* XX.218-21.

[141] Qviller 1981, 127-28, examines this passage as an example of the tensions that may arise between king and people over the extraction of surplus production.

the term *δῆμος*, often in combination with a word such as *ἄλλων* or *ἀλλοδαπός*, is similar to its use in the context of exile, referring primarily to the territorial aspects of the community without, perhaps, losing overtones that invoke the people.

Δῆμος and *Βασιλεύς*

Perhaps the most illustrative use of *δῆμος* involving (although not exclusively) people rather than territory can be found when Homer reveals the political role of the *δῆμος*. Twenty-nine times Homer employs *δῆμος* when he speaks of the political or public aspects of a land or people, making this one of the most common uses of the term. Homer uses the term *δῆμος* when he speaks about both the active and passive political rolls of the people; passive when kings or counselors act upon the *δῆμος*, active when the *δῆμος* wields political power in its own right. In other cases, the use of the term *δῆμος* in the context of governance leaves some doubt as to whether rule over people or territory is indicated.

Eight times, *δῆμος* is used in the context of kingship or leadership.[142] Perhaps the most familiar example of this meaning of *δῆμος* occurs in Book II of the *Iliad*, where Odysseus moves through the Achaian army, reproving those who wish to abandon the war against Troy. On the one hand, when Odysseus addresses *τινα...βασιλῆα καὶ ἔξοχον ἄνδρα*, "some king, or man of influence" it is with *ἀγανοῖς ἐπέεσσιν*, "soft words."[143] On the other hand, Odysseus' treatment of men of the *δῆμος* is quite different:

> *ὃν δ' αὖ δήμου τ' ἄνδρα ἴδοι βοόωντά τ' ἐφεύροι,*
> *τὸν σκήπτρῳ ἐλάσασκεν ὁμοκλήσασκέ τε μύθῳ:*
> *δαιμόνι' ἀτρέμας ἧσο καὶ ἄλλων μῦθον ἄκουε,*
> *οἳ σέο φέρτεροί εἰσι, σὺ δ' ἀπτόλεμος καὶ ἄναλκις*
> *οὔτέ ποτ' ἐν πολέμῳ ἐναρίθμιος οὔτ' ἐνὶ βουλῇ:*
> *οὐ μέν πως πάντες βασιλεύσομεν ἐνθάδ' Ἀχαιοί:*
> *οὐκ ἀγαθὸν πολυκοιρανίη: εἷς κοίρανος ἔστω,*

---

[142] *Il.* II.198; XII.213; XXIV.777; *Od.* IV.691; VIII.157; 390. XI.353; XII.52; XIII.186; XV.534. See also *Od.* XIII.186. where Homer describes the actions of the *ἡγήτορες ἠδὲ μέδοντες*, "leaders and councilors" of the *δῆμος* of the Phaiakians.

[143] *Il.* II.189-90.

εἷς βασιλεύς, ᾧ δῶκε Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω
σκῆπτρόν τ' ἠδὲ Θέμιστας, ἵνά σφισι βουλεύῃσι.[144]

When he saw some man of the people who was shouting,
he would strike at him with his staff, and reprove him also:
"Excellency! Sit still and listen to what others tell you,
to those who are better men than you, you skulker and coward
and thing of no account whatever in battle or council.
Surely not all of us Achaians can be as kings here.
Lordship for many is no good thing. Let there be one ruler,
one king, to whom the son of devious-devising Kronos
gives the scepter and right of judgment, to watch over his people.

The ideology expressed by Odysseus in this passage (as well as the subsequent passage detailing the confrontation between Thersites and Odysseus), contrasting the roles of *δῆμος* and *βασιλεύς*, is well-known and does not need rehearsing here; clearly Odysseus envisions the proper role of the *δῆμος* as passive in the face of decisions made by the *βασιλῆες*.[145] Beyond the inferior role of the *δῆμος* expressed here, it is worth noting that Homer uses *δῆμος* in the singular, despite the fact the Odysseus clearly ranges throughout the Achaian army. Furthermore, Homer makes the contrast between *δῆμος* and *βασιλεύς* not only through the juxtaposition of this paragraph, concerning the *δῆμος*, with the previous, dealing with the *βασιλῆες*, but also by using four terms for kingship (*βασιλεύω*, to rule; *πολυκοιρανίη*, the rule of many, *κοίρανος*, ruler, and *βασιλεύς*, king) in lines 203-05 in order to emphasize the contrast with the *δῆμος*, mentioned once at the

---

[144] *Il.* II.198-206.

[145] The relationship between *βασιλεύς* and *δῆμος* depicted in this passage is explored further in the confrontation between Thersites and Odysseus, which begins only five lines later. Van Wees 1992, 83-85, treats Odysseus' confrontation with Thersites as his example of "just violence" in a system where the "princes" have the right to use force against those who question their deference and "regard bullying as the proper way to deal with the common people." Compare Luce 1978, 10. Andrea Kouklanakis, "Thersites, Odysseus, and the Social Order," in *Nine Essays on Homer*, edd. Miriam Carlisle and Olga Levaniouk, 35-53 (Lanham, Maryland: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999), 45-48, argues that Thersites character "represents dissent and rebellion on a social level," and highlights Odysseus' role as a intermediary between the common Achaians, whom he leads (and who respect him), and Agamemnon, who is his superior. Kouklanakis also makes the observation that Thersites' base status is reflected in the fact that he has no lineage (47). Qviller 1981, 129-30, similarly uses this episode to illustrate "the sentiments that were provoked in the lower ranks of the band when a pre-eminent king claimed an excessive share of the booty." Despite the fact that this passage occurs after the breakup of the "formal" assembly called by Agamemnon, its ideology still reflects Runciman's and van Wees view of the *δῆμος* as

beginning of the passage in line 198. Here, Homer considers the *βασιλῆες* to be above the *δῆμος* rather than part of it.[146] This ideology is also represented among the Trojans; when Poulydamas accuses Hektor of always working against him in the assembly before the *δῆμος*, an accusation which brings Hektor's stern rebuke and a threat of violence against Poulydamas.[147]

Not all instances in which Homer explores the relationship between *δῆμος* and *βασιλεύς* assume or imply this pronounced inferiority of the former. Instead, these passages simply describe various aspects of the relationship between *δῆμος* and *βασιλεύς*, or even contain critiques of kingship. For example, when Medon approaches Penelope in Book IV of the *Odyssey* to inform her of Telemachos' journey to Pylos and the suitors' plans to ambush him upon his return, she abrades him with a speech in which she contrasts the virtuous behavior of Odysseus with that common among *βασιλῆες*:

> *...οὐδέ τι πατρῶν*
> *ὑμετέρων τὸ πρόσθεν* ἀκούετε*, παῖδες ἐόντες,*
> *οἷος Ὀδυσσεὺς ἔσκε μεθ' ὑμετέροισι τοκεῦσιν,*
> *οὔτε τινὰ ῥέξας ἐξαίσιον οὔτε τι εἰπὼν*
> *ἐν δήμῳ, ἥ τ' ἐστὶ δίκη θείων βασιλήων:*
> *ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρῃσι βροτῶν, ἄλλον κε φιλοίη.*[148]
>
> Surely you hearkened not at all in olden days when you were children, when your fathers told what manner of man Odysseus was among them that begot you, in that he did no wrong in deed or word to any man in the land as the custom is of divine kings—one man they hate and another they love.

Foreshadowing Hesiod's later complain about the corruption of kings, Penelope claims that the *δίκη θείων βασιλήων*, "custom...of divine kings," is *ἄλλον κ' ἐχθαίρῃσι βροτῶν, ἄλλον κε φιλοίη*, "one man they hate and another they love;" in other words, to

---

passive participants in the assembly and the power of the *βασιλεύς* to ignore their wishes. Runciman 1982, 358; van Wees 1992, 32-36.

[146] For the definitions of these terms, see Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*βασιλεύω*;" "*πολυκοιρανίη*;" "*κοίρανος*;" "*βασιλεύς*."

[147] Poulydamas speaks: *Il.* XII.210-29; mentions the *δῆμος*: 212-13; Hektor responds: 230-50.

[148] *Od.* IV.687-92

act capriciously, if not corruptly.[149] By contrast, Penelope points out the uniqueness of Odysseus, insisting that he *οὔτε τινὰ ῥέξας ἐξαίσιον οὔτε τι εἰπὼν ἐν δήμῳ*, "did no wrong in deed or word to any man in the land."[150] At least in this passage and in contrast to *Iliad* II.198-206, Homer implies that the *δίκη* among *βασιλῆες* as a matter of power rather than ability or integrity.[151] Perhaps most importantly for the current context, this passage demonstrates the interaction of *δῆμος* and *βασιλεύς*, particularly the latter acting in an unconstrained manner upon the former, arbitrarily favoring some members of the *δῆμος* over others.

The remaining passages in which Homer invokes the relationship between *δῆμος* and *βασιλεύς* are more neutral in tone, simply observing some aspect of the interaction between king and *δῆμος*. In Book VIII of the *Odyssey*, for example, Odysseus begs Laodamas not to challenge him to athletic contests while the Phaiakians entertain him:

> *Λαοδάμα, τί με ταῦτα κελεύετε κερτομέοντες;*
> ...
> *νῦν δὲ μεθ' ὑμετέρῃ ἀγορῇ νόστοιο χατίζων*
> *ἧμαι, λισσόμενος βασιλῆά τε πάντα τε δῆμον.*[152]
>
> Laodamas, why do you mock me with this challenge?...I sit in the midst of your assembly (*ἀγορή*), longing for my return home, and making my prayer to the king (*βασιλεύς*)and to all the people (*δῆμος*).

Here, a foreign petitioner, Odysseus, enters the *ἀγορή* and addresses his plea *βασιλῆά τε πάντα τε δῆμον*, "to the king and all the people." This formula balances the two halves of the polity, king and people, and provides a clear example of the use of the term *δῆμος* to designate what is ruled by a *βασιλεύς*.

---

[149] An ironic use of the term *δίκη*, which had already come to mean justice and order in Homer. See Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*δίκη*;" Autenrieth, 1958 ed., s.v. idem.

[150] More literally and specifically, Odysseus neither committed any act nor said any word that was *ἐξαίσιος*, "beyond what is ordained or fated;" see Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*ἐξαίσιος*." Furthermore, the phrase *ἐν δήμῳ* might better be translated "among the *δῆμος*," emphasizing the collective nature of this entity in its role vis-à-vis the *βασιλεύς*.

[151] Van Wees 1992, 85, observes about this passage that "suddenly, injustice appears to be the rule rather than the exception" among the rulers in Homeric society.

[152] *Od.* VIII.153; 156-57.

Emphasis elsewhere seems to shift from the people to the land, or at least to an entity which may encompass both. Later in *Odyssey* Book VIII, in the course of Alkinoös', response to Odysseus' request, the Phaiakian king describes his own position:

> *δώδεκα γὰρ κατὰ δῆμον ἀριπρεπέες βασιλῆες*
> *ἀρχοὶ κραίνουσι, τρισκαιδέκατος δ' ἐγὼ αὐτός*[153]
>
> For twelve glorious kings (*βασιλῆες*) hold sway in our land (*δῆμος*) as rulers, and I myself am the thirteenth.

Again, Homer chooses to juxtapose the terms *δῆμος* and *βασιλεύς*, in this case where he is explicitly describing the position of a king. Later, in Book XI, as he orders the conveyance of Odysseus to Ithaka, Alkinoös reiterates this statement about his position, using the term *δῆμος* when he declares, *τοῦ γὰρ κράτος ἔστ' ἐνὶ δήμῳ*, "for mine is the power (*κράτος*) in the land."[154] Homer again chooses to use the term *δῆμος* when describing the position of the royal house of Ithaka. Similarly, Theoklymenos, interpreting the flight of a bird, declares to Telemachos:

> *ὑμετέρου δ' οὐκ ἔστι γένος βασιλεύτερον ἄλλο*
> *ἐν δήμῳ Ἰθάκης, ἀλλ' ὑμεῖς καρτεροὶ αἰεί.*[155]
>
> No other descent than yours in [the *δῆμος* of] Ithaca is more kingly (*βασιλεύτερον*); you are supreme (*καρτεροὶ*) forever.

Homer here uses the phrase *οὐκ ἔστι γένος βασιλεύτερον ἄλλο* "no other descent . . . is more kingly," and the word *καρτεροὶ*, "supreme" to describe the relative position of Telemachos' *γένος* within Ithaka, again choosing the term *δῆμος* to invoke the entity within which Telemachos' *γένος* is ascendant. Finally, as Eurymachos negotiates for the lives of the suitors after Odysseus reveals his identity, the former acknowledges that Antinoös' true intent had always been:

> *ὄφρ' Ἰθάκης κατὰ δῆμον ἐϋκτιμένης βασιλεύοι*
> *αὐτός...*[156]

---

[153] *Od.* VIII.390-91.

[154] *Od.* XI.353.

[155] *Od.* XV.533-34.

[156] *Od.* XXII.52-53.

> That in the land (*δῆμον*) of well-ordered Ithaca he might be king (*βασιλεύοι*)...

As in the passages discussed above, the position of kingship within the land and among the people is described using the term *δῆμος* to describe the entity over which the *βασιλεύς* rules—whether it invokes a territory or a people.[157]

A related usage of *δῆμος* also blurs the line between territory and people. Eight times Homer observes that a hero, usually a king, is honored among the people. The most common formulation of this phrase is *θεὸς δ' ὣς τίετο δήμῳ*, "honored about the countryside (*δῆμος*) as a god is," which occurs five times in the *Iliad*.[158] Three related statements appear in the *Odyssey*: *θεοῦ δ' ὣς δῆμος ἄκουεν*, "the people (*δῆμος*) harkened to him as to a god," *ἐπεὶ δὴ δηθὰ φίλων ἄπο πήματα πάσχω*, "the dues of honor which the people (*δῆμος*) have given him," and *ὅς τότ' ἐνὶ Κρήτεσσι θεὸς ὣς τίετο δήμῳ*, "he was at that time honored as a god among the Cretans in the land (*δῆμος*)."[159] In the first two instances, the term is applied to king Alkinoös of the Phaiakians, in the third to the hero Castor, son of Hylax, the father of the Kretan character invented by Odysseus. In all but one case the comparison between the hero and a god is explicit. As is indicated by the various wording chosen by the translators, reading "people" or "land" for *δῆμος* in these passages makes equal sense, but in either case *δῆμος* is the preferred term in the Homeric corpus for the entity, whether based upon territory or population, which pays divine honor to its kings.

---

[157] Qviller 1981, 118, however, argues that the *βασιλεύς* actually leads only a faction of the people within the *δῆμος*, providing the Ithakan nobles and Aigisthos as examples of people who opted out of following Odysseus and Agamemnon respectively. He summarizes: "A big-man usually commands influence only indirectly outside his own faction. 'Do it yourself. I'm not your fool' would be the likely response to a big-man who tried to command an outsider." Compare Donlan 1985, 298 ff.; Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 12-16. Luce 1978, 10-11; 15, and van Wees 1992, 25 ff., associate kings with individual *poleis* rather than with the *δῆμος*.

[158] *Il.* V.28; X.33; XI.58; XIII.218; XVI.605.

[159] *Od.* VII.11; 150; XIV.205-06. Compare Luce 1978, 11-12, who uses the similar exchange between Sarpedon and Glaukos (*Il.* XII.310-21) as an example of the status and duties of Homeric kings.

Other Political Uses of *Δῆμος*: Assemblies and Collective Debt

In addition to being Homer's term of choice for describing the entity that a *βασιλεύς* rules, *δῆμος* also appears in other political contexts in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Several of these passages involve the role of the *δῆμος* in the assembly or council, others describe taxation of the *δῆμος* or the collection of communal debts, while the remainder deals mostly with public approval or disapproval of particular acts or circumstances.[160]

Twice Homer uses the term *δῆμος* when he mentions the participants in assemblies or councils.[161] For instance, when Mentor addresses the assembly called by Telemachos in Book II of the *Odyssey*, he declares:

> *νῦν δ' ἄλλῳ δήμῳ νεμεσίζομαι, οἷον ἅπαντες*
> *ἧσθ' ἄνεῳ, ἀτὰρ οὔ τι καθαπτόμενοι ἐπέεσσι*
> *παύρους μνηστῆρας καταπαύετε πολλοὶ ἐόντες.*[162]
>
> Rather, it is with the rest of the people (*δῆμος*) that I am indignant, that you all sit thus in silence, and utter no word or rebuke to make the suitors cease, though you are many and they but few.

Unlike the passage from Book II of the *Iliad*, where Odysseus himself rebukes members of the *δῆμος* for speaking out as if they were kings, here Mentor berates the *δῆμος* for not speaking out publicly against the suitors.[163] The assembly itself is make up of the *Ἰθακησίοι*, "men of Ithaca," who presumably constitute the *δῆμος* in this context.[164] Likewise, during his story of how he came to Ithaka, Eumaios mentions that the women

---

[160] Runciman 1982, 358, emphasizes the importance of the term *δῆμος* in distinguishing the public realm from the private, and agrees that one of the principal roles of the *δῆμος* is to participate in assemblies, but limits their role to that of audience. He also denies that they suffer any taxation (or conscription). Qviller 1981, 113, sees the calling of assemblies as one of the indications that the epics reflect the beginnings of *πόλις*-based society. Qviller agrees with Runciman, however, on the issue of taxation: "There were no regular revenues like taxes or feudal dues" (118), although he does go on to examine the extraction of wealth from the community (122-28). Luce 1978, 10-11, argues that the *πόλις* is the public entity in Homer, and that assemblies should be associated with the *πόλις*. Van Wees 1992, Chapter 2, esp. 31 ff., concurs.

[161] See also the discussion of *Od.* VIII.153; 156-57, above for an instance where king, *βασιλεύς*, assembly, *ἀγορή*, and people, *δῆμος*, are mentioned together in the same passage.

[162] *Od.* II.239-41.

[163] See above; *Il.* II.198-206.

[164] *Od.* II.229. Runciman 1982, 358, like Odysseus in *Iliad* II, holds that the appropriate role of the *δῆμος* is to remain silent in the assembly.

were left alone in the palace because *οἱ μὲν ἄρ' ἐς ϑῶκον πρόμολον, δήμοιό τε φῆμιν*, "[The men] had gone forth to the council (*ϑῶκον*) and the people's (*δῆμος*) place of debate."[165] Although this reference occurs only in passing, Homer chooses to use the term *δῆμος* to refer to the people in their role as political actors. Taken together with *Odyssey* II.239-41, these passages depict the *δῆμος* listening to—even taking part in—debates in the assembly or council.[166]

In another three instances, Homer uses the term *δῆμος* when he discusses the raising of resources or the collection of a commonly held debt. At the beginning of Book XIII of the *Odyssey*, Antinoös asks those Phaiakians attending his banquet—presumably the "elders" and the *βουληφόρος*, "counselors"—to join him in giving parting gifts to Odysseus:[167]

> *ἀλλ' ἄγε οἱ δῶμεν τρίποδα μέγαν ἠδὲ λέβητα*
> *ἀνδρακάς: ἡμεῖς δ' αὖτε ἀγειρόμενοι κατὰ δῆμον*
> *τισόμεϑ': ἀργαλέον γὰρ ἕνα προικὸς χαρίσασϑαι.*[168]
>
> But come now, let us give him a great tripod and a cauldron, each man of us, and we in turn will gather the cost from among the people (*δῆμος*), and repay ourselves. It would be hard for one man to give so freely, without requital.

When the king and other elites of the Phaiakian community recoup the cost of gifts, the entity such contributions are collected from is the *δῆμος*. Likewise, as he pleads for the lives of the suitors, Eurymachos offers:

> *...ἀτὰρ ἄμμες ὄπισϑεν ἀρεσσάμενοι κατὰ δῆμον,*
> *ὅσσα τοι ἐκπέποται καὶ ἐδήδοται ἐν μεγάροισι,*
> *τιμὴν ἀμφὶς ἄγοντες ἐεικοσάβοιον ἕκαστος,*
> *χαλκόν τε χρυσόν τ' ἀποδώσομεν, εἰς ὅ κε σὸν κῆρ*
> *ἰανϑῇ...*[169]

---

[165] *Od.* XV.468. For use of the word *ϑᾶκος* to mean assembly, see Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*ϑᾶκος*," II.

[166] See Runciman 1982, 358; Van Wees 1992, 31-36.

[167] Elders: *Od.* XIII.8; counselors: XIII.12.

[168] *Od.* XIII.13-15.

[169] *Od.* XXIII.55-59.

> ...and we will hereafter go about the land (*δῆμος*) and get you recompense for all that has been drunk and eaten in your halls, and will bring in requital, each man for himself, the worth of twenty oxen, and pay you back in bronze and gold until your heart is soothed...

As in the first passage, an outlay by elites is made up or paid off (*ἀρέσκω* here, *τίνω* above) by collecting resources *κατὰ δῆμον*, from among the *δῆμος*.[170] Similarly, Menelaos addresses the leaders of the Achaians as those who *δήμια πίνουσιν καὶ σημαίνουσιν ἕκαστος / λαοῖς*, "drink the community's wine and give, each man, his orders / to the people."[171] The term *δήμια*, "belonging to the people, public," seems to indicate wine paid for at public expense, indicating the collection of funds from the *δῆμος* for this purpose.[172] Finally, Homer relates the story of how Odysseus gained possession of his bow during a journey to Messene to collect recompense for a theft from the people:

> *...ἦ τοι Ὀδυσσεὺς*
> *ἦλθε μετὰ χρεῖος, τό ῥά οἱ πᾶς δῆμος ὄφελλε:*
> *μῆλα γὰρ ἐξ Ἰθάκης Μεσσήνιοι ἄνδρες ἄειραν*
> *νηυσὶ πολυκλήϊσι τριηκόσι' ἠδὲ νομῆας.*[173]
>
> The truth was that Odysseus had come to collect a debt which the whole people (*δῆμος*) owed him, for the men of Messene had lifted from Ithaca in their benched ships three hundred sheep and the shepherds with them.

As in the first two passages concerning the collection of resources, the poet chooses the term *δῆμος* to describe the entity from which the debt is collected, emphasizing the collective nature of the debt by modifying *δῆμος* with *πᾶς*, "whole." In all three

---

[170] The fact that the translator chose to render the same phrase, *κατὰ δῆμον*, as "among the people" in the first passage and "about the land" in the second is emblematic of the ambiguity inherent in Homer's use of the term *δῆμος*. See Qviller 1981, 123.

[171] *Il.* XVII.250-51.

[172] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*δῆμος*." Qviller 1981, 123, uses both this passage and the passage involving Odysseus and the Phaiakians as examples of Homeric *βασιλῆες* financing their exchange of gifts through exploitation of the *δῆμος*. Qviller discuss the extraction of surplus from the *δῆμος* (122-28), although he also contends that there is no (regular) taxation in the epics (118). See above.

[173] *Od.* XXI.16-19.

instances, the only in the Homeric corpus involving public or collective debt, resources are extracted (or promised) from the entity invoked by the term *δῆμος*.[174]

The *Δῆμος* as a Military Force

In three passages, all in the *Iliad*, *δῆμος* describes a military unit or the explicitly military capacity of the people. In *Iliad* Book XV, Aias observes that the Achaians do not have a citadel, *ἦ κ' ἀπαμυναίμεσθ' ἑτεραλκέα δῆμον ἔχοντες*, "within which we could defend ourselves and hold off this host that matches us."[175] Similarly, Apollo, disguised as the herald Perphas, spurs Aineias to action by reminding him that many heroes have defended cities despite the fact that, *ὑπερδέα δῆμον ἔχοντας*, "they had too few people (lit. "too small a *δῆμος*") for it."[176] Finally, in one of the stories told by Nestor, Neleus—after he has taken his share for a debt owed—allows the spoils of victory collected during a successful raid to be divided among the *δῆμος*:

> *...τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἐς δῆμον ἔδωκε*
> *δαιτρεύειν, μή τίς οἱ ἀτεμβόμενος κίοι ἴσης.*[177]
>
> ...and [Neleus] gave the rest to the people (*δῆμον*)
> to divide among them, so none might go away without a just share.

Although Homer does not provide the details of the raid responsible for this loot, martial nature of the surrounding passage, both preceding and following this phrase, indicates a division of the spoils of war.[178] Thus, it appears that *δῆμος* can be employed like *ἔθνος* to invoke a military contingent, although based upon these three passages its

---

[174] In one case where no abstract term is used for the entity owing the debt, the name of the geographic region is used: *καὶ γὰρ τῷ χρεῖος μέγ' ὀφείλετ' ἐν Ἤλιδι δίῃ*, "for indeed a great debt was owing to him [Neleus] in shining Elis." *Il.* XI.697.

[175] *Il.* XV.737.

[176] *Il.* XVII.330.

[177] *Il.* XI.703-04.

[178] Qviller 1981, 128-29, discusses at length the tendency towards—and the tension that arises from—the unequal distribution of spoils by *βασιλῆες* which, along with the extraction of any surplus produced by the *δῆμος*, marks the *βασιλεύς*' exploitation of his subjects (123 ff.).

usage seems to describe a larger and less well-defined force. In any case, this usage clearly refers to a group of people rather than a territory.[179]

Δῆμος Contrasted with *Γαῖα* and *Πόλις*

Although the meanings of *δῆμος* and *γαῖα* frequently overlap, there was enough of a distinction between the two for Homer to juxtapose them in a complementary manner. Twice questions concerning origin employ both terms, both in the *Odyssey*. The first comes as Alkinoös questions Odysseus about his identity: *εἰπὲ δέ μοι γαῖάν τε: τεὴν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε*, "and tell me your country (*γαῖάν*), your people (*δῆμόν*), and your city (*πόλιν*)." The second occurs after the Phaiakians return Odysseus to Ithaka, where he awakes disoriented, and asked the disguised Athena, *τίς γῆ, τίς δῆμος, τίνες*, "what land (*γῆ*), what people (*δῆμος*) is this?"[180] *Δῆμος* is also contrasted with *πόλις*, not only in the first passage above, but also in five other places.[181] In both the case of *δῆμος* and that of *γαῖα*, Homer contrasts *δῆμος* with a term naming a settlement (*πόλις*) or territorial area (*γαῖα*). When *δῆμος* is juxtaposed with the term *πόλις*, the contrast may be between city and country. On the other hand, as the parallel with *γαῖα* may indicate, the intended contrast might be between the physical, built city (or in the case of *γαῖα* the surrounding countryside) and the people who inhabit it. A third possibility is a contrast between the physical city (or land) and the more abstract entity of the people as a civic unit. In these passages, whether the poet intends *δῆμος* to designate a particular

---

[179] But see Qviller 1981, 118, and Donlan 1985, 297, who emphasize that military bands lead by *βασιλῆες* are limited subdivisions of the people. An analogous usage involves hunting. In a simile used to describe the fury of Achilles, Homer compares him to a pursued animal, *ἀγρόμενοι πᾶς δῆμος*, "with the country all (*πᾶς δῆμος*, lit. "the whole country") in the hunt," which also invokes people rather than territory. *Il.* XX.166.

[180] *Od.* VIII.555; XIII.233. See Chapter II above for an extended discussion of face-to-face exchanges concerning origin.

[181] *Il.* III.50; XIV.706; *Od.* VI.3; XI.14; XIV.233. See also *Od.* VIII.555, discussed above. Donlan 1985, 298-99, note 21, interprets the pairing of *δῆμος* and *πόλις* in precisely the opposite manner, namely that the phrase *δῆμός τε πόλις τε*, "seems to suggest that already in the epics *demos* and *polis* had begun to converge in meaning." Luce 1978, 6, argues that in constructions like this, *δῆμος* or *γαῖα* should be translated as "region," *πόλις* as "city." He concludes by contending that when Homer combines all three terms in *Od.* VIII.555, "Alkinoös wants the ancient equivalent of a post address: country, county, and town" (6).

territory distinct from *γαῖα* and *πόλις*, or a community of people as opposed to the place they live, remains ambiguous.[182]

Δῆμος and Putative Descent Groups

In only one instance is *δῆμος* used in a manner that might invoke J. Hall's ethnic groups based upon descent from a putative common ancestor. In Book II of the *Iliad*, in the Catalogue of Ships, Homer introduces the Athenian contingent as:

> *οἳ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον*
> *δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος μεγαλήτορος,*[183]
>
> But the men who held Athens, the strong-founded citadel,
> the deme (*δῆμον*) of great-hearted Erechtheus...

It is unclear whether *δῆμος* here is intended to refer to the people, *οἳ δ' ἄρ' Ἀθήνας εἶχον*, "the men who held Athens," or to the physical place, *ἐϋκτίμενον πτολίεθρον*, "the strong-founded citadel," both explicitly mentioned in line 546. Even if Homer here invokes the people with the term *δῆμος*, the exact relationship between the ancient hero and cult figure Erechtheus and the Athenian *δῆμος* remains ambiguous.[184] The fact that this usage is unique in the Homeric corpus renders its interpretation problematic, and does not argue for a strong connection between the community represented by the term *δῆμος* and a belief in shared descent from a common ancestor.

Other Uses of *Δῆμος*

The remaining nineteen uses of *δῆμος* are varied and ambiguous in meaning. Nine of these are variations of the phrase *δήμου ἀρίστος*, "the best of the *δῆμος*."[185] As the inconsistent translation of these passages indicates, whether this indicates "best in the

---

[182] The meaning "countryside"—in a more restricted sense than *γαῖα* and opposed to *πόλις*—is suggested in by Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. "*δῆμος*," II.1, although "people" (another option provided by Liddell and Scott) would make equal sense. See Chapter I above for the dispute over whether *πόλις* invokes built space place, a collection of people, or an abstract institution.

[183] *Il.* II.546-47. See Chapter III above for an extended discussion of the Catalogue of Ships.

[184] Homer elaborates only by observing that Erechtheus established the temple of Athena and the religious rites that accompany her worship. *Il.* II.549-51.

[185] *Il.* XI.328; XII.447; XVII.577; *Od.* IV.530; 652; 666; VI.34; VIII.36; XVI.419.

land" or "best among the people" is unclear. The remaining ten passages containing the term *δῆμος* are equally ambiguous; the most common involve someone moving through or performing some activity within the *δῆμος*.[186] Once the term is used by Alkinoös when he complains that his daughter Nausikaä scorns the men *κατὰ δῆμον*, "in the land (*δῆμος*)."[187] Elsewhere Eumaios describes the people or place of his birth with the claim that *πείνη δ' οὔ ποτε δῆμον ἐσέρχεται*, "famine never comes in the land (*δῆμος*)."[188] Despite the translator's preference for the word "land," in each of these passages, it is unclear whether Homer intends to invoke the land itself or people living on it. Finally, Homer employs *δῆμος* when he describes the supernatural journey of the suitors' souls to Hades: Hermes leads them through the *δῆμον ὀνείρων*, the "land of dreams."[189] These miscellaneous uses of *δῆμος*, like the more systematic ones described above, reflect the—sometimes ambiguous—dual meaning of the term.

Δῆμος: Conclusions

The term *δῆμος* can invoke either a geographic region or a collection of people or, it seems, a composite entity consisting of both. Certain patterns emerge in its uses beyond any simple people/place dichotomy. Homer consistently uses *δῆμος* in a public or political context, whether territory or people are involved. Other terms invoking groups of people—*ἔθνος*, *φῦλον*, *γένος*, etc.—are never used in this manner; only *γαῖα* and its variants are ever used in an analogous manner, and then strictly in the sense of "land." *Δῆμος* is the only term for a group of people with political overtones, but at the same time it retains a dual or ambiguous meaning, sometimes indicating a territory, sometimes a people, sometimes both. The people under the rule of the *βασιλεύς* may also be invoked with the term *δῆμος*, but idea of territoriality is never far from any conception of a political entity.

---

[186] Traveling: *Od.* II.29; skulking or begging: *Od.* XVII.227; 558; XVIII.115; 363, XIX.73; seeking guest-gifts: *Od.* XIX.273.

[187] *Od.* VI.283.

[188] *Od.* XV.407.

[189] *Od.* XIV.12.

Most authors have tended to understate the importance of the δῆμος in the epics. Finley, for instance, does not directly discuss the δῆμος at all, despite the fact that he considers the assembly (ἀγορή), which represented a community made up of households (οἶκοι) within a set territory, to be one of the prerequisites of civilization in the epics.[190] In Finley's view, the assembly settles all public matters for the οἶκοι within its (territorially delimited) community, with public affairs being any decision requiring consultation between the various heads of οἶκοι within the community.[191] This entity (community plus territory, represented by an assembly and ruled by a βασιλεύς) is, however, almost certainly what is invoked by the term δῆμος in the epics. Finley argues that this territorial community eclipsed earlier tribal structures very early, as the Greeks were exposed to large-scale territorial organization in Egypt and the Near East in the Bronze Age. Whatever territoriality emerged in the Bronze Age, however, in large part gave way to more household- and kinship-based structures and a less integrated civic community. According to Finley, the social and community structures seen in Odysseus' Ithaka reflected the dichotomy between public and private affairs, the former handled by the ἀγορή (representing the δῆμος), the latter by the οἶκος .[192] The territorial unit is superimposed upon household and kinship organization, which are still responsible for most aspects "the usual pursuits of peace." In Finley's view the community and territorial entity ruled by the king and represented by the assembly, which I am equating with the δῆμος, was responsible primarily for matters of war.[193]

---

[190] Finley 1978, 78. Finley notes that the assembly (ἀγορή) and law (θέμις) were unknown among the Kyklopes (along with agriculture. *Od.* IX.105 ff.).

[191] Finley 1978, 79.

[192] Finley 1978, 79. Finley notes, however, that the details of this development, while complex, are lost.

[193] Finley 1978, 82-83. Finley lists "the usual pursuits of peace" as: "the procurement of sustenance, social intercourse, the administration of justice, relations with the gods, and even non-bellicose relations with the outside world." Contrary to Donlan, Finley argues that "kinship thinking permeated everything," although he later observes that οἶκος ties were more powerful than kinship ties (105). Indeed, for Finley, the community/territorial unit ruled by the βασιλεύς and represented by the ἀγορή is dispensable; the Achaian kings are away for ten years with no ill effects, while Ithaka has no king or assembly for twenty. War, the principal concern of the political community, mostly involves defense; Finley contends that defense against invaders is what brings community membership to the fore (116).

Although less well articulated, Snodgrass's view of a "traditional" Dark Age polity seems to agree with Finley's. Snodgrass does not explicitly equate this polity with the δῆμος but, as was the case with Finley, the "community" which he describes is ruled by a local king and hosts assemblies, corresponding most closely with the δῆμος of the epics. Furthermore, when discussing the social changes that may have accompanied the increase in population during the eighth century BC, Snodgrass suggests: "A loose organization under a dominant family, with *ad hoc* decisions taken by a local ruler and only occasional assemblies of any larger group, becomes unworkable when the community more than doubles in size within a single generation."[194] Considering that this observation precedes a discussion of the "structural revolution" of the eighth century, and that Snodgrass elsewhere argues that the "archaizing" world of the epics intentionally excludes the changes wrought by that revolution, it seems likely that the world Snodgrass is here envisioning is drawn at least in part from the epics.[195] Snodgrass contends that the social organization depicted in the epics (as well as Hesiod) consists of simple tribal units inhabiting certain territorially delineated areas, lacking elaborate substructures such as the φρήτρη and γένος, constituting a "state" later called the ἔθνος.[196] Specifically, Snodgrass contends that later Archaic and Classical ἔθνος was:

---

[194] Snodgrass 1980, 24.

[195] See discussion of the use of Homer as an historical source in Chapter I above.

[196] Snodgrass 1980, 26-28. Snodgrass agrees with Bourriot and Roussel that the elaborate "tribal" structure visible in the later Archaic and Classical periods is completely absent in Homer and Hesiod and could not have been a holdover from earlier times. He does not, however, go so far as Donlan and reject tribal organization entirely, instead arguing that the ἔθνος, more or less as it existed in later times, represents the older, tribal holdover. Ἔθνος in this sense must not be confused with the term ἔθνος as it is used in Homer, which is always used of individual military contingents on the battlefield, not abstract or political entities (see discussion of ἔθνος above). See also Morgan 1991, 131-63. Morgan discusses the archaic ἔθνος at length, defining it as either a confederation of cities, each with a high degree of local independence (Boiotia) or a large area of dispersed small-scale settlement and little urban development (Aitolia). In this type of "state," Morgan continues, regional identity and recognition of territorial boundaries is combined with the maintenance of internal social structure determined by kin ties or local citizenship. Morgan also argues that while the πόλις emphasized control of space and territoriality, the ἔθνος seek to "control" time and descent; lineage serves as the central distinguishing aspect of identity (141)—a scenario similar to that proposed by J. Hall. Political emphasis rests on kin ties and, although recognized, territorial boundaries are less emphasized than in the πόλις (142; 148). Although Morgan's discussion ranges over the entire Archaic period, her formulation of the ἔθνος, based on a combination of

> In its purest form...no more than a survival of the tribal system into historical times: a population scattered thinly over a territory without urban centers, united politically and in customs and religion, normally governed by means of some periodical assembly at a single center, and worshipping a tribal deity at a common religious center.[197]

Snodgrass admits that the multitude of Archaic Greek polities could fall anywhere along a scale ranging from the *πόλις* to this "pure" form of the *ἔθνος*, but he is explicit that, as an alternative to the *πόλις*, the *ἔθνος* recalls the "antecedent culture of the dark age."[198] Snodgrass, for the most part, reconstructs his description of the Dark Age *ἔθνος* from features common to later *ἔθνεα*. He believes that it was the primary community structure of the Dark Ages, and he assigns the society depicted in the epics to the end of this period. Certain aspects of Snodgrass's *ἔθνος*, including its function as a territorial "state" in the Dark Ages and its representation through an assembly, correspond to the depiction of the *δῆμος* in the epics. Furthermore, unlike Bourriot and Roussel, Snodgrass sees evidence that Homeric society was arraigned tribally, primarily based on Homer's conventions for naming peoples and "states." Snodgrass's other contentions concerning shared religious worship are, for the most part, absent from the epics, while his belief in a tribal organization is contest not only by Bourriot and Roussel, but also by Donlan.[199]

Donlan recognized the *δῆμος* as one of only three clearly defined social units, along with the *λαός* and *οἶκος*. Furthermore, Donlan argues that the *δῆμος* is "always portrayed as a single body with a common will" and should be considered "the all-

---

(strong) kinship or lineage ties combined with a (weaker) territorial basis agrees with and expands upon Snodgrass's ideas about the "traditional" *ἔθνος* as it existed in the Dark Ages, conceived of in the epics, and preserved in later periods.

[197] Snodgrass 1980, 42.

[198] Snodgrass 1980, 42-43. Runciman 1982, 373, also observes that the range of forms of state organization falls along a continuum from *ἔθνος* to *πόλις*.

[199] On *δῆμος*-wide religious practice, however, see Nestor's sacrifice with the Pylians in Book III of the *Odyssey* (1 ff.). Qviller 1981, 143, points out the uniqueness of this sacrifice. Compare P. Vidal-Naquet, "Land and Sacrifice in the *Odyssey*: A Study of Religious and Mythical Meanings," in *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World*, ed. Seth L. Schein, 15-38 (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986).

inclusive social unit—a particular people and their land."[200] Donlan devotes most of his article, however, to exploring the military/political bands of followers designated by the terms φῦλον and φρήτρη, adding that he considers these groups to have been constituent parts of the δῆμος, with their leaders collectively representing the people and ruling the δῆμος.[201] Elsewhere, Donlan also observes that the δῆμος is the arena of competition for aristocrats and the entity within which heroes vie with one another for τιμή.[202]

Although van Wees uses the term δῆμος only in its political sense of those ruled by a king—and he goes so far as to claim that the "state" has no name in the Homeric epics—the δῆμος in the epics displays many properties he attributes to the state (as well as others he confines to the πόλις). Relevant aspects of van Wees's states include their territorial extent, which generally includes several towns, and the fact that the state has a single monarch. In short, van Wees transposes much of the political activity found in Homer from the δῆμος to the town and ignores the territorial aspects of the δῆμος, treating it as simply a term denoting the people as opposed to their kings.[203]

Runciman's view of the δῆμος foreshadows that of van Wees in that he considers it as a class operating within the state rather than designating the state itself. He begins his discussion of the δῆμος in the epics with an observation of its importance: "Already in the semi-states of the Homeric poems there are not only identifiable super-ordinate and subordinate roles but also distinctions between the public and the private realms."[204] Runciman's discussion, although it treats only the communal and not the territorial aspect of the δῆμος, emphasizes the near-monopoly of the term to designate the public realm. Still, Runciman sees a rather limited political role for the δῆμος,

---

[200] Donlan 1985, 298.

[201] Donlan 1985, 295 ff.

[202] Donlan, "The Pre-state Community in Greece" (1989): 9.

[203] Van Wees 1996, 31-39.

[204] Runciman 1982, 358.

agreeing with van Wees that its role in the assembly is passive, and denying that the *δῆμος* is either conscripted or taxed.[205]

In Qviller, the *δῆμος* appears primarily as the entity from which surpluses are extracted, and proper distribution of spoils denied, in order to support the largess and gift-giving of the *βασιλεύς*.[206] This observation forms one of the central tenets of Qviller's thesis that Homeric society contained contradictions that created instability, eventually leading to the replacement of Dark Age monarchy with the typical Archaic aristocracy.[207] Furthermore, Qviller is careful to point out that the *δῆμος* is not synonymous with the following of a particular *βασιλεύς*. Instead, like Donlan, Qviller believes that such military bands are drawn from the *δῆμος*, and are constituent parts of it. The *βασιλεύς* enjoys immediate rule only over his followers, and must exercise power only indirectly outside his retinue.[208]

While some scholars have appreciated one aspect or another of the term *δῆμος* in the epics, none has recognized its use as the primary term to designate what might be called the "state." In this formulation, the "state" is the entity, encompassing both people and territory, which is the basis of governance, from which one is exiled, and which one recognizes as one's own, as opposed to other, similar entities that belong to others. Such a definition gives proper weight to the dual territorial/communal meaning of *δῆμος* and its near-monopoly of all things public and political.

Summary and Conclusions

Of terms that can designate social units or communities larger than the *οἶκος*, the most significant designate territorially defined "states" or military/political contingents united under the leadership of a particular individual. When used in the context of social units, *Γένος* does not invoke any formal kinship group, instead it is better seen as a restricted

---

[205] Runciman 1982, 358.

[206] Taxation: Qviller 1981, 122-28; distribution of spoils 128-30.

[207] Contradictions within and weakness of Homeric kingship: Qviller 1981, 130-34; rise of collective rule of the nobility: 135 ff.

[208] Qviller 1981, 118.

"category" centered on the individual, limited to close relatives and (usually paternal) direct lineage—a unit largely coterminous with the *οἶκος*, but including deceased or removed progenitors.[209] Frequently, the word *γένος* is juxtaposed with terms or phrases denoting geographical origin. In only two cases is the term *γένος* extended beyond family and direct lineage, once when it is used to describe Diomedes' Aitolian origins, and once when it is applied to the Achaians as a whole. These two isolated instances are difficult to interpret, but perhaps reflect the belief in genealogical ties among the Aitolians or Achaians. Nevertheless, the term *γένος* is almost always restricted to familial relationships or direct lineage.

Ἔθνος, like *γένος*, has an underlying meaning of a group of like beings. Unlike *γένος*, however, it does not have overtones of birth or family. Instead, *ἔθνος* invokes groups of people with a shared identity, usually in a military context. Some ambiguity remains over whether *ἔθνος* only refers to military contingents themselves or extends to include a body of people from which the contingent is drawn. In as much as it does extend to a more permanent community, the *ἔθνος* appears larger then the *φῦλον* or *φρήτρη*, and is perhaps coterminous with the *δῆμος*. Another word frequently used generically to categorize beings is *φῦλον*. Most commonly, *φῦλα* denote military contingents, but occasionally, as with the Pelasgians and the Rhodians, *φῦλα* are internal divisions within larger social units. When used in the abstract, "*φῦλα* of men upon the earth," the term seem to have a broader meaning as a social group. The uncommon term *φρήτρη* appears to designate a similar grouping, while both terms appear similar in meaning to *ἔθνος*. *Ἔθνος*, *φῦλον*, and *φρήτρη*, taken together, represent social units or military/political contingents that subdivide the *δῆμος* or *γαῖα*.

Δῆμος and *γαῖα* themselves seem closely related; Homer uses both to designate a discrete territorial region ruled by a *βασιλεύς* (or occasionally, as is the case with Elis, multiple *βασιλῆες*). *Γαῖα* refers only to the territorial region, while *δῆμος* can refer to either the territory or its inhabitants. *Δῆμος*, furthermore, is the term that most

[209] Donlan 1985, 298.

commonly takes on public or political meanings. Fugitives are exiled from the δῆμος (or sometimes a γαῖα); the δῆμος pays public debts; the δῆμος interacts with the βασιλεύς.

In short, the Homeric world consists of territorially-based communities with social, political, and ideological saliency, designated by the terms δῆμος or γαῖα, which are in turn divided into military/political associations denoted by ἔθνος, φῦλον, and φρήτρη, which may also serve as organizational units for society beyond the military sphere. The γένος, on the other hand, is limited to family and direct, usually paternal, lineage. Complicating matters further, however, Homer uses the terms γένος, ἔθνος, or—more commonly—γαῖα to designate the Achaians as a whole, perhaps indicating a nascent sense of Panhellenism.

CHAPTER V: PANHELLENISM IN THE EPICS

The extent to which a Panhellenic sentiment exists in Homer remains open to debate. The ambiguity arises from the fact that although the Greeks are depicted as operating in concert in the *Iliad*, Homer provides no common name for them. Instead, he designates the "Greeks" variously with the terms Argives, Danaans, and Achaians, which appear to be completely interchangeable. Finley provides a succinct overview of the situation regarding Panhellenic identity:

> The presence of a common name (or names) [in the *Iliad*] is a symbol that Greek history proper had been launched. But there was more than one name, and that serves as a symbol, too, of the social and cultural diversity which characterized Hellas both in its infancy and throughout its history, little though it is to be seen in the two Homeric poems.[1]

As Finley's observation indicates, Homer does not unambiguously espouse a highly-developed sense of Panhellenism. In particular, the "oppositional" Panhellenism seen by E. Hall as manifested in Aischylos' *Persians* or by Hartog in Herodotos' *Histories* in noticeably lacking in the epics.[2] Granted, Finley can argue that the Trojans are depicted in a subtly but consistently biased manner when compared to the Greeks; even he, however, must admit that the "the Trojans are as Greek and as heroic in deeds and values as their opponents in every respect."[3] Mackie also proposes a systematic difference between the presentation of Greeks and Trojans in the *Iliad*, but is careful to note that it is not ethnic or cultural, but instead literary, strictly a device of the poet.[4]

---

[1] Finley 1978, 18.

[2] See discussion of "aggregative" vs. "oppositional" identity in Chapter I above.

[3] Finley 1978, 43-44.

[4] Mackie 1996. Under most circumstances, however, Mackie does not believe that Homer has an "anti-Trojan" bias. Other scholars, including M. van der Valk, "Homer's Nationalism, Again," *Mnemosyne*, XXXVIII fasc. 3-4 (1985): 737-76, and J. Griffin, *Homer on Life and Death* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1980), 3-5, do argue that Homer has a Pro-Greek attitude. Donlan, "The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy" (1989): 12, note 35, believes that scenes of Achaian success instead "portend the eventual Achaean victory." Later, Donlan observes that all acts of supplication and ransom are made by Trojans or their allies to Achaians, a pattern which fits "the general Iliadic plan of Hellenic superiority" (14). He closes his discussion of the confrontation between Glaukos and Diomedes with the observation that Homer plays out the scene so as to portray the Achaians as superior to the Trojans in wits as well as strength (15).

Although Snodgrass does not directly address Panhellenism in Homer or Hesiod, he does briefly discuss eighth century BC manifestations of the general phenomenon. Snodgrass looks to the rise of Panhellenic religious sites at Delphi, Olympia, Delos, and Dodona, built as they were away from centers of political power, as indications of Panhellenic religious worship.[5]

Certain aspects of the epics argue for the existence of at least proto-Panhellenism in Homer. The first has been mentioned above: very occasionally, terms usually restricted to narrower groups of people and smaller social or territorial units are applied to the Achaians as a whole, including γένος, ἔθνος, and γαῖα. Furthermore, Homer recognizes that the Achaians speak a common language, while the Trojans and their allies do not. Perhaps most convincingly, Homer applies the terms Achaian, Danaan, and Argive indiscriminately to all the "Greek" heroes, but is unfailingly consistent in drawing distinctions among the Trojans and their allies, never, for instance, calling a Trojan and Lykian or *vice versa*.

Linguistic variation among the Trojan contingents in the *Iliad*

In the Classical period, language was central to Greek concepts of Panhellenism. Herodotos, for instance, considers speaking a common tongue to be one of the three central elements of Panhellenic unity.[6] The fifth century BC also saw the mutation of the concept "barbarian" to denote non-Greeks as a whole, a distinction largely based upon language.[7] Dispute over the unity or disunity of the Greek language itself is also a center of the debate about identity in the Archaic period. J. Hall sees the difference in dialects among the Greeks to have been a serious barrier to communication, which engendered identities reflecting socio-linguistic groups such as the Dorians and

---

[5] Snodgrass 1980, 55-56; 63, for the role of Delphi in Greek colonization. Homer knew of Dodona (*Il.* II.750; XVI.233-34; *Od.* XVI.327; XIX.296) and Delos (*Od.* VI.162) in their religious capacities. See also Thomas 1999, 829.

[6] Herod. VIII.144.

[7] E. Hall 1989, 76-79; 117-121; 177-79; see also 19-21 for a brief discussion of the lack of interest in foreign languages in Archaic poetry. See also J. Hall 1997, 168.

Ionians.[8] Finley, on the other hand, recognizes the substantial dialectical difference, but does not consider it a significant barrier to communication. Indeed, he believes that the Greek language was a "remarkably stable" unifying element among all its speakers.[9]

The speaking of different languages, however, is recognized only four times in Homer, and there is no overt recognition of dialectical difference.[10] One instance where Homer acknowledges linguistic diversity involves the episode involving Odysseus' description of the peoples of Krete, discussed in Chapter II above:

> *ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα μεμιγμένη· ἐν μὲν Ἀχαιοί,*
> *ἐν δ' Ἐτεόκρητες μεγαλήτορες, ἐν δὲ Κύδωνες,*
> *Δωριέες τε τριχάϊκες δῖοί τε Πελασγοί.*[11]
>
> They have not all the same speech, but their tongues are mixed. There dwell Achaeans, there great-hearted native Cretans, there Cydonians, and Dorians of waving plumes, and goodly Pelasgians.

Here, linguistic variation seems to be between "ethnic" groups in J. Hall's socio-linguistic sense of the term.[12] Two others can to be found in the *Iliad*, both concerning the Trojans. The first of these passages in the *Iliad* occurs as the Trojans prepare to counter an Achaian attack in Book II. Iris, disguised as the watchman Polites, warns Hektor of the coming onslaught and commands,

> *Ἕκτορ σοὶ δὲ μάλιστ' ἐπιτέλλομαι, ὧδε δὲ ῥέξαι·*
> *πολλοὶ γὰρ κατὰ ἄστυ μέγα Πριάμου ἐπίκουροι,*
> *ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων·*
> *τοῖσιν ἕκαστος ἀνὴρ σημαινέτω οἵσί περ ἄρχει,*
> *τῶν δ' ἐξηγείσθω κοσμησάμενος πολίτας.*[13]
>
> Hektor, on you beyond all I urge this, to do as I tell you:
> All about the great city of Priam are many companions,
> But multitudinous is the speech of the scattered nations;
> Let each man who is their leader give orders to these men,
> And let each set his citizens in order, and lead them.

---

[8] J. Hall 1997, 173.

[9] Finley 1978, 18-19.

[10] *Il.* II.802-06; 867; IV.437-38; *Od.* XIX.175-77.

[11] *Od.* XIX.175-77.

[12] See Chapter I above.

[13] *Il.* II.802-06.

The phrase *ἄλλη δ' ἄλλων γλῶσσα πολυσπερέων ἀνθρώπων·* "But multitudinous is the speech of the scattered nations," makes it clear that the allies of the Trojans speak various mutually unintelligible languages; otherwise, there would be no need to dispatch each leader to array and command his own troops. What is more, in this passage Hektor is to dispatch each commander to array the residents of his own *πόλις* (*πολῖται*). It is assumed that all members of a *πόλις* community (and the military contingent based upon it) will speak the same language, but that language barriers may arise between *πόλεις*.[14] Furthermore, the fact that Hektor turns to leaders of individual military contingents to carry out this order marks the importance of those leaders and the tactical unit they lead. Here, language is not associated with particular "ethnic" groups as it is in the passage from the *Odyssey* about Krete. Instead, it is related directly to another aspect of identity more commonly invoked by Homer: leadership of a military contingent. In light of the second passage from the *Iliad* in which linguistic diversity plays a role, however, language differences probably divide larger groups: the Trojans and the heterogeneous peoples allied with them.

Once in the Trojan Catalogue, Homer revisits the idea that various contingents speak mutually unintelligible languages. The Karians are called *βαρβαρόφωνος*, barbarous of speech, without further comment.[15] Although this may simply indicate that their speech was considered non-Greek, considering the claim made by Iris/Polites during the introduction that the speech of the Trojans and allies was "multitudinous," it is at least plausible that the adjective *βαρβαρόφωνος* here reflects some degree of linguistic diversity within the Trojan force.

The final mention of the heterogeneous speech of the Trojans occurs in Book IV of the *Iliad*, in a passage describing the uproar generated by the Trojan charge. This

---

[14] In this passage, residents of each *πόλις* form military units which order the Trojan army, despite the fact that *πόλεις* are less frequently mentioned in the Trojan Catalogue than in the Catalogue of ships. *Πόλις*-based military units seem to replace the *φῦλον-* and *φρήτρη*-based units found in the introduction to the Catalogue of ships, a substitution worth further inquiry.

[15] *Il.* II.867.

clamor is described with a simile comparing the Trojan army to a herd of bleating ewes,[16] followed by an explanation of the peculiarity of their mingled battle-cry:

> *οὐ γὰρ πάντων ἦεν ὁμὸς ϑρόος οὐδ' ἴα γῆρυς,*
> *ἀλλὰ γλῶσσα μέμικτο, πολύκλητοι δ' ἔσαν ἄνδρες.*[17]
>
> Since there was no speech nor language common to all of them
> But their talk was mixed, who were called there from many far places.

Three words, *ϑρόος*, *γῆρυς*, and *γλῶσσα*, are used for language in two separate clauses describing their heterogeneity, emphasizing the fact that the languages are diverse and mutually unintelligible. Not only does this passage, and the passage in Book II, indicate that Homer was aware of language differences, but it also points to a stark contrast with the Achaians: never does Homer assert that any part of the Achaian host speaks a language different from any other. The passage from the *Odyssey*, which describes the mixed (*μεμιγμένη*–the same verb used in this passage) languages of the Kretans indicates that Homer was aware of varying Greek dialects or non-Greek languages within the lands from which the Achaians came. The poems, however, never mention differences in speech among those described as Achaians, Danaans, or Argives; whatever group is invoked by that term appears linguistically homogenous in the epics.[18]

Differences in Use between "Achaian/Danaan/Argive" and "Trojan"

Throughout the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, Homer uses the terms "Achaian," "Danaan," and "Argive," to refer to a community that his audience could readily identify without further explanation. This community transcends internal subdivisions, such as those designated by the terms *δῆμος*, *ἔϑνος*, *φρήτρη*, and *φῦλον*. All of the men serving under Agamemnon are described as Achaian without exception, as are all of Penelope's suitors and the men encountered by Telemachos while he travels through the Peloponnesos in the *Odyssey*. The use of the term Achaian stands in stark contrast to

---

[16] *Il.* IV.433-36.

[17] *Il.* IV.437-38.

[18] *Od.* XIX.105 ff.

the term "Trojan" which, although it is occasionally used as shorthand for all the warriors opposing the Achaians, when used specifically about individual warriors or contingents of men, is strictly limited to the subjects ruled by the houses of Priam and Anchises. Homer's consistency in the use of these terms, Achaian and Trojan, and the difference between the uses of each, indicates the existence, and the importance, of a pan-Achaian category of identity in the mind of the poet and his audience.

The collective identity of the Achaians on the one hand, as opposed to the discrete identity of the Trojans is apparent in the way that Homer describes each group and its members. Trojans are repeatedly referred to by the phrase *Τρῶες κλειτοί τ' ἐπίκουροι*, "Trojans and famed allies," or a variation, while no "allies" of the Achaians are ever mentioned; the forces opposing the Trojans and their allies are simply Achaians, Danaans, or Argives. A typical example occurs at the end of the recognition scene between Diomedes and Glaukos:

> *πολλοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἐμοὶ Τρῶες κλειτοί τ' ἐπίκουροι*
> *κτείνειν ὅν κε θεός γε πόρῃ καὶ ποσσὶ κιχείω,*
> *πολλοὶ δ' αὖ σοὶ Ἀχαιοὶ ἐναιρέμεν ὅν κε δύνηαι.*[19]
>
> There are plenty of Trojans and famed companions in battle for me
> To kill, whom the god sends me, or those I run down with my swift feet,
> Many Achaians for you to slaughter, if you can do it.

Here, the Trojans and their allies are mentioned in the first half of a *μὲν...δε* clause, while the Achaians are referred to, unqualified, in the latter half. Likewise, the phrase *Τρῶες καὶ Δάρδανοι ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι*, "Trojans, Dardanians, and allies" is used repeatedly,[20] as is *Τρῶες καὶ Λύκιοι καὶ Δάρδανοι*, "Trojans and Lykians and Dardanians."[21] On the other hand, although Achaian, Argive, and Danaan are clearly interchangeable—one goes to the huts and ships of the Achaians to rouse the Danaans, for example.[22] Moreover, these terms are never closely joined by a conjunction as

---

[19] *Il.* VI.227-29.

[20] *Il.*VII.348; 368.

[21] *Il.* XI.286; XIII.150.

[22] *Il.* XIII.208-09. The terms *Ἀχαιοί* and *Δαναοί* occur interchangeably in the same sentence sixteen times in the Iliad (but never joined by a conjunction) according to a search using *The Perseus Project* (2001).

Trojan, Lykian, and Dardanian frequently are. In other words, the Trojans, Lykians, and Dardanians are discrete peoples whom the poet lists together when describing the Trojans force as a whole. The Achaians, Argives, and Danaans, however are simply alternative names for the same group of people, a conclusion bolstered by the fact that although "allies" (*ἐπίκουροι*) of the Trojans are frequently mentioned, no equivalent term is ever used with the Achaians.

Description of Greek and Trojan Heroes

Another clear indication that the Trojans and each of their allies are thought of as distinct peoples while the Achaians are seen as a collective group can be found in the way that Homer refers to individuals in the *Iliad*. The forty-six Greek heroes mentioned in the catalogue of ships are referred to indiscriminately as Achaian, Argive, or Danaan, but at some point in this poem, almost every Achaian hero is described as Achaian, Argive, or Danaan, no matter what the specific origins of that hero are. On the other hand, each Trojan is always called Trojan, but each "allied" hero is consistently referred to as belonging to his particular group. Homer never refers to a Lykian, Paionian, or Mysian as a Trojan, for example; each is always named specifically as Lykian, Paionian, or Mysian.

Homer's conception of the Achaians as an identifiable and meaningful group of people becomes clearer when the Catalogue of Ships and the Trojan Catalogue are analyzed for evidence of differentiation between the Achaians on one hand and the Trojans and their allies on the other. Homer begins his list of Trojan heroes by dividing the Trojans and allies:

ἔνθα τότε Τρῶές τε διέκριθεν ἠδ' ἐπίκουροι.[23]

There the Trojans and their companions were marshaled in order.

Homer's use of the verb *διακρίνω*, to separate, emphasizes the distinction between the Trojans (*Τρῶές*) and their allies (*ἐπίκουροι*). Indeed, Homer describes no less than fifteen contingents, two he calls *Τρῶες*, one he calls "Dardanian," and twelve others

[23] *Il.* II.815.

which constitute the *ἐπίκουροι*. Unlike the Achaians, the various contingents of Trojans and their captains are scrupulously referred to by their respective ethnic names, and are never referred to as "Trojans."

The first three contingents Homer describes, led by Hector, Aeneas, and Pandarus respectively, constitute the Trojan army proper, distinct from the allies in the minds of the poet and his audience. Not surprisingly, Hector is the clearest example; the most "Trojan" of the heroes:

> *Τρωσὶ μὲν ἡγεμόνευε μέγας κορυθαίολος Ἕκτωρ*
> *Πριαμίδης· ἅμα τῷ γε πολὺ πλεῖστοι καὶ ἄριστοι*
> *λαοὶ θωρήσσοντο μεμαότες ἐγχείῃσι.*[24]
>
> Tall Hektor of the shining helm was leader of the Trojans,
> Priam's son; and with him far the best and the bravest
> Fighting men were armed and eager to fight with the spear's edge.

The first line of Homer's description of the Trojan and allied forces thus begins with the word "Trojan," and ends with "Hektor." Not only is it explicitly and emphatically stated that Hector leads the Trojans, but also that he leads the most and best men.

A few lines later, Homer describes a second company of Trojans, lead by Pandaros:

> *οἳ δὲ Ζέλειαν ἔναιον ὑπαὶ πόδα νείατον Ἴδης*
> *ἀφνειοὶ πίνοντες ὕδωρ μέλαν Αἰσήποιο*
> *Τρῶες, τῶν αὖτ' ἦρχε Λυκάονος ἀγλαὸς υἱὸς*
> *Πάνδαρος, ᾧ καὶ τόξον Ἀπόλλων αὐτὸς ἔδωκεν.*[25]
>
> They who lived in Zeleia below the foot of Mount Ida,
> Men of wealth, who drank the dark water of Aisepos,
> Trojans: of these the leader was the shining son of Lykaon,
> Pandaros, with the bow that was actual gift of Apollo.

Here, *οἳ . . . Τρῶες* brackets the description of his men, who are clearly Trojan, but nevertheless come from *Ζέλειαν ἔναιον ὑπαὶ πόδα νείατον Ἴδης*, "below the foot of Mount Ida," rather than from the citadel of Troy itself. Thus, Homer distinguishes between the Trojans from the citadel itself, and those living at the foot of Mount Ida, but undoubtedly considers both groups and their leaders Trojan.

---

[24] *Il.* II.816-18.

A third company led by Aineias, is called "Dardanian" (*Δαρδανίοι*) in the roster of Trojans:

> *Δαρδανίων αὖτ' ἦρχεν ἐϋς πάϊς Ἀγχίσαο*
> *Αἰνείας, τὸν ὑπ' Ἀγχίσῃ τέκε δῖ' Ἀφροδίτη*
> *Ἴδης ἐν κνημοῖσι θεὰ βροτῷ εὐνηθεῖσα,*
> *οὐκ οἷος, ἅμα τῷ γε δύω Ἀντήνορος υἷε*
> *Ἀρχέλοχός τ' Ἀκάμας τε μάχης εὖ εἰδότε πάσης.*[26]
>
> The strong son of Anchises was leader of the Dardanians,
> Aineias, whom divine Aphrodite bore to Anchises
> In the folds of Ida, a goddess lying in love with a mortal:
> Not Aineias alone, but with him were two sons of Antenor,
> Archelochos and Akamas, both skilled in all fighting.

Nevertheless, both Aineias and his company are still Trojan, as becomes apparent when other appearances of Aineias, Archelochos, and Akamas in the *Iliad* are examined. Aineias himself is unambiguously referred to as Trojan no less than eight times. Four times he is called *Τρώων βουληφόρε*, "councilor of the Trojans;"[27] he is also referred to as *Τρώων ἀγὸς* or *ἡγεμόνες Τρώων*, "leader of the Trojans;"[28] and *οἳ Τρώων . . . ἄριστοι*, "the best of the Trojans (with Hektor)."[29] Aineias' Trojan identity also emerges when he joins Hektor as the two stand to face the Aiantes:

> *ὣς αἰεὶ Αἴαντε μάχην ἀνέεργον ὀπίσσω*
> *Τρώων· οἳ δ' ἅμ' ἕποντο, δύω δ' ἐν τοῖσι μάλιστα*
> *Αἰνείας τ' Ἀγχισιάδης καὶ φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ.*[30]
>
> [S]o behind the Achaians the Aiantes held off forever
> the Trojan attack. But these stayed close, and two beyond others,
> Aineias, who was son of Anchises, and glorious Hektor.

Here, *Τρώων*, immediately precedes *οἳ . . . δύω δ' ἐν τοῖσι . . . Αἰνείας τ' Ἀγχισιάδης καὶ φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ;* Aineias is paired with Hektor, who is undoubtedly Trojan, while *Τρώων*, "Trojans" is clearly the antecedent of *ἐν τοῖσι* "among them." Likewise, when

---

[25] *Il.* II.824-27.

[26] *Il.* II.819-23.

[27] *Il.* V.180; XIII.463; XVII.485; XX.83.

[28] *Il.* V.217; XIII.491.

[29] *Il.* XVII.513.

[30] *Il.* XVII.752-54.

Deïphobos decides to "take to him as a comrade one of the great-souled Trojans," he immediately decides to turn to Aineias:

> *ὣς φάτο, Δηΐφοβος δὲ διάνδιχα μερμήριξεν*
> *ἢ τινά που Τρώων ἑταρίσσαιτο μεγαλήτορα*
> *ἄψ ἀναχωρήσας, ἢ πειρήσαιτο καὶ οἶος.*
> *ὣδε δέ οἱ φρονέοντι δοάσσατο κέρδιον εἶναι*
> *βῆναι ἐπ' Αἰνείαν.*[31]
>
> So he spoke, and the heart in Deïphobos was divided,
> Pondering whether to draw back and find some other high-hearted
> Trojan to be his companion, or whether to attempt him singly.
> And in the division of his heart this way seemed best to him
> To go for Aineias.

Here, Aineias is again numbered among the Trojans. Throughout he holds a dual identity, Trojan and Dardanian.

Likewise, the companions of Aineias mentioned in the roster of the Trojans and allies also seem to be considered Trojan in the mind of the poet. These heroes, Archelochos and Akamas, are the sons of Antenor who, although he is never explicitly referred to as Trojan, appears to be one of the leading councilors of the Trojans and a close companion of Priam.[32] He also has many other sons involved in the action, such as Agenor who, with Paris and Alkathoös, leads a company of Trojans in Book XII, and is directly referred to as a *ἡγεμόνες Τρώων*, "leader of the Trojans," along with Aineias, Deïphobos, and Paris in Book XIII.[33] Archelochos and Akamas, Dardanians according to the Roster of Trojans and allies, are also sons of Antenor, who appears to be considered a Trojan in the narrow sense by Homer, and whose other sons, such as Agenor, certainly are.

The terms "Trojan" and "Dardanian" and the peoples they represent, are not, however, completely interchangeable, as are the terms Danaan, Argive, and Achaian. Unlike the latter, "Trojan" and "Dardanian" frequently occur paired, but separated by

---

[31] *Il.* XIII.455-59.

[32] As a councilor: *Il.* III.148 ff.; VII.347 ff.; as a chariot-companion of Priam: III.260 ff.; 310 ff.

[33] *Il.* XII.93-94; XIII.491.

conjunctions.[34] Furthermore, although Priam, a descendant of Dardanos, is called Dardanian, neither Hektor nor any other descendant of Priam is ever referred to as Dardanian in the *Iliad*. The key to understanding the relationship between Trojan and Dardanian may lie in Book XX of the *Iliad*, where the genealogy of Aineias and the prophecy that he will someday be king of Troy are found. The genealogy of Aineias explains the relationship between the descendants of Dardanos:

> *Δάρδανον αὖ πρῶτον τέκετο νεφεληγερέτα Ζεύς,*
> *κτίσσε δὲ Δαρδανίην, ἐπεὶ οὔ πω Ἴλιος ἱρὴ*
> *ἐν πεδίῳ πεπόλιστο πόλις μερόπων ἀνθρώπων,*
> *ἀλλ' ἔϑ' ὑπωρείας ᾤκεον πολυπίδακος Ἴδης.*
> *Δάρδανος αὖ τέκεϑ' υἱὸν Ἐριχϑόνιον βασιλῆα,*
> ...
> *Τρῶα δ' Ἐριχϑόνιος τέκετο Τρώεσσιν ἄνακτα·*
> *Τρωὸς δ' αὖ τρεῖς παῖδες ἀμύμονες ἐξεγένοντο*
> *Ἶλός τ' Ἀσσάρακός τε καὶ ἀντίϑεος Γανυμήδης,*
> ...
> *Ἶλος δ' αὖ τέκεϑ' υἱὸν ἀμύμονα Λαομέδοντα·*
> *Λαομέδων δ' ἄρα Τιϑωνὸν τέκετο Πρίαμόν τε*
> *Λάμπόν τε Κλυτίον ϑ' Ἱκετάονά τ' ὄζον Ἄρηος·*
> *Ἀσσάρακος δὲ Κάπυν, ὃ δ' ἄρ' Ἀγχίσην τέκε παῖδα·*
> *αὐτὰρ ἔμ' Ἀγχίσης, Πρίαμος δ' ἔτεχ' Ἕκτορα δῖον.*
> *ταύτης τοι γενεῆς τε καὶ αἵματος εὔχομαι εἶναι.*[35]

> First of all Zeus who gathers the clouds had a son, Dardanos
> Who founded Dardania, since there was yet no sacred Ilion
> Made a city in the plain to be a center of peoples,
> But they lived yet in the underhills of Ida with all her waters.
> Dardanos in turn had a son, the king, Erichthonios,
> ...
> Erichthonios had a son, Tros, who was lord of the Trojans,
> And to Tros in turn there were born three sons unfaulted,
> Ilos and Assarakos and godlike Ganymedes
> ...
> Ilos in turn was given a son, the blameless Laomedon,
> And Laomedon had sons in turn, Tithonos and Priam,
> Lampos, Klytios and Hikataon, scion of Ares;
> But Assarakos had Kapys, and Kapys' son was Anchises,
> And I am Anchises' son, and Priam's is Hektor the brilliant.

---

[34] See above.

[35] *Il.* XX.215-19; 230-32; 236-41.

Such is the generation and blood I claim to be born from.

Aineias is, then, is a distant cousin of Priam, with the same great-great-grandfather, Tros. In the next generation, they are descended from different sons of Tros, Priam from Ilos and Aineias from Assarakos. All should be referred to as Dardanian if that epithet were totally dependent upon descent. However, another factor seems to come into play: Aineias and his descendants are the divinely appointed heirs to the legacy of Dardanos, not the descendants of Priam. This is made clear later in Book XX, when the gods intervene to save Aineias from Achilleus:

> *ἀλλ' ἄγεϑ' ἡμεῖς πέρ μιν ὑπὲκ ϑανάτου ἀγάγωμεν,*
> *μή πως καὶ Κρονίδης κεχολώσεται, αἴ κεν Ἀχιλλεὺς*
> *τόνδε κατακτείνῃ· μόριμον δέ οἱ ἔστ' ἀλέασϑαι,*
> *ὄφρα μὴ ἄσπερμος γενεὴ καὶ ἄφαντος ὄληται*
> *Δαρδάνου, ὃν Κρονίδης περὶ πάντων φίλατο παίδων*
> *οἳ ἔϑεν ἐξεγένοντο γυναικῶν τε ϑνητάων.*
> *ἤδη γὰρ Πριάμου γενεὴν ἔχϑηρε Κρονίων·*
> *νῦν δὲ δὴ Αἰνείαο βίῃ Τρώεσσιν ἀνάξει*
> *καὶ παίδων παῖδες, τοί κεν μετόπισϑε γένωνται.*[36]
>
> But come, let us ourselves get him away from death, for fear
> The son of Kronos may be angered if now Achilleus
> Kills this man. It is destined that he shall be the survivor,
> That the generation of Dardanos shall not die, without seed
> Obliterated, since Dardanos was dearest to Kronides
> Of all his sons that have been born to him from mortal women.
> For Kronos' son has cursed the generation of Priam,
> And now the might of Aineias shall be lord over the Trojans,
> And his sons' sons, and those who are born of their seed hereafter.

The gods acknowledge that both Priam and Aineias are from the *γενεή*, lineage, of Dardanos. Indeed, aside from Priam and his children, Aineias is the last of the Dardanians, since if Achilleus kills him, the bloodline will *ἄσπερμος γενεὴ καὶ ἄφαντος ὄληται*, "perish . . . without seed and be seen no more." This foreshadows the fact that all of Priam's sons are to perish, since *ἤδη γὰρ Πριάμου γενεὴν ἔχϑηρε Κρονίων*, "at length hath the son of Kronos come to hate the race of Priam." Still, Zeus does not wish the destruction of the *γενεή* of Dardanos, only that of Priam—or more precisely, that of

---

[36] *Il.* XX.300-08.

Ilos. The sons of Aineias—the descendants, ultimately of Ilos' brother Assarakos—will instead preserve the *γενεή* of Dardanos. The shift of favor from the sons of Ilos to those of Assarakos thus explains the peculiar use of the term Dardanian, which is not quite a synonym of Trojan, but is sometimes applied to heroes who are also referred to as Trojan. The distinction appears to reflect the favor Zeus bestowed upon the heirs of Dardanos, favor which at one time extended to the descendants of both Ilos and Assarakos, but then was withdrawn from the *γενεή* of Priam and transferred to that of Aineias, and which included kingship over the Trojans. Likewise, the Trojans themselves are best understood as the putative descendants of Tros, which include the *γενεαί* of both Ilos and Assarakos, allowing Aineias and other Dardanians to be known as Trojans as well.

The Allies of the Trojans

Homer clearly and consistently distinguishes the *ἐπίκουροι*, allies, from the Trojans themselves. Twelve groups of allies are listed in the roster of the Trojans: for each a leader or leaders are also named. In the list itself, several groups are marked as remote or different from the Trojans. For example, three contingents are described as being "from afar," using the word *τηλόθεν* or the phrase *τῆλ' ἐξ*. Odios and Epistrophos, leaders of the Halizones, are described as coming *τηλόθεν*.[37] Likewise, Phorkys and Askanios lead the Phrygians *τῆλ' ἐξ*, while Sarpedon and Glaukos bring the Lykians *τηλόθεν*.[38] Furthermore, another contingent, that of the Karians, is described as *βαρβαρόφωνος*, "uncouth of speech," an example of Homer's recognition that the allies are drawn from linguistic groups different from the Trojans and from each other.[39] These markers of difference all occur in the final third of the roster of the Trojans and allies; the first three groups listed are Trojan and Danaan, the next six groups have no explicit statement of geographical distance or linguistic difference, while four of the

[37] *Il.* II.857.

[38] *Il.* II.863; 877.

[39] See above.

final six contingents are so described. This arrangement reflects the poet's conception of remoteness, both geographical and figurative, of the allies from the Trojans themselves.[40] The consistency of the references to each contingent, and the unfailing description of each hero as being from his own specific contingent, demonstrate the poet's conception of each people as distinct.

Moving beyond the Trojan Catalogue itself, the twelve groups named in the catalogue are mentioned in Homer no less than ninety-nine times, either as the name of a people (i.e. "Lykians"), as an adjective describing a person ("Sarpedon the Lykian"), or as the name of a place ("Lykia").[41] Not once in all of these occurrences is one name used interchangeably with another, as Danaan, Achaian, and Argive are; nor does a hierarchy of identity exist among these groups—there is nothing parallel to the structure of the Achaian force, where one group is a component part of another, as the Myrmidons, or Epeians are to the Achaians. Moreover, only the Lykians, whose special status is reinforced by the fact that they are mentioned far more frequently than any other group—fifty-eight times as opposed to nine for the Paionians, the next-most-mentioned contingent from the roster of the Trojans—are grouped tightly with the Trojans, as in the formula "*Τρῶες καὶ Λύκιοι καὶ Δάρδανοι*," which occurs frequently.[42] Other contingents are often mentioned in conjunction with one another, but are not frequently conjoined with the Trojans or Dardanians.[43]

Moreover, the special association between Lykians and Trojans is simply a reflection of their pre-eminence among the allies, and not, as is the case with the Dardanians and Trojans, a matter of genealogical relationship or overlap between the two peoples. Throughout the *Iliad*, they are consistently described as a separate people. Twice the Lykians are separated from the Trojans using the conjunction *ἤ* in the

---

[40] See also Chapter III above.

[41] The Lykians are mentioned 58 times, other groups a total of 41. The contingents led by Adrestos and Arapahos, and Asios are never mentioned by name and are thus not included in these numbers. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (2000).

[42] *Il.* VIII.173; XI.286; XIII.150; etc.

[43] Mysians, Hippomolgoi, Abioi, *Il.* XIII.5-6; Phrygia, Maionia, *Il.* III.401; XVIII.291; Maionia, Karia, IV.142.

formula "*Τρώων ἠ Λυκίων.*"[44] Once, Aeneas, speaking to Pandaros, distinguishes the Lykians from the Trojans with the phrase:

> *Πάνδαρε ποῦ τοι τόξον ἰδὲ πτερόεντες ὀϊστοὶ*
> *καὶ κλέος; ᾧ οὔ τίς τοι ἐρίζεται ἐνθάδε γ' ἀνήρ,*
> *οὐδέ τις ἐν Λυκίῃ σέο γ' εὔχεται εἶναι ἀμείνων.*[45]
>
> Pandaros, where now are your bow and your feathered arrows;
> Where your fame, in which no man here dare contend with you
> Nor can any man in Lykia claim he is better?

Here, Homer contrasts *τις ἐν Λυκίῃ σέο γ'*, "any man in Lykia," with *τίς...ἐνθάδε γ' ἀνήρ*, "no man here." In *Iliad* Book VI, when Glaukos relates his ancestry to Diomedes, he is consistent, using the terms Lykia and Lykians exclusively when describing his homeland.[46] Furthermore, three times Lykia is described as being far from Troy, once in the roster of Trojans itself, another in the speech of Sarpedon dealt with below, and finally just before Patroklos kills Sarpedon, when Zeus contemplates saving him from his fate:

> *ἤ μιν ζωὸν ἐόντα μάχης ἄπο δακρυοέσσης*
> *θείω ἀναρπάξας Λυκίης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ*[47]
>
> [W]hether I should snatch him out of the sorrowful battle
> and set him down still alive in the rich country of Lykia...

Zeus, snatching Sarpedon from the war *μάχης ἄπο δακρυοέσσης...ἀναρπάξας* plans to set him among the rich people of Lykia, *θείω...Λυκίης ἐν πίονι δήμῳ*, indicating a physical separation between Lykia and Troy and, more importantly, a distinction between those fighting the war, Trojans, and the *δήμος* of Lykia, amongst whom Sarpedon would be placed. Finally, separation between Lykians and Trojans is indicated in Tlepolemos' taunting of Sarpedon:

> *οὐδέ τί σε Τρώεσσιν ὀΐομαι ἄλκαρ ἔσεσθαι*
> *ἐλθόντ' ἐκ Λυκίης, οὐδ' εἰ μάλα καρτερός ἐσσι*[48]

---

[44] *Il.* 4.197, 207.

[45] *Il.* V.171-3

[46] *Il.* IV.120 ff.

[47] *Il.* XVI.436-7.

[48] *Il.* V.644-5.

> And I think that now, though you are come from Lykia, you will
> Bring no help to the Trojans even though you be a strong man...

Homer indicates separateness through motion, from one place to another (as indicated by the noun construction *ἐκ Λυκίης*, "from Lykia"), and between one people and another (as indicated by the use of *σε Τρώεσσιν*, "to the Trojans"); Sarpedon comes *from* the land of Lykia *to* the people of Troy. In these passages, Troy is separated from Lykia geographically, while the Trojans as a people are clearly distinguished from the Lykians.

This distinction is made even clearer in two longer passages where Lykians berate Trojans for cowardice, and emphasize their own prowess, despite the foreignness of their people and the remoteness of their homeland. Sarpedon, for example, in an admonishing speech directed at Hektor, clearly distinguishes his Lykians from the Trojans:

> *Ἕκτορ πῇ δή τοι μένος οἴχεται ὃ πρὶν ἔχεσκες;*
> *φῆς που ἄτερ λαῶν πόλιν ἐξέμεν ἠδ' ἐπικούρων*
> *οἷος σὺν γαμβροῖσι κασιγνήτοισί τε σοῖσι.*
> *τῶν νῦν οὔ τιν' ἐγὼ ἰδέειν δύναμ' οὐδὲ νοῆσαι,*
> *ἀλλὰ καταπτώσσουσι κύνες ὡς ἀμφὶ λέοντα·*
> *ἡμεῖς δὲ μαχόμεσθ' οἵ πέρ τ' ἐπίκουροι ἔνειμεν.*
> *καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπίκουρος ἐὼν μάλα τηλόθεν ἥκω·*
> *τηλοῦ γὰρ Λυκίη Ξάνθῳ ἔπι δινήεντι.*
> *ἔνθ' ἄλοχόν τε φίλην ἔλιπον καὶ νήπιον υἱόν,*
> *κἀδ δὲ κτήματα πολλά, τὰ ἔλδεται ὅς κ' ἐπιδευής.*
> *ἀλλὰ καὶ ὣς Λυκίους ὀτρύνω καὶ μέμον' αὐτὸς*
> *ἀνδρὶ μαχήσασθαι· ἀτὰρ οὔ τί μοι ἐνθάδε τοῖον*
> *οἷόν κ' ἠὲ φέροιεν Ἀχαιοὶ ἤ κεν ἄγοιεν·*
> *τύνη δ' ἔστηκας, ἀτὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλοισι κελεύεις*
> *λαοῖσιν μενέμεν καὶ ἀμυνέμεναι ὥρεσσι.*
> *μή πως ὡς ἀψῖσι λίνου ἁλόντε πανάγρου*
> *ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσιν ἕλωρ καὶ κύρμα γένησθε·*
> *οἵ δὲ τάχ' ἐκπέρσουσ' εὖ ναιομένην πόλιν ὑμήν.*
> *σοὶ δὲ χρὴ τάδε πάντα μέλειν νύκτάς τε καὶ ἦμαρ*
> *ἀρχοὺς λισσομένῳ τηλεκλειτῶν ἐπικούρων*
> *νωλεμέως ἐχέμεν, κρατερὴν δ' ἀποθέσθαι ἐνιπήν.*[49]

> Where now, Hektor, has gone that strength that was yours? You said once

[49] *Il.* V.472-92.

That without companions and without people you could hold this city
alone, with only your bothers and the lords of your sisters.
I can see not one of these men now, I know not where they are;
No, but they slink away like hounds who circle the lion,
While we, who are here as your companions, carry the fighting.
I have come, a companion to help you, from a very far place;
Lykia lies far away, by the whirling waters of Xanthos;
There I left behind my own wife and my baby son, there
I left my many possessions which the needy man eyes longingly.
Yet even so I drive on my Lykians, and myself have courage
To fight my man in battle, though there is nothing of mine here
That the Achaians can carry away as spoil or drive off.
But you: you stand here not even giving the word to the rest
Of your people to stand fast and fight in defense of their own wives.
Let not yourselves, caught as in the sweeping toils of the spun net,
Be taken as war-spoil and plunder by the men who hat you,
Men who presently will storm your strong-founded citadel.
All these things should lie night and day on your mind, forever,
Supplication to the lords of your far-renowned companions,
To fight unwearying and hold off the strength of an insult.

Sarpedon first reminds Hektor of an early boast, namely that he could hold Troy *ἄτερ λαῶν . . . ἠδ' ἐπικούρων*, "without hosts and allies," and then goes on to state that now *ἡμεῖς δὲ μαχόμεσθ' οἵ πέρ τ' ἐπίκουροι ἔνειμεν*, "it is we that fight, we that are but allies among you." Three times the term *ἐπίκουροι* is used, and Sarpedon takes great pains to distinguish the allies from the *λαοί*— the people of Troy—and the *γαμβροί καsιγνήτοί τε*, the brothers and brothers-in-law of Hektor. To remove any ambiguity, Sarpedon then emphasizes the remoteness of Lykia:

καὶ γὰρ ἐγὼν ἐπίκουρος ἐὼν μάλα τηλόθεν ἥκω·
τηλοῦ γὰρ Λυκίη Ξάνθῳ ἔπι δινήεντι.

I have come, a companion to help you, from a very far place;
Lykia lies far away, by the whirling waters of Xanthos;

Not only does Sarpedon emphasize the Lykians' status as allies, but he dwells upon their remoteness from Troy, not only stating that he came *μάλα τηλόθεν*, "from very far," but he strengthens the sentiment yet further reiterating that Lykia lies *τηλοῦ*, "afar" from Troy, echoing the same remoteness first apparent in the roster of the Trojans and allies. Finally, at the end of his speech, Sarpedon emphasizes the fact that he has no

quarrel with the Achaians themselves, and that those who have city and family at stake should fight all the harder. For instance, Sarpedon points out that there is nothing of his there at Troy, *ἀτὰρ οὔ τί μοι ἐνθάδε τοῖον,* that the Achaians can take from him, *οἷόν κ' ἠὲ φέροιεν Ἀχαιοὶ ἢ κεν ἄγοιεν.* This is a sharp contrast to Sarpedon's emphasis on what Hektor has to lose. The Trojan leader does not urge his army to defend their wives, and if he is not careful, Sarpedon warns, Hektor's populous city will be destroyed.:

> *...ἀτὰρ οὐδ' ἄλλοισι κελεύεις*
> *λαοῖσιν μενέμεν καὶ ἀμυνέμεναι ὤρεσσι*[50]
>
> ...not even giving the word to the rest
> Of your people to stand fast and fight in defense of their own wives.

It is rare that a commander, Trojan or Achaian, in the *Iliad* demonstrates such independence and states so clearly how little he himself has at stake in the conflict, in effect declaring that his own interests are not synonymous with those of his leader, and that the interests of their respective peoples may also differ. This attitude and recognition of varying interests presupposes a difference between the two peoples in question, in this case the Trojans and the Lykians. Interestingly, the solution Sarpedon proposes is for Hektor to exhort the leaders of his allies, *ἀρχοὺς . . . τηλεκλειτῶν ἐπικούρων,* to stand their ground:

> *ἀρχοὺς λισσομένῳ τηλεκλειτῶν ἐπικούρων*
> *νωλεμέως ἐχέμεν...*[51]
>
> Supplication to the lords of your far-renowned companions,
> To fight unwearying and hold off the strength of an insult.

Appearing in the present context, this statement emphasizes the separateness of the other allies who, like the Lykians, are defending Hektor's city, and recognizes the reluctance that they might feel fighting for another people's interests. Such a statement

---

[50] *Il.* V.485-6.

[51] *Il.* V.491-2.

reveals much about the structure of the army defending Troy; it is disunited, made up of "Trojans and allies," distinct peoples with potentially divergent interests.[52]

Nor is this the only place in the *Iliad* where a Lykian berates Hektor and asserts his prerogative to remove the Lykians from battle and lead them home. Glaukos, after the killing of Sarpedon by Patroklos approaches Hektor and admonishes:

> *φράζεο νῦν ὅππως κε πόλιν καὶ ἄστυ σαώσῃς*
> *οἷος σὺν λαοῖς τοὶ Ἰλίῳ ἐγγεγάασιν·*
> *οὐ γάρ τις Λυκίων γε μαχησόμενος Δαναοῖσιν*
> *εἶσι περὶ πτόλιος, ἐπεὶ οὐκ ἄρα τις χάρις ἦεν*
> *μάρνασθαι δηΐοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι νωλεμὲς αἰεί.*
> *πῶς κε σὺ χείρονα φῶτα σαώσειας μετόπισθεν*
> *σχέτλι', ἐπεὶ Σαρπηδόν' ἅμα ξεῖνον καὶ ἑταῖρον*
> *κάλλιπες Ἀργείοισιν ἕλωρ καὶ κύρμα γενέσθαι,*
> *ὅς τοι πόλλ' ὄφελος γένετο πτόλεί τε καὶ αὐτῷ*
> *ζωὸς ἐών· νῦν δ' οὔ οἱ ἀλαλκέμεναι κύνας ἔτλης.*
> *τὼ νῦν εἴ τις ἐμοὶ Λυκίων ἐπιπείσεται ἀνδρῶν*
> *οἴκαδ' ἴμεν, Τροίῃ δὲ πεφήσεται αἰπὺς ὄλεθρος.*
> *εἰ γὰρ νῦν Τρώεσσι μένος πολυθαρσὲς ἐνείη*
> *ἄτρομον, οἷόν τ' ἄνδρας ἐσέρχεται οἳ περὶ πάτρης*
> *ἀνδράσι δυσμενέεσσι πόνον καὶ δῆριν ἔθεντο,*
> *αἶψά κε Πάτροκλον ἐρυσαίμεθα Ἴλιον εἴσω.*[53]

> Take thought now how to hold fast your town, your citadel
> By yourself, with those your people who were born in Ilion;
> Since no Lykian will go forth now to fight with the Danaans
> For the sake of your city, since after all we go no gratitude
> For our everlasting hard struggle against your enemies.
> How then, o hard-hearted, shall you save a worse man in all your
> Company, when you have abandoned Sarpedon, your guest-friend
> And own companion, to be the spoil and prey of the Argives,
> Who was of so much use to you, yourself and your city
> While he lived? Now you have not the spirit to keep the dogs from him.
> Therefore now, if any of the Lykian men will obey me,
> We are going home, and the headlong destruction of Troy shall be manifest
> For if the Trojans had any fighting strength that were daring
> And unshaken, such as com on men who, for the sake of their country,
> Have made the hard hateful work come between them and their enemies,
> We could quickly get the body of Patroklos inside Ilion.

---

[52] See Mackie 1996, 31-36, for a discussion of the confrontations between Hektor and allied commanders.

[53] *Il.* XVII.144-59.

Glaukos begins by warning Hektor to devise a way to save the city and citadel (*πόλιν καὶ ἄστυ*) alone (*οἷος*) with only the people born in Ilios (*σὺν λαοῖς τοὶ Ἰλίῳ ἐγγεγάασιν*). This places the burden on Hektor as leader of the people from the city, aided only by those who have a stake in the war, namely, those who were born in and continue to dwell in Troy. Glaukos goes on to state that none of the Lykians will fight for this *πόλις* any longer, since they do not receive any gratitude (*τις χάρις*) for fighting hostile men, *μάρναsθαι δηΐοισιν ἐπ' ἀνδράσι*. The offense given the Lykians is particularly egregious since Sarpedon—whom Glaukos believes Hektor should have protected—was a guest-friend and comrade, *ξεῖνος καὶ ἑταῖρος*, of Hektor, and moreover became a great help not only to Hektor, but to Hektor's *πόλις* as well. Due to Hektor's negligence, Glaukos now threatens to lead his Lykians home, and thus, in his estimation, seal Troy's fate. With Sarpedon dead, Glaukos emphasizes that the Lykians are his (*ἐμοὶ*) and that he has reason to lead them home, away from Troy, the foreign *πόλις* that Sarpedon had fought to defend. Again, the separation between the Lykian's home and the Trojan *πόλις* is clear, as is the potential for divergent interests between the two peoples. Finally Glaukos, like Sarpedon before him, gives Hektor some advice. This time, however, it is not to rally Troy's allies, but instead takes the form of a wish, a wish that the Trojans would fight as men who are fighting to save their fatherland (*πάτρα*). This speech of reprimand, and that delivered earlier by Sarpedon, indicate that the Trojans and the Lykians do not share a citadel (*ἄστυ*), a *πόλις*, or a fatherland (*πάτρα*), nor are they of the same people (*λαός*). The Trojans, according to these speeches, are those whom Hektor commands directly, those who are the siblings and in-laws of Hektor, or those who are born in or dwell in Troy. The only ties that bind the Lykians and other allies to the Trojans are those of *ξεῖνος καὶ ἑταῖρος*, guest-friendship and companionship. The relationship is personal and based upon the aristocratic ethos, but as such does not produce a special category of identity encompassing Trojans and allies; as we have seen, aristocratic guest-friendship can unite even Trojans and Achaians.[54]

---

[54] Glaukos and Diomedes, for example; see Chapter II above.

Descriptions of the other allies listed in the roster of the Trojans display the same differentiation between allied contingents and Trojans as do descriptions of the Lykians. Each is clearly a people apart. When Zeus turns his eyes away from Trojans, removing his favor in battle, he looks upon Thracians, Mysians, Hippomolgoi, and Abioi:

> *αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν τρέπεν ὄσσε φαεινὼ*
> *νόσφιν ἐφ' ἱπποπόλων Θρηκῶν καθορώμενος αἶαν*
> *Μυσῶν τ' ἀγχεμάχων καὶ ἀγαυῶν Ἱππημολγῶν*
> *γλακτοφάγων Ἀβίων τε δικαιοτάτων ἀνθρώπων.*
> *ἐς Τροίην δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἔτι τρέπεν ὄσσε φαεινώ.*[55]
>
> ...and [Zeus] himself turned his eyes shining
> far away, looking out over the land of the Thracian riders
> and the Mysians who fight at close quarters, and the proud Hippomolgoi,
> drinkers of milk, and the Abioi, most righteous of all men.
> He did not at all now turn his shining eyes upon Troy land...

The redirection of Zeus' gaze, the turning away from one people to others is emphasized by the use of both *πάλιν* and *νόσφιν ἐφ'* with *τρέπεν*; the sentiment is reinforced by the repetition of the description of Zeus' action, this time reworded to emphasize that Zeus in no way looked to the Trojans, *ἐς Τροίην δ' οὐ πάμπαν ἔτι τρέπεν ὄσσε φαεινώ*, "He did not at all now turn his shining eyes upon Troy land." Zeus' redirection is complete; he no longer concerns himself with the affairs of the Trojans, and instead distracts himself by gazing upon other, distinct peoples. Thracians, Mysians, Hippomolgoi, and Abioi are excluded from the community of the Trojans by Zeus' divine gaze.

Distance or separation from Troy is a common theme. The Paionians, for example, are described as being afar, *τηλόθεν*.[56] Helen sarcastically asks Aphrodite if, after Menelaos defeats Paris, the goddess will drive her yet further on to the cities of Phrygia or Maionia:

---

[55] *Il.* XIII.3-7.

[56] *Il.* XXI.154.

τί με ταῦτα λιλαίεαι ἠπεροπεύειν;
ἦ πῄ με προτέρω πολίων εὖ ναιομενάων
ἄξεις, ἢ Φρυγίης ἢ Μηονίης ἐρατεινῆς...[57]

Strange divinity! Why are you still so stubborn to beguile me?
Will you carry me further yet somewhere among cities
Fairly settled? In Phrygia or in lovely Maionia?

Likewise, when Hektor angrily describes to Poulydamas how the wealth of Troy has been squandered on the war, he states that the kingdom's treasures and possessions have been sold away to Phrygia and Maionia:

νῦν δὲ δὴ ἐξαπόλωλε δόμων κειμήλια καλά,
πολλὰ δὲ δὴ Φρυγίην καὶ Μηονίην ἐρατεινὴν
κτήματα περνάμεν' ἵκει...[58]

...But now
the lovely treasures that lay away in our houses have vanished,
and many possessions have been sold and gone into Phrygia
and into Maionia the lovely...

A degree of separation in space and separateness of people is indicated in each of these passages, which consistently portray movement from one place or people to another, movement which is highlighted by the mutual exclusiveness of Troy on the one hand and these allied polities on the other. Thus, Helen worries that Aphrodite will drive her from Troy to Phrygia or Maionia, Zeus turns away from the Trojans to the Thracians and Mysians, and the wealth of Troy has been alienated to Phrygia and Maionia. Combined with the fact that each of these peoples is consistently described as having its own leader and its own homeland—descriptions which are more rigid and frequent than those applied to any Achaian contingent with the possible exception of the Myrmidons—it becomes clear that the Trojans and their allies, as opposed to the Achaians, are not in any way conceived of as a group united by a common identity of any sort.

Another means of addressing the issue of the identity of the Trojan allies is to examine how the poet refers to each group. As we have already seen, heroes who are

---

[57] *Il.* III.399-401.

[58] *Il.* XVIII.290-92.

called Dardanian are also called Trojan, as in the case of Aeneas or Anchises. On the other hand, Lykians like Sarpedon are always called Lykians, never Trojans or Dardanians.[59] The latter pattern also holds for the leaders of the other allied contingents mentioned in the Trojan Catalogue. Discounting those described as Trojan, Dardanian, or Lykian, eighteen such leaders are mentioned in the Roster.[60] Six of these heroes are only mentioned once in the *Iliad*, in the catalogue itself.[61] The other twelve appear in at least one additional place, for a total of thirty-five occurrences of these twelve names outside the Trojan Catalogue. In none of these thirty-five occurrences is the hero in question referred to as Trojan, Dardanian, Lykian, nor by any other ethnic term other than that applied to him in the Trojan Catalogue; the term used in the catalogue is employed in three of the thirty-five subsequent occurrences.[62] Such consistency is striking.

The allies mentioned in the roster of the Trojans and allies, then, are clearly and at all times distinguished from the Trojans themselves. No group name is interchangeable with another, and no hierarchy of identities among the groups exists; each is a self-contained, distinct community. Furthermore, Homer describes several of the groups as remote from the Trojans. One group—the Karians—is singled out as speaking a distinct language. Only rarely are allies, with the exception of the pre-eminent Lykians, closely grouped with the Trojans; more often in the course of the narrative they are associated with other allied contingents, reflecting the idea that the allies are conceived of separate from the Trojans, while the allies themselves are, in turn, divided into many mutually exclusive groups.

Demonstrating that various heroes are genuinely Trojan and drawing a fine distinction between these heroes and those that are considered both Trojan and

---

[59] See above.

[60] Adrestos, Arapahos, Asios, Hippothoös, Pylaios, Euphemos, Pyraichmes, Pylaimones, Odios, Epistrophos, Chromis, Ennomos, Phorkys, Askanios, Mesthles, Antiphos, Nastes, and Amphimachos.

[61] Arapahos, Pylaios, Euphemos, Epistrophos, Chromis, and Antiphos.

[62] "Pyraechmes, that had led the Paeonians" *Il.* XVI.287; "Hippothous, the glorious son of Pelasgian Lethus" *Il.* XVII.288; "the leader of the Halizones, great Odius" *Il.* V.38.

Dardanian may seem superfluous. The care, however, with which Homer distinguishes between Trojans and Dardanians on the one hand and the "allies" on the other indicates an understanding that the nature of the forces defending Troy is different from that of the attackers. Those defending Troy speak different languages and belong to different groups, which are not simply parts of a whole, but are consistently designated as individual and independent peoples. Thus, Lykians are never called Trojans, and vice versa. The attacking force, however, is conceived of differently. Although Pylians may not referred to as Athenians, nor Epeians as Myrmidons, all are explicitly called Danaans, Argives, and Achaians, and there is no difference between those terms themselves—they are completely synonymous in a way not even Trojan and Dardanian are. This pattern has no exceptions; its consistency is startling. Such a stark contrast leaves little doubt that Homer and his audience implicitly thought in terms of a Panhellenic identity, an identity which transcended individual region and πόλις, a unifying identity which was absent from whatever motives united those who defended Troy against the onslaught of the Achaians themselves.

CHAPTER VI: HESIOD AND ARCHILOCHOS

Hesiod

The Homeric poems offers a wealth of evidence about a particular social structure and conception of identity. The possibility remains, however, that the communities portrayed in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* are idiosyncratic or only tangentially related to the realities of the eighth century BC, and that the poems themselves are the incoherent product of an oral tradition collected over a long period of time and a wide range of places. The poems of Hesiod, then, prove to be a useful corrective to Homer, as they can be attributed with some certainty to a particular author, time, and place. Hesiod lived perhaps a generation or two after the Homeric poems reached their final form, and was from an identifiable location: the village of Boiotian Askra. As such, the poems of Hesiod can provide a good corrective to the Homeric epics. As Luce points out, the epics and the Hesiodic corpus share a number of similarities in social structure—and tensions within that structure.[1] Although the size of the Hesiodic corpus is much smaller than the Homeric, Hesiod employs many of the same terms in similar, if not precisely corresponding, ways. The words *γένος*, *φῦλον*, *δῆμος*, *γαῖα*, *αἶα*, and *γῆ* all occur in Hesiod, although *φράτρη* and *ἔθνος* are noticably absent.[2]

Δῆμος

The term *δῆμος* occurs four times in Hesiod, twice each in the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*. Both times *δῆμος* appears in the *Theogony*, Hesiod applies it to Krete in the phrase *Κρήτης ἐς πίονα δῆμον*, "the rich land of Crete."[3] Interestingly, *γαῖα* and its

---

[1] Luce 1978, 14-15.

[2] The following discussion is limited to Hesiod's canonical works, the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*.

[3] Hesiod, *Theogony*, in *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns, and Homerica* with a trans. by Hugh G. Evelyn-White (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914), 477. From *The Perseus Project* (2001). Archaisms were removed from this translation by the editors of *The Perseus Project*.

variants are only used once in a similar manner, to describe a specific region, but are instead almost always more general in meaning.[4]

The two uses of *δῆμος* in the *Works and Days* are familiar from Homer. The first invokes the political or at least public overtones of the term, as Hesiod employs *δῆμος* when discussing the entity ruled by the *βασιλεύς*:

> *αὐτίκα πὰρ Διὶ πατρὶ καθεζομένη Κρονίωνι*
> *γηρύετ' ἀνθρώπων ἄδικον νόον, ὄφρ' ἀποτίσῃ*
> *δῆμος ἀτασθαλίας βασιλέων, οἳ λυγρὰ νοεῦντες*
> *ἄλλῃ παρκλίνωσι δίκας σκολιῶς ἐνέποντες.*[5]
>
> [Justice] sits beside her father, Zeus the son of Cronos, and tells him of men's wicked heart, until the people (*δῆμος*) pay for the mad folly of their princes (*βασιλέων*) who, evilly minded, pervert judgement and give sentence crookedly.

As is often the case in Homer, the relationship between the *δῆμος* and *βασιλεύς* is the subject of this passage. In particular, the responsibilities of the ruler towards the ruled receive center stage, while Hesiod sees the violation of these responsibilities as an example of *βασιλῆες* who *παρκλίνωσι δίκας σκολιῶς ἐνέποντες*, "pervert judgement and give sentence crookedly," which constitutes an affront to *Δίκη*, the goddess Justice. The theme of the "bribe-swallowing *βασιλῆες*" and their "crooked judgements" is, of course, central to the *Works and Days*. However, in this passage, one the few places where the conflict is stated abstractly—in a discussion of the role of the goddess Justice, nonetheless—Hesiod chooses to use the term *δῆμος* to describe the collective entity which pay for the injustice of corrupt kings.[6]

---

[4] See discussion of *γαῖα* below.

[5] Hesiod. *Works and Days (Opera et Dies)*. in *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns, and Homerica* 1914. 259-62. From *The Perseus Project* (2001). Archaisms were removed from this translation by the editors of *The Perseus Project*. All translation of Hesiod are from this edition unless otherwise noted.

[6] Van Wees 56; see also 35. Van Wees sees this passage in Hesiod as parallel to Homeric notions that the king gives judgments in the name of the entire community, and that the community as a whole bears responsibility for those judgments. Luce 1978, 12-13, also sees a parallel between Homer and Hesiod in this regard, comparing *Od.* IV.690 ff. (concerning Odysseus' unusually fair rule) and the fable of the hawk (representing the *βασιλῆες*) and the nightingale (representing the *δῆμος*) in *Op.* 202-09.

In the second and final use of the term *δῆμος* in the *Works and Days*, Hesiod uses another meaning of the term familiar from the Homeric corpus, namely juxtaposed with the word *πόλις*:[7]

> *οὐδέ οἱ ἠέλιος δείκνυ νομὸν ὁρμηθῆναι:*
> *ἀλλ' ἐπὶ κυανέων ἀνδρῶν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε*
> *στρωφᾶται, βράδιον δὲ Πανελλήνεσσι φαείνει.*[8]
>
> [F]or the sun shows him no pastures to make for, but goes to and fro over the land (*δῆμόν*) and city (*πόλιν*) of dusky men, and shines more sluggishly upon the whole race of the Hellenes (*Πανελλήνεσσι*).

The formula *δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε* is identical to that found in direct questions about origin in Homer, and appears to function as a way of describing a community in its entirety.[9] This passage also contains the sole instance of *Πανέλληνες*, "Panhellenes," found in Hesiod, providing a glimpse of how the term might have evolved since its single occurrence of the term in Homer.[10] *Πανέλληνες* more clearly applies to the Greeks as a whole in the *Works and Days* than in the *Iliad*, representing the Greeks as a whole by contrasting them with the people (*κυανέων ἀνδρῶν*) who dwell where the sun resides when it is absent from Greece during the winter. Based on what is admittedly only a single occurrence of the term, it appears that in Hesiod *Πανέλληνες* refers to all those who live in a delineated territory. Both territory and people are invoked in the description of winter in Greece; the sun retreats to a place separated from Greece, but both places are designated by referring to the people who dwell there (*κυανέων ἀνδρῶν δῆμόν τε πόλιν τε* and *Πανελλήνεσσι*).

In the *Theogony*, Hesiod employs the term *δῆμος* when describing a specific territory, that of Krete. In the *Works and Days*, Hesiod once uses *δῆμος* to when discussing the relationship between ruler and ruled, and later contrasts *δῆμος* with *πόλις*. In all four cases, the use of *δῆμος* in Hesiod parallels that in Homer.

---

[7] See Luce 1978, 12-15, for a discussion of the *πόλις* in Hesiod; 12 for *δῆμος*.

[8] *Op.* 526-28.

[9] *Od.* VIII.555; compare *Il.* VI.211; XX.241. See Chapter II above.

[10] *Il.* II.530, where it may apply only the contingent from Lokris or the Achaians of the surrounding region.

Φῦλον

The term *φῦλον* occurs eight times in Hesiod. Twice it is used to describe the gods as a class, distinct from mortals:

> *τῇ δ' Ἔρος ὡμάρτησε καὶ Ἵμερος ἕσπετο καλὸς*
> *γεινομένῃ τὰ πρῶτα θεῶν τ' ἐς φῦλον ἰούσῃ.*
> *ταύτην δ' ἐξ ἀρχῆς τιμὴν ἔχει ἠδὲ λέλογχε*
> *μοῖραν ἐν ἀνθρώποισι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι*[11]
>
> And with her went Eros, and comely Desire followed her at her birth at the first and as she went into the assembly (*φῦλον*) of the gods. This honor she has from the beginning, and this is the portion allotted to her amongst men and undying gods...

Here, Hesiod uses *θεῶν...φῦλον*, to refer to the gods as a whole, a meaning emphasized by the contrast between *ἀνθρώποισι καὶ ἀθανάτοισι θεοῖσι*, "men and undying gods," two lines later. By contrast, more limited groups or subdivisions of the gods are indicated elsewhere: the *φῦλον Ὀνείρων*, "tribe of Dreams" (who are related by birth from a common mother, Night) or the *θεάων φῦλον*, "company of goddesses," related because they bore children to mortal men.[12] In all three cases, *φῦλον* occurs in the singular, designating a single class of being. Likewise, Hesiod also employs *φῦλον* to refer to mortals as a class:

> *ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἀθανάτοισιν ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων*
> *καίουσ' ὀστέα λευκὰ θυηέντων ἐπὶ βωμῶν.*[13]
>
> [A]nd because of this the tribes (*φῦλ'*) of men upon earth burn white bones to the deathless gods upon fragrant altars.

The phrase *ἐπὶ χθονὶ φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων*, "the tribes of men upon earth" clearly refers to mortals as opposed to gods, as indicated by the context: humans (*ἀνθρώπων*) make burnt offerings to the immortals (*ἀθανάτοισιν*). A later instance of the same phrase, where Hesiod claims that people once lived without cares on the earth, carries the same

---

[11] *Theog.* 201-04; compare *Op.* 189.

[12] *Theog.* 212; 965, the later restated, with slightly different wording, in line 1021.

[13] *Theog.* 556-57.

meaning, referring to humans as a whole.[14] In these two passages, however, *φῦλα* occurs in the plural, perhaps indicating divisions between humans not present within the company of gods.[15]

The final two occurrences of the term *φῦλον* represent some subdivision of humanity; the first based on locality, the second on gender. Hesiod describes the people preyed upon by the Nemeiaian lion:

> *...Νεμειαῖόν τε λέοντα,*
> *τόν ῥ' Ἥρη θρέψασα Διὸς κυδρὴ παράκοιτις*
> *γουνοῖσιν κατένασσε Νεμείης, πῆμ' ἀνθρώποις.*
> *ἔνθ' ἄρ' ὅ οἰκείων ἐλεφαίρετο φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων,*
> *κοιρανέων Τρητοῖο Νεμείης ἠδ' Ἀπέσαντος*[16]
>
> ...and the Nemean lion, which Hera, the good wife of Zeus, brought up and made to haunt the hills of Nemea, a plague to men. There [the lion] preyed upon the tribes of [Hera's] own people and had power over Tretus of Nemea and Apesas.

The mention of Nemea twice in the lines preceding the phrase *φῦλ' ἀνθρώπων*, along with the list of places the lion terrorizes, indicates the territorial delineation of these *φῦλα*. Finally, a single instance of the term *φῦλον* is applied to women as a class:

> *τῆς γὰρ ὀλώιόν ἐστι γένος καὶ φῦλα γυναικῶν,*
> *πῆμα μέγ' αἳ θνητοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσι ναιετάουσιν.*[17]
>
> of her is the deadly race and tribe of women who live amongst mortal men to their great trouble.

The juxtaposition of *φῦλα γυναικῶν* and *θνητοῖσι...ἀνδράσι* clearly indicates the dichotomy Hesiod is drawing between men and women. Following the Homeric usage, as when the word describes humans as a whole, *φῦλα* is plural. In Hesiod, then, the term *φῦλον* generally refers to a class of beings—gods, humans, or women—although in one case it appears to indicate the people living in a particular area. However, when applied to humans, *φῦλα* is used, without exception, in the plural; conversely, when

---

[14] *Op.* 90.

[15] See the discussion of *φῦλον* in Chapter IV above.

[16] *Theog.* 330-31.

[17] *Theog.* 590-91.

Hesiod uses *φῦλον* to describe the gods or some group of gods, it is always singular.[18] Never in Hesiod is *φῦλον* used explicitly, as it is in Homer, to invoke a group united by lineage, leadership, or any other factor other than the single instance of persecution by the Nemeiaian lion.[19]

Γένος

The term *γένος* occurs twenty-two times between the *Theogony* and the *Works and Days*, and its use is very similar to that of *φῦλον*, indicating a class or group of beings (or once, of metal). Four times Hesiod uses *γένος* to categorize the gods as a class, while he applies it to mortals once.[20] The first instance of *γένος* in the *Theogony* is typical, and a good example of Hesiod's use of the word to describe a class of being. After listing the names of several deities, Hesiod adds: *ἄλλων τ' ἀθανάτων ἱερὸν γένος αἰὲν ἐόντων*, "and the holy race of all the other deathless ones that are for ever."[21] The position of this phrase as a catchall after a list of some twenty gods, combined with the use of the genitive plural *ἄλλων τ' ἀθανάτων* "all the other deathless ones" with *γένος* indicates that Hesiod intends the term to apply to all the gods collectively. The other instances of the term applied to the gods have a similar meaning, referring to immortals generally rather than to specific groups of them, as is twice the case with *φῦλον*. In the one case where Hesiod uses *γένος* to describe mortals, its use is analogous: *αὖτις δ' ἀνθρώπων τε γένος κρατερῶν τε Γιγάντων*, "And again, [the Muses] chant the race of men and strong giants."[22] Here, *γένος* has a broad meaning, including all sentient, mortal beings, both *ἀνθρώπων*, "humans," and *Γιγάντων*, "Giants." Hesiod also uses

---

[18] Perhaps this pattern of difference in the usage of *φῦλον* reflects Hesiod's assumption that there is only one *φῦλον* of gods but there are many *φῦλα* of humans (or men or women). Such a dichotomy could reflect a conception of the term corresponding either to Donlan's definition (a military/political band following a single leader, with Zeus cast as the single leader of the contingent of the gods) or to a tribal society (again with Zeus as the leader of the single "tribe of the gods").

[19] See the discussion of *φῦλον* in Chapter IV above.

[20] Applied to the gods: *Theog.* 21; 33; 44; 105; applied to mortals: *Theog.* 50.

[21] *Theog.* 21.

[22] *Theog.* 50.

γένος to indicate a particular kind or class of being to designate women as a gender. This occurs in the same passage as the similar use of *φῦλον*:

> *ἐκ τῆς γὰρ γένος ἐστὶ γυναικῶν θηλυτεράων,*
> *[τῆς γὰρ ὀλώιόν ἐστι γένος καὶ φῦλα γυναικῶν,]*
> *πῆμα μέγ' αἳ θνητοῖσι μετ' ἀνδράσι ναιετάουσιν*
> *οὐλομένης πενίης οὐ σύμφοροι, ἀλλὰ κόροιο.*[23]
>
> For from her is the race of women and female kind: of her is the deadly race and tribe of women who live amongst mortal men to their great trouble, no helpmeets in hateful poverty, but only in wealth.

Hesiod repeats the terms *γένος...ἐστὶ γυναικῶν* over two lines in a context, the creation of woman, which clearly indicates that *γένος* applies to women as a whole, set in opposition to men. Furthermore, unlike the simultaneous use of *φῦλον*, *γένος* appears here, as elsewhere, in the singular. Hesiod also extends the idea that *γένος* refers to the classification of a type of material:

> *αἶψα δὲ ποιήσασα γένος πολιοῦ ἀδάμαντος*
> *τεῦξε μέγα δρέπανον καὶ ἐπέφραδε παισὶ φίλοισιν*[24]
>
> Forthwith [the Earth] made the element (*γένος*) of grey flint and shaped a great sickle, and told her plan to her dear sons.

Apparently, *γένος* can indicate the type of an inanimate object as well as a class of being. Finally, the meaning may extend yet further to include an abstract, although personified, idea; at the beginning of the Works and Days, Hesiod chooses *γένος* as the word indicating the two types or kinds of strife in the world:

> *οὐκ ἄρα μοῦνον ἔην Ἐριδων γένος, ἀλλ' ἐπὶ γαῖαν*
> *εἰσὶ δύω...*[25]
>
> So, after all, there was not one kind of Strife alone, but all over the earth there are two...

This observation modifies Hesiod's genealogy from the *Theogony*, where he introduces a single *Ἔρις*, Strife, and enumerates her offspring.[26] This use of *γένος* in the *Works*

---

[23] *Theog.* 590-93.

[24] *Theog.* 161.

[25] *Op.* 11-12.

[26] *Theog.* 225-32.

and Days could either indicate a subgroup of the gods, indeed M. L. West chooses "strife-brood" to translate *Ἐριδων γένος*, and *Ἐριδων* is plural. If the personification is taken less strongly, however, *Ἐριδων γένος* could simply refer to a kind of *ἔρις*. In any case, Hesiod commonly uses *γένος* to delineate a class, type, or group of beings or things.

Twice in the *Theogony*, Hesiod employs the term *γένος* to refer specifically to children or offspring, a usage again familiar from Homer. The first of these describes the offspring of Keto and Phorkys:

> *Κητὼ δ' ὁπλότατον Φόρκυι φιλότητι μιγεῖσα*
> *γείνατο δεινὸν ὄφιν, ὃς ἐρεμνῆς κεύθεσι γαίης*
> *πείρασιν ἐν μεγάλοις παγχρύσεα μῆλα φυλάσσει.*
> *τοῦτο μὲν ἐκ Κητοῦς καὶ Φόρκυνος γένος ἐστίν.*[27]
>
> And Ceto was joined in love to Phorcys and bore her youngest, the awful snake who guards the apples all of gold in the secret places of the dark earth at its great bounds. This is the offspring (*γένος*) of Ceto and Phorcys.

The second introduces the daughters of Tetus and Ocean: *τίκτε δὲ θυγατέρων ἱερὸν γένος*, "Also [Tetus] brought forth a holy company (*γένος*) of daughters... [list follows]."[28] Although in the first of these passages, Hesiod indicates a single offspring, while he names a "company of daughters" in the second, he uses *γένος* in the singular in both cases. It is clear, however, that *γένος* here refers to direct offspring.

Between lines 110 and 180 of the *Works and Days*, Hesiod uses *γένος* ten times as he tells the myth of the ages of man. Each age or race of humans—gold, silver, bronze, heroes, and iron—is introduced and dispatched with the term. The race of gold sets the pattern:

> *χρύσεον μὲν πρώτιστα γένος μερόπων ἀνθρώπων*
> *ἀθάνατοι ποίησαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες.*
> *οἳ μὲν ἐπὶ Κρόνου ἦσαν, ὅτ' οὐρανῷ ἐμβασίλευεν:*
> ...
> *αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ δὴ τοῦτο γένος κατὰ γαῖ' ἐκάλυψε*
> ...
> *δεύτερον αὖτε γένος πολὺ χειρότερον μετόπισθεν*

---

[27] *Theog.* 333-36.

[28] *Theog.* 346 ff.

ἀργύρεον ποίησαν Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχοντες.[29]

> First of all the deathless gods who dwell on Olympus made a golden race of mortal men who lived in the time of Cronos when he was reigning in heaven.... But after the earth had covered this generation...then they who dwell on Olympus made a second generation which was of silver and less noble by far.

In this passage, the creation and destruction of the race of gold as well as the birth of the silver race is announced using the term *γένος*. Hesiod continues the pattern through the remaining generations of humans, up to his present, the baleful Age of Iron. It is unclear whether *γένος ἀνθρώπων* is best read as a "generation" or "race" (i.e. type) of human in this passage, although the usage seems closest to Glaukos' digression about the succession of generations in the *Iliad*.[30]

The remaining use of *γένος* is unique in Hesiod, and may embodying J. Hall's definition of an "ethnic" group based upon putative descent.

ἀλλὰ σύ γ' ἡμετέρης μεμνημένος αἰὲν ἐφετμῆς
ἐργάζευ, Πέρση, διῖον γένος, ὄφρα σε λιμὸς
ἐχθαίρῃ, φιλέῃ δέ σ' ἐυστέφανος Δημήτηρ
αἰδοίη, βιότου δὲ τεὴν πιμπλῇσι καλιήν[31]

> But you, ever bearing my instruction in mind, must work, Perses, you who are of Zeus' stock (*γένος*), so that Hunger may shun you and august fair-crowed Demeter favour you and fill your granary with substance.

Here, if *διῖος* refers to descent from Zeus, Hesiod is asserting putative descent, with *γένος* as the term employed to designate the extended descent-group.[32] On the other hand, *διῖος* could simply mean "illustrious," and indicate no more than Hesiod's claim to status for his family. In either case, *γένος* does seem to refer to the family of Hesiod and

---

[29] *Op.* 110-12; 121; 127-28.

[30] *Il.* VI.145-51. See discussion in Chapter II above.

[31] *Op.* 299-302. Translation from Hesiod, *Theogony* and *Works and Days*, trans. M. L. West (New York: Oxford University Press, 1988).

[32] Liddell and Scott, 1940 ed., s.v. *διῖος*, assert that *διῖος* is not used as an adjective of Zeus before Aischylos. However, the term can mean "heavenly" in epic, and could be read literally here as indicated descent from one or more gods.

Perses, although the precise extent of that family intended by Hesiod with the term *γένος* remains unclear.[33]

Γαῖα, Αἶα, and *Γῆ*

The term *γαῖα* and its variants occurs much more frequently in Hesiod than the other words examined above. Most of its uses, however, tend to be mundane and unrelated to questions of identity or origin. The most common use of the word means simply the world as opposed to the heavens or the underworld, the earth as a physical body, or the land as opposed to the sea.[34] Twenty-five further instances in the *Theogony* invoke the goddess Earth.[35] In another three cases, *γαῖα* refers directly to soil or dirt, from which the gods mold creatures.[36] Hesiod only once uses the term *γαῖα* to indicate a specific region or territory:

> *καὶ τοὺς μὲν πόλεμός τε κακὸς καὶ φύλοπις αἰνή,*
> *τοὺς μὲν ὑφ' ἑπταπύλῳ Θήβῃ, Καδμηίδι γαίῃ,*
> *ὤλεσε μαρναμένους μήλων ἕνεκ' Οἰδιπόδαο,*
> *τοὺς δὲ καὶ ἐν νήεσσιν ὑπὲρ μέγα λαῖτμα θαλάσσης*
> *ἐς Τροίην ἀγαγὼν Ἑλένης ἕνεκ' ἠυκόμοιο.*[37]
>
> Grim war and dread battle destroyed a part of them, some in the land (*γαίῃ*) of Cadmus at seven-gated Thebes when they fought for the flocks of Oedipus, and some, when it had brought them in ships over the great sea gulf to Troy for rich-haired Helen's sake.

Here *γαῖα* refers to a discrete land, the identity of which Hesiod defines by association with its ancestral hero. This use of *Καδμηίδι γαίῃ* exactly parallels Homer's use of

---

[33] See discussion in Chapter IV above.

[34] This meaning occurs fifty-three of eighty-two instances of the term. Examples of the use of the term to mean the world as opposed to the heavens or the underworld include: *Theog.* 720; 721; 723; 725; 679 (the final describes a tripartite division between earth, sea, and sky), *Op.* 548; land vs. sea: *Theog.* 413; 790; 878; as a physical body, which has creatures "down in" it: *Theog.* 483; 121. This final use is occasionally juxtaposed with *χθών*, "earth," and appears to carry a similar meaning.

[35] In one ambiguous case from the *Works and Days*, which I have placed in the previous category, Hesiod uses the phrase *γῆ πάντων μήτηρ*, "earth, the mother of all," although it is unclear whether he means the goddess or the physical earth as the producer of crops, or some combination of the two.

[36] *Theog.* 571; *Op.* 61; 70.

[37] *Op.* 162-66.

δῆμος when he calls Athens the δῆμον Ἐρεχθῆος, "the δῆμος of Erechtheus."[38] Unfortunately, with only a single example of this usage, little more can be said other than that in Hesiod, γαῖα can refer to a specific region, and that such a region can be identity by invoking the name of a hero associated with the place.

Summary and Conclusions

Many of the same terms relating to social groups and communities found in Homer also occur in Hesiod, and their meanings are generally quite similar. Hesiod's most frequent way to refer a specific region in with the term δῆμος, which also carries political overtones, reflected in its use when Hesiod discusses the role of the βασιλεύς. As in Homer, the δῆμος represents the political unit over which the βασιλεύς rules (or the βασιλῆες pass judgment). The term φῦλον generally invokes a category of being—god or human, male or female—although once is geographically delimited, applying to the peoples living in a particular area. Like φῦλον, γένος usually evokes a category of creature, although it may also apply to inanimate objects or, possibly, abstract ideas. Hesiod also chooses γένος as the term to designate the succeeding generations of humans in his legend of the ages of man. More concretely, γένος describes children or offspring, although in one instance it probably refers to a more extended descent group, perhaps also invoking the divine origin of that group. This last usage is the closest in Hesiod to J. Hall's idea of the ethnic group being based upon putative descent. Perhaps the greatest divergence from Homer is Hesiod's use of γαῖα, which with one exception refers to the world as a whole or the deity Earth as opposed to a particular territorial region. The single exception that does describe a specific area defines that area using the name of an ancestral hero. Hesiod claims no descent from that hero for the people of his land, instead simply associating the place with the name of the hero. In short, Hesiod's categories of identity are similar to Homer's, with continued use of δῆμος as the most common way to refer to the communal and political aspects of a group, less

[38] *Il.* 546-51. See discussion in Chapter III above.

use of *γαῖα* for that purpose, and similar use of *φῦλον* and *γένος* to invoke categories of beings, but only exceptionally in a way relevant to group identity.

Archilochos

Archilochos survives in a much more fragmentary condition than Hesiod, which sometimes makes it difficult to determining the meaning of terms. Still, Archilochos provides important comparative material for a few of the terms found in Homer. Archilochos, like Hesiod but unlike Homer, can be placed geographically and chronologically; he flourished around the middle of the seventh century BC, was born on Paros and spent at least part of his life on Thasos. This places him about half a century after Hesiod, and perhaps a century after Homer. Despite the fragmentary condition of his poems several of the terms from Homer and Hesiod I have discussed also occur in Archilochos' works: *γῆ* occurs five times, *δῆμος* three, *γένος* once (and three more times in compounds), and *Πανελλήνοι* once.

Two of the three uses of *δῆμος* have at least some context.[39] One occurs in a statement about not worrying what "people" think:

> *Αἰσιμίδη, δήμου μὲν ἐπίῤῥησιν μελεδαίνων*
> *οὐδεὶς ἂν μάλα πόλλ' ἱμερόεντα πάθοι.*[40]
>
> Aisimides, if you mind what other folk (*δῆμος*)
> will say, you'll never have a lovely time.[41]

Here, the public (but not political) meaning of *δῆμος* is indicated. *Δῆμος* has a similar meaning in the second fragment containing the term:

> *εὖτε πρὸς ἆθλα δῆμος ἠθροΐζετο,*
> *ἐν δὲ Βατουσιάδης...*[42]
>
> At the time when the people (*δῆμος*) are first crowded together for contests

---

[39] Arch. 14.1; 182.1. M. L. West, *Iambe et Elegi Graici ante Alexandrum Cantati* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1998). The third use of *δῆμος*, 207.1, occurs in the definition of *μυσάξυη* in the *Suda* as an alternative word for "prostitute," clearly giving it a "public" connotation. See West 1998, 80.

[40] Arch. 14.

[41] Translation from M. L. West, *Greek Lyric Poetry* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1993).

[42] Arch. 182.

in the Batousiade...[43]

Although public games could potentially have political overtones, the term *δῆμος* refers directly to the people themselves crowding in to view the contest. Considering these two passages, the only meaning of *δῆμος* firmly attested in Archilochos is "people;" neither use admits any overtones of "land," while any political connotations in the second passage above are secondary to the plain meaning of the term.

Γῆ occurs five times, more commonly than *δῆμος* but in even more fragmentary passages. In one fragment Archilochos juxtaposes *γῆ* with the phrase *ὑψηλῶι π̣[άγωι*, "lofty hills," and appears to mean only land in the generic sense.[44] Three others occur in Archilochos' tetrameters, a meter he usually reserves for political and military topics. The first appears to describe warfare around a city; a partial line reads *γῆν ἀεικίζουσιν*, "they ravage the land."[45] The idea that a war is in progress is reinforced by the words *προαστίωι*, "before the city," nd *πῦρ*, "fire," in the preceding two lines. The next occurrence of the term is similar, occurring in another partial line reading *γῆ φόνωι*, "the land...with slaughter;" (West translates the line as: "earth ran with blood.").[46] These two uses of the term could mean simply "land" or "earth" in the generic sense, or could have political connotations, considering the context of war. The final fragment from Archilochos' tetrameters is slightly more complete, and does seem to invoke the political aspect of *γῆ*. In this passage, Archilochos asks a comrade to be brave and remember *γῆς...τῆσδε*, "this land:"

Γλαῦκε, τίσ σε θεῶν νό]ον
καὶ φρ̣ένας τρέψ[ας
γῆς ἐπιμνήσαιο τ[ῆσδε
δει]νὰ τολμήσας μεθ̣[
---] ἣν εἶλες αἰχμῆι και λ̣[
---]σον {δ} ἔσκεν καὶ ξαλ[[47]

---

[43] My translation.

[44] Arch. 175.4.

[45] Arch. 89.27.

[46] Arch. 91.32.

[47] Arch. 96.

> Glaucus, which of the gods has turned your wits?
> Have a thought for this land...
> Braving dangers with us...
> ...your spear conquered...[48]

Archilochos, expressing emotional concern about the defense of what may be his homeland, may invoke the communal, as well as territorial, sense of the term *γῆ*. One other fragment, although much shorter, may also be emotionally charged: *ἐμοι τόϑ' ἥδε γῆ χ[*, "to me, formerly, this land..."[49] Although there is not much here to build from, the use of *ἐμοι*, which personalizes the statement, along with *τότε*, which gives it a sense of being in the past, seems to indicate some sense of loss, and again mean that *γῆ* invokes attachment to a community rather than simply indicating a piece of land.

Γένος itself occurs only once in Archilochos, where it means "by birth" in a hymn to Hephaistos, invoking birth only in the literal sense.[50] In three other passages, Archilochos uses compounds of *γένος*; twice he uses the term *ἰϑαγενής*, legitimate, once he employs *γενναῖα*, "of noble birth." In these three passages, *γένος* appearently refers to "birth" both the literal sense and in the sense of (good) lineage, particularly in the last usage cited. Overall, however, Archilochos' use of *γένος* is very restricted compared to Homer or Hesiod.

Archilochos, like Homer and Hesiod, gives us a tantalizing glimpse of Panhellenism, without providing enough information to determine exactly the nature or extent of it. Tetrameter 102 reads: *Πανελλήνων οἰζὺς ἐς Θάσον συνέδραμεν*, "The misery of the Panhellenes meets in Thasos."[51] Considering Archilochos' role in the colonization of Thasos, this phrase may contrast the Panhellenes with the Thasians, but not enough information is provided to be sure. If Archilochos does intend this phrase to distinguish Panhellenes from non-Greek natives of Thasos, it could mark the beginning of the shift to "oppositional" construction of Greek identity.

---

[48] Translation from West 1993.

[49] Arch. 221. My translation.

[50] Arch. 108.2.

[51] Arch. 102. My translation.

Although the fragmentary state of Archilochos' poems limit their usefulness, his use of at least a few terms can be compared with that of Homer and Hesiod. The use of δῆμος focuses strictly on people, without territorial or significant political overtones. The meaning of γένος is also more limited, meaning either simply birth in the literal sense, and sometimes "good" or "legitimate" birth, the latter perhaps invoking some sense of lineage. Γῆ more fully reflects the various Homeric meanings of the term, invoking both land and a more abstract territorial community. Finally, although it occurs in a brief and enigmatic passage, Panhellenes seems to follow the Hesiodic usage, referring to all the Greeks, and has perhaps advanced in meaning as a result of increasingly frequent confrontations between Greeks and non-Greeks, as at Thasos.

Taken together, neither Hesiod nor Archilochos represents a radical break with Homer as far as the means of terms relating to social groups and communities are concerned. Usage of such terms appears more restricted in each of the later authors, but this may largely be a function of how much shorter, and in the case of Archilochos, fragmentary, their poems are. At most, emphasis might change slightly, as appears to be the case with Panhellenism. In Homer it is nascent, invoked by any one of three terms and detectable more through patterns of word use throughout the epics. By the time of Hesiod and especially Archilochos the term Panhellene itself has come into play, and its meaning has been refined, perhaps though the trade reflected in Hesiod's grudging advice about ship construction and the colonization which provides the background for Archilochos' poetry.

CHAPTER VII: CONCLUSION

Identity in the epics proves to be based primarily upon the functional social units that make up the Homeric world. Comparing the terms in which the poet casts the identity of his heroes with the social groups depicted in the epics produces a similar range of communities: household, military/political contingent, and territorial "state." Even the Panhellenic community—surely nothing more than an ideological entity in the eighth century—is articulated as a functional social unit in the *Iliad*, a super-state with Agamemnon as its overlord. Although the following discussion focuses on the world of the epics, I believe that the concepts encountered reflect those current in the mid-eighth century Greece; because of the nature of oral tradition, abstract concepts such as social structures and identity most likely date to within three generations (at most) of the time of Homer. As such, the evidence contained in the epics provides our best window onto the ideas that articulated Archaic Greek society prior to the revolution which brought the *πόλις* into ascendancy as the primary social, military, and political unit.

In face-to-face encounters between heroes, the *οἶκος*—as reflected in terminology related to close relatives and the physical estate—makes up a significant portion of exchanges about identity. As is the case throughout these exchanges, proper names of relatives, places, and groups predominate over abstract concepts when heroes talk about their respective *οἶκοι*. Wives, sons, possessions, paternal fields, and houses all appear in these exchanges, often spoken of with longing and strong emotion, as befits warriors long removed from, or desperately defending, hearth and home. The critical social and economic role of the *οἶκος* has been acknowledged for some time, by Finley and others. Because of longstanding and relatively uncontroversial scholarship (I am not aware of anyone who denies the importance of the *οἶκος*), I have not dealt with the *οἶκος* at length in this dissertation. The *οἶκος* is, however, clearly central both to heroic identity and social formation in the world portrayed in the epics.

By contrast, more distant relatives are mentioned far less often, and usually serve one of two purposes. Relatives beyond those typically included within an

individual *οἶκος* are usually named either to establish status through the retelling of a noble lineage, or to garner support from those relatives (as is the case with the cousins Sarpedon and Glaukos). Although noble ancestry contributes to individual identity and enhances the position of the leader among the people he leads, other extra-*οἶκος* familial relationships are best seen as a "category" of people radiating out from the individual rather than a cohesive group or community. Accordingly, the term *γένος* almost always applies either to family within the *οἶκος*, to ennobling ancestors, or to important collateral relatives. Indeed, the epics seem to make the case of those who argue against the importance of kinship- or descent-based groups and institutions, either as functional social units or as the basis for a strictly ideological, "ethnic" community made up of an extensive group of people whose identity arises from belief in descent from a common ancestor.

Instead, the important functional and ideological communities in the epics are not kinship based, but are instead based on military/political contingents and territorial states. For the most part, *φῦλον*; *ἔθνος*, and *φρήτρη* designate military/political contingents united by common leadership. There is some evidence, however, in the epics that these temporary functional groups may reflect more permanent and deeply rooted communities. In the catalogues from *Iliad* Book II, both the underlying groups from which the contingents are drawn and the contingents themselves, are called *ἔθνεα*. Homer refers to humanity as a whole as "the *φῦλα* of men," while communities such as Rhodes are settled *καταφυλαδόν*, *φῦλον* by *φῦλον*. Similarly, someone ostracized from the *δῆμος* becomes *ἀφρήτωρ*, excluded of all *φρήτρη*-relationships. Examples of *φῦλον*; *ἔθνος*, and *φρήτρη* designating permanent social units are comparatively rare, and remain inconclusive. When, however, they are combined with the importance of leadership to heroic identity, the likelihood of Homeric society being divided into such groups increases. Just as *οἶκος*-relationships are more often invoked by proper names of close relatives, the prevalence of semi-permanent military/political contingents is supported by the frequency of leadership as a component of identity (expressed more often through verbs of leading or "generic" nouns like *ἀγός*, *ἀρχος*, or *ἡγεμών* than

"titles" like *βασιλεύς* or *ἄναξ*), both in face-to-face encounters and in third-person descriptions of heroes by the poet. The link between leadership in the epics and social units like the *φῦλον*; *ἔθνος*, and *φρήτρη* is not certain. Still, I believe that at least some of the exercise of leadership over men, which is so central to heroic identity, reflects rule over these social units rather than leadership over retainers affiliated with a single *οἶκος* on the one hand, or kingship over more extensive units such as the *γαῖα* or *δῆμος* on the other. As such I take *φῦλον*; *ἔθνος*, and *φρήτρη* to represent communities larger than the *οἶκος* but smaller than the *δῆμος* and, furthermore, to be constituent parts of the latter, with only the reservation that the *ἔθνος* may be coterminous with the *δῆμος*.

Δῆμος, unlike *ἔθνος*, designates the territory of the community as well as its people, and is used in the context of a much broader range of public or political activities. *Γαῖα* also denotes territory and sometimes substitutes for *δῆμος* in a political context, but it invokes only and specifically the land, never the people living on it. In this sense, perhaps, the *δῆμος* is the combination of the *ἔθνος* and the *γαῖα*, the totality of land and people that constitutes the Homeric community. The partial overlap in meaning of *δῆμος* and *γαῖα* (in both territorial and political contexts), along with the fact that references to the *γαῖα* are much more common than to social units based, like the *ἔθνος*, exclusively on people, emphasizes the territorial aspects of the community represented by the term *δῆμος*. The significance of this community, moreover, cannot be overstated. Whereas the precise role and importance of the *φῦλον*; *ἔθνος*, or *φρήτρη* require speculation, that of the *δῆμος* is clear. The *δῆμος* is one's own community; that which is foreign and other starts at its border. Lawbreakers are exiled from the *δῆμος*. The *δῆμος* must pay public debts. The principal political community, with the *βασιλεύς* at its head, is embodied by the term. The *δῆμος* serves as the principal social and political unit larger than the *οἶκος*, and includes both the territory of the state and its people.

At the highest level of social organization in the epics lie the Achaians as a whole. Although there is little evidence beyond the religious sphere for any functional Panhellenism in the Greek world, the Achaians are construed as a cohesive social and

political community in Homer. Politically, this unity is manifested through common allegiance to Agamemnon and participation in a collective effort to avenge the wrong done to Menelaos. Territorially, all Achaians are thought to share a single, defined homeland. Such unity is certainly a translation of ideological beliefs into the political sphere within the epics. At the same time, the political unity of the Achaians in the *Iliad* is but one reflection of the fact that all Achaians are somehow united. The Achaians as a whole are once called a *γένος*, at another time an *ἔθνος*, and are frequently referred to as sharing a single *γαῖα*. Unlike the Trojans and their allies, no linguistic variation among the Achaians is admitted. Finally, although the Trojans are always kept distinct from their allies, and different allied contingents from one another, all of the "Greeks" in Homer are included in the terms Achaian, Danaan, and Argive. In other words, the poet is clearly capable of consistently and unfailingly discriminating among distinct groups of people such as Trojans, Lykians, and Thracians, but sees no need to do so among any of the internal divisions of Achaians. The Achaians in Homer belong to individual *οἶκοι*, separate military contingents, *φῦλα*; *ἔθνεα*, and *φρήτραι*, and distinct "states," the *γαῖα* or *δῆμος*, but all are still conceived of as Achaians, even if their political unity is a poetic fiction. This fiction also serves to highlight the tension between real and imagined communities; Greeks of the Archaic era certainly derived their identities in part from functional social groups, but the projection of political unity onto Panhellenic ideology reminds us not to correlate such groups with conceptual categories of identity without appropriate caution.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alty J. "Dorians and Ionians." *Journal of Hellenic Studies* CII (1982): 1-14.

Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. Second Edition. New York: Verso, 1991.

Anderson, J. K. "The Geometric Catalogue of Ships. In *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Vermeule*, edited by J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, 181-92. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995.

Andrews, A. "Phratries in Homer." *Hermes* 89.2 (May 1961): 129-40.

Autenrieth, Georg. *A Homeric Dictionary*. Translated by Robert P. Keep. Revised by Isaac Flagg. Norman: University of Oklahoma Press, 1958.

Bonfante, G. "La nazionalità dei Troiani e dei loro alleati." *Indogermanische Forschungen* 100 (1995): 135-36.

Bourriot, F. *Recherches sur la nature du Génos: étude d'histoire sociale athénienne, périodes archaïque et classique*. Paris: Université de Lille, 1976.

Bryce, T. R. "Pandaros, A Lycian at Troy." *American Journal of Philology* 98.3 (1977): 213-218.

Buckler, John. Review of *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis* by Jeremy McInerney. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2000.11.29. http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2000/2000-11-29.html (18 May 2001).

Cabanes, Pierre. "Cité et *ethnos* dans la Grèce ancienne." In *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*, edited by Marie-Madeleine Mactoux and Evelyn Geny, 63-82. Paris: Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besancon, 1999.

Carlisle, Miriam, and Olga Levaniouk, editors. *Nine Essays on Homer*. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.

Carter, J. B. and S. P. Morris, editors. *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Vermeule*. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995.

Cartledge, Paul. *The Greeks: A Portrait of Self and Others*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

Cook, Erwin F. *The* Odyssey *in Athens: Myths of Cultural Origins*. Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1995.

Crane, Gregory R., editor. *The Perseus Project*. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu (18 May 2001).

Crielaard, Jan Paul. "Homer, History, and Archaeology." In *Homeric Questions* edited by Jan Paul Crielaard, 201-88. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1995.

Crielaard, Jan Paul, editor. *Homeric Questions: Essays in Philology, Ancient History and Archaeology*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, Publisher, 1995.

Donlan, Walter. *The Aristocratic Ideal in Ancient Greece: Attitudes of Superiority from Homer to the End of the Fifth Century BC*. Lawrence, Kansas: Coronado Press, 1980.

Donlan, Walter. "The Pre-state Community in Greece." *Symbolae Osloenses* LXIV (1989): 5-29.

Donlan, Walter. "The Social Groups of Dark Age Greece." *Classical Phiology* 80 (1985): 293-308.

Donlan, Walter. "The Unequal Exchange between Glaucus and Diomedes in Light of the Homeric Gift-Economy." *Phoenix* XLIII.1 (Spring 1989): 1-15.

Donlan, Walter, and Carol Thomas. "The Village Community of Ancient Greece." *Studi micenei ed egeo-anatolici* 31 (1993): 61-71.

Drews, Robert. "Argos and the Argives in the *Iliad*." *Classical Philology* 74.2 (April 1979): 111-135.

Edwards, Mark W. 1991. *See* Kirk, G. S, editor. Volume V. 1991.

Emlyn-Jones, C., L. Hardwick, and J. Purkis, editors. *Homer: Readings and Images*. London: Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1992.

Evelyn-White, H. G. *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns, and Homerica*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1914; reprint 1964.

Finley, M. I. *Early Greece, the Bronze and Archaic Ages*. London: Chatto and Windus, 1981.

Finley, M. I. "The Trojan War." In *Homer: Readings and Images*, edited by C. Emlyn-Jones, L. Hardwick, and J. Purkis, 105-116. London: Duckworth & Co. Ltd., 1992.

Finley, M. I. *The World of Odysseus*. Second edition. London: Penguin Books, 1978.

Fisher, Nick, and Hans van Wees, editors. *Archaic Greece : New Approaches and New Evidence*. London: Duckworth, 1998.

Gates, Henry Phelps. *The Kinship Terminology of Homeric Greek*. Bloomington: Indiana University Publications in Anthropology and Linguistics, 1971.

Griffin, J. *Homer on Life and Death*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1980.

Hagg, Robin, editor. *The Greek Renaissance of the Eighth Century BC: Tradition and Innovation*. Stockholm: Svenska Institutet I Athen, 1983.

Hainsworth, Byran. 1993. *See* Kirk, G. S, editor. Volume III. 1993.

Hall, Edith. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy.* New York: Oxford University Press, 1989.

Hall, Jonathan M. *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 1997.

Hartog, Francois. *The Mirror of Herodotus: the Representation of the Other in the Writing of History.* Translated by Janet Lloyd. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1988.

Haubold, Johannes. *Homer's People: Epic Poetry and Social Formation.* New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000.

Hesiod et. al. *Hesiod, The Homeric Hymns, and Homerica.* Translated by Hugh G. Evelyn-White. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Hesiod. *Theogony* and *Works and Days.* Translated by M. L. West. New York: Oxford University Press, 1988.

Heubeck, Alfred, Stephanie West, and J. B. Hainsworth. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume I: Introduction and Books I-VIII.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Heubeck, Alfred, and Arie Hoekstra. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume II: Books IX-XVI.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1989.

Heubeck, Alfred, Manuel Fernández-Galiano, and Joseph Russo. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey Volume III: Books XVII-XXIV.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Homer. *Iliad: Books 1-12.* Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by William F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Homer. *Iliad: Books 13-24.* Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by William F. Wyatt. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1999.

Homer. *Odyssey: Books 1-12.* Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995; reprint with corrections 1998.

Homer. *Odyssey: Books 13-24.* Translated by A. T. Murray. Revised by George E. Dimock. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1995; reprint with corrections 1998.

Hope Simpson, R., and J. F. Lazenby. *The Catalogue of the Ships in Homer's Iliad.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1970.

Hornblower, S. *A Commentary on Thucydides Volume I: Books 1-3.* Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1991.

Humphreys, S. C. *Anthropology and the Greeks*. Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1978.

Janko, Richard. 1992. *See* Kirk, G. S, editor. Volume IV. 1992.

Kirk, G. S., editor. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume I: Books 1-4*, by G. S. Kirk. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1985.

Kirk, G. S., editor. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume II: Books 5-8*, by G. S. Kirk. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990.

Kirk, G. S., editor. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume III: Books 9-12*, by Bryan Hainsworth. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Kirk, G. S., editor. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume IV: Books 13-16*, by Richard Janko. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1992.

Kirk, G. S., editor. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume V: Books 17-20*, by Mark W. Edwards. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Kirk, G. S., editor. *The Iliad: A Commentary. Volume VI: Books 21-24*, by Nicholas Richardson. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1993.

Kirk, G. S. *The Songs of Homer*. New York: Cambridge University Press, 1962.

Konstan, David. "Defining Ancient Greek Ethnicity." *Diaspora* 6.1 (Spring, 1997): 97-110.

Kouklanakis, Andrea. "Thersites, Odysseus, and the Social Order." In *Nine Essays on Homer*, edited by Miriam Carlisle and Olga Levaniouk, 35-53. New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1999.

Latacz, J., ed. *Zweihundert Jahre Homer-Forschung*. Stuttgart: B.G. Teubner, 1991.

Lattimore, Richard. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1961.

Liddell, Henry George, and Robert Scott. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. Revised and augmented throughout by Sir Henry Stuart Jones with the assistance of. Roderick McKenzie. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1940. Accessed through Gregory R.Crane, editor. *The Perseus Project*. http://www.perseus.tufts.edu (18 May 2001).

Loptson, Peter. "Pelasgikon Argos in the Catalogue of Ships (681)." *Mnemosyne* XXXIV fascimile 1-2 (1981): 136-38.

Lowry, Eddie R. Jr. "Glaucus, the Leaves, and the Heroic Boast of *Iliad* 6.146-211." In *The Ages of Homer: A Tribute to Emily Vermeule*, edited by J. B. Carter and S. P. Morris, 193-204. Austin: University of Texas Press, 1995.

Luce, J. V. "The *Polis* in Homer and Hesiod." *Proceedings of the Royal Irish Academy*, Section C, 78.1 (1978): 1-15.

Machacek, Gregory. "The Occasional Contextual Appropriateness of Formulaic Diction in the Homeric Poems." *American Journal of Philology* 115.3 (Fall 1994): 321-36.

Mackie, Hilary. *Talking Trojan: Speech and Community in the Iliad.* New York: Rowman & Littlefield Publishers, Inc., 1996.

Mactoux, Marie-Madeleine and Evelyn Geny, editors. *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque.* Paris: Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besancon, 1999.

Malkin, Irad. *The Returns of Odysseus: Colonization and Ethnicity.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998.

McInerney, Jeremy. *The Folds of Parnassos: Land and Ethnicity in Ancient Phokis.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1999.

McGlew, James F. "Royal Power and the Achaean Assembly at *Iliad* 2.84-393." *Classical Antiquity* 8.2 (October 1989): 283-95.

Mitchell, Lynette G. and P. J. Rhodes, editors. *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece.* New York: Routledge, 1997.

Morgan, C. "Ethnicity and Early Greek States: Historical and Material Perspectives." *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Society* 37 (1991): 131-63.

Morris, Ian. "The Early Polis as City and State." In *City and country in the Ancient World*, edited by J. Rich and A. Wallace-Hadrill, 25-57. London: New York : Routledge, 1991.

Morris, Ian. "The Use and Abuse of Homer." *Classical Antiquity* 5 (1986): 81-138.

Morris, Ian, and Barry Powel, editors. *A New Companion to Homer.* New York: Brill, 1997.

Nagy, Gregory. *Greek Mythology and Poetics.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Nagy, Gregory. *Homeric Questions.* Austin: University of Texas Press, 1996.

Ong, Walter. *Orality and Literacy: The Technologizing of the World.* London: New York : Routledge, 1991.

Page, D. L. *History and the Homeric Iliad.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1959.

Perlman, Paula. "One Hundred-Citied Crete and the 'Cretan *Πολιτεία*.'" *Classical Philology* 87.3 (July 1992): 193-205.

Pinsent, J., and H. V. Hunt, editors. *Homer 1987: Ppapers of the Third Greenbank Colloquium.* Liverpool, England: Liverpool Classical Monthly, 1992.

Polignac, Francois de. *Cults, Teritory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1995.

Powell, Barry B. "Word Patterns in the Catalogue of Ships (B 494-709): A Structural Analysis of Homeric Language." *Hermes* 106.2 (1978): 255-64.

Qviller, Bjørn. "The Dynamics of the Homeric Society." *Symbolae Osloenses* LVI (1981): 109-55.

Raubitschek, Anthony. "What the Greeks Thought of their Early History." *Anient World* XX (1989): 39-45.

Reece, Steve. "The Cretan Odyssey: A Lie Truer than Truth." *American Journal of Philology* 115.2 (Summer 1994): 157.

Rich, J. and A. Wallace-Hadrill, editors. *City and country in the Ancient World.* London: New York : Routledge, 1991.

Richardson, Nicholas. 1993. *See* Kirk, G. S, editor. Volume VI. 1993.

Rihll, T. E. "The Power of the Homeric *βασιλεῖς*." In *Homer 1987: Papers of the Third Greenbank Colloquium*, edited by J. Pinsent and H. V. Hurt, 39-50. Liverpool: Liverpool Classical Monthly, 1987.

Roussel, D. *Tribu et Cité: études sur les groupes sociaux dans les cités grecques aux époques archaïque et classique.* Paris: Les Belles lettres, 1976.

Runciman, W. G. "Origins of States: The Case of Archaic Greece." *Comparative Studies in Society and History* XXIV.3 (1982): 351-377.

Sakellariou, M. V. *The Polis-State: Definition and Origin. ΜΕΛΕΤΗΜΑΤΑ* 4. Athens: Research Center for Greek and Roman Antiquity, National Hellenic Research Foundation, 1989.

Scully, Stephen. *Homer and the Sacred City.* Ithaca, New York: Cornell University Press, 1990.

Scully, Stephen. "The Polis in Homer." *Ramus* 10 (1981): 1-34.

Smith, Anthony D. "Ethnic Election and Cultural Identity." *Ethnic Groups* 10 (1993): 9-26.

Snodgrass, Anthony. *Archaeology and the Rise of the Greek State.* Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 1977.

Snodgrass, Anthony M. *Archaic Greece: The Age of Experiment.* Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.

Snodgrass, Anthony M. *The Dark Age of Greece: An Archaeological Survey of the Eleventh to the Eighth Centuries BC.* New York: Routledge, 1971.

Snodgrass, Anthony M. "An Historical Homeric Society?" *The Journal of Hellenic Studies* XCIV (1974): 114-25.

Strasburger, Hermann. The Sociology of the Homeric Epics. In *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*, edited by G. M. Wright and P. V. Jones, 47-70. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. CD-ROM. University of California, Irvine, 2000.

Thomas, Carol. "Monarchy in Ruins." *Aegaeum* 20 (1999): 827-32.

Trundle, Matthew F. "Identity and Community among Greek Mercenaries in the Classical World: 700-322 BCE." The Ancient History Bulletin XIII.1 (January-March 1999): 28-38.

van der Valk, M. "Homer's Nationalism, Again." *Mnemosyne* XXXVIII (1985): 373-76.

van Wees, Hans. *Status Warriors: War, Violence and Society in Homer and History*. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 1992.

Vansina, J. *Oral Tradition as History*. Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1985.

Vidal-Naquet, P. "Land and Sacrifice in the *Odyssey*: A Study of Religious and Mythical Meanings." In *The Black Hunter: Forms of Thought and Forms of Society in the Greek World*, edited by Seth L. Schein, 15-38. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1986.

Welskopf, Elisabeth Charlotte. "Die Bezeichnungen *λαός, δῆμοσ, ὅμιλοσ, πληθύς, ἔθνος* in den Homerischen Epen." In *Untersuchungen ausgewählter altgriechischer sozialer Typenbegriffe*, 163-92. Berlin: Akademie-Verlag, 1981.

West, M. L. *Greek Lyric Poetry*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1993.

West, M. L. *Iambe et Elegi Graici ante Alexandrum Cantati*. Special Edition (Volumes I & II combined). New York: Oxford University Press, 1998.

Willcock, M. M. *A Commentary on Homer's Iliad: Books I-VI*. New York: MacMillan and Co. Ltd., 1970.

Wright, G. M. and P. V. Jones, editors. *Homer: German Scholarship in Translation*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997.

VITA

Shawn Ross was born in Salem, Oregon, and grew up in the rural Willamette Valley south of Portland. In 1993 he earned a Bachelor of Arts in History from Whitman College in Walla Walla, Washington, before continuing on to earn a Master of Arts in History from the University of Washington in 1996. In 2001 he earned a Doctor of Philosophy at the University of Washing in History.